

# 秦川 徐庆全：1983 年“清除精神污染” Qin Chuan (interviewed by) Xu Qingquan: “Purging Spiritual Pollution” in 1983

作者：秦川 徐庆全 时间：2015-05-20 来源：八十年代 The Eighties

<http://www.hybsl.cn/beijingscankao/beijingfenxi/2015-05-20/52285.html> on May 20, 2015

● 秦川 徐庆全

## FN 149 Qin Chuan and Xu Qingquan on Eliminating Spiritual Pollution in 1983

徐庆全(以下简称徐)：1983 年，是马克思逝世一百周年，在中宣部的安排下，3 月 7 日，周扬在中央党校纪念马克思逝世 100 周年学术报告会上，宣读了长篇论文《关于马克思主义的几个理论问题的探讨》。这篇文章在 3 月 16 日的《人民日报》发表了，引起了一场风波。您是《人民日报》总编辑，是重要的当事人。请您谈一下这方面的情况。

秦川(以下简称秦)：周扬要作这个学术报告，我是知道的。他在起草这篇文章时，让当时《人民日报》的副总编辑王若水参加。王若水跟我说过。至于报告的内容是什么，我也没问。3 月 7 日，周扬在中央党校宣读论文的时候，我没有到会。不过，听《人民日报》理论部主任回来，周扬的报告十分精彩，宣读过程中鸦雀无声，读完后掌声很热烈。王震、邓力群也参加了。我说，那就在《人民日报》发表吧。八日头版关于学术报告会消息是我签发的，消息中关于周扬报告“全文本报另行发表”这句话是王若水加的。

徐：按照王若水的回忆，在 3 月 10 日，胡乔木到周扬家里去，谈到了这篇文章的情况。王若水回来后向您说了吗？

秦：说过。我们在发表了周扬作报告的消息后，就决定要发表报告的全文，所以消息上加上了“全文本报另行发表”的话。不过，我还是打电话给邓力群，征求他的意见。邓说，他没有把握，要我直接向胡乔木请示。3 月 10 日，王若水从周扬家里出来后，就向我谈了胡乔木在周扬家里说到的意见。王若水告诉我，乔木的观点和周扬的观点没有大的分歧。乔木强调批评抽象的人道主义或资产阶级的人道主义，这个观点周扬和他也能接受。他最担心胡乔木批评异化概念，但是乔木只字未提。另外，乔木没有说周扬的文章不能发表。听到王若水这样说，我认为这应该是乔木的意见了，所以，我也就没有给乔木再打电话请示，决定还是发表。

徐：您当时知道周扬的报告中谈到了人道主义和异化的问题吗？

秦：知道。周扬的报告就在我们《人民日报》印刷厂排印的，他在中央党校做完报告后，就把报告稿分发，征求意见，我也收到了一份。

徐：从现在知道的情况来看，周扬的文章之所以引起风波，是胡乔木对周扬报告中谈人道主义与异化的部分不满。您认为周扬谈这个问题有什么不妥当吗？

秦：我认为没有什么。从当时的情况来看，关于人道主义与异化的讨论，在社会上已经进行了好几年了，报刊上发表了很多文章，而且还出版了好几本书。

徐：那时我是大二学生，不过，我也感觉到，当时的报刊似乎很关心“人”的问题。记得当时戴厚英写过一本书，《人啊，人》。我们都争相传阅。那时，谈人道主义与异化的问题，恐怕是与反思“文革”联系在一起的。

秦：是的。人道主义问题是怎样提出来的？这有它的时代背景。它在八十年代初提出来不是偶然的。“文革”是一场浩劫，对全社会的破坏实在是太大了。“文革”一结束，痛定思痛，反思是必然的。

徐：对“文革”的反思，文学创作是走在前列的。当时流行一时的“伤痕文学”，对反思有极大的促进作用。

秦：是的。在思想理论界，人们也在进行反思。中共十一届三中全会之后，解放了思想，很自然地要对过去的历史进行反思：我们的毛病出在什么地方？为什么这种惨剧会在社会主义国家一再发生？怎样才能防止这种灾难重演？从指导思想上看，既然确定了实践是检验真理的标准，那么是否要用实践来检验我们对马克思主义的理解，对马克思主义进行再认识？过去对人道主义的多次批判是正确的吗？“一切为了人，为了人的幸福”是修正主义口号吗？只讲阶级性，不讲人性和个性，这是符合马克思主义的吗？

另一方面，党中央决定实行改革开放，这也需要从理论上做出马克思主义的解释。既然意识形态是适应经济基础的，那么，当经济基础发生变化时，意识形态(包括价值观念)如果还是原封不动，继续过去“左”的一套，就会受到越来越多的怀疑，产生“信仰危机”。1980年《中国青年报》发起关于人生观的讨论，引起很大的轰动，就是一个信号。人道主义和异化问题，就是在这种背景和气氛下提出来的。

徐：在当时关于人道主义与异化的大讨论中，作为党报的《人民日报》也曾经发表汝信的肯定人道主义的文章。

秦：1980年8月15日，《人民日报》发表了汝信的文章《人道主义就是修正主义吗？——对人道主义的再认识》。文章认为：“人道主义就是主张要把人当作人来看待，人本身就是人的最高目的，人的价值也就在于他自身。”作者否定了人道主义只是青年马克思所受的费尔巴哈的影响的观点，认为费尔巴哈把人作为出发点，这并没有错，问题是他所说的人太抽象了。马克思的唯物史观和剩余价值两大发现，不仅没有取消马克思的人道主义思想，反而使它建立在真正科学的基础上。

这并不是肯定人道主义的第一篇文章，但它是影响较大的一篇。胡乔木当时是中国社会科学院院长，他的秘书打电话给汝信说：“乔木同志看了这篇文章，认为写得很好，他很赞成文章的观点，希望你继续研究。本来他要亲自写信给你的，因为太忙，抽不出时间，叫我打电话转达这个意思。”

