

## 李洪林：我的“理论工作”生涯 Li Honglin: My Career in “Theoretical Work”

发布时间：2011-04-06 21:12 作者：李洪林 浏览：23 次

李洪林：我的“理论工作”生涯

New url: <http://w.hybsl.cn/article/13/25499>, accessed October 23, 2023

FN 187 – Li Honglin on Writing the ‘Four Upholds’ Speech

我现在是一介平民，退休以前的职业是所谓“理论工作者”。在当代中国，被称作“理论”的，只是马克思主义。其他人文学者和社会科学家都要冠以本科的帽子，只有研究或宣传马克思主义的人，才算是“理论工作者”或“理论家”。

### 我怎样用理论为政治服务

我一到“解放区”就做理论工作，也就是马克思主义的教学、研究和宣传。那时我所理解的马克思主义是解放全人类的学说，共产党就是为人类有史以来最美好的共产主义社会而奋斗的大公无私的政党。作为这个党的一分子，投身于共产主义事业，使我充满了自豪感，并且热爱自己的事业。这种热情一直延续到 1959 年春天。

这个时期，我是无条件地相信党，我的理论工作就是全心全意为党的政策作出理论上的说明，从马恩列斯毛那里找出根据，证明党的路线是正确的。一九五八年那种疯狂的“大跃进”，我也是坐在办公室里鼓气煽风的“理论家”之一。我最尖端的作品是一九五九年给《红旗》杂志写的一篇社论：《十分指标，十二分措施，二十四分干劲》。这个题目便已说明一切。一九五八年为了钢产量翻一番（从五百三十五万吨升为一千零七十万吨），发动九千万人上山，砍光森林烧炭，砸了铁锅炼“钢”，庄稼熟了烂在地里没人收，还叫农

民“放开肚皮吃饭”：这种“革命浪漫主义”已经斫丧了国家元气，弄得人困马乏并且开始挨饿。在这种困境下，一九五九年中共中央又订出个一千八百万吨的钢指标，这在当时是绝对不能实现的空想。然而胡乔木还叫我写出那样一篇“鼓劲”的《红旗》社论。我在一九五八年“大跃进”高潮中从未到下面走走，哪里知道生产第一线的艰辛！所以接到这个任务，丝毫也未感到有什么不对，而是兴致勃勃地在稿纸上把那“十分”“十二分”和“二十四分”的“辩证关系”演绎得头头是道。虽然这篇文稿又经胡乔木修改之后才作为中共中央权威刊物的社论发表出去为害全国，但我毕竟是它的起草者，至今想起来都心中有愧。

反映真实情况，却犯了错误

我当时工作单位是中共中央政治研究室。它实际上是直接为毛泽东服务的一个小小的秀才班子，主任是陈伯达，副主任是胡绳和田家英，他们都是毛的大秘书。这个单位虽然“级别”很高，但并不是中共中央的职能部门，没有行政性的任务，也没有下级对口单位，只接办毛所交代的社会调查和理论研究方面的任务。当时它编印一个只向毛和中央反映情况的半月刊，叫做《思想界动态》，由我负责编辑。有一次中央办公厅转来一个材料，是武汉华中工学院一个学生张治水写给毛泽东的一封长信。此信全面批评了“三面红旗”（即“多快好省地建设社会主义的总路线”“大跃进”“人民公社”），反映了民不聊生的情况，并对毛略有微词。信写得很恳切，希望中央能够纠正这些错误。

我因脱离实际，对外面的情况并不了解，而这封信所陈述的严重情况，和公开报道的“大好形势”截然相反，所以引起我高度重视。我觉得必须让毛和中央看到这封信。尤其毛一贯重视调查研究，这个材料他不会置之不理。于是我把它登在《思想界动态》一九五九年第十四期（七月下半月）上。谁知那时中央正在庐山开会。《思想界动态》送到庐山，正是彭德怀在庐山会议上给毛泽东写信批评“大跃进”，而毛借机发起“反对右倾机会主义斗争”的时候。真是无巧不成书，这一期《动态》来到庐山，正好撞到枪口上。

我因刊登张治水这封信，被指控为“配合”彭德怀反对三面红旗，“向党进攻”。所以我经历了参加革命以来第一次狂风暴雨般的批判。批判完就被“下放”到农村去“劳动锻炼”了。

现实使我更加右倾

1960年和1961年，我分别在北京和河北的农村度过。党把我“下放”，是为了改造我的右倾，不料我却被可怕的现实教育得更加右倾了。我亲眼看到了农民怎样在人民公社的囚笼里痛苦地煎熬。这还不说，一九六二年春天我参加田家英领导的湖南调查，使我和党的政治路线离得越发遥远了。

田家英是奉毛泽东和刘少奇之命，到他们两人在湖南的老家做农村调查的。我被分在宁乡调查组，去一个炭子冲大队。所有的农民，可以说都是家徒四壁。我们在一家农民的锅里看到的“饭”是“米糠”煮青杏。他的小孩子们围着桌子，仔细找寻稻壳中偶尔遗留下的谷粒，剥出一颗生米粒，连忙放在嘴里，像含一粒糖果一样慢慢咀嚼。看了这些可怜的孩子，真叫人心酸。

