2000

Role models in the contemporary Chinese essay :: Ba Jin and the post-cultural revolution memorial essays in Suixiang lu/

Larissa Castriotta
University of Massachusetts Amherst

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/theses

Retrieved from https://scholarworks.umass.edu/theses/1383

This thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses 1911 - February 2014 by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.
ROLE MODELS IN THE CONTEMPORARY CHINESE ESSAY: BA JIN AND THE POST-CULTURAL REVOLUTION MEMORIAL ESSAYS IN SUIXIANG LU

A Thesis Presented
by
LARISSA CASTRIOTTA

Submitted to the Graduate School of the University of Massachusetts Amherst in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

September 2000

Master of Arts in Chinese
ROLE MODELS IN THE CONTEMPORARY CHINESE ESSAY: BA JIN AND THE POST-CULTURAL REVOLUTION MEMORIAL ESSAYS IN SUIXIANG LU

A Thesis Presented

by

LARISSA CASTRIOTTA

Approved as to style and content by:

 Donald E. Gjertson, Chair

Alvin P. Cohen, Member

Yaohua Shi, Member

Chisato Kitagawa
Department of Asian Languages and Literatures
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**Chapter** | **Page**
---|---
1. ROLE MODELS IN BA JIN’S MEMORIAL ESSAYS | 1
  Introduction | 1
  Early Life and Education | 2
  Ba Jin’s Relationship with the Chinese Communist Party | 5
  Ba Jin’s Views on Literature and Its Uses | 7
  *Suixiang lu* and the Memorial Essays | 11
  Defining Role Models | 14
    Learning from the Past | 14
    Role Models | 16
    Kindness and Loyalty | 18
    Faith and Idealism | 21
    Truth | 22
    Responsibility | 24
    Patriotism | 25
  Anti-Role Models | 26
    Inconsistency Between Words and Actions | 29
    Protecting Oneself at All Costs | 30
    Cowardice | 34
  Response to *Suixiang lu* in Contemporary Chinese Intellectual Circles | 35
  Conclusion | 41

2. “REMEMBERING HU FENG” | 43
  Part One | 43
  Part Two | 53
  Part Three | 55
  Part Four | 58

NOTES | 65
CHAPTER 1

ROLE MODELS IN BA JIN’S MEMORIAL ESSAYS

Introduction

Using the “Memorial” type of essay in Suixiang lu [Random Thoughts] to create role models, Ba Jin instructs his readers how to be a good person. Ba Jin uses the behaviors of his remembered family and friends to exemplify humanitarianism, and to promote other values that he considers important. Ba Jin contrasts his own behavior with that of the subjects of his essays in order to emphasize these points. He also makes it clear that his own behavior can be considered representative of Chinese people since 1949, while his subjects’ behavior was the exception during that time. The response to Suixiang lu in Chinese intellectual circles shows that Ba Jin is effective in conveying his message with these essays. Using the Memorial essays collected in Suixiang lu, I will show how Ba Jin carefully sets forth as an example his own experience, and that of those he remembers fondly. Looking at the response of his contemporaries to this work, I will demonstrate that Ba Jin has been successful in creating role models that inspire his readers. Finally, I have translated “Remembering Hu Feng,” an essay which is representative of the Memorial style.
Early Life and Education

Ba Jin (Li Feigan) was born on November 25, 1904, to a wealthy, official, landowning family in Chengdu, Sichuan. His father was a local magistrate, his mother a devout Buddhist. She instilled in Ba Jin a sense of compassion, kindness and humanitarianism that stayed with him, and that show up in many of his writings. After the death of his parents while still a young boy, Ba Jin came under the care of his grandfather and the extended family. He was aware of the suffering of others, especially the servants in his household, and of the inequality built into traditional family and governmental systems. The experiences he had and the events he witnessed while a member of a traditional household, combined with the humanitarian values instilled in him by his mother, caused the young Ba Jin to hate the traditional family system and the societal and governmental systems which supported it. Ba Jin was instilled with a desire to take action to change the situation.

Ba Jin’s earliest formal education was in the Classics. But as he grew up he was exposed to Western thought, and as a teenager he began studying English. Though too young to participate in the May Fourth Movement, it nevertheless influenced Ba Jin. Journals emphasizing western philosophies and featuring translations of western literatures appeared in Chengdu. Authors called for language reform, political reform, educational reform, and abolition of the traditional family. Literature that aimed to help others improve their situations appealed to Ba Jin. It was in this atmosphere that he encountered Anarchism.
Anarchism is a political philosophy in which its followers believe that any form of government or governmental authority is unnecessary. Anarchists advocate a society based on voluntary cooperation between groups and individuals; they believe in the ultimate goodness of human beings as individuals and in their ability to reason. In those fundamental Anarchist beliefs there is a spirit of humanity that appealed to Ba Jin, a sense that each individual in society has a worth that is equal to all other individuals, and must be treated as such. Olga Lang describes Ba Jin’s approach to political and social problems as that of a “humanitarian and moralist.” Having been deeply influenced by his compassionate mother, Ba Jin considered moral and ethical questions to be important. Indeed the great appeal of anarchy to idealists like Ba Jin was its focus on ethical problems and its demand that there must first be great moral improvement of the individual before society can be changed. Anarchy also attacked the very institutions and systems that Ba Jin despised, and provided a framework for Ba Jin’s developing beliefs. Anarchists called for the destruction of traditional systems, like the family and government, and they placed a high value on the individual’s ability to affect change. These facets of anarchism appealed to Ba Jin’s sense of compassion towards all people, and to his desire for freedom from the system, not only for himself, but for others enslaved by it. Kropotkin’s “An Appeal to the Young,” a work that was aimed at wealthy youth who wanted to help “the people,” strongly affected Ba Jin. He was so taken with that work and others, like writings by Michel Bakunin, Emma Goldman and Leopold Kampf, that Ba Jin later derived his
pen name from two anarchist writers who profoundly affected him: Bakunin and Kropotkin.

After the death of his grandfather during the 1919 Chinese New Year, Ba Jin had greater freedom to explore his ideas. He enrolled in a foreign language school. He became more active in the Anarchist scene in Chengdu. In 1920, he joined the anarchist secret society Shi She [Equitable Society]. With some friends he founded a new group called Jun She [Equity Society]. He distributed and contributed to publications for this organization. It was Ba Jin’s first experience with the creation of literature.

In 1923 Ba Jin and his elder brother left Chengdu for Nanjing and Shanghai. They studied at Southeastern University’s middle school in Nanjing, and graduated in 1925. After graduation, Ba Jin went on to Shanghai. Shanghai was a hotbed of political activity. Both the Nationalists and the Communists were active in Shanghai. Trade unions flourished and labor strikes were common, as political workers rallied to unite laborers against imperialist and capitalist business owners and unfair labor and trade practices. Once there, Ba Jin was able to participate in the vibrant political community. But, as an anarchist, Ba Jin did not ideologically belong to either the Communists or the Nationalists. He did find the Communist Party more sympathetic to his ideals, since they too wanted to abolish both traditional and modern (capitalist) systems which oppressed the people. But Ba Jin did not then, nor at any other time, join the Communist party.
He went to France in January 1927. Although Paris was the center of the Anarchist movement, Ba Jin was frequently lonely and depressed. He read a great deal, studied French, and translated anarchist writings into Chinese. He also began writing fiction, finishing his first novel, *Miewang* [*Destruction*]. He sent it to China, where it was serialized before his return, and published in book form in 1929. By the time he returned to China in December 1928, Chinese intellectuals, already viewed Ba Jin as a successful and important author. Readers and critics liked the subject matter of the revolutionary youths fighting for their cause and Ba Jin’s simple, straightforward writing style. Left-leaning intellectuals who, like Ba Jin, believed that art must serve a purpose, thought Ba Jin’s fiction would inspire youth to action. In Shanghai he continued his political activism by translating, editing and writing.

**Ba Jin’s Relationship with the Chinese Communist Party**

Throughout the War of Resistance against Japan (1937-45), and later the Civil War (1945-49), Ba Jin continued to write essays and fiction. In his writings he attacked the Nationalist Government for perpetuating the oppression of the peasants, and for the lack of political and artistic freedom under their regime. He criticized the Nationalists for doing nothing while Westerners mistreated Chinese citizens, and the Japanese continued to encroach on Chinese territory. Because they shared Ba Jin’s views of the Nationalists and launched similar criticisms of their own, the Communists viewed Ba Jin’s attacks as tacit support for the
Communist Party. Communist leaders liked Ba Jin because he attacked traditional institutions and because he was popular and influential with young readers. Ba Jin supported the Communists to the extent that he perceived their goal of equality and freedom for all was similar to his. But, even before Liberation in 1949, he remained cautious towards the Communists. He had heard about the Rectification campaigns at Yan'an in 1942, and the thought reform campaigns after Liberation beginning in the summer of 1951. These campaigns continued every year or two right up to the Cultural Revolution (1966-76) and even after it with varying degrees of intensity and violence. He looked on as "loyal communists," like Ding Ling⁹, were criticized for their "anti-party" beliefs.¹⁰ Based on his experience with and knowledge of the Chinese Communist Party, he edited out any traces, however small, of anarchist themes in his work. To avoid being singled out for criticism himself, he participated in sometimes violent political campaigns against others. He did this by writing condemnatory essays and giving speeches during campaigns like the 1955 Anti-Hu Feng campaign, the Anti-Rightist campaign in 1956-57, and the Cultural Revolution.

In an effort to blend in with the masses, after 1949 Ba Jin essentially stopped writing fiction. He published some short stories about the Korean War, but they were mainly propagandistic in nature. The main character in these works was the Communist military hero, a young man far from home, making the world safe for communism; he was a patriot, giving his life for the Motherland, and saving his comrades-in-arms at the same time.¹¹ By going along with the
Communist regime’s purges and political campaigns and by keeping a low profile artistically, he managed to avoid trouble until 1968, during the Cultural Revolution.

The ruling clique, consisting of Jiang Qing and other so-called radicals vying for power, within the Communist Party labeled Ba Jin a counterrevolutionary in 1968. He suffered through mass-criticisms and struggle sessions. He wrote and re-wrote self-criticisms. He was sent to a May 7th Cadre School for re-education. The authorities denied medical treatment to his wife for cancer, and labeled his children as the offspring of a counterrevolutionary, encouraging them to separate themselves from their father. He managed to survive the years of torture and isolation in the “cow sheds,” the grief of losing his wife, and the horror of watching his friends being tortured and harassed to death at mass criticism meetings. He still lives with the guilt of not only surviving, but of having participated in the Cultural Revolution, those “ten years of calamity” that caused both his own and others’ suffering.

Ba Jin’s Views on Literature and Its Uses

A 1937 survey of college and high school students showed Ba Jin was second only to Lu Xun in popularity. Indeed, in the 30s and 40s Chinese youth responded to Ba Jin and his fiction. In his work they found characters with whom they could relate, characters who faced similar problems: an oppressive family system, choices between love and familial duty, choices between love and
revolutionary duty, and the prospect of facing death in order to pursue their beliefs. Ba Jin's characters were clearly role models for them, promoting values such as courage and compassion. His characters had a universal appeal while maintaining their individuality, something that was attractive to young readers. Ba Jin's work spoke to them in the same way that Kropotkin's work had spoken to him. He did not preach anarchism in his work; his characters were simply young people working for a better China, a China free from imperialism and traditional society's restraints. His characters longed to free China, and young Chinese; they were wholly dedicated to their cause, willing to die fighting for it.

