

SATIRE IN CHINESE COMMUNIST LITERATURE*

VINCENT Y. C. SHIH

Liu Hsieh 劉勰 said long ago: "The mind of the people is as precipitous as mountains, and their mouths, when stopped, are like dammed-up rivers. As their resentment and anger differ, their ways of expressing their feelings in jests or derision also vary."¹ Criticism there will always be when there is dissatisfaction, however politically dangerous the circumstances may be. But the sense of self-preservation dictates that the form a criticism takes has to be the result of a judicious choice. Liu Hsieh attributed the difference in forms in which feelings are expressed to the differences in resentment and anger rather than to the nature of political power. His position is understandable. In the whole history of imperial China the relationship between the ruler and the ruled has not been one of reciprocity, despite the Confucian teaching to the contrary. Loyalty is demanded of the ruled, to be violated only at the penalty of death. But the benevolence and respect expected of the ruler are generally left to his caprice. The ruler is beyond criticism, and any criticism is given at the risk of the giver. For this reason various forms of criticism were developed in ancient China with various kinds of resentment in view and with the specific purpose of softening the hurt feelings of the criticized.

Wang Hsien-ch'ien 王先謙 in his *Shih san-chia i chi-shu* 詩三家義集疏 made the following observation: "Poetry may be either praise or censure. Censure poetry takes many forms, each with its own distinct pattern: it may criticize directly, or by a subtle satire, or by giving unreserved praise. A praise-censure poem may sound like any other praise poem; but the discrepancy between the factual course of events and what the poem portrays would make it obvious that it is intended to be a criticism." The use of satire, while a literary device to produce effectiveness, also indicates that there is reason for not wanting to call a spade a spade. Such a device is not, of course, restricted to poetry. Jester Chan used it to cure Erh-shih of his folly of wanting to paint the city wall, and Jester Meng used it to make King Chuang of Ch'u realize the stupidity of his plan to give his favorite horse a state funeral.²

Things have not changed radically in modern times, human nature being what it is. With all the totalitarian attempt to control the mind of man, satire is more than ever resorted to to express feelings of resentment. What happened in mainland China in recent years shows on the one hand the power of satire and on the other the lasting truth of Liu Hsieh's statement quoted above.

* This paper was read before the Annual Meeting of Pacific Branch, Association for Asian Studies, in June, 1966, and is published here with minor modifications.

Theoretically a socialist state, whether of Russian or Chinese extraction, is beyond criticism because it is so perfect. In Yevgeny Yevtushenko's acid remark, "Its proponents claimed that in our society there could be no struggle between good and bad but only between the good and the even better."³ Thus, in a state such as Communist China or Soviet Russia, satire is theoretically dead. But if that were truly the case, there would be no point in discussing Communist literature in general, still less the use of satire in particular; for it would be most unlikely that one could say anything really significant about it. In fact, however, satire is far from being dead. Man's sense of decency will not allow external forces to silence his inner voice. Throughout the history of man, no power has been strong enough to exercise a complete control over the mind of man. Some have chosen to go to the stake for their convictions, like Bruno; some have outwardly acquiesced but still cherished their beliefs, like Galileo. It would be a miracle indeed if the Communists could have brought about radical changes in human nature in only a few decades. At the very most their effort at control would only drive the writers to a greater subterfuge. Some cease to write anything meaningful;* some escape to what is less political; and some resort to subtle satires.

As Wang Hsien-ch'ien suggested, satire can take a number of forms. Pasternak did it by way of translation.** The Chinese writers either come right out for

* Mao Tun ceased to write on pretext of being burdened down by official duty, Shen Ts'ung-wen stopped writing because he was unable to catch up with the pace of social changes, and even Chang T'ien-i becomes satisfied with writing children's stories.

** By turning away "from a translation of words and metaphors" to "a translation of ideas and scenes" Pasternak made Shakespeare's line "Art made tongue-tied by authority" ingeniously descriptive of totalitarian Russia. Vladimir Markov in his "An Unnoticed Aspect of Pasternak's Translations" gives Pasternak's translation of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* as an illustration of Pasternak's intention. The following is one example:

In the original:

For who would bear the whips and scorns of time,
The oppressor's wrong, the proud man's contumely,
The pangs of despised love, the law's delay,
The insolence of office, and the spurns
That patient merit of the unworthy takes....

Pasternak's translation (when translated back to English from Russian):

Or else who would bear the phony greatness of the rulers,
The ignorance of the bigwigs, the common hypocrisy,
The impossibility to express oneself,
The unrequited love and illustriousness of merits
In the eyes of mediocrities.

Markov commented: "It sounds like a precise description of Pasternak's own lot or of the situation of many soviet artists and intellectuals. As far as Pasternak personally is concerned, it fits his situation after *A Second Birth*, when, because of 'the impossibility to express himself' he was producing almost nothing but translations. But it sounds simply prophetic when we recall the persecution of Pasternak after his acceptance of the Noble prize." In summing up Markov calls Pasternak's translation "lyrical confession camouflaged as a translation. Instead of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, Pasternak himself or rather some kind of Soviet Hamlet makes his appearance here." See Markov's article in *Slavic Review*, vol. XX, No. 3, October, 1961.

satire, justifying it by their good motive of bringing about change for the better, or take advantage of high level patronage to thrust satirical jibes at the new bureaucracy, or seek refuge in the time-honored device of escaping to historical themes, or, even more subtle still, give unreserved praise to the regime.

