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ABSTRACT

The essay-writer Zhou Zuoren was a part of the May Fourth intellectual movement in China. In his works, he tried to establish a new way of thinking about Chinese cultural identity that emphasized the relative nature of that identity vis-a-vis other cultures and cultural histories. He compared and contrasted foreign literatures and cultures with that of China in order to further this new way of thinking. Zhou also believed that the absorption of foreign influence would rejuvenate Chinese culture. His was a fundamentally cosmopolitan endeavor, but his observations about foreign cultures and literatures were overshadowed, or perhaps even dictated, by his deep concern with Chinese identity. When cultural rejuvenation did not seem to occur in China, Zhou attempted to distance himself and his career from responsibility for not having reached the intended goals, rather than give up the vision of identity that sustained his work. Likewise, when the forces of foreign imperialism threatened to disrupt cultural study as he had envisioned it, Zhou attempted to retreat from the world. As a cultural man, he was unwilling to make a political commitment in a time of crisis for China, but eventually he was forced into a commitment by others.
CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE i
ABSTRACT ii
CONTENTS iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iv
INTRODUCTION 1
ENVISIONING CULTURE 6
CULTURE AND THE NATION: Envisioning China as a Member of an International Cultural Community 29
EAST AND WEST: Versions of Visions 37
CHINA: The Lame Duck in a Community of Cultural Histories 41
IMPERIALISM 55
CONCLUSION 72
ENDNOTES 78
WORKS CITED (ENGLISH) 82
WORKS CITED (CHINESE) 83
WORKS CONSULTED 85
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am indebted to Professor Michael Duke for his timely advice, guidance, and encouragement. I also would like to thank Natalie Griller for her stimulating conversation, John Funge for helping me use the Chinese-character program, and Baining Guo for being steadfast in his support. In addition, I am grateful for the St. John’s Fellowship that allowed me to study at UBC.
INTRODUCTION

The title of this work reads, in part, "Zhou Zuoren on Culture and National Identity." Yet Zhou Zuoren's discussions of these topics cannot be understood well without first questioning the meaning of the very concepts of "culture" and "national identity" as Zhou saw them. Such a project is difficult and tentative at best, for precision and ideological consistency were not traits for which Zhou Zuoren was known; yet by the same token, it is a highly instructive project, revealing a language and way of viewing the world in great flux during a crucial period in Chinese history.

Starting with "culture" and national identity, I attempt to set aside some of the larger contextual debates in favor of a focused, close reading of a number of Zhou's essays on topics relating to "East" and "West," imperialism, and the ideal role of a scholar as well. In doing so, I hope to delineate more clearly some recurrent issues and problems to which Zhou returned again and again in his work, sometimes without a satisfactory resolution; perhaps, from them, one can expand outward and derive a fresher and more nuanced

1 Previous English-language studies of Zhou Zuoren's essays have provided extensive biographical information in addition to analyses in terms of style and influence studies. Wolff's Chou Tso-jen, Pollard's A Chinese Look at Literature and Wang's "Chou Tso-jen's Hellenism," respectively, cover these areas. While I touch briefly upon a few of Zhou's personal experiences and some of the thinkers Zhou found significant, my main focus will be on Zhou's approach to comparative cultural and literary studies as voiced in his essays.

Several excellent works on Zhou Zuoren have appeared in Chinese recently, including Qian's Biography of Zhou Zuoren and Ni's China's Traitor and Recluse being particularly good biographies, and Shu's Zhou Zuoren: Success or Failure? offering very useful and meticulous discussions of Zhou's writing and style.
understanding of larger debates as well.

Zhou Zuoren the man was no easier to pin down than the words he used. Was he a traitor to his country for collaborating with the Japanese during the War of Resistance? A heroic man who helped protect Beijing University from the Japanese and who bravely contacted the Communist underground? A victim of pessimism whose writings reflected his loss of faith in the people? Or highly influential literary giant who helped found modern Chinese literature, and who spearheaded many areas of study in the humanities? No description seems to fit him entirely, or perhaps one might better say that all fit him to a degree. Zhou is frequently referred to in terms of conflict, contradiction, and complexity.

Zhou Zuoren (1885-1967) was born in Zhejiang Province during the time of the Qing empire (1644-1911). He went to Nanjing while still a teenager to join his older brother Zhou Shuren, who later was to become famous under the pseudonym Lu Xun. Zhou Zuoren studied in a naval academy there, where he began to learn English.

In 1906, Zhou won a scholarship to study in Japan, once again following in the footsteps of his older brother. He first studied science there, and then switched to European literature at Rikkyo University. He also began to learn Greek and Japanese, and to study classical Greek and Japanese literature.

---

2 Biographical details are from Wolff, Chou Tso-jen and 周作人 Zhou Zuoren ed. 肖同慶 Xiao Tongqing.
Zhou married a Japanese woman, Habuto Nobuko, in 1909. Two years later, he returned to China with his wife without having formally completed his studies. After teaching English at a middle school, he moved to Beijing and joined the faculty of Beijing University, where he taught Greek, Roman, and modern European literature. He remained on the faculty of Beijing University almost continuously until 1937, although his specialty changed from European literature to Chinese literature, and in 1931 he became dean of the new Japanese literature department.

In the years 1918-1938, he published essays and articles in a number of different journals. He also formed part of the May Fourth Movement, which began with student protests in 1919 and ushered in a period of change and innovation in intellectual circles in China. His prestige at this time rivalled that of his older brother. In 1919 he also made the first of several return visits to Japan.

In the 1920's, Zhou suffered from a number of difficulties in his life. He had a much-discussed quarrel with his older brother which led to a break in their relations. He was endangered by several of the warlord governments into whose hands Beijing passed. And in 1929, a favourite daughter died of illness at the age of fifteen.

In 1937 Zhou stayed on in Beijing as the Japanese occupied North China, stating as his reason for remaining that his family was too large and strapped for cash to flee. He was badly frightened in 1939 by an attempt on his life.
which he believed was masterminded by the Japanese. In 1941 he began to take positions in the realm of culture and literature under the Japanese puppet government. In that same year he visited Japan as a delegate to the East Asia Cultural Conference. There are differences of opinion as to how much Zhou actually assisted the Japanese. In any case, he was aligned with them on a symbolic level, and as Edward Gunn in Unwelcome Muse notes, "that [Zhou] made announcements on behalf of the government was inevitable" (154-5).

In 1945, after the defeat of the Japanese, Zhou was arrested by the Nationalists and served nearly five years in jail before being released. Returning to Beijing, he continued to write essays, many of them retrospectives. His wife died in 1960, and he passed away seven years later, after a long period of mistreatment and abuse by Red Guards in the Cultural Revolution.

When asking who Zhou Zuoren was, the question of his collaboration becomes inevitable. English-language defenders of Zhou have argued that Zhou "maintained an imperturbable honesty of character and purpose and a devotion to truth" (Wolff 19), and that Zhou made his loyalty to China clear through his essays, "despite his collaboration with the Japanese" (Pollard A Chinese Look at Literature 124). These scholars see the ideas expressed in Zhou's essays as being largely separable from his collaboration, which they seem to view as a personal choice made while under extreme pressure from
the Japanese, and therefore not of great importance in terms of Zhou’s thought.

On the other hand, some mainland Chinese scholars such as 倪墨炎 Ni Moyan and 趙京華 Zhao Jinghua have viewed his collaboration as the result of a progression that began years before the actual fact, and that is manifested in the style and content of his earlier essays.

Clearly, differences of opinion in regard to Zhou’s collaboration have affected the way in which essays written up to twenty years previous to that time have been interpreted. Unfortunately, it seems that no “fact” from Zhou’s personal life has been unearthed yet that would clear up the debate in regard to his collaboration; many aspects of his personal life remain shrouded in mystery, and he himself was evasive about his collaboration afterwards.3

A further problem is that one cannot ascribe absolute theoretical coherency to Zhou Zuoren’s work. Like many of his intellectual peers of the May Fourth Movement, Zhou juggled various ideas about humanism, individualism, social Darwinism, nationalism, and culture along with numerous others, accepting or rejecting elements of them according to their appeal to his nature and drawing somewhat haphazardly upon his interpretations of them in response to various issues of the day in China. Therefore, Zhou’s theoretical approaches to culture and literature must be seen as relational, a form of "roving opposition" aimed at moving targets in

---

3 See, for example, 周作人回想录 Bitter Tea: The Memoirs of Zhou Zuoren.
the cultural and political spheres, rather than a complete entity unto itself.

I believe that if one reads Zhou's essays as conversations on problems of culture and national identity, then the ideas expressed in them do not make the moral issues involving collaboration clear; instead, they engender ambivalence in the reader. It is with this ambivalence that I approached the writing of this thesis, and which ultimately led me, somewhat to my own surprise, to a rather different interpretation of Zhou's attitude towards the relationship between his cultural studies on the one hand and the political commitment asked of him in his daily life on the other.

ENVISIONING CULTURE

In his book, The Crisis of Chinese Consciousness, Lin Yü-sheng has argued compellingly that there was "... a profound crisis of cultural identity in the consciousness of the twentieth-century Chinese intelligentsia" (6). This crisis was brought about by the destruction of a centuries-old world view, or cosmology, that had upheld Chinese cultural life until the late nineteenth century. With the end of the last Chinese empire in 1911, the last symbol of the old cosmology also came to an end. From that time, "those who wanted to hold or defend traditional ideas and values were forced to look for new justifications" (17), and most intellectuals, in fact, believed that

... the task of rejuvenating a corrupt and atrophied China involved nothing less than complete transformation of the
traditional Chinese world view and total reconstruction of the traditional Chinese mentality (26).

This led to a “totalistic cultural iconoclasm” (155) by which many May Fourth intellectuals, including Zhou Zuoren’s elder brother, 鲁迅 Lu Xun (周樹人 Zhou Shuren), believed that everything Chinese had to be discarded, and a new cosmology built upon new foundations.

Lin stresses that the revolution the May Fourth intellectuals proposed was almost entirely in the realm of ideas — a 思想革命, “revolution of thought.” “In contrast to those theories of change that emphasize political power, social conditions, or modes of economic production,” writes Lin, “this notion stressed the necessary priority of intellectual and cultural change over political, social, and economic changes” (26). They believed that change in the intellectual and cultural realm, “a change in the system of symbols, values, and beliefs” (27), would on the one hand be the consequence of a change in Chinese world views, and on the other bring about as a result a number of changes in the realms of politics, society, and the economy.

Zhou Zuoren fits in much the same category as many of his peers from the May Fourth Movement period. He was not “totalistic” in his cultural iconoclasm, for he took a strong interest in traditional Chinese literature and philosophy; but he was almost exclusively interested in cultural study, which he seemed to think was the key to China’s rejuvenation and survival as a nation. He did not try to create a new cosmology for the Chinese, but he did
try to re-envision China as a cultural entity in such a way as to take into account the new information about foreign cultures that poured into Chinese intellectual circles at that time. If the old cosmology focused on the centrality of China as an empire and the emperor as its central symbol, then Zhou’s reaction was to attempt to gain a new understanding of China’s place in a diffuse world through its interconnectedness with other nations, so that China could be seen as a part of a web of cultural histories that met, separated, and met again over the course of time. Chinese cultural identity, as Zhou saw it, was fundamentally relational.

Lin argues that intellectuals such as Zhou Zuoren were using a “cultural-intellectualistic approach” to their work, which

... had the potential to evolve into an intellectualistic-holistic mode of thinking, that is, a way of perceiving traditional Chinese society and culture as an organismic entity whose form and nature were effected by its fundamental ideas (29).

This observation is central to understanding Zhou Zuoren’s work in literature and culture. He gathered together what we would see as separate fields in the humanities, but what he saw as an interrelated complex, under the umbrella of his studies of “culture,” “customs,” “habits,” and “beliefs.” For that reason, Lin’s observation also is central to understanding Zhou’s use of the word “culture” itself.

While a history of the meaning of “culture” or 文化 wenhua in a larger May Fourth Movement context is outside the scope of this work, the
discussion that follows will focus on how one man -- Zhou Zuoren -- put 文化 wenhua and related terms in practice in his own essays. By looking at the ways in which Zhou used or described these terms, their meanings as they commonly were understood -- and as he wished them to be understood -- may be inferred. Indirectly, Zhou's concerns about language will reflect the concerns of many of his contemporaries as well.

The essays examined here were all written between 1918 and 1938, and the word usage in them reflects a language in flux in time and in the mind of the writer. One can see a shift in the intended meaning of 文化 wenhua in Zhou Zuoren's essays over this twenty-year period. While once it meant "high culture," it increasingly came to mean a much broader concept referring to the traditions and ways of thinking of a people. This shift does not represent a very significant change in Zhou Zuoren's interests, but rather an attempt to find a way of expressing interests he had held all along, and which he previously had referred to with expressions such as 風俗習慣， or "social customs and habits." All the same, Zhou's greatest approval was reserved for "high" culture, while his interests in broader areas of culture took the form of cultural criticism.

The word "culture" is not simple in either language; in fact, it is vague and multi-dimensional enough to encompass a litany of meanings, which makes it a very convenient but imprecise word. In English, the word originally referred to the cultivation or tilling of fields; it has developed many
more meanings since. Broadly speaking, we may think of culture as a level of intellectual and aesthetic training and refinement achieved among individuals or societies, sometimes called "high culture" or to be "cultured." On the other hand, we may think of "culture" as "the body of customary beliefs, social forms, and material traits constituting a distinct complex of tradition of a racial, religious, or social group," (Webster's Dictionary) including both "low" or "popular" and "high" culture, and giving rise to such concepts as "multiculturalism." These meanings have changed over time and taken on different nuances in different contexts; the "culture" of today is not the same as the word of a hundred years ago.

