



Journal of East-Asian Urban History, Vol. 2 No. 1, June 2020. pp. 87-111
<https://doi.org/10.22769/JEUH.2020.2.1.87>

Original Article

The Dilemma of Cultural Propaganda and Academic Research: New historical drama “Hai Rui’s Dismissal” in Shanghai

Zhang Sheng

History Institute of Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences, China, Associate Professor

E-mail: zhangsheng@sass.org.cn

(Received 24 Jan 2020 : Accepted 30 Apr 2020)

ABSTRACT

Since 1949, The first generation leader MAO zedong liked reading history books and historical biography, It led to criticism and evaluation of history and character be targeted in every movement, before the *February Outline(er yue ti gang)* had been revoked, the Shanghai society discussed “*Hai Rui’s Dismissal*” “basically” within the “learning and using Chairman MAO’s works(huo xue huo yong mao zhu xi zhu zuo)” category, with the deterioration of the national political situation, based on the historical drama “*Hai Rui’s Dismissal*” discussions, the dilemma of cultural propaganda and academic research appeared.

Key Words: *Hai Rui’s Dismissal*, Shanghai, historical drama, Cultural Propaganda, Academic Research, Mao zedong

I . Introduction

In January 1961, Wu Han published the script “*Hai Rui’s Dismissal*” in *Journal of Beijing Literature and Arts*. On November 10, 1965, under the arrangement of the Jiang Qing, Yao Wenyuan posted the *Review of New Historical Drama Hai Rui’s Dismissal* in *Wen Hui* Newspaper, the review negated Wu’s creation intention directly, named “*Hai Rui’s Dismissal*” as a poisonous weed. All provinces propaganda, culture, education and scientific research departments began to discuss “*Hai Rui’s Dismissal*”. On February 12, 1966, Peng Zhen and the Communist Party’s Propaganda department agreed and distributed the *February Outline*. In April, 1966, MAO Zedong modified the “*revocation of < the report outline of five people team of cultural revolution about the current academic discussion > notification*” many times, the notice draft was officially named as the Notice of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China. It was passed in the meeting of the enlarged central committee of the Communist Party of China on May 16, 1966. As we all know, the 5.16 Notice in Modern China History.¹⁾

Such a political movement, initiated by the top, began in Shanghai, in the name of the propaganda and academic discussion, with the influence of China’s political activities in the 1960s. Did it have great influence on all social status in the new China Shanghai city? How did the people in Shanghai discuss the new historical drama “*Hai Rui’s Dismissal*”? This is the purpose of this paper.

1. Revision of the draft of the notice on discussing the issue of *Hai Rui’s dismissal* by Shanghai Municipal Party Committee

Shanghai Municipal Party Committee issued a notice “about discussing *Hai Rui’s Dismissal*” problem on January 6, 1966, the notification drafted by the Propaganda Department of Municipal Party Committee in December 27, 1965. There was a theme sentence²⁾ “sharp class struggle in ideological sphere” in the draft. Besides that sentence, the notice was more qualified as an updated version movement of “learning and using Chairman MAO’s work”.

The draft called, we should make full use of Chairman Mao’s works, and view history, reality and everything from the perspectives of class struggle and historical materialism. Break through

1) For relevant research on Hai Rui, please refer to Shen Qi: a review of the history of Hai Rui research, Vol. 4 of Hainan history and culture, edited by Yan Guanglin, social sciences literature press, 2014 edition.

2) Learning notice on discussion of “Hai Rui’s dismissal” (Draft), A22-1-939, Shanghai archives collection.

the shackles of the old ideas and traditions, and establish the proletarian world further more.³⁾ The draft also specified the scope and content of study. The first step was to study among the main party and government leaders and some propaganda, literature and art, and education Cadres in the party. The director of the Municipal Party Committee and District Committee and some propaganda, education, and health cadres at the higher level was about 816 person, the branch secretary or above of the propaganda system branch, the staff member or above, the screenwriter, director, professional writer, and editor was about 531 person. The director and deputy director in higher education system including some teachers of politics, literature and history from middle school was about 2750 person, the total amount was 4062 person.⁴⁾ The study focused on five problems: “class struggle is the driving force of social development; state and revolution; moral inheritance; critical of historical heritage; evaluation of historical figures.”.

In the formal notice issued by Shanghai Municipal Party Committee, the reading materials were basically unchanged. After the adjustment by Yang Yongzhi, Minister of Propaganda Department, the text of the notice changed a lot.

First, the original title “notice on the discussion and study of criticizing the dismissal of Hai Rui” was once deleted to “notice on the discussion of the dismissal of Hai Rui”. The “struggle to promote proletarian ideology in the field of ideology and eliminate bourgeois ideology” in the printed version of the text was also deleted as “based on the policy of hundred schools of thought”. The title and intention were close to peaceful academic discussion, but some radical words were still retained, such as “Now, there is a discussion on the issue of the new historical play” *Hai Rui’s dismissal* “in the press. This discussion is not only about a evaluation of the play, but also about the new development of class struggle in the field of ideology over the years.” About the several tasks that should be speeded up in Shanghai, the notice put forward in particular: “to launch a full debate in the press, we should let go of the participation of relevant personnel in the fields of historiography, literature and art, philosophy, education, etc., put facts in order, reason and carry out a hundred schools of thought to contend. If problems are not properly resolved, they will never stop.”

Second, the scope and specific contents of the study had been deleted, and the contents and methods of the study have been briefly changed to “the contents of the study are centered on the issues discussed in the newspapers and magazines, learning the relevant works of Comrade Mao Zedong, and referring to the relevant works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, as well as the

3) Learning notice on discussion of “Hai Rui’s dismissal” (Draft), A22-1-939.

4) Learning notice on discussion of “Hai Rui’s dismissal” (Draft), A22-1-939.

important articles in the newspapers and magazines; the methods of study are mainly self-study, and reading the relevant documents and materials carefully. The main leaders of party and government of cities, districts, counties and units may read fewer documents, and the number of discussions may be arranged by the units themselves. Cadres of the cultural and educational system should read more documents and discuss them carefully.”⁵⁾

The 4th item of the notice also emphasized that “non party research, teaching staff shall be organized to study and discuss. In all kinds of discussions and symposiums, whether within the party, outside the party or within and outside the party, we should adhere to the policy of letting a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend, so that everyone can speak freely, debate fully and distinguish right from wrong.”⁶⁾

The notice listed a number of reading materials. The first part was mainly the chapters in the selected works of Mao Zedong, including the first to seventh sections of *The investigation report on Hunan peasant movement*, the section of “learning” in *The position of the Communist Party of China in the national war*, the section of “Ancient feudal society” in the second section of the Chinese revolution and the Communist Party of China, and the section of “National” in the 15th section of the new democratic theory Scientific mass culture “, section I and Section VIII of “on *The correct handling of contradictions among the people*”, as well as “*Transforming our study*”, “*The speech at Yan’an Literature and Art Symposium*”, “*About the people’s democratic dictatorship*”, “*Getting rid of illusions and preparing for struggle*”, in addition to Section VI of “*On the cultivation of Communist Party members*” of Liu Shaoqi, “Party members’ personal interests serve unconditionally” From the party’s interests “and the seventh section” examples of various erroneous ideologies in the party “, there are two paragraphs about moral issues, as well as” *About the state* “and” *The task of the Youth League* “in the complete works of Lenin. The second part is Yao Wenyuan’s” *Review of the new historical play “Hai Rui strikes*”, Qi Benyu’s “*Study of history for revolution*”, Fang Qiu’s “*What kind of social trend does Hai Rui strikes*” represent. The third part is Wu Han’s raw materials on Hai Rui’s problems. The articles “*Hai Rui scolds the emperor*”, “*On Hai Rui*”, “*Hai Rui strikes*”(historical drama), “*Self Criticism on Hai Rui strikes*”

In particular, the reference listed that “in Chairman Mao’s works and some classic marxism books, quotations on class struggle, state theory, morality, cultural heritage, evaluation of historical figures

5) Notice of the Publicity Department of Shanghai Municipal Committee of the Communist Party of China on the discussion of “Hai Rui’s dismissal”, A22-1-939.