汝信把这个情况告诉了《人民日报》编辑部。我和王若水知道后很高兴，并建议编辑部给这篇文章评了“1980年好文章”奖。那时报刊上发表的有关文章很多，我没有听到来自党中央的任何批评意见。

徐：参与周扬报告起草的王若水，在当时就曾写过好几篇文章。

秦：但是，王若水写的文章虽然有很大的反响，但他从来没有在《人民日报》发表过。原因我也知道，因为王若水是《人民日报》的副总编辑，他是避嫌。

徐：看来，周扬对关于人道主义与异化的讨论还是很关注的，他在报告中讲到这个问题，显然是支持这场大讨论的。

秦：周扬是马克思主义理论家，在“文革”后，他对理论的研究更加重视。我想这也是为了对“文革”进行反思。关于人道主义与异化的问题，在六十年代反对苏联的时候，周扬就曾研究过。不过，那时，为了适应形势的需要，周扬对人道主义进行了批判，但似乎肯定了“异化”的概念。“文革”后，他担任中宣部顾问。在一次中宣部的会上，他承认了他过去对人道主义的批评是不妥当的。汝信参加了这次会。大概他早就有这种想法，周扬的表态鼓起了他的勇气，所以，他才写了文章交《人民日报》发表。

徐：《中国青年报》发动的人生观的大讨论的时候，我在学校曾经参与过讨论，但并不理解其中的大背景。您谈到的人道主义与异化的讨论的背景，对我很有启发。现在，还是请您接着谈周扬的报告在《人民日报》发表前后的情况。

秦：3月12日是星期六，我去周扬家，对他说：“你的文章我们登出预告，已经过去好几天了，还没有发表。”周扬在跟我谈了胡乔木来他家谈话的情况后说：“乔木让改一改，关于异化问题，联系实际略为展开一下。我在监狱里蹲了几年，出来后又没有专门搞过调查研究，联系实际比较困难，加上身体也不好，我没法改。”我说：“那就发表吧。七日晚上的电视我看了，王震、邓力群都过来与你握手，还会有什么问题？”周扬说：“我考虑一下给你。”他又反问我一句：“你敢发吗？”王若水和周扬都跟我谈了胡乔木的意见，都没有提到不能发表的事情，所以，我认为发表也没有什么问题。周扬把他的文章又看了看，交给我。

徐：其实，12日，您到周扬家去的时候，根据中宣部的安排，中央党校的会上，就有四位学者发表了不同意周扬文章的讲话。您当时知道吗？

秦：知道。这四位同志的发言，影响很大，因为消息传出去了，说是要批评周扬，所以大家很注意。那时，报社社长胡绩伟出差了，处理周扬文章的责任落在王若水和我头上。我和王若水都认为，既然周扬不愿意修改，编辑部也不必坚持非要他修改不可。一篇文章不可能把所有的问题都谈到。胡乔木并没有指出这篇讲话有什么错误，只是说有这样那样的“不够”。这些问题将来可以另行组织文章来讲。周扬文章的题目是《关于马克思主义的几个理论问题的探讨》，这表明，周并不是代表党中央对理论问题发表结论性的意见，发表这篇讲话也不会妨碍别人提出相反的观点。为了表明这一点，可以在发表周扬讲话的同时，也发表四位不同意见者的讲话摘要。我们都认为，这样处理是妥当的，用不着再请示胡乔木。

徐：你们的确这样做了，但还是引发了风波。

秦：周扬的文章在3月16日《人民日报》上发表出来了，同时见报的有黄楠森等人反驳周扬的文章。当天上午，我一上班就接到了邓力群的电话，怒气冲冲地说：“你为什么要发表周扬文章？乔木同志早在3月8日就打电话给中宣部，已明白表示周扬讲话不能在《人民日报》上

发表，你们为何不听?这是一个严重的错误!你要立即检查，九点钟把检讨送中宣部来。”又说：“王若水是把他人道主义观点掺到周扬文章中去的。”我解释说：“王若水不是掺进去的。本人并不想去。”部长生气了，“啪”的一声，电话断了。

徐：到这个时候，你还替王若水解释。

秦：其实，从1980年以来，胡乔木、邓力群就对胡绩伟、王若水有很深的成见。他在电话里说到王若水的情况与事实不符。王若水确实写过有关人道主义的文章，但春节前周扬找他帮助起草，他两次向我说过不愿去。当时，他刚离婚不久，把几年不在身边的孩子接回来，准备过一个团圆节。我劝他：“周扬同志轻易不求人的，去去为好。”所以，他才去的。

徐：你是不是马上写了检查。

秦：是的。我如实写明情况，包括王若水参与周扬文章起草的情况，承担发表周扬文章没有请示的责任，赶在九点之前匆匆送去了。

随后，邓力群叫中宣部送了一份电话记录给《人民日报》。这个电话记录的要点是这样说的：

周扬同志的讲话，难以处理，问题不少，不是加几句话、删几句话能解决的。这是目前思想界的重要讨论对象。总的意见，异化也好，人道主义也好，这种宣传本身是抽象的。这篇文章没有分析。社会主义社会哪些存在异化现象?存在反人道主义现象?如有贩卖人口现象，有犯罪现象，(但这是)可以禁止的。文章中有的没有涉及，有的含混地说到一点，如关于特权等。如说权高于法，可以讲是异化，也可以说是违反人道主义的。如离开具体现象去讲，去讨论，会给人以暗示说，我们社会主义社会没有人道。

人道问题要具体讨论，拥护什么现象?反对什么现象?如干部服从分配到边疆地区工作，是不是异化?是不是不合人道主义?只抽象地讲，不具体答复，会给人以暗示：人要自由流动，不能自由流动，就是没有把人的权利放在第一位，就是不人道。

任何一个时期讲人道主义，都是为了拥护什么，反对什么，是有目的的。这篇讲话目的何在?是用来批判“文化大革命”?还是用来批判什么?如果是批判“文化大革命”，现在又没有“文化大革命”了。现在正在开展学雷锋运动，这是人道主义的高度发展，为什么视而不见?象雷锋这样的事，过去个别的会有，但不可能大规模地出现。现在讲人道主义，给人以什么目的?