Early on in his career Ba Jin believed that technique and artistry, were secondary to content. Like Lu Xun, Ba Jin believed that with literature one could awake the masses, could incite them to action, and that authors had a duty to do just that. Ba Jin was so successful in this that Lu Xun remarked in 1936 that "Ba Jin is an enthusiastic writer with progressive ideas. He is one of the very few good writers." 16 Ba Jin held that all writers have a duty to their readers. That duty is to enlighten, to attack the common enemy, and to be truthful. In the 1950s, Ba Jin looked back on works that influenced him as a youth. He "particularly liked fiction written by authors from 'oppressed nations'." 17 What he appreciated was that these authors "used the pen as a weapon, spoke out for their comrades, not only pouring out grievances and asking that they be redressed, but also accusing and attacking the enemy." 18 Ba Jin wants his work "to be widely read, leading people to cherish light, and to hate darkness." 19 Ba Jin believed that as an author
he must “always exhaust my duty to call out to people in the dark of night.” 20 In 1956, discussing the effect of Gorky on his work, Ba Jin summed up his own view of art and literature with Gorky’s words: “Literature’s goal is to change people for the better.” 21 Ba Jin believed that an author’s work must serve a purpose in order to be successful. In a 1962 speech about the writer’s responsibility he asserted that “when a work can truly be used as a ‘weapon’ and ‘educational tool,’ only then can an author be considered to have shown courage and exhausted his responsibility.” 22 To Ba Jin, it is important that the author “talk sincerely and responsibly to the reader, saying what the author wants to say.” 23 He announces “As long as I say I am a writer, then I must earnestly write, and must place value on a writer’s courageous and responsible spirit.” 24

In the 1962 speech, given at a time of relaxation in governmental control over art and literature, he spoke out against the atmosphere of terror in which most artists worked. He described an environment where there are “people who with one hand draw boundaries, and with the other grasp a club and go looking for people with shortcomings.” 25 Though he did not specify, Ba Jin is clearly describing Party leaders who set criteria for art and literature, and then went seeking those whose work did not meet the criteria. Those whose work did not conform were punished, even though the work in question may have been subject to a different set of criteria when it was created. Thus there was a creative environment which was stifled by fears of arbitrary oppression. He lamented that “when the clubs are swinging, few authors stand up and speak calming words, [or]
express opinions that conform to the actual situation.”26 It was this environment that prevented them from fulfilling their duties as artists, and what he believed was “the greatest obstacle”27 to truly great Modern Chinese Literature: “those boundaries and clubs and the fear and worry of coming under attack.”28 This fear drove “people (myself included), to be very careful, whether speaking or writing. [They did not] dare to reveal their abilities at all, preferring only to say what others have said many times before.”29 This issue of an author being able to work without fear of oppression was dear to him because he believed that “authors of the new China should not worry about standing out.”30 Ba Jin also placed a good deal of importance on the writer’s responsibility to be truthful, saying that “if everyone had stood up and told the truth, we could have reduced the suffering of our country.” He stressed though, that “I do not criticize others here, I should also be criticized, because I too wrote essays that spread ‘exaggerations’.”31

About four years after this 1962 speech, the Cultural Revolution began. The situation of terror that Ba Jin described in 1962 worsened during the Cultural Revolution, when Red Guards shouted the “truths” that they were fed by others, and untold numbers of people suffered and died. As he had done in 1949, Ba Jin resumed his position of trying not to “stand out.” Fearing for his own safety, he retreated. He spoke out when he was called upon, but did not speak his own words. He said what those in charge told him to say. Coming out of that period of terror, from 1978-1986, he wrote Suixiang hu, in which he returns to some of
the themes he discussed in 1962, such as the writer’s responsibility and truthfulness.

Suixiang lu and the Memorial Essays

Suixiang lu is a collection of 150 essays. Beginning in 1978, they were published in the Wen Hui Bao, a Shanghai daily newspaper, the essays were later collected in five volumes: Suixiang lu (1979), Tansuo Ji [Exploration] (1981), Zhenhua Ji [Truth] (1982), Bingzhong Ji [In the Hospital] (1984), and Wuti Ji [Untitled] (1986). Finally, they were collected in one volume, Suixiang lu (1987).

With the publication of these essays, Ba Jin was the first Chinese author to address what happened during the Cultural Revolution, and to express guilt about his role in it. He clearly states how his actions during the Cultural Revolution and earlier political campaigns, directly and indirectly, hurt his family and friends. He states that out of self-preservation he knowingly harmed others. Further, he not only tells readers that he accepts the responsibility for the consequences of his actions, he also tells them that it is time for them to do the same. If they do, he believes China can avoid repeating such a destructive event as the Cultural Revolution. Instead of trying to cover up his shame and forgetting the past, Ba Jin tells his story truthfully, as he sees it. And he urges others to do the same. He also addresses contemporary issues, like marriage, education, and the harmful effects of gossip. He discusses his writing process, the role of literature in contemporary society, and the relationship between politics and literature.
Within *Suixiang lu* there are more than twenty essays that are “Memorials.” In these essays Ba Jin eulogizes family members and friends.

Through his remembrances, Ba Jin allows his friends and family to live on. In the process of remembering the lives of others, Ba Jin reveals to us a great deal about his own life and experiences. The essays provide a personal perspective on historic events, such as the Anti-Rightist Campaign (1957-58), the Great Leap Forward (1958-62) and the Cultural Revolution, and the consequences of those events.

In 1947, Ba Jin published a collection titled *Huainian* [Remembrances]. In it he explains why he memorializes his friends and family, people who seem ordinary:

> Although these people are ordinary, they are capable of emitting a pure ray of their spirit, this is something most people seldom do. They do not harm others, or angle for fame by deception; [they are] modest, kind and gentle, [they] have the stamina to stand fast in their post; [they are] poor in material things, rich in spiritual things; [they] love friends, love work, and are sincere towards others, [they] repeatedly ‘give’ and do not ‘take.’ They are anyone’s friend and mentor. I benefited greatly from them. I must show others their pure spirits.

Much as his later Memorial essays do, these essays represent a ray of hope to Ba Jin. He strongly believes that the people he remembers surely are not the only or the last good people in China. It is to people who possess those same qualities that Ba Jin turns in the “Memorial Essays” in *Sui xiang lu* -- to people who adhere to their beliefs in the face of adversity, who remain truthful and compassionate, who never forget their responsibilities as human beings and as artists, no matter the cost, and who are role models for Ba Jin.
One could argue that Red Guards possessed the same qualities that Ba Jin admires in his friends. They were fiercely Nationalistic, protecting China from internal and external foes. They acted on their beliefs, by beating reactionaries and by volunteering to serve in rural China in an effort to help China modernize. Yet they lacked a fundamental quality which Ba Jin admires over all others: a spirit of humanity. The Cultural Revolution was a power struggle at the top levels of the Communist Party that trickled down and was carried out at local levels. Whoever was in charge at any given time directed Red Guards to revolt against counter-revolutionaries and other anti-Party elements. A counter-revolutionary or anti-Party element was any person who was perceived as an enemy by those holding power. During the course of the Cultural Revolution any person could be considered a counter-revolutionary or anti-Party element based simply on family ties and background, school or work affiliations, or whether or not someone in charge liked one. Red Guards viciously attacked these “enemies” of the state and of the Party. Red Guards beat teachers, turned in family members as class enemies, humiliated neighbors. They did not question the things they were being told, they did not think independently, and they did not demonstrate any compassion towards their enemies, at times failing even to recognize that they were fellow human beings. What the Red Guards lack is what he respects in his friends. His friends retain their humanity and compassion when others, including Ba Jin, have thrown it away. And they never forget that those around them, even those with whom they may disagree, are human beings, not animals.
Defining Role Models

Ba Jin strongly believes that one must look to the past for lessons for the future. For him, learning from the past means looking to those people who lived exemplary lives. In the preface to a new collection of his Memorial essays,35 Ba Jin says of his friends that “those loved and respected people who died all were models I studied.”36 The qualities Ba Jin highlights in those he remembers are: kindness, sincerity, personal loyalty, faith, idealism, truthfulness, responsibility towards one’s work and patriotism. In addition, each of his subjects possesses the courage and will to act on their beliefs. Ba Jin uses the behavior of his friends to define what is good, thus creating for his readers role models or teachers. Though he does not specifically call each person in the Memorial essays a ‘role model’ or ‘teacher’, it is clear from the way he recounts his memories of their lives, and how they affected his own life, that Ba Jin intends readers to learn from them. In sharp contrast to his role models, Ba Jin describes his own shameful behavior. He shows that he failed to learn from his friends, or even to live up to his own expectations. He uses his own actions to define what he perceives as bad.

Learning from the Past

Ba Jin believes that only by remembering the past and learning from it, will China be able to move into the future, and to avoid the recurrence of past mistakes. He urges readers to accept a share of the responsibility for their part in
what he describes as one of China’s most horrific periods of time. Starting from around 1957, the Anti-Rightist campaign, and continuing right through the Cultural Revolution, Ba Jin remembers, “we paid special attention to class struggle and glorified individual worship [Chairman Mao]. …We witnessed a hell of incomparable brutality drawn out of the fresh blood of the Chinese people.”

Through his experiences with his friend Feng Zikai, Ba Jin learned that “remembering and cherishing him after he is dead is not as good as loving and protecting him while he was alive. Let us remember this painful lesson.” “Past events cannot be dissipated,” he laments while recalling the painful memories of Hu Feng’s life during the Cultural Revolution. “All those memories collected together will become a copper-cast alarm bell. We must always remember this painful lesson.”

Ba Jin holds himself, and his readers, accountable for what happened in China during the violent decades of the 50s, 60s and 70s. Looking back at the Anti-Hu Feng campaign in 1955, Ba Jin recalls his criticism of the short story “Wadi zhanyi” [“Battle of the Ditch”], and how it contributed to the persecution of its author, Lu Ling. He explains, “When I criticized “Battle of the Ditch”, my intention was not to harm the author.” But still he feels responsible and continues, “regarding the misfortune he encountered, his unjust case, his illness, how can I explain it all to later generations?” He thinks about friends who have died during the political campaigns, and he wonders, “how do I explain myself to those friends who died full of hatred?” In the Memorial Essays, he asks how
later generations, “youths tens or hundreds of years from now” will judge him. “They will absolutely not tolerate a lying cheat.” He reminds readers that “later generations will be our true judges...they won’t be able to forgive us.” He knows that later generations will look back on China during the second half of the twentieth century and recognize the waste of talent, and will hold all who lived through it accountable.

Ba Jin uses the example of the patriotic writer Lao She to illustrate this point. During the Cultural Revolution “we were unable to protect Lao She. How will we explain that to later generations?” he wonders. And even after the Cultural Revolution, “we were not able to clear up the questions surrounding Lao She’s death. How will we explain that to later generations.” With confessions and acknowledgement of his guilt in Suixiang lu, Ba Jin tries to make things right. His goal in writing these essays is to “let later generations know that I really tried hard,” he declares. “I had hoped to be able to make up for harm done to a friend in the past.”

Role Models

In the Memorial essays, Ba Jin defines what it means to be a good person: one who is kind and sincere in dealings with others, and is serious about their duties and country. Ba Jin uses the subjects of the Memorial Essays to establish guidelines for the values that he considers important, using their lives and actions as examples. These values are kindness, sincerity, loyalty, optimism and idealism -
especially during times of adversity; truthfulness - even at great personal risk; a serious attitude towards one’s work and responsibilities; and patriotism. By showing his deep admiration and respect for those who possessed these values, and who dared to live accordingly, Ba Jin establishes the importance of learning from these people.

To learn from past events, Ba Jin directs readers to look to his friends, the subjects of the Memorial Essays as role models. He identifies them as models he personally studied, and continues to learn from. Many of his teachers were literary figures, men and women who successfully used their talents to improve China. Ba Jin considered Lu Xun, Mao Dun, Lao She, and Ye Shengtao role models because their work accomplished what they advocated. They advocated an art and literature that was accessible to more people, one that awakened and educated those who encountered it. Through Lu Xun, Ba Jin realized that “using the pen for battle is not a simple thing,” and because he was successful, “Lu Xun established a model for me.”

Lu Xun was a model author because he not only wrote, but he acted, “when he printed books to send people, he himself designed the cover, he himself wrapped, sealed and mailed it. With each [step in the] process he put used painstaking effort.”

Mao Dun, too, was a model for Ba Jin. During “those years he stood beside Lu Xun using his pen in battle, using his works to educate the youth.” Ba Jin states “from beginning to end I took him as a teacher.” With regards to his works and what he accomplished for the homeland, Mao Dun was for Ba Jin “a
model I wanted to learn from.”52 “Comrade Lao She was a model of the best Chinese intellectual,” to Ba Jin.53 He describes Lao She as “the most successful author to use art in political service.”54 Using his skill and position as an artist for the good of China, Lao She was a man whose actions matched his words. Ba Jin respected Lao She as a model because he carried out his beliefs in the way he lived his life.

Ba Jin sees Ye Shengtao as a role model because he took his duties seriously and responsibly. Ye Shengtao not only took his work as an editor seriously, he took seriously his duty to be a good person as well. He notes that he had other friends like Ye Shengtao, but that Ye “was also my teacher.”55 Ye Shengtao guided him personally as well as professionally. Ba Jin explain, “to publish books I needed a responsible editor. To live life I also needed a responsible editor. Having them [editors], I could move forward rest assured, without fear of losing my footing and falling.”56 Ye Shengtao showed him “not only a writing path, but also a path to being a good person.”57 To Ba Jin, Ye Shengtao was special because he took “writing and being a good person and put them together.”58 Ye Shengtao taught Ba Jin that just writing stories was not enough, through his work he must convey the importance of being good.