Mao Tun, Lao Shê and Shen Ts'ung-Wen

Mao Tun, a spokesman for the Communist doctrine of socialist realism, that is, the combination of realism and romanticism, deplored the lack of satire in his survey of the 1960 crop of literary productions.⁴ The most daring one is Lao Shê, who theorized on the significance of satire as a literary device, criticized the lower echelon of bureaucracy under the protective cover of Lo Jui-ch'ing, used historical themes to attack the present regime, and sometimes employed praise to express his contempt. As I have dealt with his satires elsewhere,⁵ I shall only give a brief account of his satirical plays together with a short note on his view of satire.

In 1956 he wrote "Hsi Wang Ch'ang-an" 西望長安 (Look West to Ch'ang-an), a play ridiculing Communist cadres. The title is a partial quotation from a line of Li Po's poem. The full line runs: "Hsi wang Ch'ang-an pu-chien chia" 西望長安不見家 (Look west to Ch'ang-an, I do not see my home). Since "chia" (home) 家 has a homophonic character (佳) meaning good, the abbreviated quotation has the implied idea that Ch'ang-an is no good. Ch'ang-an was the capital of the T'ang dynasty, roughly the site of the present Hsi-an reflecting the Communist capital at Yen-an before and during the war of resistance. To say that "Hsi-an" is "no good" is tantamount to saying "Chinese Communism is no good." The play is filled with hilariously comic scenes, attesting to the credulity and stupidity of the Communist cadres and the inefficiency and aimless activity of Communist government organizations. Party members, piqued by this satire, started criticizing the play. Before anything terrible could happen, Lao Shê made the revelation that it was written under the direction of Lo Jui-ch'ing, then head of the secret service, later Minister of Defense and now rumored to have been purged, and the Party saw fit to drop the whole matter.⁶

The second play is entitled "Ch'a-kuan" 茶館 (Teahouse). A famous teahouse in Peking is used to link three periods in modern Chinese history: the years from the Reform Movement in 1898 to the beginning of the Republican period, those from 1912 to the war of resistance, and finally the years immediately after the war. Through the words of the customers who frequent the teahouse, and the ever-declining fortune of the teahouse itself, the author unrolls before the audience an increasingly sad picture of China, demonstrating the truth of a statement which the Communists have tried hard to combat during the Anti-Rightist Campaign: "The present is not as good as the past." The activities of secret service men, the lack of food, the tragic circumstances of one's inability to

even heed the sick and the hungry, the plight faced by the national industrialists whose factories are confiscated, these and many other of the conditions portrayed combine to give a picture more fittingly applicable to the present than to the old.⁷

Earlier, Lao Shê discussed the significance of satires in an article "T'an feng-tz'u,"⁸ 談諷刺 which I have not discussed in my paper on Lao Shê. In view of the courage with which he discussed satires, his article deserves a careful consideration. I shall, therefore, let him speak for himself at length.

He started out by describing the new society in glowing terms, a society in which freedom was universally enjoyed. So armed, he posed the question: "Do we or don't we need criticism or self-criticism?" When this was established, he went on: "Just because we cherish democracy, and just because we emphasize criticism and self-criticism, we need satirical literature and we should appreciate it. Appreciation of satirical literature is one way to show our democratic spirit." Then he gave the following warning:

I would like to warn those who are afraid that their itch might be scratched (i. e. their shortcomings might be pointedly exposed) that they had better take a good look at themselves to find out if there is in them an inclination toward flattery and a dislike to be criticized. Writers generally have a sense of justice. They do not praise those who should have been criticized. It does nobody any good to paint false prosperity and peace.

His advice to the criticized:

Should any of the criticisms in writings be found applicable to actual life, and the hypothetical character resembling some actual medical doctor or some actual hospital, then (the right attitude for that person to take is) 'if true, change; if not true, make double effort to do what is right.'

In defense of his position concerning satires, he raised a few questions which he refuted convincingly. The first question: "Writers distort facts. In our society there isn't anybody like that." His rebuttal:

Exaggeration is a necessary means in satirical literature. To exaggerate, one collects all traits that need be criticized and attributes them properly to one single character. This is the way to create a fresh image of a living man... Having admitted the need of using satires, one has to make it biting and pungent, piercing deep into the bone. If a satire does not hurt and does not reach the itch, it fails in its function and loses its effectiveness in educating. A satirist's thrust is bitingly pungent and callous,

but his heart is filled with warm feeling, hoping that the people will forever renew themselves, marching forward shoulder to shoulder.

The second question: "Since satire requires exaggeration, blowing up a minor error a hundredfold, would it not be suggesting that our society and our system are no good?" His answer:

A satirist in his exaggeration aims at encouraging and not at negating our society and system...The shortcomings of satires lie in their not being deep-reaching, in their lack of courage... due to strong resistance in our society, a piece of literary writing will be subject to a number of ordeals on its first appearance. So writers become afraid and dare not fully express their thought.