对当前的社会现象完全不提，或提得片面，只讲一点点，不加分析，这样一来，会给人以什么印象?我们党的十二大讲社会主义精神文明建设就是讲人道主义嘛!为什么提也不提?

不要抽象地提问题。马列主义要摆到具体条件下来讲。现在文艺界就有人在文艺上宣传超阶级观点，反对阶级斗争的作品已经发表好几篇了。?

希望能有人在讨论会上做一个发言，这么讲可以讲到要害，不然毫无意义。关于异化、人道主义这方面的问题，邢贲思同志搞过一些，最好请他准备一下，明天做个发言(发言时注意口气不要太大)，不然周扬的文章发表了可能成大的问题。

徐：从这个电话记录来看，胡乔木基本上是否定了周扬的文章的。你给邓力群打电话请示是否发表周扬的文章时，邓力群为什么没有对你说乔木这个电话记录呢？

秦：不知道什么原因，也许是乔木并没有让邓力群向我传达。邓力群给我打完电话后，又接着给王若水打电话，气势汹汹，强令其作出检查。王若水也写出了检讨。

徐：从以后的事实上看，你和王若水写了检讨，也并没有过关。

秦：在邓力群的主持下，中宣部向中央书记处呈报了《中宣部关于人民日报擅自全文发表周扬同志长篇讲话的情况和处理意见》。报告前两稿我没见过，我看到的是第三稿，据说已经改得温和了许多，但仍歪曲事实，蓄意整人。

报告谈到《人民日报》的责任说：“在这件事情上，秦川同志负有重要责任。但是，从全过程来看，主要责任在王若水同志。这次他帮助周扬同志起草报告稿，实际上把他近年来一直宣扬的基本观点都写进稿子里了。人民日报编委会开会讨论时，当面听了乔木同志批评和要求修改后再发表的王若水同志，不仅没有提醒此事应请示乔木同志，要慎重处理，而且‘欣然同意’全文发表。他实际上是想通过这种形式，使他一直宣扬的观点成为权威性的观点，扩大他的影响。我们认为，事情发展到这种地步，王若水同志的错误是严重的。”

这个《报告》提出了三条处理意见：

一、关于人道主义问题，作为学术问题，今后仍可允许进行不同意见的讨论。周扬同志文章既然已经全文发表，学术讨论会上持不同观点的文章，也应陆续在报纸上全文发表。同时准备组织力量，认真研究，写出文章，对这一问题进行马克思主义的阐述。

二、对《人民日报》的编辑部进行必要的调整。王若水调出《人民日报》，另行分配工作。

三、周扬同志不顾自己的地位，在乔木同志代表耀邦同志提出要他修改后再发表的意见以后，不认真考虑这篇报告发表可能产生的影响，自食前言，不作修改。对周扬同志在这件关系重大问题上不严肃、不负责的表现，希望他有所认识，表示正确的态度。

徐：从这个报告上，是要对《人民日报》作组织上的处理了。

秦：3月25日，中宣部召集我们开会，将邓力群的报告同周扬、秦川、王若水等同志见面，核对事实，听取意见，再报告中央。

徐：据说，在这个会上发生了很激烈的争吵。

秦：是的。这一天，我们来到中南海中宣部的一间小会议室。屋里光线暗淡，也没有开灯。大家分作两排在铺着白色桌布的会议桌前坐下。

开始大家沉默着，阅读邓力群给中央的报告。我看了一半，就觉得不是味道。理论问题，怎么要整人？动不动就是纪律处分，而且事情和过程也没有说清楚嘛，幸亏中央让我们当面澄清

事实。在党的十一届三中全会以后，如此对待像周扬这位在党内外、国内外都有影响的老同志，而且他还是中央顾问委员会委员、中央宣传部顾问，真是太霸气了！

徐：周扬的反映如何？

秦：周扬看得快一些。我发觉他气色有些不对，想站起来，又坐了下去。突然，他举起那本报告，扔在乔木面前，连声说：“你们这样做不正派、不正派，这样做不正派！”

坐在对面的乔木震惊了，十分激动地说：“你说什么？说中央不正派？”

周扬愤怒地说：“你们这样不正派！”

瞪大眼睛的乔木把头伸过来，面对周扬，声色俱厉地呵斥道：“你这是反中央！”

周扬应声作答：“你不要戴帽子！我是反对胡乔木你这个具体的中央委员。”

乔木怒得有点失常：“你这是反中央政治局！”声音都变了。

周扬据理不让，大声说：“我只是反对你胡乔木这个具体的政治局委员！”气氛骤然紧张。

我坐在乔木对面，眼见这个场面，赶忙出来打圆场：“你们都是我的老上级、老领导，还是团结起来坐下说吧。”乔木大概也意识到自己的失态，接过话茬说：“是啊，我和周扬早在上海就一起工作了。”

胡乔木稍微冷静了一下，问：“告诉你不要发表，为什么还要发表？”

周扬说：“你来我家时没有说过不让发表，你只是说异化部分要联系实际，加强一下，修改以后发表。我没法修改。既然大会都讲了，讲话稿也印发了，报纸为什么不可以发表？”

乔木对周扬说，我本来跟你说好，作为学术文章，修改好在《哲学研究》上发表。我也是代表耀邦同你谈话的。周说，我没有听见代表耀邦这个话。又说，你这个人的话，今天这样讲，明天那样讲，我知道你讲的什么，我根本记不住。说着两人就争了起来。乔木坚持说不听招呼擅自发表是错误的。周扬重申他从未听说过不让发表。