Much the same can be said of 文化 wenhua, although its source and connotations differ. 文 Wen originally referred to ornamentation (derived from patterns carved onto jade). However, it is most commonly associated with writing; 文學 wenxue, or the imitation of 文 wen, refers to the literary arts. 文 Wen can also mean "intellectual," or "educated"; a 文人 wenren is a man of letters, or a scholar. 文 wen also is sometimes seen in opposition to military pursuits, that is, 武 wu.

文化 Wenhua, is, literally, to be transformed by 文 wen. Because of its relation to words for writing and literature, this word for "culture" implies literary culture to a greater extent than the English word, although its

---

4 See for example 新華字典 Xinhua Dictionary and 牛津精選英漢漢英詞典 The Oxford Concise English-Chinese Chinese-English Dictionary.
meanings, too, are broad and subject to change. Traditionally, 文化 wenhua referred to transformation through civilized rule, or to civilize, and then to the possession of a literary education. In modern times, this word also came to mean achievement in the sphere of high culture, that is, the material and spiritual wealth created by societies over the course of their histories, especially in terms of education, science, the arts, etc.; or a word in archeological studies, such as in reference to "hunt and gather" cultures (汉语大词典 Hanyu Dictionary). These meanings most likely were borrowed from the West and grafted onto the more traditional meanings of 文化 wenhua.

The word also increasingly has come to approximate the common contemporary use of the English word "culture," that is, the general concept of the customary beliefs, social forms, and ways of thinking that form a distinct complex of a distinct group. This twentieth-century meaning is probably borrowed from the Western concept as well. Modern Chinese versions of such concepts as "multiculturalism," or 多元文化, take the word 文化 wenhua as its base.

But Zhou Zuoren did not live long enough to hear the word "multiculturalism," although he would have been very interested to know it. In the majority of cases from 1918 to 1938, one can see in Zhou Zuoren's essays a tendency to interpret 文化 wenhua somewhat conservatively, that is, referring to high cultural achievement alone. In “亲日派” "The Friends of
Japan," written in the early 1920's, he remarked that "A country's glory lies in its culture -- academic research, art and literature . . . ." In the 1925 essay "Feelings on the Shanghai Incident," he likewise referred to 文化 wenhua in terms of "学問藝術" "scholarship and the arts." That Zhou often saw 文化 wenhua as being a characteristic that is achieved through education and refinement, and not as a composite of customs and ways of thinking shared by everyone among a distinct people, is further proven by a reference in "希臘的維持風化" "Greece's Support of Rectification" to a “無文化的民族,” or "a people without culture."

A main -- perhaps the main -- goal of his scholarship was to understand the peoples of various nations of the world. Studying national high cultural achievements, or 文化 wenhua, was one method to achieve his goal, and he employed the method many times as a man of letters and scholar of literature both Chinese and foreign. He frequently compared literatures with the intent of drawing a conclusion about the relative natures of the national cultures in the countries in which the literature was produced.

However, over the course of time, Zhou sometimes expressed dissatisfaction with the limitations of 文化 wenhua as a category. The images of the peoples of the world that the study of high culture alone conveyed, while beautiful or even seductive to the mind, were inaccurate. He was reaching for something more like the most modern meaning of our word,
"culture," so that he might better understand the peoples of the world.

This is not to say that Zhou Zuoren was a great fan of "the masses," nor of what we call "popular culture." Zhou several times expressed disgust with the communists for placing so much trust with the "masses," and quoted Gustave le Bon's analyses of the base nature of the masses with approval (Pollard "Chou Tso-jen: A Scholar Who Withdrew" 348-9). In this sense Zhou was similar to Western writers such as John Burroughs (1837-1921), the naturalist and pastoralist writer of turn-of-the-century America. Burroughs praised the pleasures of everyday life on the farm and frequently described the joys of small, everyday experiences in the country. He also calmly and casually referred to his neighboring farmers in general as "the Nimrods," establishing firmly his sense of superiority over and difference from the people whose way of life he seemed to praise.5

Both Burroughs and Zhou wrote as educated men whose wide-ranging intellect could grasp concepts and patterns beyond the mind of the rank and file; and they could simultaneously be sensitive to touching moments and small pleasures of everyday life with the eloquent appreciation of the fine scholar. As 舒芜 Shu Wu has commented in 周作人的是非功過 Zhou Zuoren: Achievement or Failure? " When looking towards the lower and

5 A number of instances appear in The Writings of John Burroughs.
broader areas [of culture], Zhou himself did so from a high and distant place; he did not personally go down to the broader and lower areas to see" (205). This is the role both Burroughs and Zhou played and which probably was expected of them by many of their readers.

Zhou's goal was not to praise the masses, but rather to engage in cultural criticism: thinking about culture, how it functioned in society, how it could be improved, and what some of its more interesting manifestations were. He frequently analyzed and criticized the "feudal" society he had been born into -- "not," as David Pollard in "Chou Tso-jen: A Scholar" notes,

... that Zhou ever seriously addressed himself to the question of the economic infrastructure of feudal society and its rights and wrongs; to him feudalism meant the traditional notions, practices, and ethics which comprised the ideological superstructure of that society ... concubinage, footbinding, female chastity, superstition, taboos, cringing before authority, mesmerization by the literary ideal, and so on (334).

That is, like many other intellectuals of the May Fourth period, Zhou insisted on limiting his work to a "revolution of thought" — and, while he groped for a broader understanding of cultural study, he never broke away from the distinctions he made between culture on the one hand and military pursuits, politics, and economics on the other.

The nature of Zhou's broad interest in cultural criticism is revealed in some of the subjects he read and discussed in his essays: folkways and folklore, manners, social customs, traditional ideals and social morality, ethics, religion, superstitions, witchcraft, mythology, cultural anthropology,
women's status in society, children's issues, sexual psychology, and the common routines of everyday life, all of which frequently was discussed in terms of their pertinence to a specific nation or people. He read and wrote widely on these subjects, and was considered a leading scholar in some areas, such as mythology, social customs, and women's and children's issues (舒 Shu 166-8; 趙 Zhao 76).

For Zhou, these various strands of interests all came together through an "intellectualistic-holistic mode of thinking" about culture. He perceived society and culture as an "organismic entity whose form and nature were effected by its fundamental ideas," (29) as Lin Yü-sheng noted in regard to Zhou's peers. It frequently was in this amorphous area that Zhou conducted his numerous cultural studies and cultural comparisons, or what 舒蕐 Shu Wu has called the study of "民族神神文化" "the spiritual culture of the people" (170-1).

Zhou may have felt that 文化 wenhua, when referring to high culture alone, was not an entirely appropriate word for some of the cultural study in which he was engaged, and so in his earlier works he relied on words like "customs" or "social morality" to fill in some of the gap, as when he spoke of "本國的風俗習慣" "the country's social customs and habits" in "新希臘與中國" "New Greece and China," written in 1927. However, rather than completely set aside 文化 wenhua as a category, he tried in some of his later essays to stretch its meaning to take in some of these elements, thus
bringing his interests in what he previously had been calling "popular customs" or "social morality" within its range. In doing so, he may have been influenced by some Western works he was reading, such as the cultural anthropology of J. G. Frazer.6

This change can be seen most clearly in several 1932 essays. In one of these essays, published in the 看雲集 Looking at Clouds Collection, he argued for a broad-based approach to the study of 文化 wenhua as opposed to an exclusive emphasis on "high" or "literary" culture: “研究中國文化，從代表的最高成績看去固然是一種看法” “Of course, one point of view on the study of China’s culture is to approach it from its highest representative achievement,” he wrote, “但如從全體的平約成績著眼，所見應比較地更近于真相。” “but if you look at the overall average achievement, what you see should be closer to the truth.” (“擁 護達生編 等”)

This idea is explained further in 文學的範圍 "The Scope of Literature," published in 中國新文學的源流 The Origin and Development of New Chinese Literature. He describes Chinese 文化 wenhua in terms of a triangle which is divided into three parts. 原始文化 "Primitive culture" occupied much of the base area of the triangle, while 人文民俗 "folk ways and customs" shared the base and middle areas; in the peak of the triangle were 學術與藝術 "academic research and the arts." Together, these three elements

6 Zhou discusses the connections between Frazer’s cultural anthropology and popular customs in “鄉村與道教思想” “The Countryside and Taoist Thought” in 談虎集 (上) On Tigers II, drawing attention to the “culture” of “cultural anthropology.”
formed the whole of 文化 wenhua. High culture -- literature, the arts, and academic research -- did not form the totality of culture, then, but rather was the noblest subset of a broader concept.

As with culture in general, Zhou diagrammed literature as a triangle, pictured below:

[Diagram of a triangle with labels: primitive literature, pure literature, popular literature]

He commented, "我們必須拿它當作文化的一種去研究，必須注意到它的全體，只是山頂上的一部分是不夠用的。” "To research literature, we must treat it as a type of culture, and we must give attention to its entirety; just the little part at the peak is not enough" (qtd. in 舒 Shu 197).

Three years later, in 日本管窺之三 "A Limited Vision of Japan, #3," published in 風雨談 On Wind and Rain, Zhou added that

I have said before that culture ("wenhua") generally is limited only to academic research, arts and literature; but now I feel that it is not so. It is true that academic research, arts and literature are the highest representatives of culture, but the lower parts are very powerful in society . . . . So it seems that, in regard to culture, we cannot take only literati and academics as our object; we must widen our range. a

That these ideas had long-term resonance for Zhou can be seen by his 1940 comment in 日本之再認識 "Japan Re-Encountered" that,

to know the culture of a country, it is mistaken, or at the very least insufficient, to seek it only through its literature and art.
An interpretation of a country's culture should be applicable to other aspects of the country as well. If the interpretation works only in the cultural sphere, but fails to provide an explanation of any other features, then it cannot be a valid one (trans. in "Seven Essays").

These pained attempts to delineate a broader understanding of culture to include, but not be limited to, high or literary culture may seem a bit simplistic to the reader of today. Yet they may represent a significant shift for Zhou Zuoren. He had been struggling to find a way to talk about peoples as cultural units, and he needed an umbrella word under which to place "low" or "popular" culture, customs, traditions, habits, and so on, as well as "high" literary and artistic culture. In these essays one can see that he attempted to stretch the meaning of 文化 wenhua so that it might become that umbrella word, much as the English word "culture" has taken on new meanings in the past century. I say "stretch the meaning," not necessarily because Zhou was a leader in this linguistic change, but rather because the fact that he went to the effort of explicitly setting out his ideas on the meaning of 文化 wenhua implies that he felt that it was not already commonly understood, and needed to be explained in some way to his readers.

While the change is subtle, it also marks a shift in what we might call "national consciousness" -- that is, a change in emphasis from a largely non-representative high culture produced by elites to a whole system or network of interrelated characteristics that permeates peoples from top to bottom, and which distinguishes nations from one another as cultural
categories. It allows one to talk about "the English" or "the Greeks" as both national and cultural units, and likewise it allows one to draw "the Chinese" into this international community of national cultures. Instead of being that of The Empire, central and singular, China's place in the world as a nation was to be understood in terms of being one among a plurality of cultures.

Zhou's image of the role of the academic was of a cosmopolitan with an international perspective who could draw upon more than one cultural tradition for sources, and who was capable of mediating between or synthesizing from those cultural traditions in order to reduce misunderstandings between peoples and to further humanistic goals in general.

To an extent, these discussions and comparisons were grounded in a belief in universal human interests and humanistic values, particularly, as David Pollard has noted in *A Chinese Look at Literature*, in terms of a concern for the quality of everyday life (137).

Ernst Wolff has translated an article written in 1918 by Zhou under the title *人的文學*, which Wolff renders as "Humane Literature." The ideas therein were discussed by Zhou many different times in many different contexts in the 1920's and 1930's. In this article, Zhou expressed the hope that

---

7 Because the essays described here cover a twenty-year time period, and because Zhou himself fluctuated in his use of the word "wenhua," the discussions that follow will of necessity use the English word "culture" rather loosely. Unless noted otherwise, the word "culture" will be applied in its broader sense, including but not limited to "high" culture. In translations of passages from Zhou's essays, "wenhua" is translated as "culture"; in most cases, the context will make the import of the word clear.
literature can be used to promote some of the ideals of humanism. Of particular significance here is the conclusion to which this humanistic philosophy led Zhou in terms of international relations:

One should not think of oneself as different from the mass of mankind, or as a superior in morality, and draw up borders and spheres, because man is always related to mankind and vice versa.

. . . Because mankind's fate is one and the same, the anxiety about my own fate should therefore also be anxiety about the common fate of mankind. That is why we should speak only of our time and age and not distinguish between Chinese and foreign. In our occasional creations, we naturally tend toward the Chinese, which we can understand more accurately. Beyond that we must introduce and translate foreign writings in large quantities, expanding the mind of the reader, so that he can perceive humanity as a whole; and we must nurture a humane morality and achieve realization of a humane life (105).