炭子冲大队的调查报告是我执笔的。对我右倾的批判言犹在耳，但我已顾不上这些指控，而是如实地把这种人间地狱的惨状都写出来了。

田家英很欣赏这篇调查报告，因为那上面写的都是他也亲自看到的。我们回到北京以后，田把调查材料交上去了。我很高兴，能让毛直接看到这些第一手材料。

谁知我又错了。毛泽东看了调查报告以后大怒。田家英把毛的责备独自承担了，从而使我躲过一劫。但我的思想却开始彷徨了。

1962年中共八届十中全会猛烈批判“三风”（“黑暗风”，认为形势不好；“单干风”，认为人民公社搞糟了；“翻案风”，认为反右倾反错了），号召全党“千万不要忘记阶级斗争”，“阶级斗争要年年讲、月月讲、天天讲”。这就让我明白了：政治是左比右好。

### 《理论风云》的命运

20世纪70年代末到80年代初，是中国走向改革开放的历史转折时期。回顾一生，“参加革命”逾六十年，只有这短暂的几年，才不曾虚掷年华，总算做了一点有意义的事情。然而这几年也是在风霜雨雪中度过。

那时我的本职工作是在中国历史博物馆筹备中共党史展览。我的兼职是参加中央文件起草小组，那倒是个美差，因为它是一座平步青云的天梯。但是能不能平步青云，要看你“党性”如何而定。我的“党性”本来就不够格，况且后来又和胡乔木闹翻了，自然不是“通天”的材料。而我真正有兴趣的是按照自己的心意写文章，自己命题自己写，最惬意了。

那两三年，是我写作最密集的时候，经常收到大量读者来信，给我热情的鼓励和支持，使我就好像生活在他们中间一样。另一方面，这些文章也遭到一些人的反对和中伤。

1985年，三联书店出版一套《研究者丛书》，第一辑是我的文集《理论风云》，收录了这个期间我发表的文章。因为这些文章和它的作者早就受到最高层的“关注”，所以此书刚一出版，就被陈云办公室从三联书店要去五本。后来传出来的权威评语是：“没有理论，只有风云”。

这句评语倒也中肯。这本文集确实谈不上有什么“理论”，因为所谈的都是常识，并无创见，只不过别人尚未说出来的时候，我把它说出来罢了。而在当时，要想说出常识，就得突破禁区；说出常识以后，又须防备暗箭。其所以只须防备暗箭，不必抵御明枪，是因为

我的这些文章发表之后，从来没有人公开和我论战，而都是背地里向上诬告。不论突破禁区还是防备暗箭，都是一种战斗，它可以说是在当代中国仅有的一次“思想解放运动”的风云际会中产生，又在“反对自由化”的风雪交加中遭到禁锢，所以取名“理论风云”。这本书第一版卖光了之后，三联书店又重新进行装帧设计印刷了第二版，但是不久就“奉命”收回，化为纸浆了。对于这种现代化的“焚书”（实际是“煮书”），我曾有意循法律途径讨个公道，为此询问三联领导人：封杀此书的命令来自何处？封杀的理由为何？均避而不答，使我打算起诉都找不着被告人。然而我又不能把三联书店告上法庭，因为正是由于三联的关爱，这本书才能面世，我怎能恩将仇报呢？想当初三联敢于在我落难之时出版此书，已属石破天惊，如今被迫收回，显然有难言之隐。我不忍强人所难，只得作罢。

被视为离经叛道的《理论风云》，可以说是完全正统的马克思主义，而且被我用来作为论据批判“左祸”的，有许多都是毛泽东和他的“思想”。这也正是官方始终拿不出一篇像样的文章对它开展正面批判的原因。如果用“左”和“右”来衡量的话，官方认为它太右，而我现在却认为它有许多地方都太左了。

## 提出“现代迷信”

1978年春，我写了一篇《科学和迷信》寄给人民日报，社长胡绩伟和副总编王若水主张发表，但当时的总编辑不赞成，这篇文章就退给我了。正好，这一年夏天，文化大革命中停刊的《中国青年》杂志准备复刊，找我约稿，我就把它改写成《破除迷信，掌握科学》给了他们。文章批判了对毛泽东的迷信，我把它叫“现代迷信”。胡耀邦很欣赏这篇文章，要《中国青年》杂志作为“本刊特约评论员”的文章发表了。

当时中共中央副主席汪东兴很恼火，但又抓不住文章的辫子，所以就找些别的理由把这一期《中国青年》给查禁了。但这期杂志已经发行了很多，还有人把它拆开，一页一页贴到“西单墙”，所以“现代迷信”就成为流行词汇之一了。

这一期《中国青年》出版之后，不记得是哪一天了，忽然有一个身材矮小，十分瘦弱的青年人到中国历史博物馆来找我。他是从云南来的，刚从监狱里放出来，并给我看他的两只手腕。