这时，一位同志插话说：“我们当时做了记录，对照记录稿，乔木同志说过不要发表。”

周扬再次为自己辩护：“乔木说的是异化问题要联系实际。”

原是周扬在鲁艺的学生的贺敬之也表态说：“中宣部作记录，我相信记录是真实的，也相信周扬同志不会说假话。”

徐：3月8日，胡乔木在周扬家谈话，在场的王若水也作了记录，把两个记录对照一下不就搞清楚了吗？

秦：其实，记录不记录的，到这个时候已经不管用了。话题谈到记录后，与会者沉默了一

段时间。这时候，邓力群突然站了起来，声音大得惊人，以申斥的口气说：“周扬同志，我多年来都尊敬你，你是我尊敬的老同志——”这句开场白之后是一番劈头盖脑的批判。最后，他厉声说：“希望周扬同志认真学习邓小平同志在中顾委成立时的讲话，不要干预中宣部的工作！”

徐：看来，会议的气氛确实很紧张。不过，对您倒没有什么大的批评。

秦：我和周扬都不同意对王若水所做的组织处理，还在会上替王若水争辩了几句。但是，没有用。会议的核对工作没有完成，只好散会了。当我们离开会场时，乔木带着微笑拍着我的肩膀说：“你要安居乐业。”

徐：这话的意思是，您的责任已经清楚了，没有什么问题了。

秦：但是，周扬和王若水对这样的处理是不满意的。会后，周扬和王若水都向中央写了信。周扬给胡、邓和耀邦写了一封信。他把信转我一份。信中说，“中宣部向中央书记处的报告稿与事实有些出入，我谨向中央如实地说明情况”。信后附上他的说明：

二月中旬，中国社会科学院和中央党校联名写信给我，约请我在马克思逝世一百周年学术报告会作一讲话。当时我因跌伤骨折住院，偶然和前来探视的王元化同志谈起此事，并希望他和王若水同志帮我起草。出院后我因仍有低温到天津继续休养。春节后就在王元化、王若水、顾骧三位同志的协助下赶写成了这篇讲话，这时离报告会只有一天时间了，第二天我因体力不支，请广播员宣读了这样一篇讲话。这样一篇重要讲话，虽是一篇学术性的探讨文章，但以我的身份宣讲，是不够慎重的。报告会的第二天，我立即把讲稿的清样分送胡耀邦、胡乔木、邓力群、贺敬之等同志审阅。

三月十三日、四日上午，胡乔木同志约请夏衍、郁文、贺敬之、王若水等同志在我家谈话，主要是谈对我的讲话，对王若水文章，以及对文学上的现代派的意见。对我的讲话，主要是认为人道主义讲得不充分。乔木同志说他是人道主义者，认为没有把社会主义的人道主义和资产阶级的严格区分开来，而对社会主义的人道主义更充分地发挥。文中我提到了马克思主义的人道主义，这和乔木同志所赞成的社会主义人道主义并没有根本的不同。当时我还问了一句我的讲话是否要改了以后再发表，他说可以在出单行本时再改，再详细发挥。我没有听见乔木同志说他是正式代表耀邦同志来同我谈话的，而且耀邦同志退回寄给他的清样也没有这样的批示。对王若水同志讲人道主义的文章，主要是批评他的“怪影”以拟不当。对现代派，认为要批评。

因为我在那天谈话中，把克服“异化”和体制改革联系起来，认为这样才不致流于空谈，才能和当前贯彻中央的改革精神联系起来。也许这样联系是不适当的，所以，第二次他又在电话中提醒我“异化”是一个重要问题，有争议的问题，要我多加考虑，但也没有说什么不同的意见。

乔木同志谈话后，邓力群同志来电话谈到我这篇讲话的修改，要我把谈话弄个摘要。我说报上发表的已是摘要，我不想再摘了，说时很不耐烦，态度很不冷静，这是不对的。

这篇讲话的预告和全文发表，我事先并不知道。至于这篇讲话，虽有人帮助起草，但整个内容和文章的结构，都是我的意见，如有错误和不妥之处，完全是我的责任。

徐：我早就听说周扬有一个说明，但是没有看到。周扬在这个说明中，说到胡乔木还打电话跟他谈“异化”问题，这个情况您知道吗？

秦：胡乔木跟周扬打电话谈“异化”的事情，我不太清楚，但是，我知道胡乔木从周扬家里回来的第二天，曾给郁文打过电话，补充谈到了“异化”问题。我有这个电话的记录稿。郁文的记录是这样的：

关于异化的问题我忘记谈了。我想马克思早期说的异化和晚期说的不一定一样。不管一样不一样，社会主义社会将它应用过来，不加区别，不对。用这个名词要加以区别。如果因为(社会主义)社会中有非人道现象，同资本主义社会中的非人道现象混在一起，就把问题谈乱了。一个是非基本的现象，甚至是非法的;一个是基本的现象。我这个意见将另外写信告诉他们。如有同志谈到这个问题时，可把这个意见补充上。

徐：周扬递上说明后，中宣部的报告在什么时候批下来了？

秦：据我所知，周扬这份说明情况的报告上交后，一直没有下文，也没有听说中央领导有什么批示。中宣部的这个报告后来也没有下文了。

徐：我看到 1983 年 4 月初的《人民日报》曾有一条消息，报道周扬和法国《人道报》来访者会见。那时，从你上面讲的情况看，周扬已经被批评了，为什么还要特意报道他与法国《人道报》会谈呢？

秦：你看材料还是比较细的，这个问题你也注意到了。你注意的好。法国《人道报》来访时，是《人民日报》负责接待的，主要是我出面来接待。是我特意请周扬来参加，我主持，他主谈，发消息。