I am reluctant to treat 人的文学 "Humane Literature," a relatively early piece of work, as a manifesto of Zhou's beliefs before and after the time of its writing; it might be, in part, a recasting of some new ideas he had been reading, some of which he retained and some of which he did not. By his own admission, written in the 1925 essay 元旦試筆 "A Tentative Essay for New Year's," the -ISMS he espoused swung with the times, from anti-foreign monarchism to popular revolt to anti-Manchu to ethnic nationalism, and then "'五四時代我夢想著世界主義" "in the May Fourth period I dreamed of globalism" which later was reduced to pan-Asianism and then returned to ethnic nationalism as a response to Japanese and English imperialism. For that reason, 人的文學 "Humane Literature," written during Zhou's May Fourth-period "globalism," should not be read too literally; nor, in fact,
should any of the short-lived intellectual fads of that time be taken too seriously.

The application of words like "humanism" to Zhou Zuoren's beliefs is further complicated by the Confucian concept, 仁 ren, which bears some relation to the Western "humanism," but is based upon a different tradition. The concept of 仁 ren also factored into Zhou's philosophy, as has been discussed by Wolff (55). To what extent these two concepts affected Zhou's theories, and how, would be a difficult and perhaps pointless question, however, for what Zhou embraced was not the letter but the spirit of "humanism" and 仁 ren -- or perhaps one might better say that Zhou embraced "humanism" and 仁 ren to the extent that he felt the spirit of those concepts expressed his own.

Despite the above caveats, I have quoted from 人的文學 "Humane Literature" because in a broad sense it represents an early and clear expression of that spirit. The basic values in 人的文學 "Humane Literature" of impartiality and open-mindedness, as well as the belief in the possibility of rapprochement among peoples and the benefits of being exposed to foreign literature in order to raise the moral quality of Chinese society as a whole, were a powerful and consistent strain in his work over the years.

"... Humanist thought that assumes similarities on the large scale and differences on the small scale is the special characteristic of modern
literature," wrote Zhou in 藝術與生活 Art and Life.8 His broad-based interests in literature bear out this philosophy, for not only was he familiar with many of the classics of China and Greece, but also with newer works from China, Japan, and all over Europe; and he always tried to bring these works together through their similarities before teasing out their smaller differences.

In addition to teaching European, Chinese, and Japanese literature during various times in his academic career, his interests were reflected in his numerous translations of a wide variety of literature which he rendered into Chinese from versions in English, Greek, or Japanese. Translation was an important source of income for Zhou during times of financial difficulty, and he also saw translating as an important way to introduce Chinese to foreign literatures and cultures. Early in his career, he worked together with his brother Lu Xun to translate short stories by Wilde, Poe, Maupassant, Schwob, (Hans Christian) Anderson, Stepniak, Garshin, Chekhov, Sologub, Sienkiewicz, Mrazovic, Ephthalioptis and Juhani Aho (MacDougall 9). His later descriptions and translations are too numerous to describe here; they included translations of Japanese, Greek, Russian, Eastern European, English, and French works, and descriptions of writers such as [Havelock] Ellis, Blake, Ibsen, Russell, [Lafcadio] Hearn, Homer, Frazer, Voltaire, Chaucer, Nietzsche, Goethe, and many others from ancient Greece and Japan.

While he did read more traditional forms of literature, Zhou's wide interest in cultural studies was reflected in his equally wide interest in legends, myths, children's literature and theatre, folk ballads, short poems, parables, riddles, journals and diaries, scientific articles, and so on -- what he called 雜文學 "miscellaneous literature" (舒 182). To give an example of Zhou's own assessment of these wide interests, in the 1940 essay "日本之再認識" "Japan Re-encountered" he listed the kinds of books on Japan he had been reading for the last twenty years: haikai, haibun, miscellaneous haiku, comic and satirical poems; ballads and folk songs; sharebon novelettes, joke books, short talks and comic tales; books on woodblock prints, Otsu-e folk prints, and folk art (trans. in "Seven Essays").

"The Chinese have an inherent tendency to conceit, which is ill-suited to the study of foreign cultures," Zhou once remarked. As an antidote to conceit, to provincialism and to narrow-minded conservatism, Zhou pressed for the same broad cultural study for others as that in which he himself engaged. In 北大的支路 "Beijing University's Side Road," he lists reasons why Chinese should study Greece, India, Arabia, and Japan: Greece's philosophy and literature are valuable in their own right and similar to China's, in addition to being the foundation for Western culture; India is valuable for having brought Buddhism to China; Arabia is valuable for achievement in literature and the arts, and for having long-standing

9 “日本與中國” "Japan and China" trans. in "Seven Essays."
connections with China and Chinese people; Japan is valuable for its similarity to China and Greece, and for its new literary movements. This list is in addition to the study of Korean, Mongolian, and Manchurian, which Zhou also praised.

Not as many people studied foreign cultures as he would have wished. In "The Friends of Japan," he lamented that

China has not really had true friends of Japan, because China still has no people who understand the real glory of the people of Japan. All you have to do is to look at how China's publishing world does not have one book or article on Japan's arts and literature, and you will know. The Japanese people have experienced one person who has a profound relationship with them based upon mutual understanding. He is Lafcadio Hearn (1850-1904); it's he who was a real friend of Japan! Does China have a person like this? I'm ashamed to say, there is none. Besides this, are there real friends of England, Germany, France and Russia who really can understand and introduce the cultures of England, Germany, etc. to China? And what real friends of India are concentrating on researching India, the country that is most related to Chinese culture? Isn't it then so that there are not many... who can really understand the worth of our country's culture?

The move from discussion of foreign cultures to his own was not incidental. Part of Zhou's philosophy as he expressed it in several different essays was that through the study of others, one gains a better understanding of oneself. As D. E. Pollard writes, Zhou's interest in

... popular customs... would seem not only to be based on the importance he consciously placed on the way the routine business of life was conducted; it also seemed to have a positive feedback into his own life, in that learning of other people's ways stimulates awareness of one's own (Pollard, "Chou Tso-jen: A Scholar" 351).
In a later essay, "Japan Re-Encountered," Zhou mentioned that his reason for persisting in studying Japan despite the growing enmity between the two countries is

...certainly not because of any desire to 'conquer through the knowledge of self and of the enemy,' but really because, inspired by Wang Yangming's (1472-1528) dictum 'I and you are like them,' we hope that through a knowledge of them, we might come to a better understanding of ourselves (trans. in "Seven Essays").

This sensitivity to the way in which knowledge about oneself (or one's people) relates to knowledge of others is revealed in Zhou's emphasis on cultural comparisons that often concluded with comments on the similarity and differences between Chinese and other cultures, and how the Chinese might profit from that knowledge. It was his habit to interpret information about foreign cultures in terms of what they meant for China, and he also frequently drew instructive parallels between China's cultural relations and those of countries from other traditions.

Clearly Zhou saw Japan as being closest to China in terms of culture and history; Japan, more than any other country, could reveal to China her own identity. In "Japan and China" Zhou wrote:

China, quite apart from studying Japan with the objectivity due any national civilization, should pay it particular attention, because of the many features to which we may refer with profit in the study of our own culture, both past and present. From a utilitarian point of view, then, the Chinese of today cannot afford to ignore the study of Japan (trans. in "Seven Essays").

Japan both preserved China's past and offered scenarios for China's future; at
the same time, Japan was a template for China, offering her moral instruction by example, with clean, simple, gracious living and natural ways, all of which, Zhou thought, were reminiscent of ancient Greece. For example, he associated the willingness to expose one's bare feet to view among the Japanese with the Greek celebration of the unadorned human body in their art, and contrasted it with the bound and covered feet of the Chinese women.

However, many other countries played large and small roles in Zhou's cultural comparisons as well.

In "Europe's Moral Rectification," Zhou takes the opportunity of a news item on the existence of reactionaries in Europe to point out that Europe is similar to China. It is not full of progressives alone. Blind imitation of Europeans is no guarantee for advancement on the side of progressives, for the reactionaries of China will find fuel for their arguments in Europe as well.

And Zhou's "New Greece and China," written in 1921, makes an extended list of comparisons between contemporary Greece and China:

...[I] feel that [Greece] is quite similar to China. First, there's the narrow rural way of thinking. If someone asks a man where he is from, he certainly won't say "Greece" or "X Island X County," but rather must use the name of the little place where he was born and raised. Even if he left in his youth and lived somewhere else for twenty or thirty years, the people there still won't recognize him as a native. From start to finish, he sees
himself as a *xenos*\(^{10}\) as well.  
Second, there are power struggles. They have a saying: "he's a good servant, but a bad master." That is to say that as soon as someone has power and influence, he acts badly. As a result, the war for independence from Turkey was nearly lost because the revolutionary leaders jockeyed for power. After independence, the politicians all declared themselves leaders and fought each other; every year the Congress is disbanded at least once.  
Third is conservatism. The country's customs and habits are all [considered] good. Marriage must be arranged by a match-maker. When someone dies, the relatives (female) must wail as if they were singing a song; those present at the burial must give a last kiss to the deceased. And they hate Europeanization more than anything else.  
Fourth is swindling. I'm told that there, train tickets, newspapers, and cigarettes are the only things that have fixed prices; all else depends on an individual's on the spot ability to negotiate a price. When traders win, they're happy, of course; when they sell something cheap, they're still pleased to pocket the money all the same, and in their hearts they respect the buyer's ability.  
Fifth is pantheistic superstition. An Englishman has criticized them, saying, "The people of Greece have seen the rise and fall of many philosophers, but in the end they held onto their inherited religion." . . . divination of dreams, incantations to the gods, spells for rain; they only lack quiet meditation and fox spirits.\(^{c}\)

Having established that China and Greece are similar, Zhou then went on to draw out what he felt was an essential difference, from which China might learn:

. . . What I want to say is that, like China, Greece is an old country, and like China has these bad points. Yet in the end it was able to throw off Turkey's control, and now has formed a presentable nation. Why *was* that?  
The Greek people have a unique quality that has been inherited from previous times, and that is the ardent desire for life.\(^{d}\)

---

\(^{10}\) The word "xenos" is used in original.
Zhou quoted from the novel *One Man's Death* by a modern Greek poet, Palamas,\(^{11}\) as proof of this characteristic, and then offered this commentary:

[The Greeks] take Ibsen's so-called 'all or nothing' attitude towards life, and make enthusiastic demands [of life]. Their ability to carve out a place for themselves in the modern world stems from this. But what is China like? Chinese people are truly too lacking in the will to live, [ranging from] not having enough [will to live] to not having any at all . . . .

His message to the Chinese reader was that, upon examining Greece, they should see that the Chinese needed to develop a "ardent desire for life" if they wished to win a place for themselves in the modern world as well.

Zhou also read and translated many works from "weak and small nations" of the world, particularly of Eastern Europe. His interest grew out of a concern for the fate of China; as a result, he sympathized with works that described similar conditions in other countries (Wolff 44).

Additionally, Zhou translated and/ or discussed a number of Russian works by writers such as Tolstoy, Dostoevski, and Andreyev, partly because he felt that many circumstances in Russia and China were similar. An example of Zhou's comparisons between Russia and China will be given later in this work.

Judging from the tenor of many of Zhou's essays such as "New Greece and China" above, it seems that his comparative studies of foreign cultures were a key part of his thinking about his own country. The

\(^{11}\) Prob. Kostes Palamas (1859-1943).
identity of Chinese culture -- whether popular, traditional, or literary and artistic -- was revealed to a significant extent by its juxtaposition with the foreign cultures Zhou studied.

In a sense, Zhou required that other nations play certain fixed cultural roles in determining China's own cultural identity, and in allowing Zhou to explore that cultural identity at length in a highly self-critical light, as when he complained that the Chinese did not have an "ardent desire for life." China was weak and oppressed, like the Eastern European nations; arrogant and self-satisfied, like the imperialists; an influential country fallen on hard times, like Greece; an Asian nation absorbing Western influence, like Japan; and so on. As will be discussed later in this work, the relational nature of Chinese identity that Zhou envisioned meant that nations that behaved out of character were a threat to what it meant to be Chinese.

CULTURE AND THE NATION: ENVISIONING CHINA AS A MEMBER OF AN INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL COMMUNITY

Zhou Zuoren lived in a time of national self-definition, or re-definition, for the Chinese. For Zhou, thinking about culture was a way of thinking about the nation, and not surprisingly, his idea of what was important to a nation was weighted in favor of culture and cultural achievement. Nations primarily were cultural entities; political, military, economic, and other
factors were downplayed or dismissed. For example, in "The Friends of Japan," written in 1920, Zhou argued that

... A country's glory is in its culture -- academic research, the arts and literature -- and not in its territory owned, its advantageous positions or its military might. Furthermore these things sometimes trouble and reduce the glory it has.^[1]

It was this culture -- academic research, arts and literature -- to which Zhou spoke when making many of his cultural comparisons, and by virtue of which he wished China to share a place in the international community of cultures. It did not include aspects which were unrelated or irrelevant to a country's culture or its glory, and in keeping with that conceptual framework, Zhou rarely directly confronted the political and military divisions and economic upheavals which had riven China during the time span covered here. As Zhou once wrote in the journal *Yu Si*,

I certainly don't have any -isms to propagandize, and I don't have any interest in politics or economics. All we want to do is to break down a little the muddled and stagnant atmosphere in Chinese life and intellectual circles (qtd. in Qian 307).^[2]

If culture was of central importance to the nation, and a "revolution of thought" the way to revitalize the nation, then one's nationalism naturally should reflect these emphases. Not surprisingly, Zhou frequently advocated of a kind of Chinese "nationalism" which lent itself much more to the concept of nation-as-culture than to the nation as an interacting cultural, military, and political unit.