The final question: "This may be true, but why should we hang our wash in public?" Answer:

It is the writers' responsibility to sing the praises of what is bright and expose what is dark. If there is only praise but no exposure, darkness will gradually spread and become a serious problem sooner or later. Satires are timely surgical operations, scraping the bone to get rid of the poison in order to save life.

I have never ceased wondering how Lao Shê could get away with all this.*

Shen Ts'ung-wen, who, we have noticed, has chosen silence and occasionally written poems praising the new regime and Mao Tse-tung, cannot refrain from referring to Po Chü-i and T'ao Yüan-ming as a veiled protest. Two lines of his poem which I quoted once before: "In their (referring to Po and T'ao) poetry they show love for the people, and in the people's heart they are deeply enshrined" may again be read as a satire against the powers that be.⁹

Not all writers are as fortunate as Lao Shê or Shen Ts'ung-wen. Recently a number of writers have been singled out for liquidation. Mao Tun lost his position as Minister of Culture and Hsia Yen, as Vice Minister because Hsia in 1958 dramatized Mao Tun's "Lin-chia p'u-tzu" 林家舖子 (Lin's Family Shop), a work describing bankruptcy of national industrialists during the 30's. On the surface it was criticized for glamorizing the bourgeoisie, propagating defeatism, and opposing revolutionary socialism; but in fact Hsia, or more correctly Mao Tun behind him, did exactly what Lao Shê was doing in his "Teahouse" reflecting the tragic fate happening to the national industrialists, whom the Communists first encouraged by cooperation and then liquidated by confiscation. Two others who resorted to historical themes have met with similar fates.

* He did not. It has been reported that he had committed suicide. Later events seem to indicate that the literary purge was an integral part of Chinese Communist power struggle.

T'ien Han and his "Hsieh Yao-huan"

T'ien Han, a famed playwright, joined the Communist Party in the thirties. He, like Lao Shê, is one of the few who do not allow their Communist affiliation to affect their aesthetic conscience sufficiently to blind them to what is irrational in a Communist society. According to Liu Meng-nai,¹⁰ T'ien Han had been grumbling about the dark phases of Communist China for some time. In 1956 T'ien wrote "Pi hsü ch'ieh-shih kuan-hsin ho kai-shan i-jen ti sheng-huo" 必須切實關心和改善藝人的生活 (There is a need to show an earnest concern regarding the livelihood of artists and a desire to improve it) in an effort to bring the plight of actors and actresses to the attention of the authorities in the hope that something could be done about it. In the article he exposed the sad situation which had led some actors in local guilds of Hunan and Kwangsi to commit suicide. And in 1957 when Wu Tsu-kuang, a dramatist, was liquidated for criticizing the cadres's interference with the freedom of actors, T'ien showed a great deal of sympathy with Wu.¹¹ And in 1958 he wrote "Kuan Han-ch'ing" 關漢卿 in which these statements occur: "Grievance and injustice like this is repeatedly reenacted even now;" and again "This is indeed a rotten time. Evil ones live on in countless number but good fellows are picked off one by one." For these reasons, T'ien had been subjected to severe party criticism. With the appearance of "*Hsieh Yao-huan*" 謝瑤環 in 1961, there must have been dissatisfaction within the party against T'ien but only recently a general attack upon his counter-revolutionary spirit was launched. To show the serious nature of the case, a word about "*Hsieh Yao-huan*" will be of help.

In this play T'ien Han sings the praises of Hsieh Yao-huan, a woman official during the reign of Empress Wu of the T'ang dynasty. Hsieh Yao-huan has memorialized the throne to take measures to give succor to the severely harassed people, enabling the tillers to have land to till and the hungry to have food. As the play proceeds, T'ien Han describes how the officials treat the people "like fish and meat" in their effort to deprive them of their land, filling the air with nothing but resentment. Empress Wu is indirectly criticized for listening to the sycophants and for oppressing and destroying the loyal and upright ministers; for her love of travel, draining the state treasury; and for her ministers' attempt to cast a huge memorial in her honor by collecting metal from the people, including even their ploughs and hoes, making it impossible for them to farm their land.

Whether T'ien Han intended to use the historical theme to criticize the present regime needs no argument from us. The Communist themselves were quick to label the work as "chih sang ma huai" 指桑罵槐 (cursing the locust while pointing to the mulberry), a picturesque way of describing an oblique satirical attack. They dubbed this attempt "to seek succor for the people" anti-socialist activity,

because it implies that under the present regime "the people are suffering from unendurable oppression." Then they pointed out that the collection of metal for the casting of memorial is the shadow of the backyard furnaces, and Empress Wu's love for travel reflects the similar activities indulged by Chairman Mao. In an article, "T'ien Han ti 'Hsieh Yao Huan' shih i k'o ta tu-ts'ao" 田漢的謝瑤環是一棵大毒艸 (T'ien Han's 'Hsieh Yao-huan' Is a Big Poisonous Weed), by Yün Sung (apparently a pen name), there is this subtitle: "Hsieh Yao-huan's effort 'to seek succor for the people' is T'ien Han's own effort 'to seek succor for the people.'" The indictment:

Comrade T'ien Han's apparent attribution of all kinds of crime to Empress Wu is in fact a case of "cursing the locust while pointing to the mulberry tree," an insult to our present socialist society. He is expressing his concern about the present socialist society by way of his criticism of Empress Wu's conduct. In his mind's eye our proletarian dictatorship has now become the opposition of the people and is unable to represent the interests and political power of the people; and for this reason the people are about to rise against this regime...He considers our proletarian regime a tool for the oppression of the people....This regime treats the people as if they are grass, deprives them of both their land and goods, and has created a mess. To sum up, the people cannot long endure such a life and the proletarian regime is doomed.¹²

We cannot agree more with the Communist assessment of T'ien Han's intent in writing this play. And it is only natural to find T'ien Han also denounced as a rightist opportunist, a catch-all net for all Communist deviates from the official line.