徐：我明白了，您是以这种方式来表达您的想法。与《人道报》会谈的情况，您还记得吗？

秦：会谈是在周扬的寓所进行的。周扬对这次会谈很满意。会谈后，我们一起到四川饭店设宴招待法国客人，周扬兴致很高。

徐：回过头来还说中宣部的报告。后来，中宣部就这个问题还谈过吗？

秦：没有。只有一次，还是胡乔木找我们谈话时说到这个问题。那是在 8 月初，胡乔木找我、王若水谈《人民日报》的工作和整党，又就这个问题批评了我们。他说，发表周扬文章的问题，周扬的态度尽管不算坚决，比《人民日报》要好。这篇文章所涉及的理论问题和政治问题，关系这样重大，《人民日报》就当儿戏发表，完全没有考虑它的影响。党中央机关报对中央的利害竟然置之度外，这是难以想象的。在现阶段，离开社会主义建设(包括精神文明建设)，离开阶级斗争，抽象地讲人道主义，讲人是马克思主义的出发点，就会加入社会上的反党潮流，成为他们重要的组成部分。这不是骇人听闻，这是事实。他还说，周扬文章虽然发生这么多问题，还是要慢慢来，慢慢来总是要来的，着急也没有用。

徐：这期间，您与周扬交往多吗？

秦：多，我常去周扬同志家。有一次，我到周扬家里去，只听他夫人苏灵扬说：“小胡(按：指胡乔木)为什么这样?起应(即周扬)在上海替他恢复了党籍，那时不像这样啊!晚上老来电话，催他在报纸上公开承认错误，简直睡不安宁。”

我为发表周扬文章深深感到不安，我说：“我不该发表你这篇讲话!”他笑了笑说：“不是你的错。你不发表，照样要批判的。我太熟悉了。讨嫌的是，晚上老来电话，说中央领导要我公开作自我批评。”

徐：看来虽然报告没有批下来，但是对周扬和王若水的处理，还是要进行的。

秦：是的。十二届二中全会结束后，10月底，胡乔木在邓力群陪同下来到报社，宣布中央的决定：接受胡绩伟的辞呈;免去王若水的副总编辑职务。不久，周扬被迫以接受记者采访的形式，作了自我批评，公布全国。

徐：而在此前后，“清除精神污染”的运动已经在全国形成了气候了。

秦：本来我以为胡乔木、邓力群应该就此干休，没有想到胡乔木、邓力群并不满足于整周扬和《人民日报》，他们一面逼周扬作公开检讨，一面又组织了一批“大批判”文章，强令《人民日报》刊登。他们要把斗争面扩大升级，提出要“清除精神污染”。

徐：那时，我还在上大学，我们也都有很深切的感受。当时，学校做了若干的规定，比方说，不能穿喇叭裤，不准烫发之类的规定，搞得我们很莫名其妙。好在这场运动持续的时间并不长。

秦：“清除精神污染”提法的首创者是邓力群。早在1983年6月4日，邓力群在中央党校的一个讲话中最早使用了这一概念，用以指责有关人道主义和异化问题的文章。

徐：您说这个情况，我还是第一次知道。邓力群的讲话公开发表了吗?

秦：这个我不记得了，反正当时我对这个印象很深，你可以查一查资料。到了10月，在邓力群的宣传下，王震出来讲话了。由邓力群主持的研究室起草的关于“要开展清除精神污染”的报告，经中央党校校长王震之口，在南京召开的科学社会主义学会成立大会上宣读了。这是向全国公开表示要开展：“清污运动”的号召。震动全国，也引起国际上的注意。于是各报刊，知名人士的表态文章，大有造成风雨欲来的形势。后来，在中央领导同志的反对下，才没有引起大的运动。

徐：有的文章说，这是一场不叫运动的运动。陆定一在给周扬的女儿的信中说，周扬“是被气死的”，是不是跟他的检讨和清除精神污染运动有关系?

秦：恐怕有这方面的原因。周扬“文革”后从秦城监狱出来，一直为三中全会的拨乱反正欢呼，把小平同志重新主持工作以来的思想路线称为“我国现代史上第三次思想解放运动”。可是，他的报告发表后，有人说他反对四项基本原则。他对此是想不通的。所以，他做了检讨后，身体一天一天衰弱下去了，心力交瘁了，一年以后竟一病不起，直到1989年与世长辞。在很长一段时间里，每当我去医院病房，看见周扬一动不动地躺在那里，心中就是一阵悸动。他

怎么变成这样了呢?我忘不了周扬对我说的话：“秦川，我们再不能重复‘左’.....在秦城监狱中.....我想了许许多多.....”

徐：我看到的回忆文章中说，这场争论过后，胡乔木给周扬写了一首诗，其中有“雨后的阳光将照见大地,更美了：拥抱着一对战士”的话。但是，这样的美景至今似乎也没有出现。对于这一争论，乔木后来承认，“有些过分政治化”了，他是不是也感觉到有些不妥？

秦：乔木写诗给周扬，我知道，也看过这首诗。但他对这场争论的感受我不太清楚。就我的想法而言，是很“政治化”了，而且对周扬和王若水的处理也过分了。但当时，我们都不知怎样能帮上忙，只能常到周扬家看看，陪他聊聊天。

徐：现在，周扬和乔木都先后去世了，对这个问题或许人们可以更心平气和地讨论了。

秦：这本来是一个学术问题，因为政治化而不好说了。我觉得您说得对，现在是可以讨论一下。

徐：谢谢您的谈话，这对我有很大的帮助。

DeepL Translation

## **Qin Chuan and Xu Qingquan: Purging Spiritual Pollution in 1983**

Xu Qingquan (hereinafter referred to as Xu): In 1983, it was the centenary of Marx's death. Under the arrangement of the Central Propaganda Department, on March 7, Zhou Yang read a lengthy essay, "Discussion on Several Theoretical Issues Concerning Marxism," at the Academic Lecture held at the Central Party School to commemorate the centenary of Marx's death. The essay was published in the People's Daily on March 16, causing a furor. You are the editor-in-chief of the People's Daily and were an important party to it. Could you please talk about the situation in this regard?