天哪！他的两只手腕整整一圈没有完整的皮肤，因为在狱中长期戴着收得很紧的手铐，勒得手腕子整个溃烂了！溃烂治好之后，皮肤再也不能复生，就落下像手镯一样可怕的伤疤。

我摸着他那没有知觉的伤疤，问他为什么被折磨成这样。他告诉我：是“现行反革命罪”，因为他“攻击毛主席”。

我又问他，现在怎么又放出来呢？

他手里拿着一本《中国青年》复刊号，告诉我说，他的“罪行”和《中国青年》上那篇“评论员文章”的观点一样。他在狱中读到这篇文章，就据理申诉，他的罪名果然被推翻了，人也就放出来了。他一放出来就到北京找《中国青年》杂志表示感谢，并要求见见文章作者。杂志编辑部告诉他，那篇文章是我写的，所以就找到历史博物馆来了。

不敢忘记受难者的嘱托

打从 1978 年起，我就不断收到报刊编辑部转给我的读者来信。因为我的文章在报刊上发表的频率较高，又都是批判“左毒”的，所以不少来信的内容都是“左毒”受害者希望我帮他们伸冤的。我对这千里之外伸过来的求救之手，不敢有丝毫怠慢，因为每一封信都寄来一颗受难者期待的心，他们的遭遇使我感同身受。所以我把每一封信都附上我的信，一起寄到所在省委去了。我印象特别深的是黑龙江一个人，他 1959 年因为给彭德怀鸣不平而被判重刑，至今仍在狱中，家中只有老母一人，因思念他而病倒，他害怕今生再也见不到她了，所以请我搭救。

我一边看他的信一边掉眼泪，因为我母亲此刻也正在病床上呻吟，等待我下班回去看她。我立刻写了一封信和他的信一起寄给黑龙江省委。一两个月后，奇迹出现了！他来信告诉我，他已出狱回家，和老母团聚了。狱方告诉他，是我的信使省委给他平反的。这使我得到极大的安慰。

另一次使我得到更大喜悦的是我一封信促成二百多个冤案受害人重见天日。

《人民日报》在1980年把我在理论务虚会的发言《领袖和人民》正式发表了。这篇文章一下子传遍全国，结果许多因为所谓“恶毒攻击罪”而被判重刑入狱的“左毒”受害者纷纷通过各种途径给我写信，要求我帮助他们伸冤。从这些信上可以看出，其实他们直接反对的不过是林彪和四人帮。这些信都是寄到《人民日报》转给我的。他们在监狱里或劳改场，没有通信自由，都是通过千辛万苦偷偷写下，又通过千辛万苦辗转带到监外投递到邮局的。那些由于躲避搜查而时时藏匿的破旧信封，被揉得乱七八糟的信纸，密密麻麻的蝇头小字，寄托着他们多么殷切的希望！我没有想到，自己写的文章和会议发言竟引起这样大的反响。过去我虽然也常接到读者求助的信件，都是零星寄到的，我也就零星转寄，如今这一大堆信件，都是已经定案并在服刑的“反革命罪犯”，显然不是我这种普通干部转一转申诉信就能解决问题的。最后我有了主意；把信件集中起来，给邓小平写了一封信。简要地介绍一下信中所反映的问题，即现在有不少人因反对林彪和四人帮而仍在服刑。然后把那些申诉信附上，一起送去了。

这封信果真起了作用。邓小平阅后批了几个字：“请胡耀邦同志处理。”胡耀邦雷厉风行，马上指示公安部在全国范围内普查一次，凡因反对林彪和四人帮而入狱者，一律平反，并限期报告处理结果。几个月后，结果出来了，全国有二百多桩这类冤案都平反了。其实这事的处理过程，我一点都不知道。当时我在中央宣传部工作，胡耀邦有一次到宣传部来，才告诉了我，并且说：“你做了一件大好事。救人一命，胜造七级浮屠。你救了好几百人啊！”我才知道那封信起了那么大的作用，真觉得不虚此生。当然，这也幸亏是邓小平亲眼看到这封信并且批给胡耀邦处理，胡耀邦又明确指示平反并且限期报告结果，所以才如此顺利地把那样多的人解救出来了。否则，凭我一介书生，怎能有回天之力呢？

## 《读书无禁区》的故事

在《理论风云》中余音袅袅久而未衰的当推《读书无禁区》。直到去年《读书》杂志撤换主编，人们还在谈论这篇文章。

1979年春天，三联书店创办《读书》杂志，找我约稿。我写了一篇《打破读书禁区》。这篇文章引起《读书》编委们的兴趣，决定把它当作《读书》杂志创刊号的开篇文章。他们还嫌题目不够有力，杂志创办人范用就把它改成掷地有声的响亮口号：《读书无禁区》。果然一炮打响，在知识界引起强烈共鸣。这五个字一直都是《读书》杂志的旗帜，成为这本杂志的骄傲。其实这个著名的口号并非我的原创，他们改题目时也没有告诉我。我起初曾有恢复原题之意，因为这个新题容易被好事者纠缠不休，不如原题之无隙可击。但后来又决定认可这个新题，不往回改了，这是因为：