The Communist case against Wu Han

Wu Han, a historian, a Deputy Mayor of Peking under P'eng Chen, has come under fire recently because of his play "*Hai Jui pa-kuan*," 海瑞罷官 written in 1960. Hai Jui (1515-1587) was one of the most respected officials in the Ming dynasty. During his office as a Hsün-fu 巡撫,¹³ he did most for the people in building irrigation systems, bringing relief to districts devastated by flood and famine, and, in particular, by cracking down on local gentry, forcing them to return land to the peasants and righting wrongs done to them by powerful families in collusion with local officials. The play was first performed in Peking, at the beginning of 1961, with Ma Lien-liang, a famed actor, playing the leading role. Shortly after, the performance was banned. The gist of the Communist denunciations may be gathered from an article by Yao Wen-yüan in *Wen-hui pao* 文匯報 toward the end of 1935: (1) Wu casts a glamour over Hai Jui, who after all belonged to a ruling

clique in a feudal society. As such, all he did was to ameliorate the people's conditions for the security of the ruling family. To sing the praises of such a character is to lose one's sense of class distinction and hence to act against the interest of the proletariat. (2) In romanticizing Hai Jui's effort in getting the land returned to the peasants and injustice redressed, Wu is "chieh ku feng-chin" 借古諷今 (criticizing the present by reference to the past), a phrase Wu Han had used himself.¹⁴ For his criticism is actually tied up with the activities of the 1961 deviationists, stirring up the people to appeal to the government for the return of the land that had been collectivized and to redress injustice against them. What irritated the Communist regime seems to be the fact that the play was especially written to support those rightist opportunists who, since 1958 after the inauguration of the movement to raise the "three red flags," have been deploring the mess the state collectives were in, the increasing seriousness of the poverty of the people, and the blindness with which the "Great Leap" was being pushed. Specifically, it was written to support P'eng Te-hui and his group who, in a conference on Lu-shan, had criticized the government for its reckless measures, and to protest their removal from office in the same manner in which Hai Jui was removed under the pressure of the gentry.¹⁵

Wu Han and T'ien Han wrote their plays respectively in 1960 and 1961; and yet it was only very recently that the Communists began to take them to task. Why? If I were to venture a guess, it would seem to have a great deal to do with the actual conditions, economic and otherwise, in China during 1961 and 1962. The country was in a real mess after the stupid adventures of the "three red flags." To suppress cries which seemed justified by everything one could see would have seemed very unwise. It would be best to treat them as historical plays and bide time for a more opportune moment to launch a crushing attack. Now seems to be the time, with the improvement of the economic conditions at home.

In both Hsieh Yao-huan and Hai Jui there is the spirit of justice, a virile determination to perform one's duty at all odds. Such a spirit is best expressed in a poem by Teng T'o, who along with Wu Han and Liao Mo-sha was accused of "Sung-ku fei-chin" (singing the praises of the past and condemning the present); and whose "*Yen-shan yeh-hua*" 燕山夜話 (Evening Talks at Yen-shan) is dubbed "tu-ts'ao" (poisonous weed), the same term used in connection with Wu Han's "*Hai Jui pa-kuan*," and T'ien Han's "*Hsieh Yao-huan*."

Giving instruction at Tung-lin, continuing what Kuei-shan had started,
 They were concerned with all things in between heaven and earth.
 Let no one believe that scholars spend their life in empty talks.
 Those spots where their heads fell were red with their blood.¹⁶

Apparently Teng, Wu, and Liao were as determined in their opposition to the present regime as those Ming dynasty scholars of Tung-lin, and are now just as severely persecuted as those early scholars were by the hated officials.

Praise as a form of satire

In discussing praise as form of satire, we have to go back to Lao Shê and Shen Ts'ung-wen. Shen at the beginning of the Communist regime, had been singled out for attack in spite of his plebeian background. On Shen's part, he did not have any great love for the regime. Even in 1957 when the Communists honored him with the publication of a selected work of his, he had only this to say:

Our country under the correct and firm guidance of the great Communist Party and through the effort of millions of people has assumed a new appearance.¹⁷

But in just another two years we find him sparing no words of praise in describing the Communist liberation of China and the activities of the new state:

After the liberation of all China and the establishment of the People's Government, our state entered into a new age in history, and literature and art also entered into a new age in history. In order for the principles pointed out to us by Chairman Mao in his talk at Yen-an to be realized, literature and art should be oriented toward serving the political interest of the workers, the farmers, the soldiers, and the proletariat. All artists and writers in the nation have enthusiastically responded to the great call, courageously throwing themselves into the great furnace of the revolution, taking part in land reform, three- and five-anti campaigns, resist-America and help-Korea campaign, thought reform, and the anti-rightist campaign.¹⁸

Shen must have known the tragic situations writers and thinkers found themselves during the "Hundred Flowers Bloom" period, and he must have also been aware of the stupidity of the various campaigns he enumerated. Did the artists and writers really respond to the great call "enthusiastically?" Judged in the light of Wang Hsien-ch'ien's dictum, Shen's statement could only be interpreted as a satire. But since his words of praise do not convey any of his real feelings, being worn-out cliches devoid of any significance, he did not draw any critical attention.