Kindness and loyalty. Ba Jin’s friends were, by nature, kind and sincere in their relations with other people. His frequent use of the word “shanliang” [kindhearted] to describe his friends establishes the importance of that value.59
Being sincere and honest with others is also a quality Ba Jin highlights. He recalls that Ma Zongrong “is sincere in his relations with others.” Out of kindness and sincerity springs loyalty. To Ba Jin, loyalty is helping, encouraging and standing by one’s friends, especially during troubled times. Ba Jin cherished the spirit of loyalty both before and after Liberation. Before Liberation Ba Jin respected his elder brother because he “used his limited income to raise the ‘old family,’ to help others.” Mr. Hu [Kuang Hu] had a similar spirit, he used his connections with the Nationalists in order to help Ba Jin and other friends escape from Japanese-occupied Shanghai. Jun Zheng was the type of person who shared what he had, “he was not a selfish person,” and, “in those days [when] life was certainly not easy, Jun Zheng and his wife cared for us.” Ma Zongrong also protected his friends. To Ma, “cursing my friend is like cursing me.” Ma carried his loyalty to the extent that “in order to protect a friend, he did not fear offending anyone.” Ba Jin asks, “How could I forget him? He was my best friend, he believed in me.” He continued, “If he heard others speaking ill of me, he would quarrel with them.” It was Ma’s fierce loyalty to Ba Jin, and others, that Ba Jin admires and wants his readers to emulate.

After Liberation, it became difficult to maintain personal loyalties. If one’s friends were implicated as criminals in a political campaign, their troubles often washed over an entire circle of friends. Maintaining ties of friendship in that sort of environment was difficult, even dangerous. A simple act of kindness could be seen by the government as a small part of a huge conspiracy, or by the accused as
a plot by the government to draw out the “criminal.” In this atmosphere of mistrust, true acts of kindness were rare. Ding Ling’s story about Fang Lingru is a good example of loyalty persevering in a hostile environment:

She [Ding Ling] suddenly said to me [Ba Jin]: ‘I will never forget one person: Fang Lingru. During a troublesome time for me, she came to see me of her own accord, expressing a willingness to help me. At that time I didn’t dare believe her. But she came several times, still saying: “I really sympathize with you, respect you……” She truly was a good person’.

Reaching out to a friend, expressing loyalty and respect was not common during the political campaigns after 1949, so when Ba Jin encountered it, it was all the more precious to him. Something as simple as a letter sent during the Cultural Revolution was an act of kindness he highly valued. When Ba Jin’s wife, Xiao Shan, was sick, they received a letter from Shen Congwen. Ba Jin describes the scene in which Xiao Shan “tearfully clutched the pages of the letter, rereading it, in a small voice talking to herself saying: ‘There are still people who remember us’.” Ye Shengtao, Ba Jin’s editor, also made efforts to preserve ties of friendship during the Cultural Revolution. Ba Jin recounts how, after Ye’s “liberation” during the Cultural Revolution, he set out to ask after the condition of his friends, “among them was me, he was still worried about my safety.” Jun Zheng and his family attested to Ba Jin’s loyalty to the state at a time when Ba Jin was about to be criticized. When someone came to them asking about Ba Jin’s “anti-socialist words and actions,” Sister Guohua, indignantly answered, ‘Don’t worry, he has not said [any] or done [any].’ Though her angry denial
could not help Ba Jin, it was her loyalty to him that he valued, and wants readers to recognize.

Among all his friends, his wife Xiao Shan showed Ba Jin the greatest loyalty, and she paid dearly for it. She not only physically protected him, but also spiritually nourished and encouraged him. One night as a group of Red Guards came into their home, Xiao Shan ran to get help. She feared that the Red Guards would take away her husband. Instead they beat her until she was black and blue. Ba Jin explains, “she was beaten only for protecting me.” Xiao Shan believed “if she received more spiritual torture, she could lessen the pressure on me.” In addition to keeping him from physical harm, Xiao Shan also “also gave me comfort and encouragement.” She provided Ba Jin with “unending comfort, expressed faith in me, felt I was being treated unfairly.” She did this at a time when even husband and wife could not trust each other. Many of Xiao Shan’s friends turned their backs on her because of the trouble Ba Jin faced. And because of her refusal to renounce him, the authorities denied her medical treatment for cancer until it was too late to save her. But none of that deterred Xiao Shan from loving, protecting, and encouraging her husband.

Faith and Idealism. For Ba Jin “there is nothing more tragic than ‘having no faith’ and ‘having no idealism’.” Thus, in his essays, he highlights people who possessed faith and unshakable idealism. They believed that the future would be better than the present, and they did whatever was necessary to ensure that belief
was realized. In the 1950s when first reading Fang Zhi’s work Ba Jin described them as idealistic and ambitious,\(^7^9\) and that Fang Zhi himself was “a young writer full of hope.”\(^8^0\) Ba Jin praised Fang Zhi’s ability to fill his work with idealism.\(^8^1\) Describing the moviemaker Zhao Dan, Ba Jin “appreciated his spiritual state. He was optimistic, full of faith.”\(^8^2\) Jun Zheng “believed in the future.”\(^8^3\) He worked long hard hours, but always smiling, he said “later it will be better.”\(^8^4\) Ye Feiying believed that youth were the key to a better future. Therefore he directed his energy, to the detriment of his health, to educating and preparing youth for the future.\(^8^5\) Ba Jin respected the spirit of “forgetting oneself to help the public.”\(^8^6\) Mr. Hu [Kuang Hu], another educator, gave away money intended for his own personal use to his students, so that they may have better books, a better education and a better future. The idealistic Mr. Hu created a utopian-like school, in which the school was like a family, teachers and students living side by side, learning and doing manual labor to support and educate themselves.\(^8^7\) Mr. Hu believed the future could be better and took steps to ensure that it would be.

**Truth.** Telling the truth is important to Ba Jin. Throughout the essays Ba Jin advocates being truthful whatever the risk, and many of his friends did so. He believes that artists especially have a responsibility to tell the truth.\(^8^8\) Speaking “empty words”, saying something one doesn’t truly believe, is a practice that Ba Jin despises, and he highlights his friends’ dedication to the truth by stating “he never spoke empty words,”\(^8^9\) and “he did not speak empty words, he wanted to do
 Acting on the truth is a crucial part of being a truthful person. It displays courage. Ba Jin admires those who speak out and defend the truth regardless of the consequences to them personally. In the Memorial Essays, he portrays his friends as role models of truthfulness, people who dared to be truthful even when it was dangerous.

Lu Xun was a such a model. “In all the books he wrote, he spoke the truth,” Ba Jin declares. He describes Lu Xun as one who, “throughout his life, sought truth and progress. He courageously examined society and even more courageously examined himself; he did not fear acknowledging mistakes, and even more did not fear correcting mistakes.” Hu Feng, too, courageously spoke out and was criticized for it. Before Liberation Ba Jin asked Hu Feng, “Why do other people have opinions about you? He bluntly answered: ‘Because I speak up for intellectuals’.” Ma Zongrong, too, “in order to protect the truth, disregarded personal danger,” declares Ba Jin at the beginning and end of “Remembering Elder Brother Ma.” Zhao Dan was a model of truthfulness and courage. Ba Jin describes how he “gave voice to the words inside our hearts, what we wanted to, but could not say.” Ba Jin distinguishes between himself and his friend explaining, “I advocated speaking the truth, and on his death bed he actually established a model of it.” In “Remembering Zhao Dan” Ba Jin openly admires Zhao Dan’s openness in speaking the truth. Zhao Dan spoke the truth as he saw it, not as those in charge told him to see it. During the Cultural Revolution he was severely punished for that sort of truthfulness. “He spoke so openly, so
concisely,” Ba Jin says. After the Cultural Revolution “he was the first person to tell the truth.” From these examples, one sees that Ba Jin respects those who are truthful and who have the courage to act on truth in spite of risks to one’s own safety.

Responsibility. Ba Jin admires those who treat their responsibilities and duties seriously. One will recall from his 1962 speech about the Writer’s Responsibility, he believes writers occupy a special role in Chinese society. The writer has the power and duty to awaken and educate the masses with his/her writing. Ba Jin respected and wanted to emulate those people who approached their responsibilities as writers with seriousness, and who were successful with their work. Fang Zhi “never forgot what kind of responsibility being a writer brought.” The type of responsibility Mao Dun brought to his writing carried over to all. “Any work he did was always done with that same serious responsibility,” declares Ba Jin. Lu Xun also approached all that he did responsibly, “whether it was reading a proof, sending a periodical, reading and revising a draft, editing an album of pictures, matters large and small, whether it was his own affair, or that of others, Lu Xun treated them all seriously, truly doing everything conscientiously and meticulously.” About Jun Zheng, Ba Jin “knows he worked very hard,” and that his “writing attitude was earnest and serious.” An image of Jin Yi that stayed with Ba Jin was of a man “seriously and responsibly engrossed in work.” He recalls that Jin Yi’s “writing attitude was extremely
Ye Shengtao was a "responsible editor." Xue Feng continued his duties as a Party member in spite of criticism by the Party. "He was a Party member, he could not shirk his obligations," states Ba Jin. Ba Jin worked closely with Hu Feng organizing Lu Xun's funeral service. He witnessed Hu Feng working seriously and being criticized by other members of the funeral committee, but Ba Jin remembers that "he was willing to work regardless of criticism, always keeping the greater good in mind."

Patriotism. Ba Jin views a responsible attitude towards one's duties as an act of patriotism. To Ba Jin patriotism is not just a love of the homeland and its citizens, it is also a willingness to devote one's life, even sacrifice it if necessary, to improve the homeland. "Comrade Lao She is the greatest patriot," declares Ba Jin. In fact Ba Jin finds accounts of Lao She's "suicide" improbable because Lao She was so much a patriot that suicide was unthinkable. Unthinkable because it would have taken him away from the people that he loved and served. Writer Mao Dun, too, used his talents as an artist in the service of this country. Mao Dun "left behind a wealth of [literary] treasures for the Motherland and her people." Ba Jin admires Mao Dun's dedication to the "Motherland's socialist literary undertakings," and how "he contributed the energy of his whole life to them." Fang Zhi also focused his talents and creative energy on serving the people. Fang Zhi "treated the pen as fire, as a sword, praised the true, the beautiful, the good, attacked the false, the ugly, the evil, and hoped to use his work as some
contribution for the country, for society, for the people.” The value of Jin Yi’s works is in their ability to “inspire the people to passionately love the Motherland.” The patriotism of educators manifested itself in their actions on behalf of China’s youth. Kuang Hu was “an educator for the country, for the people.” He was a teacher who “gave the energy of his whole life to the education of the youth.” Ye Feiying, another educator, also “in the end gave his life for the Motherland and her people.”

Anti-Role Models

Having established what he considers good, Ba Jin further defines it by contrasting his own behavior with that of his friends at similar points in time. After 1949, he lost the moral courage that marked much of his earlier writing and actions. He stopped writing fiction, except for the occasional propagandistic military hero story, and he gave up his true voice by writing what he was told to write by Party leadership. As for his reason for doing this, he offers that he was merely trying to survive and not draw attention to himself. He had seen what happened to colleagues who were persecuted for their literary work, and in an effort to avoid such treatment, he simply retreated. He portrays his behavior as exactly the opposite of those he respects. Ba Jin describes how, in an effort to survive, he lost sight of the values he respects in others: basic kindness and loyalty, a willingness and courage to defend the truth whatever the risks, and a serious attitude towards his responsibilities as an author. Instead, he chose to go
along with the often violent political campaigns that marked China in the 50s, 60s, 70s. He cut himself off from his friends, betrayed them by lying and by ignoring the truth, and by not living up to his responsibilities as a writer. He makes it clear that he knew what he was doing and saying was wrong. His descriptions are marked with guilt and shame about how he acted and failed to act, and what he said and failed to say. Ba Jin does not attempt to make an excuse for this type of cowardice, instead he uses the confessional essay as a medium to show how NOT to behave in similar circumstances, and he offers as role models individuals who did not relinquish their values under any circumstances.