第一，改题目的编委陈翰伯范用等出版界元老，与我虽非至交，却属知己。他们改题，与文章主旨完全一致，而且更加铿锵有力，读起来也容易上口。我应当尊重和欢迎这种修改，并引以为荣。

第二，更重要的是，此文一发，立刻引起强烈反响。这里有两个“烈”：一是热烈欢迎，一是猛烈反对。知识界是热烈欢迎，因为它说出了大家的心里话。而道学家和主管思想控制的官员则猛烈反对：读书无禁区，这还了得！“小学生能看《金瓶梅》吗？”这是义正词严的神圣讨伐令。《读书》杂志专门为此展开讨论。在这篇文章激起如此轩然大波的情况下，我必须义无反顾地独自承担《读书无禁区》从内文到标题的全部责任，所以更加坚定地捍卫“读书无禁区”这个口号了。

其实那篇文章本身的逻辑是没有漏洞的。文章的主旨是反对把禁书作为政策，决无鼓励文化垃圾之意，更不曾提倡小学生去读《金瓶梅》。白纸黑字俱在，那些一看题目就兴师问罪的十字军，不久也就偃旗息鼓了。

正因为《读书》杂志经过《读书无禁区》这场风浪，名气更大了，读者更喜爱了，所以这个口号已经成为《读书》杂志的标志。

此段回忆写罢，偶然上网搜索一下“读书无禁区”，看看这个词是否在人们的记忆中留下一点痕迹。结果“百度”搜出一万三千条，“GOOGLE”搜出二万七千条，第一条就是“水木清华”在2000年1月9日“读书心得版·精华区”上贴出的《读书无禁区》原文。

在流行风尚转瞬即逝的今天，我在上个世纪的一篇文章，至今仍有知音实在出乎意外。网上许多条目写的都是“犹记《读书无禁区》”，直到最近，仍然有人“犹记”。

“宜观星辰辨南北，勿随萤火逐东西”这副对联，是我从自己的理论活动中得到的经验教训。我做了一辈子理论工作，现在既说不清“理论”的定义，也说不清“政治”的定义。但我对理论和政治的关系却有一点重要心得，这就是理论不应该为政治服务。

当然，在现实生活中，谁也脱离不了的政治，理论也不是处在真空当中。但是理论追求的是真理，而政治追求的是权力。在政治角斗场上，是强者胜，而强者未必“真善美”，也可能是“假恶丑”。特别在曲折复杂的政治斗争中，在策略上常常需要兵不厌诈，纵横捭阖，声东击西，变幻无常，理论怎能跟得上呢？即使能够跟上，这种“理论”也就不成其为理论了。

因此，要处理好理论和政治的关系，唯一的办法是超脱于政治之外。理论工作者必须用自己的头脑独立思考，应该把政治本身也作为一个客体进行观察和研究，而不应当跟在后面

亦步亦趋。例如《孙子兵法》就把最为变化无常的战争作为客体进行研究，探求那纷纭复杂现象背后的本质。

在这个过程中，最不可取的是为现实的政治“量体裁衣”，用理论给当权的政治进行包装。这种做法，即使从执政者本身的利益来说，都是有害无益的，因为听不到不同的声音，有了错误将失去纠正的机会。

这样反省的结果，如果用一句很简单的话来说，就是“讲真话”。真话不一定是真理，但假话一定不是真理。用在理论工作上，就是“凭良心，讲真话”，而切不可昧着良心讲假话。

理论研究不是设计政治方案。政治设计可以有步骤，有妥协，有过渡。因为各个政治主体的立场不同，力量强弱也不同，彼此的诉求都不相同，要找到一个结合点十分不易，很难痛痛快快，常常是拖泥带水。这需要政治家的智慧和技巧。讲理论就要抛开一切利害得失，剥去所有外衣和偶然因素，把问题说透。讲理论只问真不真，不必考虑谁看了会怎样，尤其不能考虑当权者看了会怎样。事实上你即使想打动当权者，也是把问题说得越透，越有可能打动他的心。

DeepL translation

## **Li Honglin: My Career as a "theoretical worker"**

Published: 2011-04-06 21:12 Author: Li Honglin

Li Honglin sketch portrait

I am now a civilian, and before I retired, I was a so-called "theory worker". In contemporary China, what is called "theory" is only Marxism. Other humanities scholars and social scientists have to be

labeled as undergraduates, and only those who study or publicize Marxism are considered "theory workers" or "theorists."

### How I Use Theory to Serve Politics

As soon as I arrived in the "liberated areas," I started to do theoretical work, that is, teaching, researching and publicizing Marxism. At that time, I understood Marxism to be a doctrine for the liberation of all mankind, and the Communist Party to be an altruistic party that would fight for the best communist society that mankind had ever known. Being a member of this party and committing myself to the communist cause filled me with pride and love for my cause. This enthusiasm continued until the spring of 1959.