Lao Shê here again played his role of a praise-critic with wit and humor and for the time got away with it. He expressed his praise for the regime in a number of ways: one is the form in which he followed the party line to the letter by writing Party eight-legged essays, a role which has earned him the title

of "cultural slave,"¹⁹ another is the form in which he echoed party accusations; and finally the unreserved praise of Mao's poetry. His attitude toward Wu Tsu-kuang during the anti-rightist campaign in 1957 may give us a fair idea of his art. Wu came under fire because he criticized party guidance as interfering with the work of the writers and theater workers. Having written a number of short essays defending party guidance in art and literature, Lao Shê directed his abusive denunciation at Wu, ending in the following words of warning:

Wu Tsu-kuang, you who have been called a bright star in a muddy world! Formerly you had no prospect, now you have still less. In the old society there were toilet pits, so maggots could live. In our new society there are not only no public toilet pits, nor are there any maggots. All flies will also be destroyed. Wu Tsu-kuang! Repent!²⁰

The man who uttered these words must be completely out of his mind. Was Lao Shê mad? Hardly. Obviously there is more than meets the eye. By allying himself with the Communists and speaking for them, his stupidity becomes theirs. Thus with one masterful stroke, he succeeded in holding up the comical imbecility of the Communist regime for all to see.

The sharpest satirical jibe Lao Shê reserved for Chairman Mao, if only indirectly. After having cited Shakespeare, Tu Fu and Li Po as great poets, he also cited a modern doggerel praising Mao Tse-tung as equal in beauty and profundity. Here is the popular one:

Tung fang hung	東方紅
T'ai-yang sheng	太陽升
Chung-kuo ch'u le ko Mao Tse-tung	中國出了個毛澤東

(The east is red,
The sun rises,
In China appears a certain Mao Tse-tung).

His comment:

This poem uses fast beats, but it is an exquisite poem. The whole structure is terse and precise. The poet does not talk in the following way: "It has been dawn for a long time, and the east is glowing red. The sun is about to rise. Oh! Mao Tse-tung is comparable to the sun in China." The poet exercises economy in writing this poem; how great its forceful spirit, how weighty its structure, how deep the feeling, how sonorous the sounds. Whether reading or singing, it is always exquisite...

What more can one ask of a man, who, knowing fully well that the thread by which the sword of Damocles is hanging over his head may break any time, has the courage to laugh, to cajole and to mock?

Ping Hsin, a glorifier of the regime

Praise of a regime can be done by expressing opinions in line with the regime, by upholding its policy, and by direct unreserved praise. Lao Shé followed all these methods; and it is in Ping Hsin we find a crystalline example of direct praise.²¹

Anyone who is acquainted with Ping Hsin's family background, her education, her attitude toward life, her literary career, and her style and subject matter would never associate her with anything remotely connected with communism, unless, of course, one could bring oneself to believe in a miraculous change of her nature and a sudden liquidation of her Baconian idols which had accrued to become her second nature. She came from a well-to-do family,* was educated at the mission-supported Yenching University and at Wellesley in the United States, had expressed in all her writings nothing but tender feelings for children, her love for the sea, and above all, for her mother, and had been most appreciative of the friendship and care showered on her both in China and abroad. With delightful naivete she had given young people, puzzled by the problems of the day, some exquisite moments of escape by her angelic voice expressing simple ideas in brilliant phraseology carved from traditional poetry, particularly *tz'u*. Her poetry, after the style of Tagore, achieved a seeming profundity by the art of suggestion through the use of imagery. Her philosophy, if she has any at all, is never consistent. Life to her is at one moment "like a lamp floating on a sea, brilliant for an instant but extinguished the next."²² And yet in the same piece she considers life a new creation after having been shattered to pieces by parting, love and sorrow, a new creation out of sickness, which, in addition to putting her together again, gives her the wisdom that makes her a new person. "Thanks to sickness and sorrow experienced at parting, I for the first time in the past twenty years have come to recognize life...to accept it and to enjoy it."²³ She