Qin Chuan (hereinafter referred to as Qin): I knew that Zhou Yang was going to give this academic report. When he drafted this article, he asked Wang Ruoshui, the deputy editor-in-chief of the People's Daily at the time, to attend. Wang Ruoshui told me about it. As for the content of the report, I didn't ask, and I wasn't present when Zhou Yang read his paper at the Central Party School on March 7, but I did listen to the theory of the People's Daily. However, the director of the Theory Department of the People's Daily came back and said that Zhou Yang's report was very brilliant, that there was no sound during the reading, and that the applause after the reading was very enthusiastic. Wang Zhen and Deng Liqun also attended. I said, "Then publish it in the People's Daily. On the front page of the 8th, the news about the symposium was issued by me, and in the news about Zhou Yang's report, "the full text will be published separately in this newspaper" was added by Wang Ruoshui.

Xu: according to Wang Ruoshui's recollection, in March 10, Hu Qiaomu to Zhou Yang's home, talked about the situation of this article. Did Wang Ruoshui tell you about it when he returned?

Qin: I did. After we published the news of Zhou Yang's report, we decided to publish the full text of the report, so we added the words "the full text of the report will be published separately in this newspaper" to the news. However, I called Deng Liqun to seek his opinion. Deng said he was not sure and asked me to ask Hu Qiaomu for instructions. on March 10, Wang Ruoshui came out of Zhou Yang's

house and talked to me about Hu Qiaomu's comments at Zhou Yang's house. Wang Ruoshui told me that there was no major difference between Qiaomu's views and those of Zhou Yang. Qiaomu emphasized the criticism of abstract humanism or bourgeois humanism, a view Zhou Yang and he could also accept. He was most worried about Hu Qiaomu's criticism of the concept of alienation, but Qiaomu said nothing about it. In addition, Qiao Mu did not say that Zhou Yang's article could not be published. When I heard Wang Ruoshui say this, I thought it should be Qiao Mu's opinion, so I didn't call Qiao Mu again for instructions and decided to publish it anyway.

Xu: Did you know at the time that Zhou Yang's report talked about humanitarianism and alienation?

Qin: Yes. Zhou Yang's report was printed at the People's Daily printing house, and after he finished his report at the Central Party School, he distributed it for comments, and I received a copy.

Xu: From what we know now, the reason why Zhou Yang's article caused a furor was Hu Qiaomu's dissatisfaction with the part of Zhou Yang's report that talked about humanitarianism and alienation. Do you think there is anything wrong with Zhou Yang talking about this?

QIN: I don't think there was anything. Judging from the situation at the time, the discussion on humanitarianism and alienation had been going on in society for several years, with many articles published in the press and several books.

Xu: I was a sophomore in college at the time, but I also felt that the press at the time seemed to be very concerned with the issue of "human beings. I remember that Dai Houying wrote a book, "People, People". We all passed it around. At that time, I'm afraid that talking about the issue of humanism and alienation was linked to reflecting on the Cultural Revolution.

QIN: Yes. How did the question of humanitarianism come up? It had its own background. It was not by chance that it was raised in the early 1980s. "The Cultural Revolution was a catastrophe that devastated the whole society. "Once the Cultural Revolution was over, it was inevitable to reflect on the pain.

Xu: Literary creation was at the forefront of reflection on the Cultural Revolution. At that time, the popular "scar literature" had a great effect on reflection.

Qin: Yes. In the world of thought and theory, people were also engaged in reflection. After the Third Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee of the Communist Party of China (CPC), ideas were liberated, and it was only natural to reflect on the past: what went wrong with us? Why did such tragedies happen again and again in socialist countries? How can we prevent the recurrence of such disasters? From the point of view of guiding ideology, since it has been established that practice is the criterion for testing truth, is it necessary to use practice to test our understanding of Marxism and to re-conceptualize it? Were the many critiques of humanism in the past correct? Is "all for the sake of man, for the sake of man's happiness" a revisionist slogan? Is it consistent with Marxism to speak only of class, not of humanity and individuality?

On the other hand, the decision of the Party Central Committee to implement reform and opening up also requires a theoretical Marxist explanation. Since ideology is adapted to the economic base, when the economic base changes, ideology (including values), if it remains unchanged and continues to be "leftist", will be subject to more and more skepticism, resulting in a "crisis of faith". This was signaled by the fact that in 1980 the China Youth Daily launched a discussion on the concept of life, which caused a great stir. It was in this context and atmosphere that the question of humanism and alienation was raised.

XU: During the great discussion on humanitarianism and alienation at that time, the People's Daily, which was a party newspaper, also used to publish Ruxin's article affirming humanitarianism.

Qin: On August 15, 1980, People's Daily published Ruxin's article, "Is Humanism Revisionism? --A Re-conceptualization of Humanitarianism". According to the article, "Humanism is the assertion that man is to be treated as a human being, that man himself is the highest end of man, and that man's value lies in himself." The author rejects the idea that humanism is merely the influence of Feuerbach, the young Marx, and argues that Feuerbach took man as his starting point, which is not wrong, but the problem is that the man he was talking about was too abstract. Marx's materialist conception of history and the two major discoveries of surplus value not only did not cancel Marx's humanitarian thought, but also put it on a truly scientific basis.

This was not the first article that affirmed humanism, but it was one of the more influential ones. Hu Qiaomu was the president of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences at the time, and his secretary called Ruxin and said, "Comrade Qiaomu read this article and thought it was very well written; he agrees with the article's point of view and hopes that you will continue to study it. Originally he wanted to personally write to you, because too busy, can not find the time, asked me to call to convey this meaning."