6) Notice of the Publicity Department of Shanghai Municipal Committee of the Communist Party of China on the discussion of “Hai Rui’s dismissal”, A22-1-939.

and other issues” were also included in the study. However, some current affairs materials in the draft, such as Peng Zhen’s speech *At the Modern Peking Opera viewing performance conference*, Ke Qingshi’s *Vigorously developing and prospering socialist drama, better serving the economic foundation of socialism*, and Chen Boda’s articles published in the *Red Flag* magazine of *Critical inheritance and new exploration*, had been deleted.

From the perspective of Shanghai Municipal Party committee’s notice, Shanghai’s discussion on the issue of “*Hai Rui’s dismissal*” was limited to the party members’ and the masses’ learning of Mao Zedong Thought. From the perspective of reference books, although the book list includes many aspects of Mao Zedong’s works, it was not closely related to the following “current affairs materials”. It showed that in the early stage of the discussion of “*Hai Rui’s dismissal*”, Shanghai could not understand the intention of Central Committee, it can only be understood as a new learning movement from the inertial thinking.

From January 4, 1966 to April 20, 1966, the office of Propaganda Department of Shanghai Municipal Party Committee compiled and published 25 brief reports on the discussion of historical plays, even twice one day. These briefs were mainly discussions in Shanghai’s cultural, educational, publicity, publishing and scientific research institutions, and the text was mainly the conversation of the person concerned.

2. Discussion on the new historical play by the cadres of district level

The notice of Shanghai municipal Party committee required that “first of all, we should do a good job in the study of cadres above the department heads (directly subordinate section chiefs) and leaders of the party and government in the cultural system. Every Saturday morning, the departments and directors concentrate on the study of the District Committee, and the cadres of the cultural and educational system should also focus on discussion several times in a certain period of time. The learning requirements of general cadres can be lower than those of the above objects, and the documents can be a little less.”⁷⁾ The implementation of the notice by the district Party Committee in Shanghai is quite different.

“In 12 days, Comrade Li Zhipu, Secretary of the CPC Hongkou District Committee, carefully read nine books, including *The report on the investigation of Hunan movement*, *About the people’s democratic dictatorship*, *The Manifesto of the Communist Party*, and *About country*, and carefully

7) Notice of the Publicity Department of Shanghai Municipal Committee of the Communist Party of China on the discussion of “*Hai Rui’s dismissal*”, A22-1-939.

wrote more than 40 pages of notes. He made a speech at the learning meeting of the District Committee and was very popular. Zhang Zhutian, Secretary of Jing'an District Committee, Chen Yuan, Minister of education and health department, and so on, often study late into the night in order to solve a problem."⁸⁾ It looks like a propaganda caliber than really work.

For example, on January 29, 1966, Jing'an District Department and director general divided into three groups to discuss the issue of "*Hai Rui's dismissal*" for the first time. According to the minutes of the meeting, some comrades "checked that they did not have a strong sense of class struggle and did not care about or pay attention to the issue of " *Hai Rui's dismissal*. "Some comrades seriously said:" this is a matter for the academic and literary circles, or just a play. The evaluation of a character is not in line with us. Most people say that we "don't understand history, don't understand it, don't have any interest." They don't care, don't pay attention to, don't understand and don't have interest. This kind of similar words had appeared many times in other areas, such as Hongkou District, "some comrades review that they didn't care about this in the past. It has nothing to do with the current production. Some comrades in charge of the industrial sector originally felt that these articles were too long, too specific in content, and they didn't know much about history. At present, production is so tense, how can they have time to read them?"⁹⁾

They also complained that the time was not enough and materials were too much. "Now we need to read book version Jia, four theories, work and ideological problems, and discuss *Hai Rui's dismissal*. Some discussed it once or twice and changed it to intensive reading on *Practice theory*."¹⁰⁾

The discussion of "*Hai Rui's dismissal*" was not balanced in the study of Shanghai district level organs. A few units did not pay enough attention to the study. The office of the publicity department criticized that "the leading cadres of some units do not pay enough attention to the spirit of carrying out the policy of" hundred schools of thought contend "in the discussion; the leading cadres of some units mainly combine the discussion of " *Hai Rui's dismissal* "with the current study of the chairman's works notified by the municipal Party committee The opinions carried out have not been fully

8) On February 5, 1966, all departments and directors of Jing'an District first discussed the issue of "Hai Rui's dismissal", which was compiled and printed by the Propaganda Department of Shanghai Municipal Committee of the Communist Party of China: Reflection on the discussion of "Hai Rui's dismissal" (hereinafter referred to as "situation reflection") No. 10.

9) On February 11, 1966, leading cadres of all units discussed the issue of "Hai Rui's dismissal from office" preliminarily, the 11th issue of "situation reflection".

10) On February 11, 1966, the leading cadres of various units preliminarily discussed the issue of "Hai Rui's dismissal".

implemented.”¹¹⁾ Therefore, in the discussion of the practical learning of the cadres in the districts, the learning effect mostly depended on self-consciousness, and the negative attitude was mainstream.

On the evaluation of historical figures, there was no lack of serious thinking on the part of district cadres. For example, Xue Yinghui, the director of a trade union in a district, put forward that “historical views and class views should be unified, but how can they be unified when evaluating specific figures? If all historical figures use the class view, then only the leaders of the peasant revolution are good?” Zhou Deying, deputy secretary of the Communist Youth League, raised the issue of “unity of motivation and effect. In the past, most of the characters in history were representatives of the interests of the ruling class.”. In terms of subjective motivation, they all serve the interests of the class, but in terms of objective effect, they often do something beneficial to the people. For example, Hai Rui built Wusong River, Sui Yangdi opened canal, Qin Shihuang built great wall, etc¹²⁾

3. Attitude of cultural units

According to the arrangement of the municipal Party committee, all units of the Shanghai publicity and culture system had organized discussions one after another. The Publishing Bureau and the Culture Bureau gave great importance to the discussions, most of which were held once a week.

Peking Opera Academy, YueJu Academy, Shanghai Editorial Office, Shanghai Library, some research institutes of the Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences, etc. had been discussed more than ten times. Most units had also discussed five or six times, seven or eight times, but the situation was very unbalanced. For example, the number of discussions in music units affiliated to the cultural bureau was generally less than that in other units. In recent days, the chorus had been reorganizing its leadership, and no discussion had been organized. Among the units affiliated to the Publishing Bureau, the humanities branch and the culture publishing house had only discussed four times, and the Science and Technology Publishing House had only discussed two times.¹³⁾

However, most of the units in the cultural and educational system failed to take the lead in learning party members. “Reading books and reading materials are few, the party’s thinking is not very open, and leadership learning also lacks “capital” However, the issue of “*Hai Rui’s dismissal*” was well arranged by some units in combination with the study of Mao Zedong Anthology. For example, Beijing Theatre Opera School and other units all said under the pretext: “at present, the task

11) On February 11, 1966, the leading cadres of various units preliminarily discussed the issue of “Hai Rui’s dismissal”.

12) On February 11, 1966, the leading cadres of various units preliminarily discussed the issue of “Hai Rui’s dismissal”.