* The phrases she loves to use also suggest her attitude toward life: *ch'en mo* 沉默 (reticent); *yu-ching* 幽靜 (retiring and calm); *ch'ang-wang* 悵惘 (lost and bewildered); *ch'iao-jan* 惘然 (melancholy); *an-tan* 黯淡 (dark and listless); *tan-yüan* 淡遠 (aloof); *t'ien-tan* 恬淡 (tranquil); etc. These and many others also indicate her literary style, delicate, persuasive, and enchanting, a style which is crystalline pure, as is symbolized by her pen-name *Ping Hsin* 冰心 (Icy Heart). But after the takeover, we find her constantly mouthing the following clichés: *ch'ung-t'ien kan-chin* 沖天幹勁 (heaven rushing vigorous effort), *lao-tung jen-min* 勞動人民 (laboring masses), *she-hui chu-i ti chien-she* 社會主義的建設 (socialist reconstruction), *sheng-ch'an chih-shih* 生產知識 (knowledge of production), *shih-chi ti chien-ku* 實際的艱苦 (the hard-won experience in actual life), *tuan-lien* 鍛鍊 (training), *ch'ing-ai ti tang* 親愛的黨 (my beloved Party), *ching-ai ti ling-hsiu* 親愛的領袖 (my beloved leader), *tox-cheng* 鬭爭 (struggle), *p'u-tou* 搏鬥 (fight to the end), *jen-min ling-hsiu Mao chu-hsi* 人民領袖毛主席 (People's leader, Chairman Mao), *wei-ta ti she-hui chu-i* 偉大的社會主義 (great socialism), *jen-min kung-ch'eng-shih* 人民工程師 (engineers of people's souls). Try to imagine what kind of writing one would produce by constantly and liberally spreading these Party clichés in one's writings. But this is exactly the kind of writings Ping Hsin has been producing as a writer now in Mainland China. A soul so delicate and sensitive as hers, I cannot imagine the hell she is living through just now.

does not strike one as having strong convictions; all that she has seems to be spontaneous outpourings of her simple soul in a voice as enchanting as the proverbial *tu-chüan* (cuckoo) crying out her heart in blood tears.

With the coming of the Communist regime, her change was most startling. She regretted that she had failed "to join hands with the laboring masses;"²⁴ she has lost her usual reserved and delicate style and picked up the propagandic writing to glorify the regime. The more we read of what she has written since the takeover, the more we feel that her change is only apparent, and all her words of praise could be interpreted as satires. After all didn't Yevgeny Yevtushenko tell us the rules one has to play by in a Communist state: "For a poem to go through, there had to be a few lines devoted to Stalin. This even began to seem perfectly natural to me."²⁵ Is it too farfetched to believe that Ping Hsin, in her frustration, might have experienced similar feelings and reacted accordingly?

In 1959 she wrote "Hsiang mi-feng i-yang lao-tung ti jen-min" 像蜜蜂一樣勞動的人民 (Bee-like Laboring Masses) to glorify the communes.²⁶ She says, "The communes are fast rising suns."²⁷ And in her "Tsai tao ch'ing-lung ch'iao ch'ü" 再到青龍橋去 (Visiting Ch'ing-lung ch'iao for the Second Time), she portrayed in glowing terms the joy and happiness of the youth who had been sent there in the hsia-fang movement.²⁸ According to her, they were there "to conquer nature and reform their thought." Similar sentiments are expressed in another article entitled "Ku chan-ch'ang pien-ch'eng liao ta kuo-yüan" 古戰場變成了大果園 (The Old Battlefield Has Turned into a Large Orchard). Here she makes the following remark:

Chairman Mao, in sending the cadres away in the hsia-fang movement, aims first of all at raising the thought level, secondly at affording chances to train for physical fitness, and thirdly at making the youths capable of both mental and physical enterprises. Most of the cadres who have been sent down are incapable of either shouldering or lifting loads of any weight. Many of them take physical labor lightly. But once here, changes begin to take place in their thinking; they begin to realize the greatness and dignity in labor. They begin to feel their own smallness and inadequacy when they get into contact with the farmers.... In their work they have exhibited heaven-penetrating effort and vigor.²⁹

She describes the life of university students sent to work in a mountainous region in the following words: "How lovely and how fortunate these young people are! How beautiful a strip of mountain land have they received for 'greenization!' 綠化³⁰ That the commune movement was a farce and hsia-fang was meant to be a punishment for the recalcitrants is a common knowledge. It is inconceivable that Ping Hsin did not know the failure of the one and the suffering entailed in

the other. I do not think it is too farfetched to interpret these as satires if we apply what Wang Hsien-ch'ien formulated as the norm.

A classic case of Ping Hsin's satire through praise is contained in two articles written in 1954, included in *Kuei-lai i-hou* 歸來以後 (After I Came Back [from visits abroad]).³¹ I must admit that the term "praise" is used here merely to mean that Ping Hsin, in speaking the way she did, was following the Communist official line to the letter. In both articles Ping Hsin was protesting on behalf of the Japanese people the atomic bombing of Hiroshima. In "Jih-pen jen-min tsai tou-cheng 日本人民在鬭爭 (The Japanese People are Engaged in Struggle)³² she said with profound indignation,

I deeply understand the Japanese people's sufferings. During those years after the war I was living in Tokyo. In a city as beautiful as this, there was not a house, not a bridge, which did not witness the insult, the murder which the Japanese suffered under the imperialistic occupation of the United States.³³

And she concluded the article by condemning the United States for taking Saipan and with profound sympathetic admiration for the Japanese people's resolve, accusing the United States of war crimes.³⁴ Ping Hsin was in Japan with her husband, who was a member of the Chinese Occupational Mission after the war. Unless she had lost her reason, she could not have held the United States responsible for the Pacific War; neither is it conceivable that she could have forgotten what the Japanese army had done in China; and she must also have been aware that but for the speedy ending of the war by the bombing, whatever side issues the bombing may have created, untold misery inflicted upon her own people by the atrocities of the Japanese army would have persisted for an unknown period of time. Furthermore, in accusing the United States of war crimes, is she not in the same breath condemning China too, as China and the United States were allies against the same enemy? Knowing Ping Hsin as we do, such utterings, together with many other similar condemnations of the United States and her accusation of the cultural imperialism of the missionaries as best exemplified by the Yenching University where she graduated and later taught,* reveals without a doubt the agony of a suffering soul, who, like Lao Shê, is attempting to tell posterity that what she says should not be taken literally.**

* All these will be fully developed in my forthcoming paper on Ping Hsin.