I say "a" Chinese nationalism because there are two words in Chinese
which both translate roughly as "nationalism," but they have slightly different meanings, and Zhou Zuoren used them differently. The first is 民族主義 minzu zhuyi, referring to ethnic nationalism, which Zhou supported. The second is 國家主義 guojia zhuyi, which Zhou used negatively to criticize blind patriotism.

When Zhou spoke approvingly of 民族主義 minzu zhuyi, he was not necessarily implying any support for or even interest in national leadership or a national political structure, for the word does not contain such meanings within it. 民族主義 minzu zhuyi, directs itself more towards ethnic loyalty than to loyalty to a politically organized group. It is a loyalty that rests on the shared traits of a people. In contrast, the English word, "nationalism" usually rests on shared traits and their representation or advocacy by a certain leadership or political structure; and the Chinese word, 國家主義 guojia zhuyi, simply translates literally as "country-ism" or "state-ism."

民族主義 minzu zhuyi, can have racial overtones, and a racist interpretation of 民族主義 minzu zhuyi was a possibility for Zhou Zuoren, who had studied with the nationalistic, anti-Manchu thinker 章太炎 Zhang Taiyan in Japan. However, Zhou was dismissive of racism, writing in "Women’s Issues and Eastern Civilization, Etc." that

To force a distinction between those people [of the "East" and "West"] and to be blindly arrogant about oneself is like calling yourself the yellow race, the central race. Even the colour of our
It is more likely that when advocating 民族主義 minzu zhuyi, Zhou was declaring his loyalty to a group of people with whom he had shared traits in the cultural sphere, for as Ernst Wolff has pointed out, Zhou himself thought that the nationalistic teachings of 章太炎 Zhang Taiyan had led him, somewhat surprisingly, towards culture, and towards literature in particular. Wolff writes that

It is interesting and characteristic of Zhou Zuoren's temperament and inclinations that this strong upsurge of nationalism . . . led in his own case to concrete consequences mainly in the literary field. The influences appear to have intensified in him an already latent fascination for popular tales and myths, which worked to broaden his interests to include the popular literary treasures of foreign peoples (44).

While it is difficult to make a definitive statement on Zhou's 民族主義 minzu zhuyi, it seems likely that Zhou's vision of Chinese identity was a culture-based one; that in fact he saw the concept of "nation" in terms of culture; and that his advocacy of "nationalism" was not a political act.

One way in which Zhou sometimes described the Chinese people as a distinct entity or "nation" was with the expression, 國民性 guo min xing or "national character." While a number of references to 國民性 guo min xing were made in his writings, the word was often used rather casually. However, a direct discussion of what this word meant to him can be found in his 1922 essay, 國粹与歐化 "National Essence and Europeanization," in which
he contrasted his loose, broad definition of Chinese cultural characteristics to
the rigid, close-minded definition implied in "national essence," a
concept which he opposed.

In this essay, Zhou envisioned a Chinese culture that took advantage both
of its own inheritance and of new influences from abroad, creating a cultural
synthesis without stooping to blind imitation of foreigners. The "Chinese"
nature of their culture need not be regimented or controlled, but rather be
allowed to develop naturally, he argued, and continuous change within it
should be recognized and accepted. To an extent, Zhou, who tended towards
broad universals, seems in this essay to set out the terms by which one can
recognize the national cultural unit without insisting on its being absolutely
different or closed off from the rest of the world. In fact, what he advocated is
China's cultural entry into a world community of cultures with which China
interacts but from which, because of its unique inheritance and the absorption
of influences into a uniquely Chinese context, remains quite naturally
distinct.

A believer in freedom of thought and individualism, Zhou once wrote
that “提倡國民文學必須提倡個人主義” “to advocate national literature, one
must [also] advocate individualism,” or else 容易變成狂信，這個結果是凡本國
人必好，凡別國的必壞，自己的國土是世界的中心。” “it easily will change
into fanaticism, the result of which is that anybody from this country must be
good, and anybody from other countries must be bad, and the land of one's
own country is the centre of the world.”

In accordance with this idea that individualism would temper a harmful tendency towards programmatic nationalism, Zhou opposed cultural control or forced unity for Chinese arts and letters to ensure that they remained sufficiently "Chinese,"; rather, the free and changing characteristics of participating individuals would come together in a naturally developing and changing Chinese 國民性 "national character" on its own. He wrote,

We advocate respecting each person's individual character and naturally likewise respecting a national character made from a union of the individual characters; furthermore, we hope that it can develop in literature and the arts, creating a vibrant national literature.

And,

I believe that any educated Chinese with 'do not imitate anybody' as his only condition, if we let him spontaneously employ whatever kind of writing to record whatever kinds of thoughts he has, his result still will be a work of 'Chinese' art and literature. His unique personality will exist in it together with the common national people's character, although the abovesaid might have received considerable influence from foreign origins.

From this we can see that Zhou believed in the possibility of cultural synthesis, in which beneficial elements of foreign cultures could be absorbed into this national character, creating a new and better Chinese culture. The cultural synthesis in China just might flower into a renaissance. Not a totalistic iconoclast, he did not wish to discard everything Chinese in the

process; he stated that

We oppose imitating the ancients, and at the same time oppose imitating Westerners . . . . but it is all right to receive their influence, and it can be beneficial . . . . We welcome Europeanization because we are happy to get a kind of new atmosphere which can contribute to our enjoyment and use, creating a new vitality; this doesn’t mean injecting it right into the veins, using it instead of one’s own blood.

Zhou promoted the image of China as a culture interrelated and in flux relative to other cultures of the world, both geographically and historically. He sharply attacked China-centered or Asia-centered views on culture, and was derisive of the concept of Chinese "national essence," because he thought it entailed unreasoned and undiscriminating prejudice in favour of all that was designated as "traditionally Chinese." For Zhou, the suggestion that a Chinese "national essence" or "Pan-Asianism" was to be promoted among the people ran counter to his advocacy of open-minded cosmopolitanism and the study of foreign cultures. He considered such a suggestion fodder for reactionaries who called for the rejection of all things foreign and a return to the supposed cultural foundations thought to have made China great. In "Russell and National Essence," Zhou complains that "when [Bertrand] Russell came to China, he in his very first speech encouraged Chinese people to conserve their national essence . . . ." He felt that Russell was pandering to the reactionary forces in Chinese society, which needed no encouragement. He explained further by way of Rabindranath
Tagore:

Why do Chinese people like India's Tagore? Because he advocates Asianism and opposes Westernization. Why is it that when you say "national essence" or "Asianism," Chinese like it? Because they are lazy, because they're afraid to think hard, and because they're afraid of changing their lives. So they want to oppose new thinking and new life; so they want to return to the ancients and expel that which is foreign.\(^1\)

At the same time, Zhou also distanced his ideas from that of 中學為體西學為用 "Chinese studies for substance and Western studies for use," a concept that had been in currency and that had carried overtones of Chinese supremacy. He wrote in "國粹與歐化" "National Essence and Europeanization" that proponents of "Chinese studies for substance and Western studies for use"

. . . have a kind of prejudice for the superiority of the national essence. Only under this condition [of its superiority] do they accept countless harmless changes in substance. I, on the other hand, take the inherited national character as a native ground, exhausting the potential of its innate character in its capacity to accept influences in all areas, making them melt and soak through, forming one body, continuously changing, creating a permanent and often new national character . . . .\(^m\)

Zhou's pursuit of cultural and literary studies were undertaken with this vision of cultural synthesis -- that is, the bringing of foreign writings into China and the bringing of China into the cultural community of the world (in the eyes of the Chinese) -- in mind. Zhou was able to apply his prestige as a leading writer and an expert on foreign cultures towards teaching Chinese people new ways of thinking about Chinese culture or 文化 wenhua and its
relationship to other cultures, or as he wrote in the magazine 語絲 Yu Si in 1925, "現在要緊的是喚起個人的與國民的自覺" "Now it is important to arouse individual and national self-awareness" through cultural study and the absorption of influence (qtd. in 錢 Qian 317).

He disparaged a China-centred view of the world and, by drawing comparisons between Chinese and other cultures as well as advocating cultural synthesis, he educated Chinese as to their interconnectedness with a greater whole. Even as his writing envisioned China the cultural nation to his readers as a member of an international community of cultures, it re-envisioned China itself for them.

**EAST AND WEST: VERSIONS OF VISIONS**

Generally speaking, Zhou opposed a simplistic division of the world into "East" and "West." As he wrote in 北大的支路 "Beijing University's Side Road,"

Lately everybody likes to talk about some sort of Eastern culture and Western culture. I don't know as to whether the two are so different on an essential level, and I don't know as to whether Western culture can be encompassed in two or three simple sentences...

He was quick to point out that neither category should be seen as absolute, although he did recognize cultural affinity among groups of nations that had been influenced by the same cultural traditions, such as China and Japan.
Furthermore, Zhou sometimes pointed out similarities or differences among cultures that cut across the categories "East" and "West," as has been noted in the cases of England, Greece, and Eastern Europe. He wrote in "致溥儀君書" “A Letter to Mr. Pu Yi [‘the last emperor’]" that

Chinese people have been talking a great deal about Eastern culture and Western culture recently, but ultimately there are no people who specialize in studying one particular kind of culture, and so all fail to grasp the main points, adding that

I think that the cultures of China, India, and the root of Europe's, Greece, all should be studied by specialists who combine their results, then make comparisons; then and only then will there be the possibility of discussion. No second-hand evidence can be relied upon or believed.

Especially in his earlier essays, Zhou associated an enthusiasm for the essentializing categories of "Eastern" and "Western" civilization with enthusiasm for retrogressive cultural politics and a backlash against new ideas. His views in the 1928 essay, "Women's Issues and Eastern Civilization, Etc." provide an example of how Zhou argued against these categories:

The most important thing is that young people need to smash this concept in their minds of an Eastern civilization. . . . Young people . . . have swallowed this poison, and mistakenly believe that there really are two kinds of civilization on earth, the Eastern being the spiritual one, the Western being the material one, and that the spiritual is better than the material, so that Eastern culture really is a world treasure, and China can die [but] this treasure will exist forever. This kind of puerile boastfulness also has naive and romantic elements to it . . . not only does it reject culture of foreign origins, creating closed minds, but also it turns into reactionism and conservatism . . . .
he wrote. 其實 "Actually," he added, 這些議論都是廢話, 人類只是一個, 
文明也只是一個, 其間大同小異。 。 。 " all that talk is a waste of breath. 
People are all one, and civilization is one as well. There are great similarities 
and few differences among them . . . . "

While Zhou's dismissive approach to the categories "East" and "West" 
certainly may have been determined in part by his universalistic principles, 
one can also see from the examples above that he was responding directly to 
issues of the day which concerned him, such as the myth of Asian racial 
superiority, and used the vantage-point of universalism as an effective way to 
attack it. In that sense one could say that Zhou needed methods with which 
to oppose forces in his own milieu which displeased him, and sometimes 
used principles such as universalism as his tools.

In earlier essays, Zhou's opposition to "Eastern civilization" may have 
been intended to combat the tendency to essentialize and state the superiority 
of Chinese civilization. He feared that a belief in a (superior and 
China-dominated) Eastern civilization would lead to a narrow-minded 
repudiation of the Western influences he advocated and a trend towards 
conservatism and reactionism among the Chinese.

Afterwards, his arguments against the categories of "East" and "West" may 
have been less against Chinese conservatives and more against Japanese 
pan-Asianist cultural propaganda, although once again, he feared an alliance
between (Japanese) pan-Asianists and Chinese conservatives; as he remarked in 日本與中國 "Japan and China," ". . . it is odd that so many of [Japanese] opinions are shared by the Chinese authorities and establishment figures" (trans. in "Seven Essays"). His opposition to such an alliance did not change until the Japanese takeover of Beijing.

After he began to collaborate with the Japanese, articles were published under his name which expressed a very different view on the "East." Edward Gunn, in Unwelcome Muse, translates a passage from one of those articles which urges students and intellectuals to "join together in the Greater East Asian War" until "complete victory," holding "Greater East Asianism" as a central ideology: "Asia is one, and the wellsprings of its culture are one as well, mutually dependent on each other as the lips are to the teeth . . . ."(154-5) While it is not clear to what extent Zhou actually assisted the Japanese, it is clear that on a symbolic level, Zhou in his collaboration as a cultural man publicly embraced a new perspective on the East and West, and in doing so his decision to collaborate became disastrously entwined with his published academic work and public persona.
Zhou Zuoren believed that the study of other countries' cultural histories, and particularly those of Japan and Greece, offered China scenarios for its past and future. While he did believe that the Japanese, for example, had a unique culture of their own, he also thought he saw elements of Tang dynasty China preserved in twentieth-century Japan. This living Chinese history existed alongside changes brought about by modern Western influences on Japan -- the results of which would anticipate those from Western influences upon China.

I believe that were we to take a general overview of the literary changes which have taken place in Japan over the past forty years, it would greatly aid our understanding of many of our own problems... Japan has preserved a great deal of ancient culture for us, and has also conducted experiments in the new culture on our behalf, and this should benefit us greatly, (trans. in "Seven Essays," my emphases)

Zhou wrote of Japan in 日本與中國 "Japan and China."

Here and in many other instances, Zhou engaged in cultural comparisons in which the overriding question was, How can China benefit from this? So overriding was this question that, at times, it seems to direct or even very nearly determine what Zhou finds in other cultures. In the case of the study of cultural histories, this problem in Zhou's work was particularly acute.