Ba Jin compares himself directly to his friends to show that he lacked the virtues they possessed. When Ba Jin compares himself to Ye Feiying, he realizes what a failure he is. Ba Jin says that “he gave his life, did not take one, comparing our hearts, I am ashamed. I am not qualified to criticize him. He is not a person who told lies.” Feiying remained honest and true to the end “finally giving his life to the Motherland and her people.” Ba Jin makes the following distinction between himself and Ye: “The difference between us seemed to be that I spoke more empty words, he did more things.” After the Cultural Revolution, Fang Zhi, with his last bit of strength, worked on publishing a magazine devoted to youth, to inspiring and encouraging them. Ba Jin considered himself a friend of youth, in fact a goal of his writing was to motivate youth to action. Yet when asked by Fang Zhi to contribute to the magazine, Ba Jin replied with a “short letter saying I was too sick to write an essay.” Fang Zhi was capable of writing works
that excite and encourage people, while Ba Jin laments his own ineffectiveness at that aspect of his own career. “I also have that kind of idealism, ambition and hopes. Why can’t I realize them,” he wonders.¹²⁵ When Ba Jin compares Hu Feng’s attitudes towards work with his own, he concludes “I must acknowledge that my work was not as serious and earnest as Hu Feng’s was.”¹²⁶

Similarly, when Ba Jin remembers Lu Xun, he believes:

I see his burning heart, hear his fiery words: for truth, daring to love, daring to hate, daring to speak, daring to do, daring to search. ……But when his words were used, their meaning twisted, did I stand up and say anything? When Yao Wenyuan was wielding his club, when I was closed up in a cowshed, other than being obsequious, did I dare to do anything?”¹²⁷

His behavior was opposite of that which his teacher stood for. He reveals that “precisely because I forgot [Lu Xun], I encountered those years of misfortune.”¹²⁸

In recounting his own experiences, he advises his readers not to make the same mistakes. Mao Dun was a literary warrior and teacher Ba Jin respected. Mao Dun achieved results with his works. Looking back on times when Mao Dun and Lu Xun would “teach” in the thirties, Ba Jin admits, to not being “a good student. I lacked a diligent attitude with regards to studying. And because of that, after many years, my successes on the literary front were not great. And when I think back on [that failure], I feel ashamed.”¹²⁹ Mao Dun set such an extraordinary example that Ba Jin feels he “will never catch up to him.”¹³⁰ Although Ba Jin recognized the good qualities in his friends, he did not always learn from them. In Ma Zongrong “I saw the healthy tendencies of a Chinese intellectual in his
sparkling person, but I did not learn from his good points, I did not seriously study them," he admits. Jun Zheng "was so kind, I never heard him speak ill of others, he did not complain about life." But Ba Jin admits that he "respected [Jun Zheng], but did not learn from him."

Inconsistency Between Words and Actions. Looking back over his own writings, Ba Jin finds inconsistencies between his words and actions. He admits he failed to live up to his own words, and acknowledges how difficult it is to be a good person. In the thirties he wrote about a group of educators, dedicated to youth. He talks about how he supported and respected them and their cause, and admits that later he felt "vexed over my pretty, empty words, I did not fulfill any of my promises." Even before 1949 Ba Jin failed to act, unlike the educators he professed to respect. Ba Jin laments his inability to live up to the words of his 1962 speech about the Writer’s Responsibility. Though "I did not write critical essays, and did not publicly express an opinion, when I think back on the changes in my thinking over that short period of time, I can not help but feel guilty for not exerting my ‘Writer’s Responsibility’," Ba Jin declares. He discusses how, during the Cultural Revolution, urged on by a poet who had recently denounced his own work, Ba Jin "at study meeting acknowledged that everything I wrote was a poisonous weed. In this way I completely negated myself.” He had been a fierce advocate for speaking the truth, yet his life is filled with instances when he was not truthful. Ba Jin’s life’s experience taught him that being truthful is not
easy, and he laments, "I want to speak the truth, [I] want to hear other people speaking the truth. But taking up my pen to write, opening my mouth to speak or leaning in to listen closely, it is only then that I realize: speaking the truth is not easy."  

Protecting Oneself at All Costs. One method Ba Jin and others used to protect themselves was to "draw a line of demarcation" from friends and family members in trouble. One would formally and publicly announce a severing of all ties from an accused, no matter the relationship—husbands and wives, parents and children, siblings, co-workers, teachers and students, and friends. This practice was common, even encouraged, during the Cultural Revolution. "I started to acknowledge my own 'crimes,' and to use the language of big character posters to replace my own thinking. Friends had drawn a line of demarcation from me. Actually many people I knew had gone to the 'cow sheds' before me, needless to say I drew a line of demarcation from them," he acknowledges.  

This is clearly the opposite of Fang Lingru's behavior. Fang sought out Ding Ling when she was experiencing political problems. In "Remembering Brother Feiying," Ba Jin looks back on some of his actions since 1949, and admits "When I read some of my old [pre-Liberation] works I am not embarrassed. Not like when I read essays I wrote 'drawing a line of demarcation' with Hu Feng, Ding Ling, Ai Qing and Xue Feng, or when I climbed on stage and read them in public, calling names and criticizing." He continues, "I myself could not distinguish right from wrong, truth
from lies. It did not matter if there was any evidence or witnesses, others made arrangements for me to speak, then I loudly shouted. I said I believed in others, when really I was protecting myself.”

Sometimes breaking ties with one’s friends was not as dramatic as “drawing a line of demarcation.” Ba Jin admits that after 1949, after going through “thought reform,” he “broke off relations with many friends.” During the Cultural Revolution, Ba Jin did not go out of his way to seek out friends once he was warned against it by officials. “You don’t want to casually go look up friends, there are some people who have problems that have not been cleared up yet,” officials warn him. And though he believed Jun Zheng was a “loyal and kind intellectual,” Ba Jin still did not call on his old friend. In fact when he accidentally ran into his friends at a meeting, he made up an excuse about having no time to visit with them. As he looks back on his behavior towards the artist Feng Zikai, not even placing a wreath of flowers before his grave, Ba Jin confesses, “I feel ashamed.” He realizes that “an excellent artist will always be remembered by others. But I cannot help but think: remembering him after he is dead is not as good as loving and protecting him while he is alive.” Ba Jin also describes how he does not even ask after the situation of his friends. “I must acknowledge that my experience has taught me understanding more of a situation is not as good as [understanding] less of a situation,” he explains. Ba Jin knew that asking about friends, showing concern for them could well lead to trouble for himself, so he did not look for the truth of their situations. When foreign friends
asked about Hu Feng, Ba Jin “hemmed and hawed and said nothing.” He explains that “during those days, those years and months, one campaign followed another, never ending meetings, big and small, everyone wanted to ‘pass the test.’ Everyone was so busy fending for themselves, who had the time or the courage to be asking after things one should not ask after?”

In order to survive, Ba Jin found he had to betray his friends and colleagues. He did this by actively participating in campaigns of persecution, going along with accusations made by others, and repeating words that others said. He describes his feelings about his role in the political movements, remembering that “during each movement, or after a speech, or spending the night writing, I always rejoiced that I made it past another critical juncture. I was rather proud. Now I see that I was merely deceiving myself as I deceived others.”

Ba Jin plainly states that he, unlike his loved and respected colleagues, was a man of empty words. “I often reproach myself for being ‘a person who speaks empty words’, ” he admits. During the Anti-Hu Feng campaign, Ba Jin recalls that when called upon to express an opinion, “what I said was what other people said.” In 1957 Ba Jin participated in criticisms against Ding Ling, Ai Qing, and Xue Feng, “I merely stood behind others throwing stones. I believed [what] other people [told me], I wanted to protect myself.” Also in 1957, though he was not labeled a Rightist, he “wrote some Anti-rightist essays that embarrassed me. No one forced me to [do it], but the battle lines had been drawn, someone had written a draft, how could I refuse.”
Because associations with those accused of being enemies of the state often brought harm to one, Ba Jin turned his back on friends he knew to be innocent of any crimes. Ye Feiying died alone, “no one spoke up for him.” Ba Jin explains that “[Ye] propagated anarchism, and reprinted a small volume I wrote when I was young. Several of Kropotkin’s works that I translated may have had an influence on him. Because of this, I hesitated the several times I took up a pen to clear him of the false charges. I feared leading the fire to me.” Ba Jin admits, “I feel extremely ashamed.” In a similar vein, Ba Jin explains why he waited so long to memorialize his old friend, Li Liewen, “I did not take up my pen because I feared trouble.” It was a sense of self-preservation that kept him from remembering his friend.

In “Remembering Zhang Mantao” Ba Jin goes into great detail about his betrayal of a friend during the campaign against Zhang. Looking back on a study meeting designed to discuss the “counter-revolutionary” Zhang Mantao, “no one came forward to express an opinion.” And though he had “not yet been labeled a ‘counter-revolutionary,’ although I already had my own opinion, in the study meeting I was jumpy and nervous, uneasy. I only thought about how to protect myself, I did not dare to speak a word of the truth.” He describes how illogical the case against his friend Zhang Mantao was, “but I still did not say a thing.” He tells of how he “buried my head and acted calmly, as if nothing was wrong.” And yet inside he “was secretly using all my strength to restrain the unfairness I felt in my heart. I was terrified of exposing myself, leading the fire to me. I was only
carefully protecting myself, I did not think at all about my duty as an author or as a person.” In an attempt to save himself, Ba Jin turned inward. He did not care about what happened to others, he only wanted to survive. “When Comrade Mantao was having bad times, I did not support him, did not come out and speak the truth. I only coldly looked away. Towards his misfortune I can not say I am not in the least responsible,” he confesses.

Cowardice. Ba Jin shows his readers that he lacked the courage to speak the truth, to expose Chinese society as he saw it, not as some Chinese officials wanted it to be seen. And he shows that he was not alone with this weakness. He is unlike Lu Xun who openly satirized Chinese politics under Nationalist rule, or Zhao Dan who talked openly during and immediately after the Cultural Revolution. Instead, Ba Jin turned his back on the truth and his responsibilities as a writer. In the actions of the “Gang of Four,” Ba Jin says that he witnessed actions comparable to those of the Czars “but no one, including me, came forward with a different opinion, to speak reasonably, it seemed as if everyone had lost their reason.” It is clear that Ba Jin knew that the societal chaos and violence in China was wrong, yet he did not speak out. Ba Jin explains that he participated in order to save himself. For example, during the Anti-Rightist campaign, “in order to protect myself I worked hard at playing the part of an Anti-Rightist warrior, I did not dare stand up and speak a fair word on behalf of the victims.”
Ba Jin points out that he was not alone in his shameful behavior. During a study meeting to criticize Zhang Mantao, Ba Jin implicated his superior in the meeting. “I knew our study leader’s point of view could not have been far from mine. But even he did not dare publicly doubt the explanations of certain officials,” he claims. Red Guards beat Xiao Shan severely when she tried to protect her husband and had asked for help from a police officer, but “there was only one person on duty and he did not dare intervene.” Although the Memorial essays focus mainly on Ba Jin and his colleagues, he does point out that there were others who turned away, who lied and betrayed in order to survive. But it is clear that to Ba Jin, even when judging himself, that though it was safer, it was still wrong for people to simply look away.

**Response to Suixiang lu in Contemporary Chinese Intellectual Circles**

Looking at writings about *Suixiang lu*, from 1986 to the present, is another way to gauge Ba Jin’s influence on modern China. One indication of the importance of *Suixiang lu*, and its contribution to contemporary Chinese literature and culture, is that thirteen years after the completion of all five volumes, its influence is still discussed. In a February 1999 article in *Wen Hui Bao*, Zhao Ruihong declares, “Everyone believed that *Suixiang lu* was the essence of contemporary literature, collecting the fire of beautiful thought and feeling.” In the years immediately following publication of the essays in *Wen Hui Bao* and later in collections, contemporary Chinese intellectuals hailed Ba Jin’s *Suixiang lu* as
“the greatest contribution to thought and culture during the New Period.” It was called a work that holds “an unshakable position of importance in 20th century literature.” Sun Jiguo declared, “Ba Jin’s essays of the New Period have lasting value.” And Li Fangping holds that Suixiang lu is Ba Jin’s “greatest contribution to his people and intellectuals.”

Its importance was not limited to literary spheres though, Suixiang lu “attained significance outside of literature.” Ba Jin’s work “far surpasses literary realms and is deeply influential in thought and cultural circles.” Suixiang lu “awakens a great many readers to the fact that the occurrence of the Cultural Revolution has historical, societal, cultural and economic roots.” Even a critic of Suixiang lu concedes that it “has deep and far-reaching historical and political significance, value as data about history and the humanities.” Intellectuals credit Ba Jin’s self-examination and remorse with “possessing a high degree of historical feeling.” And because the Memorial Essays go beyond simple remembrances and deal with Ba Jin’s issues of shame and self-reproach, and because they “encourage people to attain greater thoughts and feelings,” Chen Jiaping asserts that “these essays surpass other Memorial works, they possess historical depth and practical meaning.”