** In the following incident it seems reasonable, after taking into consideration her own war experience and the language she used in the narration, to assume that she meant exactly the opposite of what she directly expressed. In 1952 the United States Army received a piece of land for a shooting range, granted by the Japanese government. As the result of the opposition of the people who lived here, the United States Army gave it up in 1956. Let us see how she described it.

Uchinada is under the jurisdiction of Ishikawaken, situated to the northwest of Katsui-chirō Shō. It is a long strip of *sandy* land between the sea and Lake Abegata (?), on which there are five *barren, uncultivated* and *cold fishing villages*. *The people there go to*

Conclusion

In conclusion, it is my belief that we have reason to be optimistic about the future of Chinese literature even under the increasingly rigid political control. The use of satire in all its forms is only one of the signs pointing to this conclusion. Human nature being what it is, no force, however cynical and strong, could snuff out that daimonion which has sent so many Socrates to their fate.

Hokkaido in winter and Korean Strait in summer to work as servants to the fishermen. The women hold on to this barren sandy land, doing a bit of fishing and *farming*. In September, 1952 the United States Occupational force arrived at Ishikawaken. They liked this long and narrow sandy strip of land between the waters. They had an agreement with the reactionary Japanese government to have the land for permanent use as a shooting range. When the United States Army came, the news spread. It was the women, whose livelihood depended on the land who first spread the news in great alarm. Aroused by their indignant call, the people at Uchinada began to boil in anger. Like the sea weeds exposed to the burning sun on the beach, the people turned the sea red with their fire of resentment. But the United States Army with the Japanese government in their grip paid no attention to the people. Riding over the opposition of the Uchinada Village Council, paying no attention to the anti-shooting range parade of thousands of women, the United States Army, with overbearing arrogance, went ahead in February, 1953 with the construction project. A fence of barbed wire ten thousand metres long was put up along the border of the Uchinada village, and an iron sheet road six metre wide and a kilometre long was built. Target practice began in March. The American flag, the symbol of carange and rape and oppression, stirred up the women as it fluttered in the winds above the road; the Uchinada women, gnashing their teeth, wrapping their heads in turbans, walked resolutely hand in hand to the midst of "gun forest and bullet rain." There they sat, determined to sacrifice themselves for the protection of their country. The rain drizzled and the sea winds soughed. Like a gush of blood, the rain soaked the soul of each and every one of the Japanese people. The sea winds spread this struggle in no time throughout the three islands of Japan. Since then there rose continuously uninterrupted waves of protest and struggle against the United States military bases. Farmers came with flags made of maps, workers came with their red flags, students came with slogans on flags of all sizes; they built tents on the sandy beach and kept vigil with the villagers. Outside the barbed wire moved ten thousand heads, their shouts shaking the sky....The United States Army and Japanese police within the barbed wire fence looked *dejected and pale*. They drooped their heads before the *children* clad in rush rain coat, holding on to the wire....Finally on the thirty-first of March, 1956 the United States Army, the great and ever victorious army, under the pressure of the determined effort of the Japanese people, had their morale completely broken, took down the barbed wire and dismantled their iron sheet road and left in dejection. *Ying-hua tsan*, 86-88.

First of all, the sandy beach is apparently of little use to the people living there; secondly the United States Army seemed to have behaved very well, particularly in comparison with the behavior of the Japanese troops in China. The memory must still have been fresh in her mind as she had lived through the war years herself at one time was the wife of a member of the Chinese Mission, whose business was to discuss the criminal behavior of the Japanese army. Could she envisage a Japanese army behaving the way the United States Army did under a similar circumstance? I have underlined the significant phrases she used to bring to the surface her possible satirical motive.

Far Eastern and Russian Institute
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98105.
U. S. A.