13) On February 11, 1966, the leading cadres of various units preliminarily discussed the issue of “Hai Rui’s dismissal”.

is heavy, the work is much, and the study is not in-depth. They are still lack of confidence.”¹⁴⁾

Gu Jizhi, editor of Shanghai Science and Technology Press, said: “the *dismissal of Hai Rui* is an academic issue, and now it has been improved. Yao Wenyan even denied the repair of Wusongjiang by Hai Rui, which can be solved by looking for historical documents In the intellectual circle, it seems that *Hai Rui's dismissal* has little influence, or it has some influence in the historical circle. Wu Han's self-cultivation is not enough. He reviewed it too quickly and wrote all the problems...”¹⁵⁾

According to the editors in the publishing house, this indiscriminate discussion would bring a lot of inconvenience to the work. On January 10, 1966, after the publication of Liu Hui's “*how to evaluate the Shi Kefa*” by *Wenhui* newspaper, Tan Zong ying, the editor of Zhonghua Book office, said: “there are not too many national heroes, but too few, and they should be increased. If *Shi Kefa* can not be called a national hero, who can be called a national hero in history?” According to the editors of Shanghai People's Publishing House and Shanghai Fine Arts Publishing House, “it's more and more difficult to confuse” national heroes “with” honest officials “The editors of Cihai Editorial Office were even more worried: “Cihai is going to modify again. If we can't get it right, we can't publish. It's too bad. There's nothing to publish any history book.”¹⁶⁾

Most of the staff in Shanghai Editorial Office of Zhonghua Book Company said that the issue of “honest officials” involves the evaluation of history, historical figures, and how to deal with the issue of critical inheritance of heritage. However, Lv Zhenbai, the senior editor, and Hu Daojing, the editor, seldom spoke, or only raised some historical materials, not the real issue discussion. In contrast, Comrade Li Junmin, the chief editor of Party membership, continued to adhere to the view that “honest officials” were the essence of the feudal era.¹⁷⁾ In Shanghai Peking Opera Theater, Zhou Xinfang talked with some party members and cadres of Peking Opera Theater: “we should see whether there is a class view of the proletariat, and combine the background of the times and historical development.” Luo Jinnan of the Peking Opera Theater insisted that “discussion should be to the right things, not to the right people. Don't give people big hats. How to promote drama movement is the focus of

14) On February 5, 1966, all units of the publicity system discussed the brief introduction of “Hai Rui's dismissal”.

15) On January 4, 1966, some non party people in the publishing system asked each other for articles and some reflections of Wu Han's “self-criticism”, the first issue of situation reflection.

16) On January 17, 1966, part of the staff of Cihai editorial office and other units reflected on how to evaluate the historical method, the fifth issue of situation reflection.

17) On January 27, 1966, the situation of “honest officials” discussed by Shanghai editorial office of Zhonghua Book Company, the sixth issue of “situation reflection”.

discussion.” These conscience discussions ensured the normal direction.¹⁸⁾

4. The reflection of the circle of literature and history

“*Hai Rui’s dismissal from office*” was a historical play. How did it reflect in the circle of literature and history? Basically speaking, before the February Outline was cancelled, some professors in the field of literature and history were still discussing the issue in a practical and realistic way.

From November 30 to December 28, 1965, *Wen Hui* newspaper published some articles of Shanghai intellectuals such as Cai Chenghe, Lin Bingyi, Zhangjiaju, Yu Bai, Hao Bingheng, which criticized Yao Wenyuan’s articles. Hao Bingheng said: “Yao Wenyuan’s talk about” *Hai Rui’s dismissal* “has even hit a few sticks in the history of Hai Rui, which is too much, too extreme.” Wei Jianyou said: “I don’t think it’s of great significance to hold the meeting on the eve of the lunar new year. Many people who attend the meeting don’t speak, some are late or leave early, and the content of those who speak is also general and boundless. It’s unnecessary for the meeting to be sorted out and published.¹⁹⁾

On January 27, 1966, Zhou Gucheng, who was interviewed by the Social Sciences Federation, said: “the most important thing in historical research is to rely on materials, first-hand materials. Wu Han and I are friends. I have a good sense of his criticism. He won’t be angry after reading it. If you criticize a man for what he has admitted, he will have no opinion; if you press on his head what he does not admit, it will make people sad.”²⁰⁾ Li Pingxin of East China Normal University was the most insightful one. From January to march of 1966, he published articles such as “*diffuse and light officials*”, “*on the historical evaluation method of*” *following officials*”, “*good officials*”, “*honest officials*”, “*on the standard of evaluating historical figures and the analysis and criticism of*” *following officials*” and “*honest officials*”. At a symposium, he put forward the concept of “*revolutionary utilitarianism*”, and profoundly summarized the discussion on “*Hai Rui’s dismissal*”:

In the current discussion, some people adopt a perfunctory attitude. They are not able to talk deeply when they are at the helm of the wind. This style of study is not good. It’s time for people to think. Now they are often informed today and have a meeting tomorrow. They don’t need to look at the materials. They don’t even have time to think about it. They are just ordered to have a meeting

18) On January 8, 1966, Hao Bingheng, Wei Jianyou, Li Pingxin and Jiang Xingyu reflected on the discussion of the current issue of “*Hai Rui’s dismissal from office*”, the third issue of “*situation reflection*”.

19) On January 8, 1966, Hao Bingheng, Wei Jianyou, Li Pingxin and Jiang Xingyu reflected on the current discussion of “*Hai Rui’s dismissal*”.

20) On January 27, 1966, some reflections of Zhou Gucheng, Shu Shishu, etc., the 7th issue of *situation reflection*.

and talk about their feelings at most. This kind of meeting is not good, and the effect will not be great. In the future, it's better to inform the meeting earlier and list the central topics for discussion so that everyone can be fully prepared. It is the need of revolutionary utilitarianism to discuss *Hai Rui's dismissal*, but we can't understand revolutionary utilitarianism too narrowly. In addition to the issue of contention, other academic issues should also be advocated for research, and Marxism doesn't fall from the sky. At present, the academic research is not deep enough, especially the lack of attention to historical data. The articles written are general, with only views and no materials. This tendency is very dangerous. Now there is a saying that Luo Ergang and Wu Han made mistakes because they read too much. This is a joke! Wouldn't it be better if you had a Marxist Leninist view and read more books? We should have a good discussion on the issue of contending and criticizing the inheritance of various schools of thought. We should not adopt the method of "one stick to death", which is also a metaphysics.²¹⁾

It was worth noting that Li Pingzhi's above-mentioned talks had not been adopted and reported. With the tense political atmosphere, this reasonable speech had been abandoned.

5. A discussion comparison between the youth and the workers with peasants

In the early 1960s, the activity of learning and using Chairman Mao's works in an active way promoted by the army was in the ascendant in the society. In the face of the historical play discussion task of "*Hai Rui's dismissal*" arranged by Shanghai municipal Party committee, on January 13, 1966, Shanghai Youth Palace arranged and organized more than ten trainees from the first and second workshops on Chairman Mao's works to discuss "*Hai Rui's dismissal*". According to the archives, the participants were generally the backbones who have learned well in the first or two classes. Most of them are League Organization officers and propaganda and education section officers in shops, factories and streets. Most of them were promoted to full-time cadres of the grassroots League Committee and general branch after the "four Qing" movement. Compared with the silence in the academic circle and the cautious words of the organs, the discussion of these young people in the learning class could be called "newborn calf".

According to the minutes of the meeting, the young people seriously discussed the following questions: "what is the meaning of" clean official "? If there is no clean government, how to affirm the role in history. In history, there is no clean government, is there any progressive force? What

21) On January 8, 1966, Hao minheng, Wei Jianyou, Li Pingxin and Jiang Xingyu reflected on the current discussion of "*Hai Rui's dismissal*".

standard should historical figures use? What is the driving force of social development?" These young people had seriously discussed what the essence of "honest officials" was, and their speeches were sincere and childish:

Zhao Chengbao, director of the Propaganda Department of the Political Department of the fifth printing and dyeing factory, raised a question and said: "Wu Han described Hai Rui as the people with all his heart, which is a distortion of the facts. But someone in the factory asked that Yao Wenyuan's denial of both honest and corrupt officials is too one-sided. Is this not the denial of all that Wen Tianxiang, Yue Fei and Qin Shihuang have already affirmed?"

After asking questions, the venue was very active, and it was difficult for everyone to answer this question.

Wu Zhongwei asked: "Empress Dowager Cixi chose the summer palace. Now we can also use it. We have to be sure about that, but she is not a good person. How do you comment?"

Dou Jiahua thought that "like the first emperor of Qin Dynasty unifying China and unifying weights and measures, it should be affirmed. But the first emperor of Qin is a tyrant, and the Sui Yang emperor who opened the canal is a faint emperor. How can he be sure?"