During this period, I believed in the Party unconditionally, and my theoretical work consisted of wholeheartedly theorizing for the Party's policies and finding grounds from Marx, Enlis, and Mao to prove that the Party's line was correct. During the frantic "Great Leap Forward" of 1958, I was one of the "theorists" who sat in the office and incited the public. My most cutting-edge work was an editorial I wrote in 1959 for Red Flag magazine: "Ten points for targets, twelve points for measures, and twenty-four points for vigor. The title says it all. In 1958, in order to double steel production (from 5.35 million tons to 10.07 million tons), 90 million people were mobilized to go up to the mountains, cut down all the forests to burn charcoal, smashed the iron pots to make "steel", and when the crops were ripe and rotting in the ground, no one collected them, and told the peasants to "let go of their bellies to eat". This "revolutionary romanticism" had already destroyed the vitality of the country, leaving people exhausted and beginning to starve. In this difficult situation, in 1959, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China (CPC) set a target of 18 million tons of steel, which was an absolutely unattainable dream at that time. However, Hu Qiaomu asked me to write an editorial in Red Flag that "boosted energy". I have never been to the bottom of the climax of the "Great Leap Forward" in 1958, where I know the hardships of the front line of production!

Therefore, when I received this task, I did not feel that there was anything wrong with it at all, but I was excited to put the "dialectical relationship" of "ten points," "twelve points," and "twenty-four points" on the manuscript paper. "dialectical relationship" interpretation of the head. Although the

manuscript was revised by Hu Qiaomu before published as an editorial in the authoritative publication of the CPC Central Committee to the detriment of the whole country, but after all, I am the drafter of it, and I still think of it with a sense of shame in my heart.

Reflecting the real situation, but made a mistake

My work unit at that time was the Political Research Office of the CPC Central Committee. It was in fact a small team of showmen directly serving Mao Zedong, with Chen Boda as its director and Hu Jiao and Tian Jiaying, Mao's secretaries, as its deputy directors. Although this unit had a very high "level", it was not a functional department of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, had no administrative tasks and no subordinate counterparts, and only took over the tasks of social surveys and theoretical researches as explained by Mao. At that time, it published a bimonthly magazine that only reflected the situation to Mao and the Central Committee, called Dynamics of the Ideological Community, which I was responsible for editing. Once the General Office of the Central Committee forwarded to me a long letter written by Zhang Zhishui, a student at the Huazhong College of Technology in Wuhan, to Mao Zedong. The letter comprehensively criticized the "Three Red Flags" (i.e., the "General Line of Building Socialism More Quickly, Better and More Economically," the "Great Leap Forward," and the "People's Commune") and reflected the people's aspirations for socialism. ), reflecting the situation of the people's inability to live in poverty, and slightly criticizing Mao. The letter was written with great earnestness, hoping that the Central Committee would correct these mistakes.

Because I was detached from reality, I did not understand the situation outside, and the seriousness of the situation described in this letter was diametrically opposed to the publicly reported "good situation," so I attached great importance to it. I felt that I had to let Mao and the Central Committee see this letter. Mao, in particular, has always attached great importance to investigation and research, and he would not ignore this material. So I published it in the "Ideological Dynamics" in 1959, Issue 14 (the second half of July). Who knows that the central government was meeting in Lushan. Ideas Dynamics sent to Lushan, it is Peng Dehuai in the Lushan meeting to Mao Zedong letter criticizing the "Great Leap Forward", and Mao took the opportunity to launch the "struggle

against right-leaning opportunism" time. Really no coincidence, this issue of "Dynamic" to Lushan, just hit the muzzle.

I was accused of "cooperating" with Peng Dehuai in opposing the Three Red Flags and "attacking the Party" because of the publication of Zhang Zhishui's letter. So I experienced the first stormy criticism since I joined the revolution. After the criticism, I was "sent down" to the countryside for "labor training".

Reality made me even more right-leaning

In 1960 and 1961, I spent time in the countryside of Beijing and Hebei respectively. The Party "decentralized" me in order to reform my rightward inclination, but unexpectedly I was educated to be even more rightward by the terrible reality. I saw with my own eyes how the peasants suffered in the prison of the people's commune. To say nothing of the fact that in the spring of 1962 I took part in a survey in Hunan led by Tian Jiaying, I became more and more distant from the Party's political line.

Tian Jiaying had been ordered by Mao Zedong and Liu Shaoqi to conduct a rural survey in their hometowns in Hunan. I was assigned to the Ningxiang survey group, going to a charcoal-charged brigade. All the peasants were, so to speak, housebound. The "rice" we saw in one farmer's pot was "rice bran" with green apricots. His children gathered around the table, carefully searching for the occasional grain left in the rice husk, peeled out a raw rice grain, and hurriedly put it in their mouths, slowly chewing it like a piece of candy. It was heartbreaking to watch these poor children.

I wrote the investigation report on the Charcoal Rush Brigade. The right-leaning criticism of me is still ringing in my ears, but I can no longer care about these accusations, but truthfully write out the tragic situation of this hell on earth.