Perhaps the problem was due to Zhou's strong sense of recognition, even identification, with what he found in other cultures as they related to China's own history. Or, to look at it another way, perhaps Zhou looked for and
found in other cultures that which confirmed his feelings in regard to Chinese history.

When studying the cultural history of a foreign country, and especially that of Japan, he wished the foreign cultural identity in question to be different enough from that of China to be an "other" which, upon juxtaposition, could provide insight into Chinese culture. At the same time, he wished it to be similar enough to preserve, reflect, and display Chinese history and China's future for contemporary Chinese to consider.

At the end of the 1930's, intercultural understanding between Japan and China seemed to be of no avail and Japan's versions of China's future no longer palatable. However, Zhou attempted to maintain his vision of China and Japan's historical relationship to it. To do so, he focused exclusively on past historical connections to explain his love for Japan, thereby excluding rising militarism, which "似乎只是外來的一種影響，未必能代表日本的真精神" "seems to be only a kind of foreign influence, and cannot necessarily represent Japan's real spirit," as he noted in 日本人的情美 "The Warmth and Beauty of the Japanese People." He wrote in 日本之再認識 "Japan Re-Encountered" that "I do love Japanese daily life...the main reason for this is to be found in my own nature and habits," but added that there was a "second reason" for his love of Japan

... which might best be described as a feeling of nostalgia for the distant past. In those days we were nationalists, and all forms of nationalism included a desire to revive the past. We were against the Qing, and we felt that everything that antedated the
Qing or the Yuan, let alone things of earlier periods, was therefore good. ...The impression we had of Japan was half that of a foreign country, half that of our own past history: a history that was still vibrantly alive in this alien land, not as some fantastic dream, and not as the pantomime which it has become in Korea and Annam. For this reason we were happy to dress ourselves in the kimono. Before 1911 the gown and short jacket were regarded as the dress of the Manchu barbarians . . . . (trans. in “Seven Essays”)

It was as if the Chinese could move back and forth through epochs by visiting Japan; their history was “vibrantly alive” there and, Zhou thought in his earlier essays, so was their future. At the same time, Japan was half a “foreign country,” an “alien land” which had to be respected as a unique entity distinct from China, and which had its own lessons to offer up to the Chinese, if only they would listen.

Yet even those elements which made Japan distinct -- what Zhou saw as its preference for simplicity, gracious ways, and love of beauty in everyday life -- was enmeshed in yet another complex relationship of cultural histories. Japan did not simply link China to its own past and future, but was also a link between Greece and China. 排日評意 "On Resisting Japan," he wrote:

Whether researching past culture or establishing new arts, China cannot overlook Japan, for a kind of inseparable cultural connection grew during our thousand years or more of contact. . . . students of the Romans must research Greece as a basic part of their learning; and the study of Greece can, from Latin, receive a great deal of references and assistance. So China and Japan are on the same terms of relations in cultural study.

Zhou often thought of ancient Greece and ancient China as being very similar; over the course of history, however, Japan had taken on the mantle
of the "Greece of Asia" (perhaps by absorbing Chinese influence), and China had fallen onto the same hard times as present-day Greece. In this way the identities of ancient and modern Greece and Japan were bound up with each other and with the identity of China. C.H. Wang has commented that

[Zhou's] Hellenism seems to remain inseparable from his zeal for Japanese culture. The latter not only paved the way for him to discover ancient Greece, but also transformed itself, as it were, into a reality with which he has been able to envision Greece. Ancient Greece was only a concept, or in some cases an illusion, for Zhou Zuoren, wavering as he did between poetic imagination and rational analysis. Japan, as he experienced it in the late Meiji era, assumed the role of interpreter of Hellenism to the young Chinese student, by its subtle and graceful, if not strictly Attic, quality."

Associating Japan and Greece was not a novel idea of Zhou's, but rather held currency for quite a few thinkers of the time; for example, Zhou quoted his favorite writer, Havelock Ellis, on the comparability of Greek and Japanese customs (Wang 8). However, the mental link between the two countries may have had special resonance for a Chinese such as Zhou in terms of conceptualizing their own national history. The sense of identification Zhou felt between modern Greece and China led him to make comparisons between the two countries in order to gain insight into China's pressing difficulties and how to solve them. In "New Greece and China," for example, he had drawn parallels between Greece and China in ancient times and in the present day, and had tried to determine what it was that the Greeks now had to help them succeed that the Chinese did not,
as described in an earlier section of this paper.

Zhou similarly saw parallels between the historical experiences of Russia and China. His “Russia and China in Literature” explained that Russia's literary background was very similar to China's, and so developments in Russian literature and thought were worthy of Chinese attention. He gave a brief history of nineteenth-century Russian literature, introducing a large number of Russian writers to his readers, and then commented:

... In the second half of the nineteenth century, every country of Western Europe slowly began to change, and there was a rise in democracy. But Russia was in a reactionary period at that time; [because] this one great social problem was not resolved, other issues could not even be broached. For that reason, thought in literature and the arts concentrated on this point. Chinese creators and researchers of new literature can learn a great lesson from this fact. China's special national conditions are a bit different from Western Europe's, but have many similarities to Russia's, and so we believe that in the future, China's newly emerging literature surely and naturally will also be literature about society and human life.5

Having established similarities, he then marked out the ways in which he thought Russia and China were different: in religion, politics, geographical features, living conditions, and the length of history, the effects of which he compared and contrasted with China. He concluded:

Their literary renaissance is largely because of the stirring of new thought; one only needs to see that most of these famous [Russian] writers received new educations or studied abroad to realize this. Right now China is under the same restrictions as they were. If we can take in new thought and use it to express and explain our special national conditions, then we, also, can look forward to the appearance of a new literature, and use the
world of art to influence real life. But the first thing we should keep in mind is that we must make do with our unique background; it is not a coincidence that we have it. We can't expect to create literature just like Russia's.1

In the above examples, one can see that Zhou tried to find a place for Chinese historical processes among the historical processes of the other nations of the world -- a place that took into account both China's uniqueness and its similarity to others. Many of the comparisons he made seem overly simplistic today; but they were an attempt to understand and explain China in a larger historical context, and to find a way for this self-knowledge to benefit China by predicting and improving its future.

Despite his preference for a fair and balanced approach to comparative study, Zhou also accepted the tenets of social Darwinism as it was interpreted in a Chinese context, believing that some peoples were better qualified to succeed in the struggle for existence than others. While a similar contradiction was harbored in the minds of many a Western writer as well, it must be kept in mind that Western writers had no cause to think that they or their ilk were or could ever be among the inferior parties who did not deserve to carry on the race, while Zhou, looking around at the troubles China faced, thought that he had to accept that the Chinese as a whole were poorly qualified to exist, for they faced failure.

That Zhou and many of his contemporaries accepted some of the tenets of
social Darwinism was due in part to the influence of that previous generation of Western writers who believed in social Darwinism and whose works were now reaching China. Zhou read the works of Havelock Ellis extensively, and Ellis arguably had a greater influence on Zhou's thinking than any other writer (Wolff 39 and others). While Ellis' works were largely concerned with sexual psychology, he also discussed social Darwinism and advocated eugenics as a way of speeding it along (趙 Hao 57).

Social Darwinism among the peoples of nations also helped to explain -- or seemed to explain -- to Chinese intellectuals the position that China as a nation found itself in in the early twentieth-century, that is, frequently being treated as prey for foreign powers. In a world where nations struggled among one another for the survival of the fittest, China was challenged to become more fit or be destined to die out. Zhou spoke of the struggle for survival among nations in "On Conscription" from the collection 見雲集 Looking at Clouds, in which he wrote:

People are animals, after all; no matter to what extent they change, when all is said and done they are still animals. The law of the animal world still is the one practical law among people. People cannot escape the principle of the animal struggle for existence, in which the superior win and the inferior lose. The struggle for existence is a permanently existing reality . . .

He added that, "吳公維增說過，他用機關槍打過來，我就用機關槍打過去，這是世界上可悲的現象，但這卻是生存競爭上唯一的出路。" "Master Wu Zhihui has said, 'If he attacks with machine guns, then I will fight back with machine guns.' This is a tragic phenomenon of the world, but it really is the only
option in the struggle for existence."

Zhou's praise of the indomitable spirit and willingness to struggle for life among the Greeks reveal a belief that a nation must struggle in order to survive, and that some nations are better equipped to do so than others because of the character of their people. The strength of the character of peoples must be divided unequally, because they were engaged in a competition among one another for a survival of the fittest, after which some would survive and some would not. Clearly, Zhou wished that the Chinese had, or could acquire, the spirit of the Greeks, for China was in danger of losing the struggle.

This way of thinking implied that countries which were overrun, or in danger of being overrun, were composed of people who were somehow inferior on the fitness scale. When they failed, it was somehow their own fault for not being good enough -- as Zhou Zuoren once wrote of the Chinese, "I know I am of the same race as them, but I can't help thinking, your affliction is deserved, sad to say, you barbaric people!"13

In "詛咒" "The Curse," written in 1927, Zhou described the sensation caused among the public when the execution of several political "criminals" is announced. One man is quoted as saying that he is going to see the excitement at the execution grounds, because "... there are two women, too- it'll be

really interesting to see their bare shoulders go under the knife!" Zhou comments, "這實在足以表出中國民族的十足野蠻墮落的惡根性來了！" "That certainly is enough to reveal the Chinese race's completely savage and degenerate, hateful basic nature!" And, "這實在是個奴性天成的足類，凶殘而卑怯。。。。" "this race really is of an instinctually slavish character, brutal and abject..."

"National character," then, was not just a descriptive word meant to redefine the word culture or wenhua to break it down along national lines, with each culture's unique character making it distinctive from that of other nations. As long as "national character" referred to the whole of the belief systems of a people, including popular culture; and as long as the general tenets of social Darwinism were accepted; then the use of the word implied a qualitative judgement on the people. In the world of social Darwinism, the culture or "national character" of a people might be of an inferior quality, causing it to lose out in the struggle for existence with other nations. As Zhou once wrote, "...can such a debased specimen be equal to the task of saving the nation? I cannot but have my doubts."14 And in "怎說才好" "What Can I Say?" he explained that

Chinese people... make the killing of people their goal, taking advantage of this time to satisfy as much as possible their cruel and greedy, wanton basic nature. I cannot promise that people are not necessarily like this in other countries, but I believe that in China it always is a kind of deeply rooted hereditary disease...
in the future, the roots of China's destruction will be in this; certainly it won't be related to other countries' imperialism, and so on.

Zhou thought that the Chinese must somehow be worse than others in their "basic nature," although he could not explain how the Chinese could be different from other peoples. Here and elsewhere, he skirted the question.

Zhou’s later disbelief in Chinese historical progress may have come in part from the combination of influences from this way of viewing "national character" together with social Darwinism, and the two ideas may have reinforced one another. As time went on, Zhou became convinced that progress was necessary but not possible for the Chinese, who were inherently "diseased" and therefore losing the struggle for existence. As he wrote in "Express Mail," "I believe that what hasn't happened in history before won't happen in China in the future, either." And in "Shutting the Door and Reading Books," he wrote, "On the surface, all that history tells us is about the past, but the present and the future also are contained within it" because the future simply would be a repeat of the past under a new guise. In a sense, Zhou’s universalistic, humanistic, idealistic approach to cultural study made an exception for the Chinese, who somehow were different from and inferior to other people, and therefore unable to progress or change.

A pattern of swings between optimism and pessimism about the
possibilities for China's cultural improvement can be detected in Zhou's essays over the period 1918-1938; the pessimistic views were expressed with increasing frequency as time went on. Perhaps he was bitterly disappointed to see his liberal humanism and cosmopolitanism overtaken by narrow-minded extremism on the Left and the Right; his pleas for "tolerance in literature" in 藝術與生活 Art and Life had fallen on deaf ears.¹⁵ China should have been reinvigorated by absorption of cultural influence and by recognition of itself as a member of an international community of cultural histories, yet somehow everything had gone wrong, and China's future looked bleak. Looking for a cause, he seemed to conclude that the Chinese somehow all shared some form of genetic disability in their character, although he did not and could not explain precisely how this could be so.

Did Zhou think that he, too, had the same terrible "national character" as he ascribed to other Chinese? Are his ideas consistent with the considerably different views on "national character" he set out in "國粹與歐化" "National Essence and Europeanization," and with his liberalism and humanism set out in "人的文學" "Humane Literature?" How could humanity be one, and yet the Chinese so distinct from all the others? It seems incongruent, if not contradictory.

Zhou's famous and influential brother, 魯迅 Lu Xun (周樹人 Zhou Shuren), seemed to harbor similar contradictions in his writing. Lin

¹⁵ Also discussed in 錢 Qian 249.
Yü-sheng has researched the contradictions regarding "national character" as it appears in Lu Xun's writing, and argues that Lu Xun's inability to set aside the concept of a distinct and negative "Chinese national character" inhibited the advancement of his thinking. The concept did not allow for any real way to transcend the "dishonest and suspicious" character each person had inherited as a part of being Chinese, yet by definition this transcendence was required for progress to be possible. As Zhou Zuoren had written, "Chinese people are always Chinese people" -- a comment which was meant to express despair ("Discussing Books on National Literature with Friends"). The only way to escape one's national character was through a "categorical break" such as the madness described in Lu Xun's "Diary of a Madman."16

While the same criticisms apply to Zhou Zuoren, he may not have been quite as tormented by this theoretical problem as was Lu Xun. First, it should be noted that Zhou Zuoren wrote about experiences and ideas as they occurred to him or as he felt them. He sometimes used words loosely, as when he pictured a terrible national character in "The Curse" and an unobjectionable one in "National Essence and Europeanization." That he borrowed concepts from the milieu around him to express his anger, disappointment, or despair at events in China does not necessarily testify to his profound belief in them. Declarations about the

repetitiveness of history, or about the inferiority of national character, could have been as much a reaction to rabid dialectical materialism as it was an expression of his beliefs.