Nie Zuyi (Deputy Secretary of the general group branch of clothing, shoes and hats company) replied, "this is done by the people and the credit of the working people." Zhao Chengbao asked, "the order is from the first emperor of Qin, and the way is what he thought?"

In his speech, Chen said: "if we want to use class analysis to see historical figures, we should affirm them when they have promoted the development of production." Niezuyi asked, "as you say, with the development of science and technology in the United States now, satellites and spacecraft have been launched into the sky. Do you want to be sure of the American imperialism?" Chen Yuebao (general branch of zhongbaiyidian group) asked Wu Zhongwei, "what standard do you use when you speak like this?" Wu Zhongwei replied, "of course, it's the standards of the past, not the current situation." "Judging from the standards at that time, we should promote the social development forward at least, for example, farmers want to get land, which is the demand of farmers at that time," Dou Jiahua said. It's just a historical point of view. Chen also said: "we should use Chairman Mao's position and viewpoint to see problems, and we should also use the method of class analysis for historical figures..." Before he finished, Zhao Chengbao said, "what if there was no Marxist Leninist theory of class struggle? China's feudal society has been delayed for so long because the peasants do not understand class struggle."

At the end of the meeting, the minutes had to sum up truthfully : "as a result of the debate, we felt that" honest officials "and the historical role that should be affirmed were two different things, but we felt that the relationship between them was unclear. It was felt that there was no Marxism

Leninism at that time, and it was a bit contradictory to use the method of class analysis to look at historical figures. At the end of the discussion, there is still no solution to how to unify the views of class and history.” It seems that the discussion among young people is very heated. Due to the lack of support of academic training, they can only draw simple conclusions from simple logic, or even no conclusions at all.

On April 6, 1966, the *February outline* had been criticized. The Propaganda Department of Shanghai Municipal Committee of the Communist Party of China and the Propaganda Department of Shanghai Federation of trade unions jointly organized a symposium to criticize “Hai Rui scolds the emperor” and “*Hai Rui’s Dismissal*”. There were 12 old workers who had participated in the revolutionary struggle and 12 activists who actively studied and used Chairman Mao’s works. Due to the need of propaganda and Editing Manuscripts, Pan Zinian, Wu Chuanqi and Qi Benyu from *Hongqi, Academic Monthly and Philosophy Research* also attended the symposium. The workers who attended the symposium were all the model workers who emerged in Shanghai in the past 17 years, and some of them also emerged in Shanghai. Under the inertia of thinking bitterly and thinking sweetly and the arrangement of the municipal Party committee, “all the workers and comrades present at the meeting were very angry, and with strong class hatred, accused one after another that” Hai Rui scolds the emperor “and” *Hai Rui’s Dismissal* “were poisonous weeds, he scolded the emperor for being false, and scolded the party and our beloved leaders for being true.”

6. Changed in Academic Journal

At the beginning of the discussion of “*Hai Rui’s dismissal*”, in line with the attitude of academic seriousness, on November 10, 1965, the editorial department of *Academic Monthly, People’s Daily, Wen Hui* editor office and East China Normal University sent people to Songjiang to investigate, collected historical data and conducted field investigation. After that, in January 1966, through the joint study and decision of the Party committee and the county committee of the working group of the municipal Party committee in Songjiang socialist education movement , the “Hai Rui investigation group on the dismissal of officials” was composed of the person in charge of the culture, education and health group of the working group, which carried out the investigation, wrote the article and put it into academic discussion. The main contents of the survey were “*the construction of Wusongjiang River by Hai Rui*”, “*the retreat of land by Xu Jie*” and “*Hai Rui Temple*”. The group had successively verified Xu Jie’s former site in Songjiang; collected the land relationship data of Ming Dynasty at the foot of Hengshan Mountain of Tianma commune; visited the Hairui ancestral temples in Songjiang, Qingpu, Jiading, Jiashan and other places, collected folk legends, and made a special trip from laozhaqiao to Huangdu, along Baimao River to Changshu to explore the ruins of Wusong River built

by Hairui. At last, they wrote some critical manuscripts, such as “bullying the world, stealing the fame, Qu the country and the official”, “preventing the change of the people is more than preventing the Sichuan”, “who lives in the Buddha and burns the incense”. However, the debate on the issue of “dismissing officials” quickly developed into a critical movement in the field of politics and literature and art. All units stopped the investigation of “*Hai Rui’s dismissal*”, and the manuscript was not published.²²⁾

From November 1965 to February 1966, the editors of *Academic Monthly* received 66 articles, 30 of which were from Shanghai, 36 out of Shanghai, 41 of which were related to the dismissal and the evaluation of Hai Rui, 18 of which were related to “honest officials” and 7 of which were related to “concession policy”. Among them, in March 1966, the Academic Monthly published “farmers refuting *Hai Rui’s dismissal* from office in Songjiang County - Summary of the Symposium of some poor and lower middle peasants and cadres in the east city commune of Songjiang County”, which was a special non discussion and non description manuscript. The editorial department’s preliminary review opinion had to say: “in view of Wu Han’s argument, let the farmers talk about his opinion on the dismissal. This topic is very good, The author also took some time. But there are still shortcomings in writing. The article is lengthy and the materials are not clear. It is neither like a paper, nor a survey report, nor a summary of a discussion.”²³⁾

II . Conclusion

In the discussion of “*Hai Rui’s dismissal*”. The differences between Shanghai and other provinces and cities in China were as follows: first, the historical governor of Hai Rui to Nanzhili, with the government office in Suzhou; the drama scene of *Hai Rui’s dismissal* compiled by Wu Han was set in Huating, which belongs to Songjiang District of Shanghai after the founding of the people’s Republic of China. Second, as early as before the performance of “*Hai Rui’s Dismissal*”, Shanghai Peking Opera House had rehearsed the play of “Hai Rui submitted”. Therefore, the historical plays discussed

22) Songjiang County annals, compiled by Songjiang County Local History Compilation Committee, Shanghai People’s publishing house, 1991 edition, page 1189.

23) Songjiang farmers refute the original manuscript of “Hai Rui’s dismissal from office”, academic monthly, issue 3, 1966, C43-2-286-189

in the same period were not limited to Wu Han's "Hai Rui strikes", but also involve a number of plays such as "Hai Rui submitted" of Shanghai Peking Opera House and "Xie yaohuan" of Tian han. Generally speaking, although Shanghai was the origin of the incident of "*Hai Rui's dismissal*", before the abolition of "February Outline", the atmosphere of most of the seminars in Shanghai was relatively relaxed. Even in the meeting of the drama studio of the Cultural Bureau, Jiang Xingyu, as the author of "Hai Rui submitted", was scolded by Feng Shaobai, but the studio meeting concluded: "Feng Shaobai's speech is personal view. The discussion should be in-depth and not noisy."²⁴⁾

However, influenced by the change of the national political situation, the reversal of the event was quite different. The report of Shanghai Drama Academy was an example: "in the first stage, from Yao Wen's publication to Wen Hui newspaper's reprint of people's daily, PLA and other newspaper's notes, (teachers) are more active in thinking and put forward many questions He disagreed with the connection between "Hai Rui's strike" and the "solitary action" and "overturning the case" in 1961, and doubted whether the play was poisonous. In the second stage, the editorial department notes of people's daily and other newspapers were reprinted from Wen Hui Po to Wu Han's self-criticism and Fang Qiu's publication. During this period, a few teachers expressed silence and stopped talking. At the last stage, some comrades who have said or published erroneous opinions and articles have reviewed them everywhere and are very nervous."²⁵⁾ On April 5, 1966, the Shanghai Municipal Party Committee submitted the report on five months' criticism of Wu Han's "*Hai Rui's dismissal* from office". The tone of the final report completely adapted to the needs of the situation, and summarized the initial qualitative learning movement as a class struggle of culture and academy: "from the perspective of Shanghai, in various academic and cultural departments, the bourgeois, feudalist academic and linguistic Literary and art thought has a deep root especially. The monopoly of the bourgeois "authority" on the academic and cultural fields still has a solid foundation. Therefore, the struggle is more necessary, more urgent, more arduous and complex. It is more necessary to firmly and long-term carry out this struggle to the end."²⁶⁾

It is true that the event of the new historical play "Hai Rui's dismissal" was the fuse of the cultural revolution. Since the founding of the people's Republic of China, Mao Zedong, the first generation leader of the party, had interested in reading historical works and historical biography, which had

24) On February 12, 1966, the drama studio of the Cultural Bureau discussed the reflection of the situation of Hai Rui's dismissal from office, the 12th issue of the situation reflection.