NOTES

1. *The Mind of Literature and the Carving of Dragons*, tr. by Vincent Y. C. Shih, Columbia University Press, 1959, p. 78.
2. Ssu-ma Ch'ien, *Shih-chi* "Ku-chi lieh-chuan."
3. Yevgeny Yevtushenko, "A Precocious Autobiography," tr. by Andrew R. MacAndrew. *The Saturday Evening Post*, August 10-17, 1963.
4. Mao Tun, "1960 nien tuan-p'ien hsiao-shuo man-t'an," *Wen-hui Pao*, No. 251, 1961.
5. Unpublished paper, "Lao Shê, A Conformist? An Anatomy of a Wit Under Constraint."
6. Lo Jui-ch'ing's patronage is mentioned in Lao Shê's "Yu-kuan 'Hsi-wang ch'ang-an' ti liang-feng hsin." In *Jen-min wen-hsüeh*, No. 79, May, 1956, pp. 123-126. It is rumored that Lo has been purged recently.
7. Lao Shê, "Tea House," *Shou-huo*, July, 1957. Peking.
8. *Wen-i pao* No. 100, July, 1956, pp. 17-18.
9. Vincent Y. C. Shih, "Enthusiast and Escapist: Writers of the Older Generation," *The China Quarterly*. Also in Cyril Birch, ed., *Chinese Communist Literature*, N. Y. 1963.
10. See his article "T'ien Han yin 'Hsieh Yao-huan' ku huo," *Mainland Today*, March 1, 1966.
11. For Lao Shê's reaction to Wu's case, see my unpublished paper on Lao Shê. This point will come up in a later section where praise-satire will be discussed.
12. *Jen-min jih-pao*, February 1, 1966, p. 5.
13. At first a hsün-fu was an official sent out by the central government to tour around in certain areas to find out conditions in local districts and to redress any injustice locally done. Later the office became that of a governor of some provinces.
14. Wu Han made these statements in 1961: "Whether we are writing history or historical plays, the historical characters cannot be merely the coming back to life of these historical figures. In portraying this figure or playing the role of that character one has to emphasize that aspect of the character which has validity in relation to later generations." And again: "Each and every historical play has its purpose and historical background: some criticize the present by reference to the past, thus cursing the locust while pointing to the mulberry, and some emphasize that aspect which has educative value, and some may have other purposes." See *Wen-hsüeh p'ing lun*, No. 3, 1961.
15. See Chiang Pai-fan, "'Hai Jui pa-kuan' lei-chi Wu Han ('Hai Jui pa-kuan' proves Wu Han's fall)," *Mainland China*, March 1, 1966, pp. 5-8. See also another article on the same subject by Wang Pei in the same issue, pp. 9-12.

16. This is one of two poems Teng wrote, quoted in *Chung-yüan jih-pao*, May 14, 1966. Tung-lin is the place where Yang Shih, whose *hao* was Kuei-shan, of the Sung gave instruction. During the reign of Wan-li (1573-1620) in the Ming dynasty, Ku Hsien-ch'eng and Kao P'an-lung rebuilt the place for instruction. At the time when Wei Chung-hsien was in power, the scholars in Tung-lin gave him the most serious opposition.
17. *Shen Ts'ung-wen Hsüan-chi*, Peking: 1957, "Preface," p. 3.
18. "Tao Chin-i," *Jen-min wen-hsüeh*, No. 121, 1959.
19. See my article on Lao Shê, p. 8.
20. *Fu-hsing chi*, p. 204.
21. A full-length paper on Ping Hsin is planned for inclusion in a book on modern Chinese literary trends now in preparation.
22. "Wang-shih" in *Ch'ao-jen*, first published in 1923. This quotation is taken from 1942 K'ai-ming shu-tien edition, p. 123.

Life anywhere, what is it like?
Is it not like a flying goose walking on snow or mud?
Accidentally it may have left marks on the mud,
But does it care whether it flies east or west?

She adds the following comment:

These lines do not tell the whole truth. Not only is the goose indifferent whether it flies east or west; neither are the marks on the snow or mud to be preserved. Wherever one finds oneself, one faces what is ethereal. How real is life! And yet how ephemeral! Like is like the wind blowing against our face, so piercingly cold and strong; but once over it is lost among the trees, in the sky, leaving no trace of its coming and going; and none can catch up with it even on the fleetest of stallions. *Ibid.*, pp. 64-65.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 105.
24. "Wo-men pa ch'un-t'ien ch'ao hsing liao" ("We have waked up the Spring," one of the essays in the collection used as its title), *Pai-hua wen-i ch'u-pan shê*, 1960, p. 99. The quoted line is from Chou Yang, Chinese Communist literary watch dog, but now purged.
25. Yevgeny Yevtushenko, "A Precocious Autobiography" p. 58.
26. See the collection entitled *Ying-hua tsan* (A Praise for the Cherries), meant to praise the patriotic effort the Japanese people made to resist the imperialism of the United States, *Pai-hua Wen-i ch'u-pan shê*, 1962.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 22.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 25.
29. *Ibid.*, pp. 40-41.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 25.

31. Published by Pei-ching tso-chia ch'u-pan shê, 1958. The two titles: "Fang-jih kuan-kan" (Impressions of Japan) and "Kuang-tao—k'ung-su ti ch'eng-shih" (Hiroshima—A City that Accuses).
32. Included in *Ying-hua tsan*, pp. 68-74.
33. *Ying-hua tsan*, pp. 68-69.
34. *Ibid.*, pp. 71, 72.

中共文學中之諷刺作品

施 友 忠

中共據大陸以來，實行思想控制。文藝作家，號稱心靈工程師，實傀儡而已，任其擺布。所有作品，亦均宣傳文字，未有真情流露之可言。惟少數作家，於作品中隱寓褒貶，頗具風人之旨。茲文略舉老舍、沈從文、田漢、吳晗、冰心等人之作品，以見借古諷今，指桑罵槐，陽美陰刺之風；亦可見中華民族浩然之正氣，非暴力所可得摧毀也。