Tian Jiaying appreciated this investigation report, because what was written there was what he had personally seen. After we returned to Beijing, Tian handed in the investigation materials. I was very happy that I could let Mao see these first-hand materials directly.

Who knows, I was wrong again. Mao was furious when he read the investigation report. Tian Jiaying took Mao's blame alone, thus saving me from a disaster. But my mind began to wander.

In 1962, the Tenth Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee of the Communist Party of China (CPC) fiercely criticized the "three winds" (the "dark wind" that the situation was not good; the "single-operator wind" that the people's commune was messed up; and the "rehashed wind" that the people's commune was not good enough); The "Reversal Wind", that the anti-rightist trend was wrong), called on the whole party "never forget the class struggle", "the class struggle should be talked about year after year, month after month, and day after day". This made me realize that politics is better on the left than on the right.

### The Fate of Theoretical Winds and Clouds

The late 1970s and early 1980s were a period of historical transition for China towards reform and opening up. Looking back on my life, I have been "participating in the revolution" for more than 60 years, and only in these few short years have I not wasted my years, and I have finally done something meaningful. However, these years were also spent in the midst of wind, rain and snow.

At that time, my main job was to prepare for the exhibition on the history of the CPC at the Museum of Chinese History. My part-time job was to participate in the drafting group of the Central Committee's documents, which was a beautiful job because it was a ladder to the sky. But whether or not you can rise to the top depends on your "party character". My "party nature" was not qualified, and later fell out with Hu Qiaomu, naturally not "heaven" material. What I am really

interested in is to write articles according to my own mind, and to write my own topic, which is the most enjoyable.

Those two or three years were the most intensive time for me to write, and I often received a large number of letters from readers, giving me enthusiastic encouragement and support, making me feel as if I were living among them. On the other hand, these articles were also opposed and vilified by some people.

In 1985, Sanlian Bookstore published a set of Researchers' Series, the first of which was my anthology, *Theoretical Winds and Clouds*, which included the articles I published during this period. Because these articles and their authors had long been "noticed" at the highest level, Chen Yun's office asked for five copies of this book from the Sanlian Bookstore as soon as it was published. The authoritative comment that came out later was: "There are no theories, only storm clouds".

This is a fair comment. This collection of essays really can't talk about any "theory", because what it talks about is common sense, and it's not original, only that when others haven't said it yet, I said it out loud. At that time, if you wanted to speak common sense, you had to break through the forbidden zone; after speaking common sense, you had to guard against hidden arrows. The reason why I only had to guard against hidden arrows and did not have to defend myself against open fire was that after the publication of my articles, no one ever openly argued with me, but all made false accusations behind my back. Whether breaking through the forbidden zone or defending against hidden arrows, it is all a kind of battle, which can be said to have arisen in the stormy weather of the "ideological emancipation movement", the only one in contemporary China, and was confined in the stormy weather of the "opposition to liberalization", and so it was named "Theoretical Wind and Cloud". After the first edition of the book sold out, the Sanlian Bookstore reprinted the second edition with a new binding design, but was soon "ordered" to take it back and turn it into pulp. I was interested in seeking justice through legal channels for this modernized "book burning" (actually "book boiling"), and asked the leaders of the Sanlian Bookstore: Where did the order to block the book come from? I asked the leaders of SFU: Where did the order to block the book come from and what were the reasons for blocking it? All of them refused to answer, making it impossible for

me to find the defendant even if I intended to sue. However, I could not take Sanlian Bookstore to court, because it was because of Sanlian's love and care that this book could come out, so how could I return the favor? When I thought that Sanlian dared to publish this book at a time when I was in trouble, it was already a shock to the world, but now that it is forced to withdraw the book, it is obvious that it has some unspeakable secrets. I could not bear to force others to do so, so I had to give up.

The Theoretical Winds and Clouds, which is regarded as deviant, can be said to be completely orthodox Marxism, and many of the things that I used as arguments to criticize the "leftist scourge" were Mao Zedong and his "ideas". This is precisely why the official government has never been able to come up with a decent article that positively criticizes it. If we use the terms "left" and "right" to measure it, the official opinion is that it is too right, while I now think that it is too left in many areas.

### Proposing "Modern Superstition"

In the spring of 1978, I wrote an article entitled "Science and Superstition" and sent it to the People's Daily. Hu Jiwei, the president, and Wang Ruoshui, the deputy editor-in-chief, advocated its publication, but the editor-in-chief at the time was not in favor of it, so the article was returned to me. It so happened that in the summer of that year, the magazine China Youth, which had ceased publication during the Cultural Revolution, was preparing to resume publication and asked me for an article, so I rewrote it as "Dismantle Superstition, Master Science" and gave it to them. The article criticized Mao's superstition, which I called "modern superstition". Hu Yaobang appreciated this article and asked China Youth magazine to publish it as a "special commentator" article.