Second, and perhaps more importantly, Zhou tended to be elitist in his cultural criticisms, and certainly viewed himself as distinct from the masses whose culture he sometimes discussed. This sense of being distinct from or superior to others may have been reinforced by writers he admired, such as Havelock Ellis, who believed that the world consisted of a superior minority and inferior majority (Zhao 57). Therefore, Zhou probably did not question the high position from which he looked down to make sweeping criticisms of the Chinese people, and beneath a veneer of humility, he probably thought that he was immune from their diseases, despite being Chinese himself.

Zhou had once borrowed from Havelock Ellis to describe himself and others like him as torch-bearers who led the people with a ray of light until passing into darkness and being overtaken by another who would lead the people even further on (Pollard, “Chou Tso-jen: A Scholar” 355). In more practical terms, he thought that intellectuals like him could be leaders in reinvigorating and raising the overall moral quality of Chinese society by thoughtfully exposing it to foreign influences. Such leaders stood out from the crowd whom they led.

In his darker essays a very different view emerged, although his sense of
If we are over-anxious to gain a place in history and to profit society, we efface ourselves too much; in fact a place in history is not the aim of writing, to profit society is by no means the duty of the writer: because to speak as one thinks is the sole basis of all literature... I am a devotee of literature, I want in literature to understand other people's feelings, and to find the pleasure of my own feelings being understood... I don't at all think these essays could be of much use to others, or could give much enjoyment,¹⁷

Zhou wrote in his preface to 自己的園地 One's Own Garden. How could the former cultural leader suddenly become irrelevant to society and to history? One may read this essay as evidence that Zhou had sincerely lost his faith in his ability to help the Chinese people and to further "progress." But I think that he was, in a manner typical of him, distancing himself from the failed enterprise of Chinese history as he saw it. His primary motivation for making such announcements on the ineffectualness of intellectuals and of history was to make it clear that he had no part in the supposed failure of the Chinese people and the progress to which they had aspired, and his innocence could be proven by the very nature of literature and literary study itself.

That is, unlike 魯迅 Lu Xun, Zhou probably was not disturbed overmuch by the conflict between an untranscendable national character and the need to transcend it; rather, he breezed over the knotty theoretical problems and instead focused his energies on making it known that he and his career in the areas of literature and culture were somehow distinct, removed, and

¹⁷ Trans. in Pollard "Chou Tso-jen and Cultivating" 193.
unimportant to the grand scheme of things, including "national character" and its role in Chinese history.

History did not progress as it was supposed to for the Chinese, and the Chinese obstinately refused to stop being Chinese; but Zhou, bitter, wished to make it clear that he and his literature were not responsible. He once quoted approvingly the adage, "the man of foresight practices self-preservation," and so he did. It was best to "閉戶讀書" "shut oneself up at home and read books" or follow what Zhou called "the most important clause in the Chinese philosophy for living, namely, 'The less you get involved, the better'" and stay out of politics, as he expressed it in an essay published in 1932. Zhou no longer portrayed himself as an agent for historical change.

**IMPERIALISM**

Despite his later collaboration with the Japanese, Zhou Zuoren was a vociferous opponent of imperialism against China, and he wrote numerous essays against Japanese and English mistreatment of the Chinese. Yet his attitude towards imperialism was complex, and despite his essays in opposition to it, the overall impression is that Zhou tended to equivocate on the subject.

---

12 "啞叭禮贊" "In Praise of Mutes," trans. in "Seven Essays."

19 "啞叭禮贊" "In Praise of Mutes," trans. in "Seven Essays."
Zhou had devoted much of his life to the study of foreign literatures and cultures, and to conveying his discoveries to the Chinese public. He believed that through synthesis with foreign cultures, Chinese culture would reinvigorate and improve itself. For that reason, he indignantly opposed anti-foreign racism and reactionism.

Foreign imperialism threatened his re-envisioning of China for his readers as a member of an international community of cultures, because it fanned racism and reactionism at a time when the Chinese should be most open to foreign influence. He was afraid that if the Chinese linked foreign imperialism and foreign culture in their minds, they would, as we say in English, "throw the baby out with the bath water." For that reason, he attempted to argue that foreign imperialism and culture were entirely distinct, and that one could oppose the former while remaining open to the latter. In fact, one must not only remain open to, but welcome foreign cultural influence, which would rejuvenate Chinese culture, thus making it better able to survive against threats such as imperialism. As a result, he always tried to maintain a distinction between the "real" Japanese and English cultures and the manifestations of their militarism and imperialism in China.

In "The Worsening of Resistance to Japan" (1920) and "Feelings on the Shanghai Incident" (1925), Zhou stressed this point. Not all Japanese or British should be opposed, he argued,
but rather only those who engaged in these violent actions. Such actions are unrelated to the cultural achievements of their nations. In the latter essay, Zhou wrote that

This time, in opposing England, everybody must recognize the subject clearly: it is to oppose those violent, aggressive English government officials who do not treat the Chinese people as human beings, and not [to oppose] sensible English individuals. The goal rests in self-defense, not revenge; therefore, we should be sure not to persecute individuals, and to maintain a fair amount of respect for English culture -- scholarship and the arts."

In essays such as the above, he seems at all costs unwilling to admit to the importance of military and political aspects of the nation, or to their possible connections to a national culture. Tying "violent, aggressive English officials" to their "scholarship and the arts" was impossible. To do so would be to interfere with his cultural and literary studies.

For Zhou, opposing the beneficial offerings of foreign culture just because it was foreign, while supporting harmful Chinese militarists and warlords just because they were Chinese made no sense. He had seen his government pass through the hands a number of different warlords in the 1920's, and then to the Nationalists (who were disappointingly like the warlords) before falling to the Japanese; it is understandable if Zhou had been somewhat jaded. None of these governments aroused much enthusiasm in him.

In “The Fists of The Capitol,” published in 1928, Zhou made the point that "fists always are the same," or oppressors are still oppressors, whether domestic or foreign; and slaves are still slaves, no
matter who their masters are. Chinese oppression should not be preferred simply for being Chinese; rather, all oppression should be opposed, no matter the source. He added that one should not be totally against foreigners, and yet show no opposition to (domestic) warlords.

Yet Zhou’s righteous anger against oppression seemed to dissipate, and to my knowledge, he did not follow through on it in other essays. His main message was not that Chinese must rise up against all oppression, but rather simply that the “fists” of the world should not influence one’s cultural studies, simply because one fist is Chinese and one is not. The Chinese should recognize that Chinese culture was not tied to Chinese rulers-of-the-day, and foreign culture was not tied to the foreign militarists who caused China so much trouble. Across-the-board xenophobia had to be combated at all costs, or else it would lead to an all-out rejection of everything foreign, including foreign culture; and that would be a great loss for the Chinese.

One could say that Zhou Zuoren placed all his trust in foreign culture. In this area, one could allow oneself to be vulnerable and open to influence even as one opposed imperialism, for the information and stimulation provided by foreign culture could not but be beneficial.

Not surprisingly, there was one form of imperialism that repeatedly received Zhou’s unambiguous, categorical, bitter denunciations, and that was cultural imperialism. For a man who advocated a free and naturally developing Chinese culture open to foreign influences, Japan's cultural
imperialism was a double betrayal -- a betrayal of his values and a betrayal of his love for Japan. Japan was taking advantage of the cultural door held open to welcome them by intellectuals such as Zhou, and he found their actions unbearable.

What Zhou hated most of all was the Japanese use of the Chinese written language to engage in cultural imperialism, for it meant that the Japanese wished to enter directly into Chinese negotiations of cultural identity amongst themselves, and to pollute the outcome. As he wrote in "The Damaging of a Confucian Temple in Shandong,"

"China's culture and all of its morality are its own; they are not borrowed from anywhere else. When we want our own things, then we take them; when we don't want them, we can let them drop. We don't need to ask other people's opinions. We have the right to determine what to reform and modify in our moral code; Japan has no say in this."

Zhou's fury at cultural imperialism and the importance he attached to it relative to different forms of imperialism can be seen in his 1927 essay, "The Good Intentions of the Japanese." In it, he wrote that

Japanese gloating over China's misfortunes and history of interfering with the domestic government, 'picking at political unrest' has already been enough. Now they want to go further and support moral rectification on behalf of China, making great efforts to carry out a cultural invasion. This kind of insidious tactics really is beyond England's. Although England is the ringleader of imperialism, they haven't come to make a Shuntian Times [Japanese propagandistic newspaper printed in Chinese] for us to read . . . y (my emphases)

If nations were defined by cultures, then cultural imperialism directly challenged China's sovereignty; it was an invasion of the space in which
Chinese negotiated cultural identity amongst themselves. To my mind, Zhou Zuoren reacted so strongly against cultural imperialism (and so ambiguously against other forms of imperialism) not only because, as a professor, culture was his sphere of interest, but also because it was the form of imperialism that Zhou saw as threatening China's cultural sovereignty. Governments changed hands, but cultural imperialism was a crime.

Zhou's opposition to foreign *military* imperialism, on the other hand, usually blurred into critiques of Chinese culture within a few paragraphs. That is, he slipped from anger at foreign imperialism in one paragraph to at least as much anger and shame over China's culture in the next.

An example, one of many, would be his 1925 essay "**Feelings on the Shanghai Incident.**" In it, he reacted to an altercation between Chinese and British near the foreign concessions that led to the shooting of Chinese. He expressed outrage that the English "don't treat other people like human beings," and then turned the tables to add, "不幸中華向來也有這種脾氣，就是對本國人也不以人相待" "Unfortunately, China also has had this kind of disposition all along; even people of this country do not treat one another like human beings." He described the women with bound feet and opium addicts he saw on the street, contrasted with students giving impassioned speeches. He concluded, "...如沒有自覺沒有改悔，這也是空想夢話——甚麻都是空想夢話。" "...without self-awareness, repentance and change, this also will be empty talk and wishful thinking -- everything will be
empty talk and wishful thinking."

It may seem strange that the unwarranted shooting of Chinese people by foreigners should provide a good (or appropriate) opportunity for analyzing Chinese culture in a critical light, but Zhou made use of this event as best he could. For him, even essays against imperialism could be treated as a platform for engaging in cultural criticism of China, for any of China's encounters with the other was material for reflection on the self.

Self-awareness, especially self-criticism, was an important counterbalance to Zhou's criticisms of others. In the 1922 essay, "Women of Advanced Countries," Zhou wrote that

To be able to know other people's good points, and to be able to know one's own bad points: that is the first important qualification for being a human. When criticizing other countries, it's more important than ever to remember . . . .

In "Express Mail," written three years later," Zhou turned once again from criticism of foreign imperialism to criticism of Chinese culture:

I think a 'national disgrace' can be discussed; furthermore, it should be discussed. But I think this so-called national disgrace does not point especially to the shame of losing some kind of national rights; it points to the shame of the people of a country having lost their qualifications for being human. It is this kind of shame that is the real national disgrace.

What is it that is so disgraceful?

Chinese women's bound feet, Chinese people's opium smoking, the buying and selling of people: all this is real national disgrace, more disgraceful than being humiliated by foreign countries.

Here we see that Zhou was not just encouraging modesty or humility for the
sake of politeness, although that may have been an element. He felt that unless the Chinese criticized and reformed themselves, they would have little grounds to complain about others. The Chinese must treat themselves as human, he argued, before they can expect others to treat them as such. He wrote in the same essay that,

I'm not saying that there's no need to oppose foreign enemies, but I feel that opposing oneself is far more important, not only because that is a more shameful disgrace, but also because one who can't reform oneself is even less likely to successfully oppose others. cc

Not surprisingly, harping on Chinese "disgrace" in an essay on foreign imperialism, while perhaps accurate, could be perceived as inappropriate. In "Women of Advanced Countries," Zhou's defense for being so highly critical of China was that his criticisms meant that he saw China's failures but wished her to improve. "我大約可以算是一個愛中國者，但是因為愛他，愈望他光明起，對于他的黑暗便愈恨，愈要攻擊。。。。" "Probably I can be counted as a patriot," he wrote, "but because I love [my country], the more I wish it to become glorious, the more I hate its darkness, and the more I want to strike out. . . ." This, then, was the "nationalism" manifested in Zhou's cultural criticisms -- criticisms which have been interpreted simplistically in retrospect as a sign that Zhou already disliked the Chinese so much that it only would be a matter of time before he sold out to Japan.

Surely Zhou did want China to improve. Yet when reading Zhou's essays, a feeling that perhaps he thought the Chinese deserved imperialism does come
through, such as in "詛咒" "The Curse," when he had commented that "這實在是個奴性天成的足類，凶殘而卑怯。" "this race really is an instinctually slavish character, brutal and abject" (quoted above) after which he had written, "...這個，我不願外國流氓來冷嘲明罵，我自己卻願承認..." "...I'm not willing [to hear from] foreign troublemakers coming to look on us coldly and castigate us, but I myself am willing to admit it..."