25) On February 18, 1966, the teacher of the Department of drama and literature of Shanghai drama academy discussed the situation of "Hai Rui's dismissal", the 15th issue of situation reflection.

26) Report on criticism of "Hai Rui's dismissal" in the past five months, A22-1-942.

led to the criticism and evaluation of historical works and figures being the target of all previous campaigns. Before the *February Outline* was cancelled, the discussion on *Hai Rui's dismissal* in Shanghai society was basically within the scope of “learning and using Chairman Mao’s works flexibly”, which Young people who are not equipped with the ability of academic interpretation seriously and childishly discuss historical issues. Cadres of urban government departments studied hard or loose. Academic journals carried out truthful surveys. Most intellectuals also had a conscience. However, with the deterioration of the national political situation, the workers and peasants could only adapt to the political situation and loudly scold, and the intellectual circles finally became speechless. From the discussion of the historical play of “Hai Rui’s dismissal”, we can see that the cultural propaganda and academic discussion in Shanghai had been into a dilemma.

Ethical considerations

Ethical issues (including plagiarism, informed consent, misconduct, data fabrication and/or falsification, double publication and/or submission, and redundancy) have been completely observed by authors.

Conflict of Interests

The authors have no conflict of interests to declare.

[原始中文]

文教宣传与学术研讨的进退失据： 新编历史剧《海瑞罢官》在上海的反映

1. 引言

1961年1月，吴晗将《海瑞罢官》的剧本发表在《北京文艺》上，北京京剧团排演。1965年11月10日，在江青的安排下，姚文元执笔的《评新编历史剧〈海瑞罢官〉》在《文汇报》发表，该文直接否定吴晗的创作意图，将《海瑞罢官》定性为一株毒草，全国各省宣传、文教、科研部门开始讨论《海瑞罢官》问题，1966年2月12日，在彭真与中宣部的主导下，中共中央批转《二月提纲》，1966年4月，毛泽东对《中央关于撤销〈文化革命五人小组关于当前学术讨论的汇报提纲〉通知稿》多次修改，该通知稿被正式定名为《中国共产党中央委员会通知》，1966年5月16日在中共中央政治局扩大会议上通过，史称“五一六通知”。¹⁾

这样一场由高层发起的政治运动，发端于上海，以文教宣传与学术研讨为名义出现的历史剧讨论，在20世纪60年代中国各种政治活动的影响下，对新中国上海城市各阶层有何影响？上海社会各行业又如何开展新编历史剧《海瑞罢官》的讨论？这是本文的目的所在。²⁾

一、上海市委《关于讨论〈海瑞罢官〉问题的通知》文稿的改动

上海市委《关于讨论〈海瑞罢官〉问题的通知》发出于1966年1月6日，该通知由市委宣传部草拟文稿，在1965年12月27日草稿中，“意识形态领域中一场尖锐的阶级斗争”³⁾一语统领了草稿全文，但除此句以外，该通知更多限定《海瑞罢官》讨论为“活学活用毛主席著作”的学

1) 有关海瑞相关研究，可以参见沈琦：《海瑞研究史综述》，闫广林主编《海南历史文化》第4卷，社会科学文献出版社2014年版。

2) 有关于《海瑞罢官》历史的一些细节，李逊《海瑞罢官：尚未披露点的史实》，《戳天之祸：三位小人物反对〈评新编历史剧〈海瑞罢官〉的遭遇〉》文章均有突破。

3) 《关于〈海瑞罢官〉问题讨论的学习通知（草稿）》，A22-1-939，上海市档案馆藏。

习运动升级版。

草稿中称：“在学习中，应当活学活用毛主席著作，以阶级斗争和历史唯物主义的观点看待历史，看待现实，看待一切事物。突破旧思想、旧传统的束缚，进一步树立无产阶级的世界观。”⁴⁾ 草稿还规定了学习范围与内容，第一步先要在党内主要党政领导干部和一部分宣传、文艺、教育干部中进行学习；市委区委处长以上级宣传、教育、卫生干部约计816人，宣传系统支部书记以上干部，编剧、导演、专业作家、编审以上约计531人，教育系统高等学校正副校长到初三以上的政治、文、史教师约计2750人，共计4062人。⁵⁾ 学习着重解决5个问题：“关于阶级斗争是社会发展的动力问题；关于国家与革命问题；关于道德能否继承的问题；关于历史遗产的批判继承问题；关于历史人物的评价问题。”

在上海市委发出的正式通知时，阅读材料基本未变，经宣传部长杨永直进行调整，通知正文有了较大变动：

其一，原题“关于批判《海瑞罢官》问题讨论和学习的通知”一度删改为“关于《海瑞罢官》问题讨论的通知”。正文打印稿中的“推动意识形态领域里兴无产阶级思想，灭资产阶级思想的斗争”也被删替为“根据百家争鸣的方针”。标题与立意均接近于平和地进行学术讨论，但有些过激的话语仍被保留，如“目前报刊上正在展开关于新编历史剧《海瑞罢官》问题的讨论。这个讨论不仅是对一出戏的评价问题，而是多年来意识形态领域里的阶级斗争的新发展。”在上海应当抓紧的几项工作里，通知特别提出：“在报刊上展开充分地辩论，要放手发动史学界、文艺界、哲学界、教育界等有关人员参加，摆事实，讲道理，开展百家争鸣，问题不得到适当解决，决不停止。”

其二，学习范围、具体内容被删，学习内容和学习方法简略地改为“学习内容以报刊上讨论的问题为中心，学习毛泽东同志的有关著作，并可参看马克思、恩格斯、列宁、斯大林的有关著作及报刊上的重要文章；学习方法，以自学为主，认真阅读有关的文件和材料，市、区、县和直属单位的主要党政领导干部阅读的文件可以少些，讨论的次数可由各单位自行安排。宣传文教系统的干部读的文件应当多些，讨论应当认真。”⁶⁾

通知第四条又特别强调，“组织党外研究、教学、创作人员进行学习讨论。各种讨论、座谈会上无论党内、党外还是党内外一起讨论，均要坚持百花齐放、百家争鸣的方针，让大家畅所欲言，充分辩论，分清是非。”⁷⁾

通知中开列了一批阅读书目，第一部分主要是《毛泽东选集》中的篇章，有《湖南农民运

4) 《关于〈海瑞罢官〉问题讨论的学习通知（草稿）》，A22-1-939。

5) 《关于〈海瑞罢官〉问题讨论的学习通知（草稿）》，A22-1-939。

6) 《中共上海市委宣传部关于〈海瑞罢官〉问题讨论的通知》，A22-1-939。

7) 《中共上海市委宣传部关于〈海瑞罢官〉问题讨论的通知》，A22-1-939。

动考察报告》第一至七节，《中国共产党在民族战争中的地位》中“学习”一节，《中国革命和中国共产党》第二节“古代的封建社会”，《新民主主义论》第十五节“民族的科学的大众的文化”，《关于正确处理人民内部矛盾的问题》第一节及第八节，以及《改造我们的学习》、《在延安文艺座谈会上的讲话》、《论人民民主专政》、《丢掉幻想，准备斗争》，此外还有刘少奇《论共产党员的修养》第六节“党员个人利益无条件地服从党的利益”和第七节“党内各种错误思想意识的举例”中有关道德问题的两段话，以及《列宁全集》中的《论国家》和《青年团的任务》。第二部分是姚文元的《评新编历史剧〈海瑞罢官〉》、戚本禹《为革命而研究历史》、方求《〈海瑞罢官〉代表一种什么社会思潮》，第三部分是吴晗有关海瑞问题的原材料，文章《海瑞骂皇帝》、《论海瑞》、《〈海瑞罢官〉(历史剧)》、《关于〈海瑞罢官〉的自我批评》。