Wang Dongxing, the vice chairman of the CPC Central Committee at that time, was very annoyed, but he could not catch the article, so he found some other reasons to ban this issue of China Youth. However, this issue had already been distributed a lot, and some people took it apart and posted it page by page on the "Xidan Wall", so "modern superstition" became one of the popular words.

After the publication of this issue of China Youth, I don't remember which day it was, a short, very thin young man suddenly came to the Museum of Chinese History to see me. He was from Yunnan, just released from prison, and showed me his two wrists.

My God! His two wrists have no complete skin, because in prison for a long time wearing tight handcuffs, strangling the whole wrist ulcerated! After the ulcers were cured, the skin never came back, and it fell into terrible scars like bracelets.

I touched his senseless scars and asked him why he had been tortured like this. He told me that he was "guilty of counter-revolutionary crimes in flagrante delicto" because he had "attacked Chairman Mao".

I asked him why he had been released.

He was holding a copy of China Youth and told me that his "crime" was the same as the "commentator's article" in China Youth. When he read the article in prison, he appealed on the basis of reason, and his conviction was overturned and he was released. As soon as he was released, he went to Beijing to express his gratitude to China Youth magazine and asked to meet the author of the article. The editorial board of the magazine told him that I had written the article, so he came to the Museum of History.

Don't Forget the Sufferers' Commitment

Since 1978, I have been receiving letters from readers forwarded to me by the editorial board of the newspaper. Because my articles were published more frequently in newspapers and magazines, and all of them criticized the "leftist poison," many of the letters were from victims of the "leftist poison" who wanted me to help them redress their grievances. I didn't dare to be negligent to the

hand of help from thousands of miles away, because every letter was sent with the expectation of a victim, and I felt the same way about their sufferings. So I attached my letter to each letter, together with the provincial party committee to go. I was particularly impressed by a man from Heilongjiang, who was sentenced to a heavy prison term in 1959 for giving Peng Dehuai a hard time, and is still in prison, with only his mother at home, who has fallen ill because of her longing for him, and who is afraid that he will never see her again in this life, so he asked for my help.

I shed tears while reading his letter because my mother was moaning in her hospital bed, waiting for me to go back from work to see her. I immediately wrote a letter and sent it together with his letter to the Heilongjiang Provincial Committee. A month or two later, a miracle occurred! He wrote to tell me that he had been released from prison and had returned home to be reunited with his mother. The prison authorities told him that it was my letter that caused the provincial party committee to rehabilitate him. This gave me great comfort.

Another occasion that brought me even greater joy was when a letter from me helped to bring more than 200 victims of injustice back to life.

In 1980, the People's Daily officially published my speech, "The Leader and the People," from a theoretical retreat. This article was immediately spread throughout the country, and as a result, many victims of the "leftist poison" who had been sentenced to heavy prison terms for the so-called "crime of vicious attack" wrote to me through various channels, asking me to help them redress their grievances. As we can see from these letters, they were in fact directly opposed to Lin Biao and the Gang of Four. These letters were sent to the People's Daily and forwarded to me. They were in prison or in the labor camps, with no freedom of communication, and they were all written down secretly through great hardships and brought outside the prison to be delivered to the post office through great difficulties. Those worn-out envelopes that were hidden from time to time to avoid searches, the crumpled letterheads, and the densely written fly-heads held their fervent hopes! I did not expect that my own articles and conference speeches would cause such a great reaction. In the past, although I often received letters from readers asking for help, they were sent sporadically, and I forwarded them sporadically, but now this pile of letters, all of which have been convicted and are

serving their sentences of "counter-revolutionary criminals", it is clear that I am not such an ordinary cadre who can solve the problem by forwarding the letter of complaint. Finally, I had an idea; I gathered the letters together and wrote a letter to Deng Xiaoping. Briefly describe the problem reflected in the letter, that is, there are now quite a number of people who are still serving sentences for opposing Lin Biao and the Gang of Four. Then he attached those complaint letters and sent them along.

The letter really worked. Deng Xiaoping read it and approved a few words, "Please ask Comrade Hu Yaobang to deal with it." Hu Yaobang, immediately instructed the Ministry of Public Security to conduct a nationwide census of all those who had been imprisoned for opposing Lin Biao and the Gang of Four, to vindicate all of them, and to report the results of the process by a deadline. A few months later, the results came out, and more than 200 such cases were vindicated nationwide. In fact, I didn't know anything about how this was handled. I was working in the Central Propaganda Department at the time, and it was only when Hu Yaobang came to the Department that he told me about it and said, "You have done a great thing. Saving a life is better than building a seven-floor pagoda. You have saved hundreds of people!" I realized that that letter had played such a big role, and I really felt that it was not a false life. Of course, it was fortunate that Deng Xiaoping saw the letter with his own eyes and approved it for Hu Yaobang to deal with, and Hu Yaobang gave clear instructions to vindicate the case and report the results by the deadline, so it was so smooth to save so many people. Otherwise, how could I, as a scholar, be able to make a difference?

### The Story of "No Limits to Reading"

In the "theory of the wind and clouds" in the aftermath of the sound of a long time and has not died when pushing the "reading without a ban on the". Until last year, when the editor-in-chief of Reading magazine was replaced, people were still talking about this article.