The fear expressed here is that the Chinese really are an inferior race; if foreign imperialists find out, they will use their superiority to criticize and punish the Chinese. Zhou, an intellectual speaking to other Chinese in a domestic dialogue concerning Chinese culture, was willing to admit to Chinese inferiority, but afraid of what antagonistic foreigners might do with the information.


I fully acknowledge the existence of all the failings of which the author accuses the Chinese. The Han race does indeed deserve extinction, and its lack of progress and self-improvement are absolutely incontrovertible facts.

Zhou then wrote that

If this is human nature, then the Chinese man is at his most
representative, and the rest of the world shall be at his mercy. If, however, this is not so, and there is no room for the survival of the heartless, the foolish and the cowardly, then China's continued existence contradicts the very laws of heaven. One might go so far as to say that even were the nation to perish, its crimes still would not be expunged completely!

He lambasted the Chinese for a litany of faults, testifying to the accuracy of Yasuoka Hideo's book. "And yet," he wrote,

I do not like to see the Japanese writing such a book. I certainly do not mean that China's faults should only be exposed by the Chinese; nor do I mean to suggest that Japan has no serious faults of its own. No, what makes me unhappy is the attitude displayed by the 'China experts,' which certainly does not redound to Japan's credit (trans. in "Seven Essays").

These "China experts" to which Zhou referred were often criticized by him in essays such as "日本浪人与順天時報" "Japanese Vagabonds and the Shuntian Times" for being arrogant, rude agents of Japanese imperialism.

Here we see several elements coming together: the "Chinese national character," social Darwinism, and imperialism. If, according to the "laws of heaven," i.e. social Darwinism, "there is no room for the survival" of the "heartless, the foolish and the cowardly" Chinese people, then the "nation" should "perish." All the exhortations by May Fourth writers such as Zhou for Chinese people to wake up, to criticize themselves, to learn about others, and to stop being so, well, Chinese, had not created the visible improvements wished for, and so proved the Chinese people's intractability.

All the same, Zhou would prefer that knowledge of this not be discussed by predatory foreigners who might get the idea of coming and fulfilling their
role for China, that is, to wipe them out, as Japan eventually attempted to do. It is as if Zhou wished to buy time before the inevitable end -- or perhaps he only wished that the Chinese might be able to sink down quietly and with dignity.

Yet Zhou still hesitated. Were the Chinese truly an exception, a race lower and baser than the rest? "If this is human nature, then the Chinese man is at his most representative, and the rest of the world shall be at his mercy," he had written. Having assumed that Chinese society was composed of a vast array of cultural characteristics underpinned by a few fundamental ideas, he then faced an either/or question in regard to those underpinnings, the answer to which would determine the nature (and value) of the characteristics that followed. Either all people were as universally terrible as he thought the Chinese were, in which case he would have to give up some of the more beautiful dreams of his cultural studies; or, the Chinese truly were an exception who were living out their role as the weak losers in a socially Darwinistic world. Zhou tended towards the latter interpretation.

**THE ROLE OF THE SCHOLAR: "THIRD ATTITUDE, THAT OF THE INDEPENDENT RESEARCHER"**

As we have seen, Zhou Zuoren held certain ideals as to what the role of a scholar like himself should be in the world. First, he should convey to the Chinese people general and specific knowledge about foreign cultures. This Zhou did in countless translations, descriptions, analyses, introductions, and
postscripts, as well as in his lectures at Beijing University.

Second, he should try to draw knowledge about foreign cultures into a Chinese context in order to facilitate cultural synthesis and cultural rejuvenation in China. This Zhou did by engaging in literary and cultural comparisons in which the import and conclusions are for the edification of Chinese about themselves.

Third, he should teach Chinese to understand their culture in an international cultural context, so that they might envision themselves as a unique but interrelated part of a community of cultures. For Zhou, foreign countries were both a mirror and a lamp into China's soul, and he wished to reflect and illuminate it for the rest of the Chinese to see. This, too, was carried out by literary and cultural comparisons, and in particular those which placed Chinese culture in a relative perspective.

The scholar also should build bridges of understanding between cultures. "It is not my intention to advocate such pleasant-sounding slogans as 'amity between the peoples of China and Japan,'" wrote Zhou in "Japan and China,"

"Japan and China,"

...I do not believe such a thing is possible. But in order that the two countries might achieve a degree of mutual understanding, and particularly because of my hope that China might pay greater attention to Japanese culture, I do think that both China and Japan must rethink their attitude towards one another with contrition (trans. in "Seven Essays)."

That is, Zhou wished to promote understanding between countries, and in particular cultural exchanges that would teach the Chinese about others.
Familiarity with cultures was to be accompanied by a certain academic distancing from them all. The scholar should be a disinterested analyst. D.E. Pollard has written that

[Zhou] belonged to a type which has had its representatives in all periods of Chinese history, the same aloof, scholarly, humanitarian, unimpressionable, skeptical observer of the oddities and idiocies of his age. . . . ("Chou Tso-jen and Cultivating” 180)

He like to strive for a detached, objective approach, and to place events in larger human and historical contexts; "even in recalling his own experiences he still writes as an observer trying to elicit the flavor of an occasion or surroundings, rather than as a participant or a natural part of the scene," notes Pollard (Pollard, “Chou Tso-jen and Cultivating” 180).

Zhou had (quite prophetically) expressed the fear in “日本与中國” "Japan and China" that, with worsening relations between the two countries,

. . . the prospects for Oriental scholarship are not encouraging, for we shall fall into two camps with respect to Japan: either that of pro-Japanese lackeys, or of anti-Japanese pawns. Then there will be no room for the third attitude, that of the independent researcher.

Likewise, in “排日諭意” "On Resisting Japan" he had written with concern,

I hope that academic research of art should go beyond politics. . . . But people are emotional animals, and I’m afraid sometimes feelings conquer reason; the study of the arts does not easily avoid the effects of politics and foreign relations,dd

which was “中国文化進步上的一個損失。” “a loss for the progress of Chinese culture.”

The one role a scholar could have with regard to imperialism was in the
realm of cultural imperialism alone, that is, to counteract propaganda by showing its falsehoods to the people for whom it was intended.

"In today's China, this work is a responsibility to be fulfilled by China's intellectual class, and in particular by those people who have some amount of understanding of Japan," wrote Zhou. People like himself, experts in culture and literature, who could show the "real" Japan and China to one another, thus breaking down misconceptions created by imperialists.

Zhou Zuoren's professional and emotional investment in cultural identity for China, and the cultural-intellectualistic approach that led him to believe that one could interpret others as cultural and national units to reflect and enlighten the Chinese people, may have caused him to turn an increasingly blind eye to Japanese militarism in particular and elements of other cultures that were unacceptable in general. A rift in Zhou's thinking, while always there, was growing more noticeable over the course of the 1930's.

Late in that decade, Zhou Zuoren did make some weak and belated attempts to acknowledge the power of politics and the military in society, and discuss its relation to "culture." For example, in 1937 in "On Japanese Cultural Books" he wrote that "politics and the military" on the one hand and "arts, literature and scholarship" on the other "are aspects of people's lives and activities," but not only are they distinct, in fact they sometimes...
"pull in opposing directions; as a result, we can only examine them separately, and not kill off the second because we look down on the first."

Here we see that Zhou acknowledged that both are "aspects of the people's lives and activities," but continued to absolutely refuse to see any connection between the two, despite the presence of cultural imperialism, of which he was well aware. This created a contradiction that was difficult to resolve -- not least because it was more a contradiction of the heart than a theoretical problem. Zhou expressed it well in "A Limited Vision of Japan, #4":

The Japanese love beauty the most; one can see it in the form of their literature and arts, and agricultural, eating, and living styles. I don't know why their actions towards China appear so shameless. The Japanese are very clever; their crafts and fine arts are proof of it. Yet their actions are very awkward. The Japanese like cleanliness; there are bathhouses everywhere, exceeding all other countries. Yet their actions are so dirty. At times it is so despicable that one feels sick. This is one of the earth's great wonders; one can almost say that it is fantastic.

This fantastic image, born of a contradiction, seemed to perplex Zhou Zuoren -- perhaps because he could not resolve the issues on a theoretical level, but more likely because he simply did not wish to see what was before his eyes. He chose in a 1936 essay, "責任 " Responsibility," to conclude instead that "文人不談武，武人不談文，中國才會好起來。。 。 " "... If military people don't talk about scholarship, and scholars don't talk about the military, then and only then will China improve..."
Zhou continued to insist that "culture" -- whatever its interpretation -- was separate from "military" and "politics," not to mention economics, which he barely bothered to dismiss. And he had asked his readers to make the same distinction in regard to foreign cultures, so that they might oppose imperialism on the one hand and still remain open to influence from those same countries within the cultural sphere on the other.

The result was that Zhou never was able to provide a satisfactory explanation for militarism and fascism in Japanese society at that time; he could not even begin to pinpoint any socio-economic forces that may have factored into such developments. Zhou Zuoren, a literal and figurative interpreter and translator of foreign culture and literature to China, and a leading expert on Japan, was at a loss in regard to by far the most important and pressing questions about Japan China needed to answer at that time. As he wrote in “日本管窺之四” "A Limited Vision of Japan, #4," in response to the question of why Japan should be imperialistic towards China,”我老實說，我不能懂” To be honest, I cannot understand.” In this sense, Zhou’s project of cultural study was an utter failure.

In the essay, "日本浪人與順天時報" "Japanese Vagabonds and the Shuntian Times," he admitted that

...I... cannot help but feel a kind of anger and hate towards some of their words and actions. Anger because they damaged my pride and self-esteem towards the Chinese people; hate because they shook my visualization of Japan."

The knowledge about foreign cultures and absorption of foreign influence
which Zhou had so fervently advocated had not reinvigorated Chinese culture, creating a renaissance; rather it had caused Zhou to lose “pride and self-esteem” for his own people. China’s entry into an international community of cultures likewise was shaken before it really had begun, for Chinese identity even in relation to Japan, the country to which it was closest, was under threat. The idealized vision of Japan which Zhou had so carefully constructed -- that of the “Greece of Asia” and the keeper of Chinese history -- was being torn apart.

To save his vision, Zhou retreated. In the 1937 essay “On Japanese Cultural Books,” he chose the subject of "saving the country" versus "selling out the country" to write

lately there has been some popular outcry about cultural invasions or cultural traitors and so on, but from my point of view, culture doesn't have any power over things relating to this.

By that time, Zhou Zuoren was facing increasing pressure from friends and colleagues who had embraced the Left, and who had become very politically active. At the same time, he was in an awkward position vis-a-vis Japan. If he were to make a complete repudiation of Japan, he not only would be breaking his principles, but also violating his own emotional attachment to Japan studies and the Japanese people, including his own wife. But by insisting on a fair and open-minded cultural exchange with Japan while bullets flew put his loyalty to China into question. For Zhou, the latter was a necessary sacrifice in the name of his principles. He tried to maintain “the third attitude” as an “independent researcher” at all costs.
CONCLUSION

In this work, I have tried to show that Zhou Zuoren, like most other May Fourth writers, prioritized issues of "culture" over all others in his concern for China and China's place in the world. Zhou Zuoren's cultural criticisms, although grounded in a love of literature, were broad and wide-ranging, reflecting the belief that Chinese society and culture consisted of an interrelated complex that was determined by its fundamental ideas.

Not a great theorist nor an entirely "totalizing" iconoclast, Zhou did not concern himself with constructing a new cosmology for the Chinese, but he did try to apply his knowledge about foreign cultures and literatures towards re-envisioning China as a nation and its relation to the world of cultures and cultural histories.

Zhou was both an expert on literature and a cultural critic, and he attempted to bring his interests together so that he might compare other nations to China, using those nations as both a mirror and a lamp to reflect and enlighten Chinese about themselves. His work was cosmopolitan and comparative in nature, and he rejected essentializing arguments in regard to China and the categories "East" and "West" because he saw them as catering to reactionaries and conservatives.

Zhou believed that national identity was determined largely by culture,
and that China as a whole could be rejuvenated by exposure to and synthesis with foreign cultures. His project was threatened by foreign imperialism, which placed the advisability of embracing foreign influence into question.

Already predisposed to think of culture as a complex of ideas unrelated to politics, military issues, and economics, Zhou chose to argue that foreign imperialism and foreign culture were distinct, and that one could oppose the former while embracing the latter. By doing so, he cut himself off from the possibility of any real understanding of other nations, a problem which stood out in relief in regard to imperialistic nations like Japan, and which crippled the goals of his work.

Zhou Zuoren's position -- as a professor at Beijing University, as a widely influential writer, and as a respected expert on foreign cultures -- could have helped him to become a leader in understanding and explaining current events that affected China, and in particular developments in Japanese society that ultimately imperiled China's very existence as a nation.

But Zhou did not want to be in such a position. Recognizing that culture was related to imperialism and politics would have required that Zhou Zuoren, cultural man, look in askance at his own connections to those elements of societies and nations, and at his responsibilities for making a political decision in regard to them. However, he saw himself as, ideally, an independent researcher who stood above the cultures he compared and criticized, and above the politics in which they were enmeshed. He was a
scholar, an aesthete, and a stylist, and he saw himself in those terms.