参考书目特别指出，“毛主席著作和马、恩、列、斯著作中，有关阶级斗争、国家学说、道德、文化遗产、历史人物评价等问题的语录”也在学习之列。但草稿中一些时事材料，彭真《在京剧现代戏观摩演出大会上的讲话》、柯庆施《大力发展和繁荣社会主义戏剧、更好地为社会主义的经济基础服务》、陈伯达《批判的继承和新的探索》在《红旗》杂志上的文章及社论已经被删除了。

从上海市委的通知字面上看，上海对于《海瑞罢官》问题的讨论限定于党员群众学习毛泽东思想活动，从参考书目来分析，书目虽包括毛泽东著作许多方面，但与后面的“时事材料”部分关联性不强，这也部分说明在《海瑞罢官》讨论的初期，上海也不能理解中央的意图，只能从惯性思维上理解做为一场新的学习运动来安排。

从1966年1月4日至1966年4月20日，上海市委宣传部办公室编印出版了25期关于历史剧讨论的简报，密集程度甚至一天两报。这些简报主要涉及上海文教、宣传、出版、科研各单位开展讨论的情况，语言多以当事人的谈话为主。

二、区级机关干部对于新编历史剧的讨论

上海市委通知特别要求，“首先抓好机关部、局长（直属科长）以上的干部和文化系统党政领导干部的学习。机关部、局长每星期六上午集中在区委学习，文化教育系统干部，在一定时期也要集中讨论几次。一般干部学习要求可比上述对象低一些，文件可以少一点。”⁸⁾市委的通知，到了上海各区的执行情况大相径庭。

“虹口区委书记李芝圃同志在十二天内就仔细阅读了《湖南运动考察报告》、《论人民民主专政》、《共产党宣言》、《论国家》等九篇著作，并且认真写了四十多页笔记。在区委学习会上做了发言，很受欢迎。静安区委书记张竺天同志和教育卫生部长陈原同志等，为了

8) 《中共上海市委宣传部关于〈海瑞罢官〉问题讨论的通知》，A22-1-939。

钻研一个问题，经常学习到深夜。”⁹⁾这种学习到深夜的刻苦程度，更接近于宣传口径，难以让人相信这是一个普遍的现象。

如1966年1月29日，静安区机关部、局长分三个小组对《海瑞罢官》问题进行了第一次议论，从会议纪录来看，有些同志“检查了自己阶级斗争观念不强，对《海瑞罢官》问题不关心、不重视，”有些同志认真地说：“这是学术界、文艺界的事，或看作只是对一个戏、一个人物的评价问题，与我们不搭界”。多数人都表示，我们“对历史不了解，看不懂，没有兴趣。”不关心、不重视、不了解、没兴趣，这种类似的话在其他区也多次出现，比如虹口区“一些同志检讨自己过去对此不关心，……与当前生产没有关系。工业部门有些负责同志本来感到这些文章太长，内容太专门，自己又不大懂历史，当前生产这么紧张，哪有时间看。”¹⁰⁾学习不够，学习材料过多也是抱怨的对象，“现在又要通读甲种本，又要精读四论，又要结合工作、思想问题学，又要讨论《海瑞罢官》，头绪太多了。有的讨论了一两次，改为精读《实践论》了。”¹¹⁾

《海瑞罢官》问题讨论在上海区级机关学习中不平衡，少数单位对学习抓得不够紧，宣传部办公室批评说：“部分单位的领导干部，对讨论要贯彻百家争鸣方针的精神注意不够；有些单位领导干部，对市委通知当前学习主席著作主要是结合《海瑞罢官》问题的讨论进行的意见，没有很贯彻执行。”¹²⁾所以，在各区机关干部实际学习讨论中，各区机关学习效果多半取决于自觉，消极态度占主流。

具体到历史人物的评价问题上，区级干部们倒也不乏认真思索之处，比如某区工会主任薛映辉提出：“历史观点与阶级观点应该是统一的，但在评价具体人物时怎样统一？历史人物如果都用阶级观点来看，那么只有农民革命领袖才是好的？”某团区委副书记周德英则提出关于“动机与效果的统一问题，过去历史上写的人物大多是统治阶级利益的代表者。他们办事从主观动机上讲，都是为阶级利益服务的，但从客观效果上看，往往也做了一些对人民有利的事。如海瑞修吴淞江，隋炀帝开运河，秦始皇筑长城等。”¹³⁾

三、文化单位的态度

按市委布署，上海宣传文化系统各单位相继组织讨论，出版局、文化局相对比较重视，多数都是一星期讨论一次。

9) 1966年2月5日，静安区各机关部、局长初次议论《海瑞罢官》问题，中共上海市委宣传部编印：《〈海瑞罢官〉问题讨论情况反映》（下文略为《情况反映》）第10期。

10) 1966年2月11日各单位领导干部初步讨论《海瑞罢官》问题的一些情况，《情况反映》第11期。

11) 1966年2月11日各单位领导干部初步讨论《海瑞罢官》问题的一些情况。

12) 1966年2月11日各单位领导干部初步讨论《海瑞罢官》问题的一些情况。

13) 1966年2月11日各单位领导干部初步讨论《海瑞罢官》问题的一些情况。

京剧院、越剧院、中华书局上海编辑所、上海图书馆、社会科学院部分研究所等，都已讨论过十几次。一般单位也讨论过五六次、七八次不等，但情况很中不平衡，如文化局所属音乐单位讨论次数比其他单位普遍为少。合唱团近一时期在整顿领导，一次也未组织讨论。出版局所属单位中，人文分社和文化出版社只讨论过4次，科技出版社只讨论过两次。¹⁴⁾

但是文教系统大部分单位没有做到党员骨干学习先行一步，“看书看材料少，党内思想没有很敞开，领导学习也有缺乏“本钱”的现象。”而《海瑞罢官》问题与学习毛选相结合，有些单位很好安排。如京剧院、戏曲学校等单位都借口说：“目前任务重，工作多，学习也就抓不深入，他们对如何打局面，尚感信心不足”。¹⁵⁾

上海科学技术出版社编辑顾济之说：“《海瑞罢官》是一个学术问题，现在把它提高了。姚文元连海瑞修吴淞江都加以否定，这只要去找一下历史文献就可以解决的，……《海瑞罢官》在知识界中，看来影响是不大的，要么在历史学界有些影响。吴晗的涵养功夫不够，检讨得太快，把问题统统写上去了……”¹⁶⁾

出版社编辑认为，这样不分青红皂白的讨论问题，给工作会带来很多不便之处。1966年1月10日，《文汇报》发表刘辉《应该怎样评价史可法》一文后，中华书局辞海编辑所谈宗英说：“民族英雄不是太多了，而是太少了，应该增加。如果史可法不称民族英雄，历史上还有什么人可称民族英雄。”上海人民出版社，上海美术出版社的编辑人员认为，“现在将“民族英雄”与“清官”混为一谈，就感到越来越糊涂了。”辞海编辑所的编辑更是烦恼：“《辞海》又要大动了。弄不好，真可能出不了，这样糟了，历史书没啥好出版了”。¹⁷⁾

中华书局上海编辑所多数工作人员说：“清官”问题涉及到对历史、对历史人物的评价，以及如何对待遗产的批判继承问题，但中老年编审吕贞白，编辑胡道静很少发言，或只提一些史料，不涉及到真正的问题讨论。相对而言，党员身份的总编辑李俊民同志在会内会外，继续坚持“清官”是封建时代的精华的观点。¹⁸⁾而在上海京剧院，周信芳在与京剧院一党员干部谈话时说：“我们看问题有没有无产阶级的阶级观点，要结合时代背景和历史发展情况。”京剧院的罗稷南坚持“讨论应是对理对事，不是对人，不要给人戴大帽子。如何推动戏剧运动，是讨论的着眼点。”这些良心之论也保证了历史剧讨论的正常进行。¹⁹⁾