Ba Jin’s colleagues perceive that “not only does he write about his own experiences, what he saw and heard and felt, he also reflects the spirit of Chinese intellectuals [who lived through] the same time.” That he “reflects in a model way the cultural attitudes of modern intellectuals.” Liu Zaifu notes in reading
Suixiang lu, he “can’t help but acknowledge that the remorseful feelings Ba Lao expresses are the feelings expressed by this generation’s true intellectuals.”182 In his discussions, “what Ba Jin dissects is not only his own spirit, but the spirit of a whole generation of intellectuals.”183 Suixiang lu is seen to “truly record the spiritual path followed by the older generation of Chinese intellectuals from the 50s to the 80s.”184 “Suixiang lu is the crystallization of the thought of awakening and pain of a generation of intellectuals,” claims Dan Chen.185 While Zhao Ruihong says simply that Suixiang lu “represents the consciousness of a generation of intellectuals.”186

Beyond representing the modern Chinese intellectual, Ba Jin portrays the general atmosphere of post-Liberation China, specifically the Cultural Revolution years. As one commentator notes, “Suixiang lu is a mirror of that unprecedented dark period of Chinese history that is the Cultural Revolution.”187 Chen Jiaping asserts “[Suixiang lu] represents the national instinct of the Chinese people and reflections on complicated times.”188 In writing Suixiang lu, Ba Jin is trying “to prevent the recurrence of the same type of disaster [as the Cultural Revolution].”189 As Ba Jin intended, intellectuals found that by “summarizing history’s tragic lesson”190 from those dark years, and thereby preventing their recurrence, Suixiang lu was like an “earth-shattering alarm moving the spirits of countless readers.”191 Wu Huanzhang continues, “any good person who experienced the ten years of calamity can find a mirror here [Suixiang lu]……and will find the lessons and enlightenment they need.”192 “[Ba Jin] hopes that those
compatriots who experienced this catastrophe would all take a lesson from it, would assume some responsibility," declares Liu Zaifu. Wu Zhouwen believes that by "going through the dissection of his soul, [Ba Jin reveals] his losses and gains, and the sweetness and bitterness of his life and creative work. [In so doing] readers draw courage and strength to move forward."194

"We should all take Ba Jin as a role model," calls out Yuan, just as Ba Jin urged readers to do with his friends. Ba Jin's life is a "cultural symbol enlightening others," declares Liu Huizhen. Li Fangping wrote, "We should all follow the path set out in Suixiang lu." In the Memorial essays, Ba Jin points to respected friends and colleagues as models after whom readers should pattern their behavior. Contemporary intellectuals, in turn, look to Ba Jin as a model. The very qualities Ba Jin admires in his friends, are the qualities he is lauded for possessing in the writing of Suixiang lu: honesty, courage, and responsibility. These essays are effective in communicating those lessons because Ba Jin's writings are "what the author saw with his own eyes, heard with his own ears, felt with his own body, and they are exceptionally personal to the reader." They are also effective because "Ba Jin is a person who always loves life and is full of feeling and hope." His readers relate to his experiences on a personal level, his essays possess "thought provoking strength." His [Memorial] essays "make people think, move people deeply" because of the way Ba Jin paints tragic historical backgrounds and "unfeelingly accuses and exposes evil forces." In his writing they see a return of his moral courage.
One of Ba Jin’s goals in writing *Suixiang lu* was to write about the truth; his contemporaries believe that he succeeded. To some, *Suixiang lu* is a book about the truth. Indeed, it is because Ba Jin had turned his back on telling the truth during the Cultural Revolution and before, that Fan Lun believes “in *Suixiang lu* [Ba Jin] repeatedly speaks the truth.” Contemporary intellectuals perceive that Ba Jin’s works are full of honesty and that he “uses his pen to embody sincerity.” Finding in *Suixiang lu* Ba Jin’s return to themes of his 1962 speech about the Writer’s Responsibility, Yuan Yonglin writes, “*Suixiang lu* explains a basic thought, this is that the author should speak the truth.” “Ba Jin aimed for truth in his style, that is his art,” claims Sun Jigu. Ye Gongjie points to three ‘truths’ in Ba Jin’s essays: “one is true and sincere emotion, another is good and true thought, the third is true and honest language.” This “truth and honesty” he continues, is “characteristic of the language of Ba Jin’s essays.” Sun Dexi credits Ba Jin’s ability to speak the truth as having “deeply moved a generation of young writers, thus pushing the New Period’s literature towards healthy development.” Chen Sihe believes that when Ba Jin was speaking the truth, that is, evaluating history independently but from the point of view of the People, he was saying what was in the “hearts of the people, and it was only then that his truth had universal appeal.” Sun Dexi recognizes that “speaking the truth requires courage; calling for everyone to speak the truth requires bravery and moral strength.” He applauds Ba Jin because he “dared to stand up, dared to
look directly at the grim reality, and called loudly to the people: ‘Speak the truth’!”

And as some of those colleagues whom he eulogized did, Ba Jin “used literature as a weapon, looking for the truth to save the country and the people.”

Ba Jin “takes up his pen as a weapon, valiantly attacking the old system, to cry out and establish a new system,” says Hu Zhongle. Feng Mu describes it as a “work filled with a spirit of unyielding courage and attack. With that point piercing through this book, it is definitely valuable to study it.”

Sun Jiguo writes, “Using his own experience, using what he saw, heard and felt, he influenced the reader...using this type of literature [the short essay] as his own weapon.”

In writing *Suixiang lu*, Ba Jin has courageously taken action. Liu Zaifu laments that “we too little see the courage of self-examination, of self reproach.” And that is precisely why Liu Zaifu loves Ba Jin, because he “possesses the enormous spiritual strength to dare to face the world and himself.” “In the process of his self-dissection, self-criticism, Ba Jin’s spirit is purified and elevated, his human-ness is revitalized, and from this we can see his honesty and bravery,” states Yuan Yonglin. Song Limin writes “It’s easy to see, this method of using one’s own ‘scandalous behavior’ to reflect upon history, to summarize lessons, compared to simply accusing and criticizing requires even more courage.”

A result of having decided to tell the truth was that Ba Jin had to take responsibility for his roles during the Cultural Revolution and earlier violent political campaigns. Ba Jin expresses an eagerness to bear his share of
responsibility for what happened. He "coldly dissects himself, feeling out the roots of history's tragedy, looking for his own responsibility." What is impressive to readers is that "when Ba Jin begins his dissection of society, he starts with himself, he does not shirk his responsibility." "Ba Jin is conscious of his responsibility," states Sun Jiguo. Ba Jin is admired because he does not "try to push responsibility [for his actions] off on the Anti-human times, rather he takes it seriously upon himself." In fact, Wang Cengqi finds that Ba Jin's "dissection [of his behavior during the Cultural Revolution] is unfeeling to the point of cruelty, using words like 'depraved' and 'shameful'." Wang Meng applauds Ba Jin's honest self-examination and declares that "if everyone were to have this same type of sense of responsibility, there is hope for the country." Ba Jin is a role model of examining himself, acknowledging his role in the Cultural Revolution and taking responsibility for it. Li Ziyun notes that Ba Jin "establishes a model of daring to examine himself, he is a model of self-examination." And like his earlier friends, Ba Jin "stands on the side of the Party and the people, is hopeful...and is fully aware of the effect his works will have on society." In this respect he is much like the people he eulogizes, he is an "author who has not forgotten his responsibility."

Conclusion

Wu Huanzhang states that Ba Jin's goal in writing *Suixiang lu* was to establish what it means to be a good person. Indeed, that was one of Ba Jin's
goals. One knows from Ba Jin’s background that he treated literature as a tool for educating readers, whether it is fiction or a personal essay. The Memorial Essays within Suixiang lu are clearly such a tool. Ba Jin describes people who taught him, through the examples of their lives, about kindness and loyalty, about the importance of standing up for the truth and one’s beliefs, and about the duty that each author has to his readers and his country. To round out his role models, he provides a contrast in the form of his life and the ultimate failure of his own moral courage. He describes in painstaking detail how during adversity he repeatedly failed to be loyal to his friends, how his actions did not match his words, and how he failed his readers because he did not tell them the truth. Readers get a clear picture of what it means to be a good person from these contrasting models. Judging from the response in Chinese intellectual circles, his message is effective, and in some ways, Ba Jin is redeemed.
CHAPTER 2

“REMEMBERING HU FENG”

Part One

I recently read a short piece in the Literary Paper entitled “Hu Feng Lost Money, Ba Jin Assisted.” This was based on recollections written by Hu Feng while he was in jail. Several years ago when Comrade Mei Zhi gave me these materials [to look over], I added an explanatory note. Hu Feng has been dead for half a year now, but my brain still preserves an image of him as that vital and vigorous literary warrior. For several years I’ve been wanting to write a little something about Hu Feng. But it’s as if something is suffocating me, I can’t spit it out, and I feel like I can’t breathe freely. Yet when I take up my pen I don’t know where the words come from. And so I thought of what happened fifty years ago. Where do I start? Let me begin by adding a little to that short explanatory note.

That day we were all at Wan Guo Public Cemetery attending Lu Xun’s funeral. The open grave was surrounded by people, and I was standing opposite Hu Feng. I could see his movements very clearly. During the funeral, I saw someone ask Hu Feng for money. He took out a bunch of bills and then put them back in his pocket. He was surrounded by people, and I was a little worried about him, but I had no way to go over and remind him [to be careful]. When the ceremony was over, the coffin, covered by the flag of “National Spirit,” had disappeared in the open grave, and the crowd had dispersed like a tide water, I saw
Hu Feng again. He was nervously looking for something in the dark. Sure enough that bunch of bills had been taken. He did not suggest that I loan him money.

After I knew about what happened I turned to Wu Langxi³, who was also there at the time, and said: “Hu Feng has lost some money while working for the public, we should all help him.” Comrade Wu Langxi agreed, and the next day sent him some money, calling it an advance on payment for an article.

I say the “Public” because at that time we were all working on Lu Xun’s funeral. Hu Feng, along with Cai Yuanpei⁴ and Song Qingling,⁵ were part of a 13 member funeral committee. Jin Yi, Huang Yuan⁶, Xiao Jun⁷, Li Liewen and I were all part of the “funeral branch office”. There were about 28 or 29 of these “temporary staffers,” all with different work responsibilities. On October 19 Jin Yi, Huang Yuan, Xiao Jun and I followed Lu Xun’s remains to the Wan Guo Funeral Home on Jiaozhou Road. [We stayed] all the way through the afternoon of October 22 when Lu Xun’s coffin was buried at Wan Guo Public Cemetery. For three days in a row we were at the funeral home managing all kinds of things, getting [there] early, returning [home] late. Whenever we saw something that needed to be done, we did it. Hu Feng was a representative of the funeral committee, and thus was our leader. Whatever plans and decisions the funeral committee made were passed on through him. But then we didn’t completely heed the leader’s words. We had all come to work on our own, to express our respect for Lu Xun. There were no organizational connections [between us].⁸ Each of us had our own ideas. Some people had objections to some of the plans, but we did
not see any other members of the funeral committee, so we had to vent our complaints to Hu Feng.

We all understood the position Hu Feng was in. On the one hand he wanted to carry out the decisions of the funeral committee. On the other hand he wanted to convince the “temporary staffers” [to carry out the decisions]. Actually, we didn’t have that many objections, but it seems that regarding the following two matters we did speak out: One was the funeral expense, the other was maintaining order during the funeral procession. I’ve already forgotten the details, because later we cleared them up and didn’t speak of them again. Only of the second thing do I still have some impression: At that time the hearse’s path was to go through the “Public Concession,”9 both sides [of the street] lined with mounted Indian police and Indian police on foot, all of them armed. When the hearse arrived at Hongqiao Road the patrol was Chinese police wearing black with white puttee, their rifles all fixed with bayonets. The situation was a little tense. We were afraid some people would make trouble which would lead to a dispute. So we advocated that when shouting slogans and distributing leaflets to be a little more careful than usual. Indeed, Hu Feng wasn’t against this. I remember on the 22\textsuperscript{nd} before the hearse went out, he was on the porch talking with someone, I walked by him and he told me to be careful maintaining order, to not let people recklessly distribute leaflets.

Hu Ziyang\textsuperscript{10} heard this, maybe she was there at the time, and later at the wrap-up meeting she criticized Hu Feng. She said he had no faith in the masses.
The wrap-up meeting was held at the Ba Xian Qiao Youth Group by the funeral committee. There were a lot of people there. It was not my turn to speak, and Hu Feng did not defend himself. In any case Lu Xun's funeral had already solemnly and peacefully ended. Going through this "public event," Hu Feng left me with this lasting impression: He was willing to work regardless of criticism, always keeping the greater good in mind.

This happened in 1936. I met Hu Feng about this year or the end of the year before. One afternoon I went to Huan Long Road (also known as Nan Chang Road) to see Huang Yuan. He wasn't home and Hu Feng was also looking for him. We met at Huang Yuan's door and started talking. Hu Feng invited me to a small place in the neighborhood for some coffee and we sat awhile. I don't remember exactly what we talked about, we simply talked a little about the situation in the literary world. [We] did not talk about literary theory or literary criticism because I've never paid much attention to those issues. Speaking honestly, I hadn't even read much of Hu Feng’s work, it seems that I had only read his writer's theory published in Literature. In addition to this [article, I also read] a review article he wrote in 1932 using the pen name "Gu Fei". [It was] about some fiction published in Modern Times Monthly and it discussed my novella A Dream on the Sea.11 I published a piece in response to it, but that only explained that I was not one of his so-called "third type of person."12 I had my own opinions and that's that.
I certainly didn’t dislike him. In 1925 he left me with a lasting good impression. He was my classmate at Nanjing’s Southeastern University’s middle school. I was two classes ahead of him, but we were in the same teacher’s world history class. He was an active member of the school. He published some articles in the school’s journal, and was a little famous. I remember he was called Zhang Guangren. But there was no contact between us, to the point that he did not know my name. In 1925 before I graduated and left [Nanjing], the May 30th Incident happened in Shanghai. I participated in the Nanjing students’ Save China Campaign. But I wasn’t a dynamic member and I only touch on the experience in my novella The Setting Sun. But Hu Feng was an activist, participating in the work of the “National Foreign Relations Support Group (?).” In the eleventh chapter of my story Fang Guoliang is none other than Hu Feng. Although it’s written very simply, even today whenever I read the following lines [I still think of him]:

Fang Guoliang, weeping bitterly, reported the work conditions of several days. All throughout he was excitedly jumping around the platform, hoarsely recounting how they only had two or three hours of sleep each day, and laboriously took care of things, while most people gradually became down-spirited……Fang Guoliang’s speech did have some result. After the meeting broke up several students voluntarily gathered together, rode a small train and got off at Xiaguan…

It’s as if I can still see him on the platform speaking fervently and excitedly. His appearance hasn’t changed much. I never told him that that day after I heard his speech, I took the train to the Heqi factory in Xiaguan. Not long afterwards I
graduated and left Nanjing. Later I heard people saying that Zhang Guangren went to Japan. It is likely I read some of his work.