Ruxin told the editorial board of People's Daily about this. Wang Ruoshui and I were very happy to learn about it, and suggested that the editorial board give the article the "1980 Good Article" award. At that time, there were many relevant articles published in the press, and I did not hear any criticism from the Party Central Committee.

Xu: Wang Ruoshui, who participated in the drafting of Zhou Yang's report, wrote several articles at that time.

Qin: However, although the articles written by Wang Ruoshui had great repercussions, he never published them in the People's Daily. The reason for this, which I also know, is that Wang Ruoshui was the deputy editor-in-chief of the People's Daily, and he was avoiding suspicion.

XU: It seems that Zhou Yang was still very concerned about the discussion on humanism and alienation, and by speaking about it in his report, he obviously supported this great discussion.

Qin: Zhou Yang is a Marxist theorist, and after the Cultural Revolution, he paid more attention to the study of theory. I think this was also to reflect on the Cultural Revolution. On the question of humanism and alienation, Zhou Yang had studied it in the 1960s when he opposed the Soviet Union. However, at that time, in order to meet the needs of the situation, Zhou Yang criticized humanitarianism, but seemed to affirm the concept of "alienation". "After the Cultural Revolution, he served as an advisor to the Central Propaganda Department. At a meeting of the Central Propaganda Department, he admitted that his past criticisms of humanism were inappropriate. Ruxin attended this meeting. Presumably, he had long had this idea, and Zhou Yang's statement drummed up his courage, which is why he wrote the article and submitted it to the People's Daily for publication.

Xu: When the China Youth Daily launched the great discussion on the outlook on life, I had participated in the discussion at school, but I did not understand the general background of it. The background of the discussion on humanism and alienation that you talked about was very inspiring to me. Now, please still go on to talk about the situation before and after Zhou Yang's report was published in the People's Daily.

QIN: March 12 was a Saturday, and I went to Zhou Yang's house and said to him, "It's been several days since we ran a preview of your article, and it hasn't been published yet." Zhou Yang, after talking to me about Hu Qiaomu's visit to his house to talk, said, "Qiaomu asked for a change, on the question of alienation, to expand on it slightly in relation to reality. I've been in prison for several years, and I haven't specialized in research since I got out, so it's more difficult for me to relate to reality, plus my health is not good, so I can't change it." I said, "Then publish it. I watched the TV on the night of the 7th, Wang Zhen and Deng Liqun all came over to shake hands with you, what else could go wrong?" Zhou Yang said, "I'll think about it and give it to you." He asked me back, "Do you dare to send it?" Both Wang Ruoshui and Zhou Yang talked to me about Hu Qiaomu's comments, and neither mentioned anything about not being able to publish it, so I didn't think there would be any problem with publishing it. Zhou Yang took another look at his article and handed it to me.

Xu: In fact, on the 12th, when you went to Zhou Yang's house, according to the arrangement of the Central Propaganda Department, at the meeting of the Central Party School, there were four scholars who made speeches disagreeing with Zhou Yang's article. Were you aware of this at the time?

Qin: Yes. These four comrades' speeches had a great impact because the news got out that they were going to criticize Zhou Yang, so everyone paid attention. At that time, Hu Jiwei, the president of the newspaper, was away on a business trip, and the responsibility of dealing with Zhou Yang's article fell on Wang Ruoshui and me. Wang Ruoshui and I both thought that since Zhou Yang was unwilling to revise, the editorial board did not have to insist that he do so. It was impossible to talk about all the problems in one article. Hu Qiaomu did not point out any mistakes in this speech, but only said that there were such and such "insufficiencies". These issues can be organized in the future to talk about another article. The title of Zhou Yang's article is "A Discussion of Several Theoretical Issues Concerning Marxism", which shows that Zhou is not representing the Party Central Committee to express conclusive views on theoretical issues, and that the publication of this speech will not prevent others from putting forward a contrary viewpoint. In order to make this clear, Zhou Yang's speech could be published along with summaries of the speeches of the four dissenters. We all agreed that this was the proper way to handle the matter and that there was no need to consult Hu Qiaomu again.

XU: You did do that, but it still caused a furor.

Qin: Zhou Yang's article was published in the People's Daily on March 16, and at the same time it appeared in the paper with articles by Huang Nansen and others refuting Zhou Yang. That morning, as soon as I got to work, I received a call from Deng Liqun, who said angrily, "Why did you publish Zhou Yang's article? Comrade Qiaomu called the Central Propaganda Department as early as March 8 and made it clear that Zhou Yang's speech could not be published in People's Daily, so why didn't you listen? This is a serious mistake! You must immediately check and send your review to the Central Propaganda Department at nine o'clock." He also said, "Wang Ruoshui is mixing his humanitarian views into Zhou Yang's article." I explained, "Wang Ruoshui did not mix it in. I did not want to go." The minister got angry and disconnected the phone with a snap.

Xu: At this point, you still explain for Wang Ruoshui.

Qin: In fact, since 1980, Hu Qiaomu and Deng Liqun have had deep preconceptions about Hu Jiwei and Wang Ruoshui. What he said on the phone about Wang Ruoshui is not consistent with the facts. Wang Ruoshui did write articles on humanitarianism, but when Zhou Yang asked him to help draft them before the Spring Festival, he twice told me he was reluctant to go. At that time, he had just been divorced and had picked up his children, who had been away for several years, and was preparing to have a reunion festival. I advised him, "Comrade Zhou Yang doesn't ask for help easily, so it's good to go." That's why he went.

Xu: Did you write a check right away.

Qin: Yes. I wrote truthfully about the situation, including Wang Ruoshui's involvement in the drafting of Zhou Yang's article, assumed responsibility for publishing Zhou Yang's article without asking for instructions, and hurriedly sent it off before nine o'clock.