14) 1966年2月5日，宣传系统各单位讨论《海瑞罢官》简况，《情况反映》第9期。

15) 1966年2月5日，宣传系统各单位讨论《海瑞罢官》简况。

16) 1966年1月4日，出版系统一些党外人士对方求文章和吴晗“自我批评”的一些反映，《情况反映》第1期。

17) 1966年1月17日，辞海编辑所等单位部分人员对《应该怎样评价史可法》一文的反映，《情况反映》第5期。

18) 1966年1月27日，中华书局上海编辑所讨论“清官”问题的情况，《情况反映》第6期。

19) 1966年1月8日，郝晷衡、魏建猷、李平心、蒋星煜对目前《海瑞罢官》问题讨论的一些反映，《情况反映》第3期。

四、文史学界的反映

《海瑞罢官》是一部历史剧，在文史学界中的反映如何？基本而言，在《二月提纲》被撤销以前，文史学界的一些教授还是实事求是的在讨论问题。

在1965年11月30日至12月28日，《文汇报》发表了蔡成和、林丙义、张家驹、羽白、郝昺衡等上海知识分子的文章，这些文章对姚文元的文章进行了一定程度的批评。郝昺衡说：“姚文元谈《海瑞罢官》连历史上的海瑞也打了几棍子，这就太过份，太偏激了。”魏建猷说：“这次《文汇报》在大年夜召开会议，我看没有什么多大意义，到会的很多人不发言，有的迟到早退，发言的人其内容也一般，不着边际，据说文汇报还要将会议情况整理发表，那就大可不必了。”²⁰⁾

1966年1月27日，在接受社联拜访时的周谷城说：“历史研究，最重要的还是靠材料，靠第一手材料。……我同吴晗是朋友，我对他的批评很有分寸，他看了不会生气。一个人凡是他自己承认了的东西，你去批评他，他是不会有意见的；他自己不承认的东西，你硬压在他头上，那是会使人伤心的。”²¹⁾最有见地的当属华东师范大学的李平心，他于1966年1-3月间先后发表了《漫谈清官》、《论“循吏”、“良吏”、“清官”的历史评价法》、《关于评价历史人物的标准问题和“循吏”、“清官”的分析批判问题》等文章。在一次座谈会上，他提出了“革命功利主义”的概念，深刻概括了关于《海瑞罢官》的讨论：

目前的讨论中有些人是采取敷衍态度的，见风使舵，谈得不深，这种学风不好。讨论问题要给人思考的时间，现在往往今天接到通知，明天就要开会，不要说看材料，连想一想都没有时间，只是奉命开会，最多谈一点感想。这种会开不好，效果不会很大。以后开会最好能早一些通知，并列讨论的中心题目，让大家充分准备。讨论《海瑞罢官》是革命功利主义的需要，但对革命功利主义不能理解得太狭窄，除了争鸣的问题外，其他的学术问题也应该提倡研究，马克思主义也不是从天上掉下来的。目前的学术研究不够深入，尤其是对史料不够重视，写出的文章一般化，只有观点，没有材料，这种倾向很危险。现在有种说法，罗尔纲、吴晗犯错误是因为书读得多，这是笑话！如果你有马列主义观点，再加上书读得多，不是更好吗？对百家争鸣、批判继承问题应该好好议一议，不能采取“一棍子打死”的办法，“一棍子打死”也是一种形而上学。²²⁾

值得注意的是，李平心上述谈话并没有被采纳上报，随着政治空气的紧张，这段颇具道理的发言被弃之未用。

20) 1966年1月8日，郝昺衡、魏建猷、李平心、蒋星煜对目前《海瑞罢官》问题讨论的一些反映。

21) 1966年1月27日，周谷城、束世澂等人的一些反映，《情况反映》第7期。

22) 1966年1月8日，郝昺衡、魏建猷、李平心、蒋星煜对目前《海瑞罢官》问题讨论的一些反映。

五、青年与工农群众讨论会比较

1960年代初期，由军队推动的活学活用毛主席著作活动在社会上方兴未艾，面对上海市委布置的《海瑞罢官》历史剧讨论任务，1966年1月13日，上海青年宫顺势安排组织了十多个第一、二期毛主席著作讲习班的学员讨论《海瑞罢官》。据档案材料，参加者一般都是前两期学习班中学得比较好的骨干，²³⁾ 多为商店、工厂、街道的团组织干事、宣教科干事，他们大部分是在“四清”运动后提拔为基层团委、总支的专职干部。相较于学界的不言与机关的慎言，这几位年轻人在学习班上的讨论的可谓“初生牛犊”。

据会议纪录，这些年轻人认真讨论了以下问题：““清官”的含义是啥？如果没有清官，历史上的作用如何肯定。历史上没有清官，还有没有进步力量？看历史人物应当用什么标准？什么是社会发展的动力？”这些年轻人在这个“清官”实质是啥的问题上认真地讨论起来，其发言真诚而幼稚：

第五印染厂政治部宣传科干事赵诚豹提出问题说：“吴晗把海瑞描写成一心一意为人民，这是歪曲了事实。但厂里有人提出来问，姚文元把清官、贪官一律否定也太片面了，这样不是把文天祥、岳飞、秦始皇等已经肯定的都否定了？”

提出问题后，会场很活跃，大家觉得很难回答这个问题。

吴忠伟问：“慈禧太后选了颐和园，现在我们也可以派用场，这点要肯定，但她又不是好人，如何评价？”

窦家骅觉得“像秦始皇统一中国，搞度量衡统一，这是应该肯定的。但秦始皇是暴君，开运河的隋炀帝是昏君，怎么能肯定呢？”

聂祖仪（服装鞋帽公司团总支副书记）回答说：“这是人民做的，是劳动人民的功劳。”赵诚豹又反问说：“命令是秦始皇下的，办法也是他想的？”

陈榴宝在发言中讲到：“要用阶级分析来看历史人物，凡是促进了生产发展时，都应肯定的。”聂祖仪就问：“照你这么说，美国现在的科学技术发展了，卫星、宇宙飞船上天了，对美帝国主义也要肯定呢？”陈榴宝（中百一店团总支）问吴忠伟：“照你这样讲法，用的是什么标准？”吴忠伟回答说：“当然是过去的标准，不能用现在的情况去看。”窦家骅抢着说：“从当时的标准看，至少也要推动社会向前发展，比如农民想得到土地，这是当时农民的要求。就是要有历史观点嘛”。陈榴宝也说：“看问题应当用毛主席的立场、观点，对历史人物也要用阶级分析的方法……”他还没说完，赵诚豹就说：“当时还没有马列主义的阶级斗争学说怎么办？中国封建社会所以拖延了这么久，就是因为农民还不懂得阶级斗争。”

23) 名单如下：陈榴宝，第一百货商店团总支组织委员；窦家骅，上海有线电厂团委干事；吴忠伟，牯岭路街道团委少年委员；赵诚豹，第五印染厂政治处宣教科干事；聂祖仪，服装鞋帽公司团总支副书记；李远庆，矿产五金进出口公司干部；杜功柏，储运公司六家嘴仓库商品护理员；卫国林，黄浦区饮食公司糕饼学徒。

会议纪录最后只好如实地总结说：“争论结果，大家觉得“清官”和应该肯定的历史作用是两回事，但又觉得这中间的关系讲不清楚。大家觉得当时是没有马列主义，又要用阶级分析的方法去看历史人物有点矛盾。讨论到最后，如何把阶级观点、历史观点统一起来看还是没有解决。”²⁴⁾ 看起来非常热烈的青年人的讨论，由于缺乏学术训练的支撑，只能从朴素的逻辑出发得出简单结论，甚至根本无法得出结论。