In the Autumn of 1935, as a result of the translation series, Huang Yuan, and Lu Xun (we all considered him our teacher), Hu Feng and I gradually became close. I quite respected him, though still did not read many of his review articles. It is not that I didn’t not read just his [work], I did not read what other people published. Even if I reluctantly read something, I did not remember it. I’d read to the end and have forgotten the beginning. I would be thinking: My work is based on my own thoughts, my own life; I speak my own words and pay no attention to what other people say. At that time [Hu Feng] and Zhou Yang were engaged in a war of pens regarding a theory of models, Literature for the National Defense, and other things. I didn’t know Zhou Yang and hadn’t read either side’s essays [on these matters]. It wasn’t just me, there were others who were not concerned with theory who [did not pay attention to these matters]. We only read Lu Xun’s response to Xu Maoyong. We listened to what Lu Xun said, and whatever slogan he endorsed, we also endorsed. But my work was never concerned with whether or not there was a slogan. If there was no slogan I would write fiction accordingly.

Hu Feng often went to Lu Xun’s house. Huang Yuan and Liewen also often went [there]. Liewen was Lu Xun’s friend, and he talked of how Lu Xun was worried about Hu Feng, feeling that sometimes he was too enthusiastic, too easily excitable. Hu Feng lived in a difficult situation. He very earnestly ran Sea
Swallow, a literary periodical irregularly published in Shanghai. Only two or three issues had been published when Lu Xun’s “Chu Guan” was published in it. Then the journal received the readers’ attention. At that time there were quite a few art and literary periodicals published in Shanghai. Besides Life Bookstore’s Literature, Light, Translation, there was also Meng Shihuan’s Author, Jin Yi’s Literary Seasons, and Li Liewen’s semi-monthly Midstream. Several months after Huang Yuan’s Translation stopped publication, the Shanghai Magazine Company began publishing it again. In addition to these there were still others. Some periodical markets were big, some small. Each had its own characteristics and united several authors; each person liked to write for the magazine they were familiar with, not necessarily just the periodicals of colleagues. We had one thing in common: love and respect for Lu Xun. Everyone was united around Lu Xun, not wanting to be unworthy of his concern for us.

Liewen and I drafted an Art and Literary Workers’ Proclamation, expressing our Resist Japan-Save China ideas. Liewen brought it to Lu Xun’s house to ask him to finalize it, sign it, copy part of it and then give several [of them] to friends for signatures. [We asked] if it were possible for him to publish it as filler in his own or his friends’ periodicals. None of us were part of the Art and Literary Association at that time. Lu Xun was sick, and hadn’t expressed an attitude [towards the declaration], so we asked him to head up the list of signers and publish this declaration. We did not hold a meeting to discuss it before or after, and did not consult with Hu Feng. Hu Feng also took the declaration to get
the signatures of friends. There weren’t many periodicals which published this proclamation, but five or six did, such as Author, Translation and Literary Seasons Monthly. Three months later Lu Xun died of his illness. Two more months passed and at the end of the year, the Shanghai branch of the Nationalist party closed down thirteen periodicals, including Author and Literary Seasons. There were no reasons given, only orders issued.  

From the time I met Hu Feng to the publication of the “third group of materials” was about twenty years. During those twenty years we saw each other fairly often, and talked frequently. During the anti-Hu Feng campaign I thought carefully about the events before it. It was very strange, we very seldom talked about artistic and literary issues. I rarely read his articles, and he seldom read my work. Actually, with me this is common; I seldom seriously talked about art and literature with anyone. I hadn’t done any research with regard to literature, and had no special views. So even today I still do not consider myself a literary specialist. What I wrote was only what I wanted to say; when I compiled a collection, I only took books [I considered] worth reading and introduced them to the reader. I live in this society, I should serve it, I work for it according to my understanding of it. I never paid attention to what theorists talked about. Because of this I had time to write millions of words, and have published many collections. But I must acknowledge that I did not work as seriously and earnestly as Hu Feng did.
I also did not have the ability to unite talented authors and poets around me. I admired [Hu Feng], but I did not want to be like him. Other than writing books, I also liked translating. [But] as for editing, I only did it because others were unwilling to. Not like Hu Feng, he considered cultivating talented people his own responsibility. He himself said it was a “love of talent,” I think that even more he liked to be close to others who shared his views and interests. But that is common. Even he didn’t expect that after the founding of the country there would be an anti-Hu Feng campaign, that his “heart that loves talent” would be charged as “counter-revolutionary.”

Honestly speaking, this campaign came like a bolt out of the blue, I considered him to be a progressive author, at least more progressive than I. Jin Yi had more opportunities to come into contact with him, and when they saw each other they loved to joke around. Jin Yi also seldom read Hu Feng’s work, but considered him to be relatively close to the Party. That was when they were in Chongqing. Later, when the Writer’s Association published the periodical *Chinese Author* in Shanghai, they were both part of the editorial staff.

I did not read Hu Feng’s work often, and am unclear about his artistic and literary views. I remember there was one time he sent me a book and we talked a little. I asked him: Why do other people have opinions about you? He bluntly answered: “Because I speak up for intellectuals.” This was around 1948. Later he went to liberated areas by way of Hong Kong. I read the articles he wrote in Hong Kong and they reminded me of a past event: In the Spring of 1941 I
returned to Chongqing from Chengdu. It was after the “Anhui Event,” when a lot of cultural people went to Hong Kong. Lao She, who had stayed in Chongqing to direct War of Resistance work for the Writer’s Association, told me: “[If] you go, tell me. When Hu Feng left he found me and we talked a long time.” Hu Feng was still publishing classical style poetry in Chongqing; he sent it from Hong Kong. I still cannot forget the first four lines of one poem: “Dawn crosses the river, Fog of the mountain city is dense, I do not cry the tears of a man far from home, Rather those of a loyal servant driven out.” This describes his feeling while setting out to cross the river for the southern shore at Crabapple Spring.

I am reminded of life in Chongqing at that time. In the Fall of 1942 I also went to Crabapple Spring to catch a bus, but I was going on to Guilin. Not two years later I returned to Chongqing, and again went through Crabapple Spring. Later I lived in Chongqing. Hu Feng returned to Chongqing earlier, after the Japanese army attacked and occupied Hong Kong. He lived in the Chongqing countryside. Each time the Council for the Art and Literary Enemy Resistance Association met, I saw him at the Zhang Family Garden. Sometimes I attended other meetings, or social activities, and he was also there. One afternoon I attended the Sino-Soviet Cultural Association’s meeting to plan for the eighth anniversary of Lu Xun’s death. The meeting was held on Minguo Road in the neighborhood of the Culture and Life Society. Song Qingling was at the meeting, the person in charge of the Sino-Soviet Association, Zhang Ximan, also came. Xue Feng and Hu Feng were both there. The meeting progressed smoothly
according to a pre-determined agenda. When the meeting was half-over Song Qingling left because of a previous engagement. Once she left, the meeting room fell into chaos. Nationalist secret agents began to besiege Hu Feng, still others slandered Shanghai’s Xu Guangping. Xue Feng defended Ms. Xu. People who had come prepared to disrupt the meeting began to argue. Zhang Ximan spoke out, but the secret agents didn’t listen, rather they admonished him. The meeting place was forcibly occupied by these people, and the meeting hastily came to an end. Several of us left one after another. We all went to Xue Feng’s place. He lived in a writer’s study, diagonally opposite from the Culture and Life Society. We grumbled a little. Xue Feng was very angry, and Hu Feng seemed to be seriously thinking about something. I urged him to be careful; that sort of secret agent could have a plot. There were many such events, but I did not record them when they happened, and [now] they are all gradually fading and leaving my memory. I want very much to write down some of our conversations, but already it is impossible.

Part Two

Right after liberation Hu Feng and I saw each other often. Attending the first National Literary Representative Meeting, we weren’t in the same delegation. He went to Beiping first, as part of the first delegation from the south. In September, however, we both attended the first Political Consultative Conference, riding the same train from Shanghai to the capital. At the Chinese Literary School
we had neighboring rooms. I always went out to find friends, but he stayed at the
guest house to receive guests. We often attended meetings together, yet very
seldom sat and talked at length.

In July 1953 I went to Korea for the second time, Hu Feng had moved to
Beijing earlier. He said he wanted to go with me, but because he was revising an
article for People’s Literature, he stayed behind. I remember the essay was called
“Broken In Health But Not In Spirit,” a piece of reportage about a wounded
Volunteer Soldier. Hu Feng and several authors had gone to live in a northeastern
hospital [to research the story]. Two days before I left [for Korea] I went to his
house to ask after him, to see whether or not it had been decided that he would go.
When I arrived, they were eating dinner. The family had guests. I didn’t know
them and he didn’t introduce them. I told him the date I was leaving, then said
goodbye and left. I had already eaten dinner, plus was carrying a bunch of books,
and the three-wheeled cart I hired was still waiting outside for me.

Not long afterwards the Second National Writer’s Conference was held in
Beijing. I had just arrived in Korea and it wasn’t that convenient for me to return
to China. I therefore asked for leave [to not attend the conference]. I didn’t
return to China until five months later. In Autumn 1954 Hu Feng and I attended
the First National People’s Congress together. We were both elected
representatives of Sichuan province and were often in meetings at the same place.
When we saw one another we were cordial, but throughout we seldom talked with
each other.
Although I had studied several documents and periodicals having many articles regarding art and literature, and had often heard reports of principles and policies regarding art and literature, I still was utterly ignorant of it. I really wanted to study earnestly and reform myself, to throw out the old and install the new, to put my tools in motion as quickly as possible and write a little something. I feared meetings, but did not dare not attend [them]. I secretly planned to avoid some meetings, the result being that often I apathetically attended many meetings, continuously making or preparing to make self-criticisms. [This] consumed twenty or thirty good years, all for nothing. The more diligent I was, the more I failed to produce any written works. And though I wore the hat of an author, I lacked the time to write. Now my days are short due to an illness which is difficult to cure. I am preparing to stop writing, and to settle accounts in the ledger of my writing life.\textsuperscript{33} When I think of the three following major campaigns, I can’t help but tremble from head to toe. I was not thrown into the abyss of the “Hu Feng Clique,”\textsuperscript{34} “the Anti-rightist Struggle,” or the “Cultural Revolution.” This is fortunate. But to those friends who died full of hatred, how do I explain myself?

\textbf{Part Three}

Last year on March 26 the Center for Modern Chinese Literature formally opened and I went to offer my congratulations. I had not been to Beijing for two and a half years. I was very happy to see many friends, but getting around wasn’t convenient. I had to let friends come see me. Comrade Mei Zhi and Hu Feng
came to see me. She pointed at Hu Feng, asking me: “Do you still recognize him?” I was speechless for a moment. I should have known he was Hu Feng, [even though] this was the first time I’d seen him since 1955. He was completely changed. One look at him and it was clear he was a sick man. His face was expressionless, and he didn’t speak. I said: “Seeing you this way, I am very sorry.” I was on the verge of tears, for myself. Before this, when he was hospitalized in Shanghai, I didn’t go see him. This is because I believed I had not repaid my debt to him. I felt ashamed. Only I know my state of mind, and sometimes even I can’t express it clearly. On the morning of the second day I attended the Writer’s Association Chairman’s committee expanded meeting. Hu Feng, accompanied by his daughter, sat at a long table opposite [me]. My eyes often rested on his face. I couldn’t find that familiar Hu Feng of the past. He sat there dumbly, did not move, and did not speak with his daughter. I thought about going to say hello during the break, to speak a few words with him. But when this part of the meeting was about to end, father and daughter stood up and left. My eyes followed them. I had so much I wanted to say. It was as if I was watching many years pass by, with no way to pull them back to me. I thought of an old saying: “Meeting one time is one time less.”35 I didn’t know that it was the last time I would see him.