In the spring of 1979, the Sanlian Bookstore founded the Reading magazine and asked me to write an article. I wrote an article entitled "Breaking the Reading Prohibited Zone". This article aroused

the interest of the editorial board of Reading, and they decided to take it as the opening article of the first issue of Reading magazine. They thought the title was not strong enough, so the magazine's founder, Fan Yu, changed it into a loud slogan: "Reading is not forbidden". It was an instant hit and resonated strongly in the intellectual world. These five words have always been the flag of Reading Magazine and have become the pride of the magazine. In fact, this famous slogan is not my original, and they didn't tell me when they changed the title. At first, I had the intention of reverting to the original title, because this new title would be easily pestered by the good people, and it was not as good as the original title which had no gaps in it. But then I decided to recognize the new title and not to change it back:

First, change the title of the editorial committee Chen Hanbo Fan with the publishing industry elders, and I am not close friends, but is a confidant. They changed the title, and the main theme of the article is completely consistent, and more powerful, easy to read and catchy. I should respect and welcome this change and be proud of it.

Secondly, and more importantly, the article was immediately received with a strong reaction. There are two "strong" here: one is warmly welcomed and the other is violently opposed. The intellectuals welcomed it warmly because it spoke from the heart. Taoists and officials in charge of thought control are violently opposed to: reading is not forbidden, this is not good enough! "Can elementary school children read The Golden Lotus?" It was a righteous and holy crusade. The magazine "Reading" devoted a discussion to it. In the case of this article stirred up such a big storm, I must have no choice but to take the responsibility of "reading is not forbidden" from the text to the title of the entire responsibility, so even more determined to defend "reading is not forbidden" this slogan.

In fact, the logic of the article itself is not flawed. The main idea of the article is to oppose the banning of books as a matter of policy, and in no way encourages cultural garbage, let alone advocating elementary school students to read "Jin Ping Mei". In black and white, those who look at the title of the crusaders, soon will also be laid to rest.

It is because the "reading" magazine after the "reading is not forbidden" this storm, the fame is bigger, readers more favorite, so this slogan has become the "reading" magazine logo.

After writing this paragraph of memories, I happened to search the Internet for "reading without a forbidden zone" to see if this word has left any traces in people's memories. As a result, "Baidu" found 13,000 entries, "GOOGLE" found 27,000 entries, and the first one was "Shui Mu Qing Hua" on January 9, 2000, which was the first article in the magazine. The first one is the original text of "Reading is not forbidden" posted by "Shui Mu Qing Hua" on January 9, 2000 in the "Reading Experience Edition - Essence Area".

In today's world of fleeting fashions, it is surprising that one of my articles from the last century is still known today. Many of the entries on the Internet read "Remembering Reading Without Limits," and until recently, there were still people who "remembered" it.

The couplet "It is better to look at the stars to recognize the north and south, do not follow the firefly to go east and west" is a lesson I have learned from my own theoretical activities. I have been doing theoretical work all my life, but now I can neither define "theory" nor "politics". However, I have learned one important lesson about the relationship between theory and politics, which is that theory should not serve politics.

Of course, in real life, no one can be separated from politics, and theory is not in a vacuum. But what theory pursues is truth, and what politics pursues is power. In the political arena, the strong win, and the strong may not be "true, good and beautiful", but also may be "false, evil and ugly". Especially in the complex political struggle, in the strategy often need to soldiers are not tired of deception, the whole world, the East and West, unpredictable, how can the theory keep up with it? Even if it can keep up, this kind of "theory" will not be a theory.

Therefore, the only way to deal with the relationship between theory and politics is to transcend politics. Theoreticians must think independently with their own minds, and should observe and study politics itself as an object, rather than following in the footsteps of others. For example, Sun Tzu's *The Art of War* takes war, the most unpredictable of all, as an object to be studied, in order to find out the essence behind the complexity of the phenomenon.

In this process, the most undesirable thing is to "tailor" the politics of reality and package the politics of power with theories. Such an approach, even in the interest of the rulers themselves, is harmful because different voices are not heard and mistakes are lost to be corrected.

The result of this kind of introspection is, to put it in a very simple phrase, "telling the truth". Truth is not necessarily the truth, but falsehood is definitely not the truth. In terms of theoretical work, it means "speaking the truth according to one's conscience", and one must not speak falsely against one's conscience.

Theoretical research is not the design of political programs. Political design can have steps, compromises and transitions. Because the positions of various political subjects are different, their strengths and weaknesses are different, and their demands are different, it is not easy to find a point of union, and it is very difficult to make a compromise, which is often a drag. This requires the wisdom and skill of politicians. Speaking theory should put aside all the interests and gains and losses, stripped of all the trappings and contingencies, to put the issue through. Speaking theory only asks whether it is true or not, and there is no need to consider who will read it, and especially not what the people in power will do when they read it. In fact, even if you want to impress the powers that be, but also the more thoroughly the problem, the more likely to impress his heart.