1966年4月6日，《二月提纲》已被批判，中共上海市委宣传部、上海市总工会宣传部联合组织了一次批判《海瑞骂皇帝》和《海瑞罢官》的座谈会，参加座谈会的有曾参加过大革命斗争的老工人和活学活用毛主席著作的积极分子共十二人，由于宣传和编辑稿件的需要，《红旗》、《学术月刊》、《哲学研究》杂志的潘梓年、吴传后、戚本禹也参加了这次座谈会。参加座谈会的工人都是上海在十七年中涌现出来的劳动模范，部分人物在后来的上海也崭露头角。²⁵⁾ 在忆苦思甜思维的惯性下和市委的安排下，“到会的工人同志都非常气愤，怀着强烈的阶级仇恨，纷纷指责《海瑞骂皇帝》和《海瑞罢官》是大毒草，他骂皇帝是假，骂党和我们敬爱的领袖是真。”

六、学术刊物的变化

在《海瑞罢官》讨论初起之时，本着学术认真的态度，1965年11月10日，《学术月刊》编辑部、《人民日报》社、《文汇报》社及华东师大等单位都派人到松江调查、搜集历史资料，进行田野调查。之后，1966年1月，经市委驻松江社会主义教育运动（四清）工作团党委和县委共同研究决定：由工作团文教卫生组负责人等组成“海瑞罢官问题调查组”，开展调查，撰写文章，投入学术讨论。调查内容主要有“海瑞修吴淞江”、“徐阶退田”、“海瑞祠庙”等。该组先后考证了徐阶在松江故址；至天马公社横山下收集明代土地关系资料；寻访了松江、青浦、嘉定、嘉善等地的海瑞祠庙，搜集民间传说，专程从老闸桥至黄渡、沿白茆河到常熟以探究海瑞修吴淞江的遗迹。最后写出了《欺世盗名屈乡宦》、《防民之变甚于防川》、《谁家生佛把香烧》等批判海瑞的文稿。但对“罢官”问题的争论，很快发展成为政治上和文学艺术领域里的批判运动。各单位遂停止了对“海瑞罢官”的调查，文稿亦未公开发表。²⁶⁾

随着《海瑞罢官》问题讨论的展开，1965年11月至1966年2月，《学术月刊》编辑收到有

24) 《上海青年官关于学习毛主席著作积极分子批判〈海瑞罢官〉的情况报告》，C26-2-153-71。

25) C1-2-5155，上海市总工会宣传部，本部和《红旗》杂志联合召开工人批判《海瑞罢官》记录整理。座谈会名单：杨富珍，女，35岁，党员，国棉一厂织布挡厂工；李素兰，女，35岁，国棉七厂档车工；张银荣，张庆才，孙长胜，李新宝，臧逢义，贺建民，王志文，庞秀英，袁鹤年，李增芳。有材料说明，此次工人的座谈会的发言曾经过上海市委安排学习演练。

26) 上海市松江县地方史志编纂委员会编《松江县志》，上海人民出版社1991年版，第1189页。

关稿件共66篇，其中本埠30篇，外埠36篇，有关《海瑞罢官》及海瑞评价的有41篇，有关“清官”的稿件18篇，有关“让步政策”的有7篇。²⁷⁾ 其中1966年3月《学术月刊》刊登了《松江农民驳斥《海瑞罢官》—松江县城东公社部分贫下中农社员和干部座谈会纪要》，这种非论非叙的特殊文稿同，编辑部初审意见只好在说：“针对吴晗的论点，让农民群众来谈谈他对《罢官》的意见，这个主题是很好的，作者也花了一些工夫。但在写作上还有缺陷，文章冗长，文章材料也不清楚，既不像论文，也不太像调查报告，座谈纪要也不像。”²⁸⁾

II. 结语

在《海瑞罢官》问题讨论活动中。上海与全国其他省市不同之处在于：其一，历史上的海瑞官至南直隶巡抚，府衙设在苏州；吴晗编写的《海瑞罢官》戏剧情景设定在华亭，属建国后的上海松江地区。其二，早在《海瑞罢官》剧目上演之前，上海京剧院已有《海瑞上疏》剧目的排演。因此，同一时期被讨论的历史剧不限于吴晗的《海瑞罢官》，同时涉及上海京剧院的《海瑞上疏》、田汉的《谢瑶环》等一批剧作。总体而言，上海虽然是《海瑞罢官》事件的起源地，但在《二月提纲》未被废止以前，上海大部分讨论会的气氛都比较缓和，甚至在文化局剧目工作室的会议中，做为《海瑞上疏》的作者，蒋星煜虽然受到冯少白的责难，但工作室会议总结时说：“冯少白的发言是个人意气，讨论要深入，不能起哄。”²⁹⁾

但受全国政治形势变化的影响，《海瑞罢官》事件的反转差异极大。上海戏剧学院的汇报是一个例证：“第一阶段，从姚文发表到《文汇报》转载《人民日报》、《解放军》等报的按语为止，（教师）思想比较活跃，并提出了不少问题。……不同意把《海瑞罢官》同1961年的“单干风”和“翻案风”联系起来，对这个戏是不是毒草表示怀疑。第二阶段，从《文汇报》转载《人民日报》等报编辑部按语，到吴晗的自我批评和方求一文发表。在这个时期内，少数教师表示沉默，不再讲话。上阶段个别讲过错话或者发表过错误观点文章的同志，则到处检讨，非常紧张。”³⁰⁾ 1966年4月5日，上海市委递交了《五个月来批判吴晗《海瑞罢官》的情况报告》，最后报告的口吻完全适应了迎合了形势需要，把最初定性的学习运动彻底错误

27) 《学术月刊编辑部关于1965年11月至1966年2月〈海瑞罢官〉问题讨论以来收到稿件的情况》，C43-2-258-42。

28) 松江农民驳斥《海瑞罢官》，《学术月刊》1966年第3期原稿，C43-2-286-189

29) 1966年2月12日，文化局剧目工作室讨论《海瑞罢官》情况的反映，《情况反映》第12期。

30) 1966年2月18日，上海戏剧学院戏剧文学系教师讨论《海瑞罢官》的情况，《情况反映》第15期。

地总结为文化学术的阶级斗争：“从上海来看，在各个学术、文化部门中，资产阶级、封建主义的学术、语文艺思想尤其有着深厚的根源，资产阶级“权威”对学术、文化的垄断也尤其仍着牢固的基础，因而，斗争就显得更为必要，更为迫切，也更为艰巨和复杂，更需要坚定地、长期地把这场斗争进行到底。”³¹⁾

诚然，新编历史剧《海瑞罢官》事件是文化大革命的导火索。建国以来，党内第一代领导人毛泽东对于历史著作与历史人物的阅读兴趣，导致对于历史著作和人物的批判与评价往往成为历次运动的靶向所在，在《二月提纲》被撤销之前，上海社会对于《海瑞罢官》的讨论基本处于“活学活用毛主席著作”活动范畴之内，不具备学术判读能力的年轻人认真而幼稚地讨论历史问题，市区机关干部或紧或松的进行学习，《学术期刊》进行如实的调查，多数知识分子亦有良心之论。但随着全国政治形势的恶化，工农群众只能适应政治形势而高声痛骂，知识界最终变得哑口无言。从《海瑞罢官》历史剧问题的讨论可以看出，上海的文教宣传与学术研讨开始进退失据、无所依归。

References

- Hu, X. (2012). Mao Zedong and some historical facts in the review of the new historical play "Hai Rui's dismissal". *Yan Huang Chun Qiu*, April, 27-30.
- Huang, Y. (2011). Mao Zedong's new cultural imagination and the historical play Hai Rui's dismissal. *Zhong Guo Xian Dai Wen Xue Yan Jiu Cong Kan*, 10, 191-203. DOI : 10.16287/j.cnki.cn11-2589/i.2011.10.018
- Jin, D., Feng, X., & Jin, G. (2014). The disaster from heaven: Three Little People's opposition to" review the experience of the new historical play "Hai Rui's dismissal". *Shi Lin*, December, 51-64.
- Li, X. (2010). Hai Rui's dismissal: The historical facts that have not yet been disclosed. *Yan Huang Chun Qiu*, March, 28-33.
- Lin, B., & Pan, J. (2016). My argument with Yao Wenyan about "Hai Rui's dismissal". *Shi Ji*, March, 15-18.

31) 《五个月来批判〈海瑞罢官〉的情况报告》，A22-1-942。