Later in Shanghai I received news of his passing. I sent a telegram asking someone to represent me at his tomb and present a wreath. I said nothing else; to
say something now was all too late. In the end I lost the opportunity to repay my
debt [to him].

But defaulting on a debt is always unacceptable. Even if debts have not
been cleared up or time has long passed, I must let later generations know that I
really tried hard, that I had hoped to be able to make up for harm done to a friend
in the past.

The unjust case against Hu Feng was reversed. I read that his wife,
Comrade Mei Zhi, wrote Biography of Hu Feng. [It was] very moving, very
difficult to bear. He was treated so unfairly. At the time he said: “I am not at
ease.” Today he probably still is not “at ease.” The origin and development of his
unjust case and its whole process has not yet been made public. I don’t have the
courage to face the truth, or to think of a way to find out even more details. [Hu
Feng and Mei Zhi] had gone to Sichuan. I heard that during the “Cultural
Revolution” Hu Feng was again imprisoned, and in the end he was sentenced to
life imprisonment. Only then did his health completely decline. I haven’t yet read
the final part of Mei Zhi’s work published in Wen Hui Monthly. I think she too
was unable to write out the events completely. I don’t have the time to clear up all
that I should know either; I only have two or three years left.
Part Four

I still have to talk about the “Anti-Hu Feng Struggle.”

In that “struggle,” what did I actually do? I remember in Shanghai I wrote three articles, and presided over several criticism meetings. After the meetings were held, they were forgotten. No one cared about the content of them. But the articles remain, at least in libraries and reference rooms. But actually even they have been forgotten. It is only when I sum up the past that they seem to be branded upon my heart. Often it is as if there is a voice in my ear whispering: “You mustn’t forget!” Once again I think of the events of 1955.

The campaign started. Someone urged me to write a criticism article expressing my point of view. I did not want to write it, and I did not know how to write it, I actually could not write it. Someone came and urged [me to write] a draft. He wasn’t very polite [about it]. I said I was slowly writing an essay discussing Lu Ling’s Battle of the Ditch. But several days later, a reporter from the People’s Daily came from Beijing to solicit a contribution. I was at the Writer’s Association attending a meeting to discuss the question of criticizing Hu Feng. When it came time to express an opinion, I was no longer able to evade it. So I wrote a piece I think was called “Their Crimes Should Be Punished,” a sort of short essay. What I said [in it] was what other people had said. But [at least] I had expressed an opinion, the first critical juncture had been passed.

The second piece was “Two Matters Regarding Hu Feng,” published in Art and Literature Monthly. It was also a short essay. Both matters I wrote of were
true. Lu Xun had plainly said he didn’t believe Hu Feng was a spy, but I explained [Lu Xun’s opinion] saying that Lu Xun had been deceived. In February 1955 while in Beijing I heard President Zhou speak, I ran into Hu Feng. He said to me: “This time I have committed a serious error, please criticize me more.” So I criticized him by saying “he had a guilty conscience.” I didn’t have any proof. But at the second critical moment I had no choice but to carry out this kind of false reasoning.

Writing the third essay, I originally thought I could smartly find a way out, but the result was that I outsmarted myself. I ended up carrying an extremely heavy spiritual burden. I probably can remember the events correctly. The second time I came back from Korea, I stayed in Beijing for several days. Lu Ling’s short story called “First Snow” had just been published in People’s Literature. Comrade Quan Lin recommended it to me, I read it, also thought it was good, and talked to others about it. Later Battle of the Ditch came out and the response was not bad, I liked it too. I knew that love between the Volunteer Soldiers and Korean girls was absolutely forbidden, but what Lu Ling wrote about was an individual’s ideal, an unrealizable wish. What was the problem then? During the campaign against the Hu Feng clique, I was forced to participate in the struggle. I truly could not write articles, so I just chose Battle of the Ditch as a target. The basis for my criticism was the ban on the volunteer army and native people falling in love. When the draft was written I sent it to People’s Literature. I relaxed a little. The situation was changing and the campaign developed; my article was published in
[People’s Literature]. It had been changed beyond recognition. I saw some political terminology I would not have thought to have written. Furthermore, I did not know where I’d gotten the power to label someone a “Counter-Revolutionary.” It also appeared that there were several sentences hastily added on [to the essay] at the last moment. In a word, reading it the first time I was very unsatisfied. But after a night, a friend came to see me, and we talked about this article. I was calm; there was nothing I could say. What I had written was an ideological criticism article, but I was supposed to denounce “Counter-Revolutionary cliques.” If the article had been published the way I had written it, then I would have become the target of criticism, charged with intentionally absolving “Counter-Revolutionaries.” The additions and changes that the editor of People’s Literature made to my essay helped me a great deal. Without them I would have encountered a great deal of trouble.

It was in this year that Art and Literature Monthly published a certain famous musician’s “self criticism.” He wrote a piece “thoroughly exposing” Hu Feng. This manuscript was handed in after the second group of materials was published. But while waiting for the Monthly to go on sale at book markets, the third set of materials appeared. The [purported] characteristics of the Hu Feng clique again escalated. Condemnatory letters arrived from readers one after another. [The musician] had to immediately make a public self criticism saying that [his article] “actually resulted in shielding Hu Feng black elements.” Even the Monthly editorial department had to acknowledge “with regard to this error...
should bear most of the responsibility.” This kind of atmosphere, this kind of environment, these kinds of methods…using the strength of the whole country to deal with “a handful” of literary men, all for what? Maybe this “clique” really did have some hidden scheme? No matter what, I only had one road to travel, if I was able to push then I pushed, if unable to push then I’d make do. Anyway, I had an excuse: “the Gods are wise and bright.” At that time I was still clearly carrying the burden of worship of the individual. I couldn’t straighten out my thinking, so I didn’t think much. I really had no time to think hard.

After the initial enthusiasm for the Anti-Hu Feng struggle, it gradually cooled down. He and his friends, those so-called “Hu Feng elements,” had not shown their faces during the struggle. Later [they were like] stones dropped into the sea, no one spoke their names again. Occasionally I asked for news of Hu Feng from close friends, and was told: “You needn’t ask.” I thought of the Qing Dynasty’s “literary inquisition” and shivered again and again and didn’t dare make a sound. Foreign friends asked me how things stood with Hu Feng and I hemmed and hawed and said nothing. During those days, those years and months, one campaign followed another, never-ending big meetings and small meetings, with everyone wanting to “pass the test.” Everyone was so busy fending for themselves, who had the time or the courage to be asking about things you shouldn’t ask after? Only once during the “Cultural Revolution,” I don’t remember where, I saw a small report or some material, saying that Hu Feng was in Sichuan. Outside of this I didn’t know anything [about him]. [It was this way]
all the way to the end of the “Cultural Revolution,” when everything that had been
turned upside down was turned around again, when the talent that had been buried
alive was returned to people, but he was no longer the former Hu Feng.

A laughing, talking poet full of energy becomes wood-like, a sick man not
at all full of life. He received so much persecution and torture! He was unable to
go on working, there is nothing more painful than this. I really did not know much
about him, my understanding of him isn’t deep. I read his 35,000 word
“Memorial,” and not long after forgot it. But thinking carefully about it, it seems
that there wasn’t anything greatly wrong with it. In order to write this
“Remembrance,” I read the *Art and Literature Monthly* from that time. I found
the editorial department’s acknowledgment of the errors of the words [of the
“Memorial”]. It was like I was beaten by a head on blow! Black characters
printed on white paper will never be wiped away. Later generations will be our
true judges. In the end for what errors should we be held responsible? They
know, they won’t be able to forgive us. In the 50s I often said I was proud to be a
Chinese author. But thinking of the “struggles,” those “campaigns,” and my own
performances (even if I was acting against my will), I still feel disgusted and
ashamed. Today looking over the words I wrote thirty years ago, I am still unable
to forgive myself, and I don’t want to ask later generations to forgive me. I think,
if Hu Feng, working for literature and the arts, had not been wrongly convicted
and persecuted, if he had not been imprisoned for a long time, if he had not been
judged and sentenced though innocent, not only would he be alive today, he also would have been successful. But today there is nothing. What else can I say?

I am a decrepit sick man, my thoughts are clumsy. Writing this kind of article is difficult. It has taken almost a year from the beginning to now to write it. Sometimes I only write thirty to fifty characters a day. I want to speak the truth, [I] want to hear other people speaking the truth. But taking up my pen to write, opening my mouth to speak or leaning in to listen closely, it is only then that I realize: speaking the truth is not easy. I read the final part of the *Wenhui Monthly’s Biography of Hu Feng*. The story is unfinished, their life in Sichuan not written about at all. I asked Comrade Mei Zhi to continue writing. Referring to her article, Mei Zhi said “past events are like smoke.” I said: Past events can’t be dissipated. All those memories collected together will become a copper-cast alarm bell. We must always remember this painful lesson.

I also want to apologize to Comrade Lu Ling here. I don’t know him, I only saw him a couple of times at the first Literary representatives meeting. He was young then, a talented author. It’s a pity he hasn’t been given the opportunity to let his pen emit even more radiance. When I criticized *Battle of the Ditch* my intention was not to harm the author, but since the campaign had escalated, my article also became more critical. I don’t know how things stand for him now, I have only heard that he lost his energy and his health. With regard to his misfortune, his unjust case, his illness, how can I explain it all to later generations? Did we artistic and literary workers of that time not make mistakes? Although I
don’t see people coming forward to acknowledge “their responsibility for some mistakes,” shouldn’t I, throwing stones into the well, have to acknowledge my own share of the responsibility? People can’t intentionally create history out of imagination, silence can’t block the flow of the truth. The unjust, dirty water splashed upon his body is of no use. It is only because [I spoke] those “words against my heart” that I am absolutely unable to forgive myself.

August 20, [1986]
Chapter 1

1. Pen Name, Ba Jin, Given name, Li Feigan, b. 1904. For a detailed look at Ba Jin’s life and beliefs, see Olga Lang’s biography of Ba Jin. Lang’s work focuses on Ba Jin and how he fits in with pre-Communist China. Nathan Mao’s Ba Jin looks more closely at the literary aspects of Ba Jin’s work.

2. An education in the Chinese Classics was meant to prepare the students for the Chinese Civil Service Exam. Though the exam was abolished in 1905, many families continued to educate their sons in this tradition.


5. Lang, 99.


7. Kropotkin, Peter (1842-1921), former Russian prince, later an Anarchist. “An Appeal to the Young,” was first published in 1880.

8. Lang, 134.


10. Merle Goldman’s Literary Dissent in Communist China analyzes the situation in which Chinese intellectuals found themselves under Communist rule. She examines the various rectification and re-education campaigns, as well as the major political upheavals.


12. According to the February 1968 newspaper article, “Daodi kexu Ba Jin de fansheng zhen mianmu” (Thoroughly Expose Ba Jin’s True Counter-revolutionary Face), Ba Jin was labeled a counter-revolutionary for a number of reasons, some of which have little base in fact. He was criticized for his family background and his anarchist beliefs. He was accused of sympathizing with the Nationalists because he did not blatantly oppose them in his early fiction. His attackers claimed he never really supported the Party or Mao Zedong. He is called a Capitalist Rightist. He was also attacked as a counter-revolutionary because of a 1962 speech about an author’s responsibility in which he advocated more freedom for artists. The reason that Ba Jin avoided attack for so long, according to his accusers, was that there were stronger, more important people behind him who protected him and made him seem more progressive than he really was.

13. The May Seventh Cadre Schools were places where intellectuals were sent during the Cultural Revolution. The name is derived from an imaginary clique
that was thought to be trying to overthrow the ruling party. See Yang Jiang’s *Ganxiao lin ji* (1981) [Six Tales from my Life ‘Downunder’].

14. Cowsheds were makeshift jails during the Cultural Revolution.

15. Lang, 3. This is significant because Lu Xun is considered to be the father of Modern Chinese literature.


32. The following is a list of the Memorial Essays found in *Suixiang lu*, along with information about the subjects.

- “Jinian Xue Feng,” August 8, 1979 – Feng Xuefeng (1903-1976), literary theorist, poet and author.
- “Diaofang Zhi tongzhi,” December 4, 1979 – Fang Zhi (1930-1979), given name Han Jianguo, author.
- “Huainian Lao She tongzhi,” December 15, 1979 – Lao She (1899-1966), given name She Qingchun, author.
- “Zhao Dan tongzhi,” October 11-13, 1980 – Zhao Dan (1915-1980), given name Zhao Feng’ao, moviemaker.
• “Huainian Feng xiansheng,” May 31, 1981 – Feng ZiKai (1898-1975), given name Feng Ren, artist and political cartoonist.
• “Huainian Ma Zongrong da ge,” January 29, 1982 – Ma Zongrong (1895-1944), pen name Zhu Hou, author.
• “Wode gege Li Xiaofin,” August 10, 1983 – Ba Jin’s elder brother, educator and translator. He was one year older than Ba Jin, and died during the War of Resistance against the Japanese.
• “Huainian yiwei jiaoyu jia,” August 22, 1983 – Kuang Hu (1891-1933), pen name Hu Sun, educator.
• “Zai yi Xiao Shan,” January 21, 1984 – Another essay recalling the importance of Xiao Shan in his life.