The 1920’s and 1930’s were an eventful time for China, and Zhou tried to negotiate his way through a mine of issues while maintaining his dignity as a “cultural man.” He intended to live out his belief that intellectuals should be the last bastion of fairness, openness, and unbiased research, transcending prejudices and ill-will between peoples. For as long as possible, he refused to be railroaded into a political commitment vis-a-vis Chinese domestic issues and foreign imperialism that would jeopardize his beliefs. "I'm an academic; there's no need for a gun," he told his captors even when arrested for having collaborated with the Japanese.20

On a less principled note, Zhou Zuoren also was a believer in social Darwinism, and he suspected that the Chinese were an inferior race which perhaps even deserved imperialism. Already sidetracked from the most important problems of imperialism by an obsession with cultural criticism, he wished to further distance himself and his work as much as possible from what he saw as Chinese hopelessness and failure by arguing that he and his work were insignificant and irrelevant to larger issues, or that “文学無用” “literature is useless.” It is unlikely that he really believed such arguments, but they did help him to cast himself as one who had no responsibility to make any political commitments, and they represented an effort to prevent literature from being besmirched by politics.

20 周作人 Zhou Zuoren, ed. 肖同慶 Xiao Tongqing 111.
Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, Zhou had long ago established for himself a vision of the nation as a cultural unit alone, both in regard to China and in regard to foreign countries. The new and changing cultural identity he wished to promote for China was a relational one that depended on comparison, exchange, and influence from and with other cultures. The potential connections between culture and politics, military, economics, and in particular, imperialism threatened Zhou Zuoren's views on the sources and meanings of Chinese identity, just as it threatened China's place in the international community of cultures. Zhou had vested emotional and intellectual interests in refusing to make a political commitment for as long as it was possible.

For that reason, in times of Chinese crisis, the stance that Zhou chose was not to take a stance. Zhou Zuoren, then, can be seen as one who held out for better answers even though China's crises called out for him to make a decision of political commitment that he could not, in good conscience, make.

Thinkers in post-colonial studies might argue (if they studied Zhou Zuoren) that China was entering an oppositional, "national liberation" phase as a response to Japanese imperialism, and that intellectuals are a part of the liberation movement. Perhaps Zhou should have changed his values to commit himself to direct struggles to maintain China's continued existence as a nation.
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One might argue that Zhou's loyalty should not have been only to culture, which he believed was the seat of Chinese identity, and that his insistence on keeping culture distinct from politics, military and economics undercut his ability to fight even on cultural turf. That is, perhaps Zhou Zuoren the cultural man should have accepted that by definition he must also be Zhou Zuoren the political man, engaging in a "literature of combat" (as Frantz Fanon called it). 21

But Zhou remained an individualist and iconoclast whose theoretical positions tended to be situational and oppositional -- that is, when traditional culture was most powerful, he attacked it; when new ideas seemed to get out of hand (as with Communism), he attacked them too. He refused to be railroaded into a political position, arguing instead that tolerance and freedom of thought should be the informing principles of the age (Art and Life). His "literature of combat" was situational, digressive, inconsistent, contrary, elitist, and he wrote as a roving cultural critic. Unfortunately, he eventually began to cripple his own work in order to maintain the independence of his stance.

Rather than propose a pat (and therefore artificial) solution to the above issues, perhaps we can learn from Zhou's tragic and disturbing example: Not surprisingly, given the above, Zhou Zuoren the cultural man tried to delay indefinitely having to face a crisis of political commitment. When the rest of

21 The Post-Colonial Studies Reader 155.
Beijing University fled south, and the Japanese troops came into Beijing, Zhou stayed where he was, neither joining his fleeing colleagues nor welcoming the Japanese. He remained largely noncommittal until the Japanese attempted to kill him, and he was saved only because a button on his sweater slowed the impact of the bullet. It is entirely understandable, although not entirely admirable, that he began to collaborate soon after. Perhaps Zhou Zuoren had not realized that if he did not make a commitment, it would be made for him.
a. 從前我說文化大抵只以學術與藝文為限，現在覺得這是不對的。學術藝文固然是文化的最高代表，而低的部分在社會上卻很有勢力。。。。所以我們對於文化似乎不能單以文人學者為對象，更得放大範圍來看才是。

b. 中國並不會有真的親日派，因為中國還沒有人理解日本國民的真的光榮，這件事只看中國出版界上沒有一冊書或一篇文藝日本的文藝或美術，就可知道了。日本國民會經常到過一個知己，便是小泉八雲 (Lafcadio Hearn 1850-1904)，他才是真的親日派！中國有這樣的人嗎？我慚愧說，沒有。

此外有真能理解及介紹英德法俄等國的文化到中國來的真的親英親德親。。。。。。派嗎？誰又是專心研究與中國文化最有關係的印度的親印派呢？便是真能了解本國文化的價值。。。。也就不很多吧？

c. 。。。（我）覺得 [ 希臘 ] 很有業與中國相像。第一是狹隘的鄉土觀念。

如有人問他是那里人，他決不說希臘或某國某省，必定舉他生長的小地方的名字。即使他幼年出外，在別處住了二三十年，那里的人並不認他為本地人，他也始終自認是一個 "外江佬" (xēnos)。第二是爭權。他們有一句俗語云， "好奴僕，壞主人，" 便是說一有權勢，便不安分。所以先前對土耳其的獨立之戰，因為革命首領爭權，幾乎失敗。獨立之後，政治家又都以首領之居，互相頹遜，議院每年總要解散一回。第三是守舊。本國的風俗習慣都是好的，結婚非用媒婆不可，人死了，親人（女的）須要唱歌般的哭，送葬的人都要助け在最後的親吻。他們又最嫌惡歐化。第四是欺詐。據說那里的東西只有火車票報章和煙捲是有定價，其餘都要憑各人的本領臨時商定。做買買的贏了固好，輸了賠賣了的時候也擔然的收了錢，心里佩復買主的能幹。第五是多神的迷信。一個英國人批評他們說， "希臘國民看到許多哲學者的升登，但終是抓住他們世襲的宗教。 。。。。詳 { 夢占卜，符咒神方，求雨求雨，中華的這些花樣，那里大抵都有，只除了靜坐與採補。}

d. 我要說的是希臘同中國一樣是老年國，一樣有這些好處，然而他畢竟能夠

擺脫土耳其的束縛，在現今成為一個像樣的國度，這到底是甚麻緣故？希臘人有一種特性，也是從先代遺傳下來的，是熱烈的求生的欲望。

e. 他們對於生活是取易卜生的所謂 "全或無" 的太度，抱著熱烈的要求。他

們之所以能夠在現在的世界上佔到地位，便在於此。但是中國卻怎樣呢？

中國人實在太少求生的意志，由缺少而幾乎至於全無。。。。

f. 。。。。一國的光榮在於他的文化一一學術與藝文，並不在他的屬地利權或

武力，而且這些東西有時候還要連累了損他原有的光榮。

g. " 我們並沒有甚麻主義要宣傳，對於政治經濟問題也沒有甚麻興趣，我們

所想做的只是衝破一點中國的生活和思想界的昏暗空濛的空氣。"

h. 那些人強生分別，妄自尊大，有如自稱黃種得中央？己土之顏色，比別

的都要尊貴，未免可笑。

i. 我們主張尊重各人的各性，對於各性的綜合的國民性自然一樣尊重，而且
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很希望其在文藝上能夠發展起來，造成有生命的國民文學。

i. 我想信凡是受過教育的中國人，以不模仿甚麼為唯一的條件，聽憑他自
發的用任何種的文字，寫任何種的思想，他的結果仍是一篇“中國的”文藝
作品，有他的特殊的各性與共通的國民性相並存在，雖然這上邊可以有許多
外來的影響。

k. 我們反對模仿古人，同時也就反對模仿西人。。。。但是受他們的影響
是可以的，也是有益的。。。。我們歡迎歐化是喜得有一種新空氣，可以
供我們的厚用，造成新的活力，並不是注射到血管里去，就替代血液之用。

l. 中國人何以喜歡印度泰戈爾？因為他主張東方化，與西方化抵抗。何以
說國粹或東方化，中國人便喜歡？因為懶，因為怕用心思，怕改變生活。所
以他反對新思想新生活，所以他要復古，要排外。

m. 。。有一種國粹優勝的偏見，只在這條件之上才容納若千無傷大體的
改革，我卻以遺傳的國民性為索地，盡他本質上可能的量去承受各方面的
影響，使其融和沁透，合為體，連續變化下去，造成一個永久而常新的國
民性。。。

n. 近來大家喜歡談甚嘛東方文化和西方文化，我不知他們是不是根本
上有這嘛些差異，也不知道西方文化是不是用簡樸的三兩句話就包括得下
的。。。

o. 中國人近來大講東方文化和西方文化，然而專門研究某一種文化的人終
於沒有，所以都說的不得要領。

p. 我想中國的，印度的，以及歐洲之根源的希臘的，都應該有專人研
究，綜合它們的結果，再行比較，才有議論的可能，一切轉手的引証全是不
可憑信。

q. 第一重要的事，青年必須打破甚嘛東方文明的關念。。。。青年。。。
中了這個毒，以為天下真有倉種文明，東方是精神的，西方是物質的而精
神則優于物質，故東方文化實為天下至寶，中國可亡，此寶永存。這種幼
稚的夸大也有天真爛漫之處。。。不論拒絕外來文化，成為思想上的閉關，
而且結果變成復古與守舊。。。

r. 不問要研究過去的文化，或是建設現在的藝術，中國都不能疏忽了日本，
因為千餘年來的交通，文化上發生一種不能分離的關係。。。。希臘研究固
然為羅馬學者的基本學問，而希臘研究也可以從羅馬去得到極大的參考和幫
助，中國與日本在文化研究上的關係正是如此。

s. 。。十九世紀後半，西歐各國都漸漸改造，有民主的傾嚮了，俄國卻正
在反革命劇烈的時候：有這一個社會的大問題不解決，其餘的事都無從說起，
文藝思想之所以集中於這一點的緣故也就在此。在這一件事實上，中國的創
造或研究新文學的人，可以得到一個大的教訓。中國的特別國情與西歐稍
異，與俄國卻多相同的地方，所以我們相信中國將來的文學當然的又自
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然的也是社會的，人生的文學。

t. 他們的文學復興，大都由於新思想的激動，只看那些有名的作家多是受
過新教育或留學外國的，便可知道。中國與他們正是同一律，我們如能夠容
納新思想，來表現及解釋特別國情，也可望新文學的發生，還可由藝術界而
影響於實生活。只是第一要注意，我們對於特別的背景，是奈何他不得，
並不是做僧行有這樣背景，以為可望生出俄國一樣的文學。

u. 原來人是一種生物，無論變化到甚好地步，歸根結蒂還是生物，生物界的
法則在人間還是唯一切實的法則，生物爭存，優勝劣敗，人類也逃不出這個
原則。生存競爭是永久存在的事實。。。。

v. 中國人。。。把殺人當做目的，借了這個時候盡量地滿足他的殘酷
貪淫的本性。在別國人也不能保証他們必不如此，但我相信這在中國總是
一種根深蒂固的遺傳病。。。將來中國滅亡之根即在于此，決不是別的帝國
主義等的關係。。。。

w. 此次反對英國，大家須得認清題目，是反對那些不拿中國人當人的凶橫
的英國官僚，並不是各個的明白的英國人民，目的是在於自衛並不是報復：
所以我們對於個人切不得有所迫害，對於英國的文化——學問藝術仍有相當
的崇敬。

x. 中國的文化以及一切道德都是自己的，並不是借來的。自己的東西要的時
候就要，不要時也可以丟開，不必問別人的意見。中國舊道德的應因應革我
們全有自主之權，日本則庸俗啓。

y. 日本人對於中國幸災樂禍，歷年幹涉內政，”挑剔風潮，”已經夠了，
現今還要進一步，替中國來維持體教整頓風化，靡行文化侵略，這種陰險的
手段實在還在英國之上。英國雖是帝國主義的魁首，沒有來辦”順天時報”
給我們看。。。。

z. 能夠知道別人的長處，能夠知道自己的短處，這是做人第一個要緊的條
件，要批判別國的時候更須緊緊記住。。。。。"

aa. 我想國恥是可以講的，而且也是應該講的。但是我這所謂國恥並不專指
喪失甚好國家權利的恥辱，乃是指一國國民喪失了他們做人的資格的恥恥，
這樣的恥辱才真是國恥。

bb. 中國女子的纖足，中國人之吸鴉片，買賣人口，都是真正的國恥，比被
外國欺侮還要可恥。

cc. 我並不說不必反抗外敵，但覺得反抗自己更重要得多，因為不但這是更
可恥的恥辱，而且自己不改悔也就決不能抵抗得過別人。

dd. 我希望學問藝術的研究是應該超越政治的。。。但是人終是感情的動
物，我恐怕理性有時會被感情所勝，學術研究難免受政治外交的影響

ee. 日本人最愛美，這在文學藝術以及農食住的行式上都可看出，不知道為
甚麻在對中國的行動顯得那麻不怕丑。日本人又是很巧的，工藝美術都可做
證，行動上卻那麻拙，日本人喜乾淨，到處澡堂為別國所無，但行動上又那
難髒，有時候卑劣得叫人恶心。這真是天下的大奇事，差不多可以說是奇蹟。

ff.。。。我。。。對於他們有些言動不能不感到一種憎恨。憤的是因為它傷了我為中國人的自尊心，恨的是因為它搖動了我對日本的憧憬。

gg.近時有些時髦的呼聲，如文化侵略感文化漢奸等，不過據我看來，文化在這種關係上是有點無能為力的。
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