34. There are many English accounts of Red Guard activity, and of the atmosphere of the Cultural Revolution in general. Several that I find informative are Nien Chang’s Life and Death in Shanghai, Jung Chang’s Wild Swans, and Yang Jiang’s Six Tales from my Life ‘Downunder.’ Nien Chang’s book is told from the point of view of a survivor of Red Guard terror, while Jung Chang’s is told, in part, from the perspective of a former Red Guard. Yang Jiang’s account of her and her husband’s, both intellectuals and authors, experience during the Cultural Revolution is yet another interesting look at a terrifying period of time and how people deal with it.
35. *Huai Nian Ji*, originally published in 1982, it is a collection of Memorial Essays dating to the mid-1930s. I have been using the expanded 1989 edition which has two essays not included in *Suixiang lu*.


40. Lu Ling (1913– ), given name Xu Sixing, author. PROtégé of Hu Feng.


42. Ba Jin. *Suixiang lu*, 887.


46. Ba Jin. *Suixiang lu*, 186

47. Ba Jin. *Suixiang lu*, 881


60. Ba Jin. *Suixiang lu*, 422. See also 185, 353, 359, 365, 607.


64. Ba Jin. *Suixiang lu*, 609.


70. Ba Jin. *Suixiang lu*, 611.


72. Sister Guohua is Gu Junzheng’s wife.
88. See Ba Jin, “Zeren xin.”
89. Ba Jin. *Suixiang lu*, 582, 584.
98. Ba Jin. *Suixiang lu*, 293.
109. Lu Xun died on October 19, 1936, his funeral was held October 22, 1936.
There have been occasions in the Party’s history where it attacked loyal supporters. For example Ding Ling, Wang Jingwei and Ai Qing all came under fire at Yan'an in 1942 for holding literary views that seemingly differed from those of the Party. In 1955 Ding Ling was accused of leading the Ding-Chen Anti-Party Clique in an attempt to undermine the Party’s cultural organization, as led by Zhou Yang. Others included in that attack were Feng Xuefeng and Ai Qing, both of whom had been loyal to the Party. There were others besides Ba Jin who withdrew from creative writing, a notable example is Shen Congwen. He was a talented and prolific writer prior to the founding of the People’s Republic. He gave up writing creatively for a safer job as a researcher of Chinese textiles.

Ai Qing (1910-1996), given name Jiang Haicheng, poet.
The Gang of Four is the official scapegoat for the Cultural Revolution. The group consisted of Jiang Qing (Chairman Mao’s wife), Wang Hongwen, Yao Wenyuan, and Zhang Chunqiao. Though officially Chairman Mao is not blameless for the Cultural Revolution, the Gang of Four was held responsible for the excesses that occurred during those ten years. They were also accused of conspiring to take over the government after Chairman Mao’s death in 1976.

People writing about the influence of Ba Jin’s Suixiang lu are older (having experienced at least the Cultural Revolution) authors (including Wang Meng), literary theorists (including Liu Zaifu), academics and students.

Zhao Ruibing, “Du Ba Jin xiansheng de yifeng xin.”

Li Ziyun, “Ba Jin sanwen manping.” The New Period in contemporary Chinese Literature was the time immediately following the end of the Cultural Revolution.

Sun Dexi, “Shilun Suixiang lu de wenxue shi yiyi,” 64.

Sun Jigu, “Ba Jin xin shiqi sanwen chuangzuo lunxi,” 38

Li Fangping, “Suixiang lu yu zhongguo zhishi fenzi de renge duli,” 132. It is important to note that these comments are made by people who experienced the Cultural Revolution first-hand. Many younger Chinese I spoke with about this work, namely classmates during the 1996-97 school-year at the Hopkins-Nanjing Center for Chinese and American Studies and co-workers in Shanghai in 1997, believe that Ba Jin’s work is not very significant, and they found it kind of funny and old-fashioned that I chose to focus my research on Ba Jin and his later work.

175. Li Ziyun, “Ba Jin sanwen manping.”
180. Li Ziyun, “Ba Jin sanwen manping.”
184. Chen Jiaping, “Cong relie de huanle dao lengjun de chenshi,” 60.
186. Zhao, “Du Ba Jin xiansheng de yifeng xin.”
188. Chen Jiaping, “Cong relie de huanle dao lengjun de chenshi,” 60.
195. Yuan Ying, “Ta huhuanzhe zuojia de lishi zerengan.” Yuan called for this because he admired the way that Ba Jin began his search for truth with himself. Yuan Ying sees it as a way for Chinese people to come together. He believes that Ba Jin’s love for his people and humanity in general reaches the most pure and the deepest boundaries. See also, Li Fangping, “Suixiang lu yu zhongguo zhishi fenzi de renge duli,” 136: “We should take Ba Jin as a model.”
201. Chen Jiaping, “Cong relie de huanle dao lengjun de chenshi,” 63.
220. Song Limin, “Quan zai xinzhe’ de chanhui – Ba Jin de Suixiang lu de ziwo jiepo,” 66.
221. Sun Jiguo, “Ba Jin xin shi qi sanwen chuangzuo lunxi,” 34.
222. Liu Zaifu, “Zuojia de liangzhi he wenxue de chanhui,” 82. Liu Zaifu (p. 82-3) talks at length about and admires greatly how Ba Jin assumes his burden of the responsibility for the Cultural Revolution.
224. Song Limin, “Quan zai xinzhe’ de chanhui – Ba Jin de Suixiang lu de ziwo jiepo,” 65.
227. Li Ziyun, “Ba Jin sanwen manping.”
228. Sun Jiguo, “Ba Jin xin shi qi sanwen chuangzuo lunxi,” 35. See also, 37: “Being a warrior, an author, Ba Jin was conscious of his responsibility.”

Chapter 2

1. Hu Feng, Born Zhang Guangren, (1902-1985). Poet and Literary theorist. I chose this essay because it is representative of the Memorial-style essay. Ba Jin goes into great detail about past historical events, recollects his experiences with his subject and why he admires him, and goes into great detail about the remorse and shame he feels about his behavior from 1949 to the present. There are times when the essay seems a bit disjointed, but one must remember that it was written over the course of a year.
2. Mei Zhi (1914- ), given name Tu Qihua, writer, wife of Hu Feng
3. Wu Langxi, Founder and editor-in-chief of the influential Culture and Life Publishers, a publishing house that specialized in producing the works of new
and popular writers, as well as literature in translation. Many of the major Chinese writers of the thirties contributed to the various series and collections published by Wu.

4. Cai Yuanpei (1867-1940), educator. Most notably he was Chancellor of Beijing University during the May 4th Movement.

5. Song Qingling (1890-1981), wife of Sun Yat-sen and political activist.

6. Huang Yuan (1906- ), given name Huang Heqing, translator and editor.

7. Xiao Jun (1907-88), given name Zhou Zuqing, writer.

8. Artists often formed organizations with colleagues who shared philosophical and political views.

9. During the time of the events, Shanghai was occupied by foreign governments. Each country had its own “concession” of land. These concessions were treated as sovereign territory of the occupying nations. The “public concession” belonged to the Chinese People.

10. Hu Ziying (1903- ), penname Song Lin, writer


12. “Third type of person,” is likely a reference to what Hu Feng called “Third type of literature.” That is, literature that favored neither the left nor the right. Both Lu Xun and Zhou Yang denounced this type of writer, believing that literature must serve a utilitarian purpose.

13. Though they attended the same school at the same time, and Ba Jin knew of him, he did not meet Hu Feng at this earlier time. When he writes that he met Hu Feng first in 1936, he means that it was then that they were introduced and became acquaintances.

14. May 30th Incident of 1925 occurred when British soldiers fired on protesting students and workers. This led to nationwide strikes and boycotts.

15. The Setting Sun, Novel by Ba Jin, published by Shanghai’s Kai Ming Press in 1930. It deals with the question of foreign imperialism and the role of bourgeois intellectuals in the labor movement.

16. “National Foreign Relations Group” The question mark is in the Chinese text. I have found nothing on it, nor have the editors of Sui Xiang Lu. Apparently it was one of many small student groups in existence at the time.

17. Zhou Yang, (1908-89). From the 40s to the mid-60s, he was the mouthpiece for the Chinese Communist Party, handling all intellectual and literary matters. During the Slogan War of the 30s, he was Lu Xun’s main opponent. He advocated and organized campaigns that were meant to tighten Party control.

18. The theory of models discussion took place in 1935 and was about representative characters in literature. Hu Feng advocated creating characters that represent certain groups or classes. Zhou Yang argued that characters should be individuals as well as types. This battle, like others of the time, evolved into an ideological power struggle between Zhou Yang’s group and
Lu Xun's group, in this case as represented by Hu Feng, which would have consequences later.

19. The War of Slogans was another factional struggle. This time the two groups were advocating slogans for the creation of literature. Zhou Yang's group the Chinese Writers Association, through Xu Maoyong, came up with the slogan "Literature for the National Defense." Hu Feng and the Chinese Literary Workers introduced the slogan "Peoples Literature for National Revolutionary Struggle."

20. Xu Maoyong 1911-1977. Xu Maoyong was the author chosen to attack Lu Xun's group's slogan. Lu Xun published Xu's letter, and a stinging rebuttal to it.

21. There were so many literary journals being published at the time, that a contribution by an author as important and well-loved as Lu Xun could ensure a publication's success.


23. The Nationalist government heavily censored all publications. Especially those which attacked Nationalist policies and leaders, which many journals and newspapers in Shanghai did.

24. "Third group of materials," personal correspondence, private notes and other writings which were published as evidence to incriminate Hu Feng and his associates. There were three such groups during the Anti-Hu Feng campaign in 1955.

25. This refers to the founding of the People's Republic of China in 1949 by the Chinese Communist Party, led by Mao Zedong.

26. The liberated areas during the Chinese Civil war were those controlled by Communist forces.

27. The "Anhui Event," refers to the January 1941 New Fourth Army Incident which almost destroyed the United Front.

28. Crabapple Spring, a transport center.


30. Xu Guangping (1898-1968), wife and former student of Lu Xun

31. Beiping, Name of Beijing during Nationalist rule when the capital was in Nanjing.

32. Reportage literature is a genre of literature which falls between journalism and fiction, usually uncovering basic sociological facts. See Liu Binyan's People or Monsters.

33. Throughout Suixiang lu Ba Jin returns to the theme of settling up accounts. He believes that he owes a debt to those colleagues whom he betrayed. His essays are a way to look back over his life and to finally settle up.

34. "Hu Feng Clique," colleagues, friends and protégé of Hu Feng. See note 35.

35. Referring perhaps to a traditional Chinese belief that one is allotted a fixed number of times to encounter another.
36. The “Anti-Hu Feng Campaign” took place in 1955. It had its roots in the earlier battles during the 1930s between Zhou Yang and Hu Feng in which Hu Feng directly challenged the Party in cultural matters. There were small scale ideological attacks on Hu Feng’s followers in 1948 and 1954, but he was never named as a target. In July 1954, during a time of comparative relaxation by the Party, Hu Feng made a report to the Central Committee in which he argued to oust literary authorities and their policies. When the 1955 campaign against him began, it was political in nature. It was meant to destroy any and all heterodoxies among intellectuals and then among the general population. Hu Feng symbolized these heterodoxies. Even after he had been destroyed, the Party continued to use him as a symbol of incorrect thinking, and continued the campaign to root out “Hu Feng-ism” in the country.


39. See note 23.

40. Here Ba Jin is saying that these matters were all out his control. He believed that the Gods had a plan, and he was not going to second guess them.

41. “Literary Inquisition,” 1774-82. The Qian Long Emperor (1736-95), commissioned the compilation of what is known as the Four Treasuries (Si ku quanshu), intended to be a complete anthology of the best writings of China’s civilization. Under the guise of this project, private libraries were searched and people who owned works which were perceived to slight the Manchus were punished and the works destroyed. Works of geography and travel that were thought to give away China’s defenses were also destroyed. Some who worked on the project used it to further their own philosophical aims. L.C. Goodrich estimates that over 2600 works were slated to be destroyed. Many of those have never been recovered. See Goodrich, 61.

42. This “Memorial” refers to Hu Feng’s report to the Central Committee in July 1954. In this report he did not advocate the overthrow of the political system, rather he argued for the dismissal of dogmatic and sectarian cultural authorities and their policies. Hu wanted literature to break free from the narrow confines of a political approach, and asked that artists be given more freedom, especially from the thought reform campaigns. He believed that the very process of writing would provide thought reform, and that artists should be able to develop their talents within the existing Communist system.
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