Subsequently, Deng Liqun told the Central Propaganda Department to send a telephone record to the People's Daily. The gist of this telephone record was this:

Comrade Zhou Yang's speech is difficult to deal with, and there are quite a number of problems which cannot be solved by adding a few words or deleting a few words. It is an important object of discussion in the current intellectual circles. The general opinion, alienation or humanitarianism, is that this propaganda is itself abstract. This article does not analyze it. What are the phenomena of alienation in socialist society? What are the anti-humanitarian phenomena? If there is human trafficking, there is crime, (but this can be) prohibited. Some of the articles do not deal with this, but some of them talk about it vaguely, for example, about privileges and so on. If it is said that power is higher than law, it can be said that it is alienation, or it can be said that it is against humanism. If we leave the concrete phenomenon to speak and discuss, it will give people the implication that there is no humanity in our socialist society.

The question of humanity should be discussed in concrete terms, what phenomena are supported? What phenomena are we against? For example, if the cadres obey the assignment to work in the border areas, is it alienation? Is it inhumane? Speaking only in the abstract, without a concrete answer, will give people a hint: people should be free to move around, not free to move around, is not to put the rights of people in the first place, is inhumane.

When humanitarianism is spoken of at any time, it is always for the purpose of advocating something or opposing something, and there is a purpose. What is the purpose of this speech? Is it to criticize the Cultural Revolution? Or is it used to criticize something? If it is to criticize the "Cultural Revolution", there is no "Cultural Revolution" now. Now we are carrying out the Lei Feng movement, which is a high degree of humanitarianism, so why do we turn a blind eye to it? Things like Lei Feng used to happen on an individual basis, but they could not happen on a large scale. What purpose is served by talking about humanitarianism now?

What kind of impression does it give to people when it does not mention the current social phenomena at all, or mentions them in a one-sided way, talking about them only a little bit without analyzing them? The Twelfth National Congress of the Party talked about building a socialist spiritual civilization, which means humanitarianism! Why not even mention it?

Don't talk about issues in the abstract. Marxism-Leninism has to be put into concrete terms. Now there are people in the literary world who are propagating a super-class viewpoint in literature and art, and have published several works against the class struggle.

I hope that someone will make a statement at the symposium, so that it can get to the heart of the matter, otherwise it will be meaningless. On the alienation, humanitarianism, Comrade Xing Ben Si has engaged in some of these issues, it is best to ask him to prepare, tomorrow to make a speech (speech to pay attention to the tone is not too big), or Zhou Yang's article published may become a big problem.

Xu: From this telephone record, Hu Qiaomu basically denied Zhou Yang's article. When you called Deng Liqun to ask for instructions on whether or not to publish Zhou Yang's article, why didn't Deng

Liqun tell you about this telephone record of Qiaomu?

QIN: I don't know what the reason was, but perhaps Qiaomu did not ask Deng Liqun to convey it to me. After Deng Liqun called me, he went on to call Wang Ruoshui, imposing on him and forcing him to make an inspection. Wang Ruoshui also wrote a review.

Xu: The fact that you and Wang Ruoshui wrote a review didn't pass muster.

Qin: Under the auspices of Deng Liqun, the Central Propaganda Department submitted to the Secretariat of the Central Committee the "Central Propaganda Department on the People's Daily's unauthorized publication of the full text of Comrade Zhou Yang's lengthy speech and the handling of the situation". I have not seen the first two drafts of the report; what I have seen is the third draft, which is said to have been changed to a much milder version, but which still distorts the facts and deliberately tries to fix people.

The report said of the People's Daily's responsibility: "In this matter, Comrade Qin Chuan bears an important responsibility. However, looking at the whole process, the main responsibility lies with Comrade Wang Ruoshui. This time he helped Comrade Zhou Yang draft the report, and in fact included in the draft all the basic ideas he had been preaching in recent years. When the editorial committee of the People's Daily met to discuss the matter, Comrade Wang Ruoshui, who had heard Comrade Qiaomu's criticisms and demanded that the report be revised and then published, not only did he not remind Comrade Qiaomu that the matter should be referred to him and dealt with carefully, but he also 'readily agreed' to publish the whole text. He actually wanted to make the views he had been preaching authoritative and expand his influence through this form. We are of the opinion that the matter has come to such a pass that Comrade Wang Ruoshui's mistake is serious."

This Report puts forward three ideas for dealing with the matter:

First, with regard to the humanitarian issue, as an academic matter, the discussion of different opinions may still be permitted in the future. Since Comrade Zhou Yang's article has been published in full, the articles holding different views at the academic discussion should also be published in full in newspapers one after another. At the same time, we are prepared to organize forces to study carefully and write articles to give a Marxist exposition of this issue.

Second, make the necessary adjustments to the editorial board of the People's Daily. Wang Ruoshui was transferred out of the People's Daily and assigned another job.

Thirdly, Comrade Zhou Yang, in spite of his position and after Comrade Qiaomu, on behalf of Comrade Yaobang, had put forward the idea that he should revise the report before it was published, did not give serious consideration to the possible impact of the publication of this report, and ate his own words without revising them. I hope that Comrade Zhou Yang, who is not serious and responsible in this matter of great importance, will realize it and express his correct attitude.

XU: From this report, it is time to make an organizational deal with the People's Daily.

Qin: On March 25, the Central Propaganda Department convened a meeting with us to meet Deng Liqun's report with comrades Zhou Yang, Qin Chuan, and Wang Ruoshui, to check the facts, listen to opinions, and then report to the Central Committee.

XU: It is said that there was a very heated argument at this meeting.

Qin: Yes. On this day, we went to a small conference room in the Central Propaganda Department in Zhongnanhai. The room was dimly lit and there were no lights on. We sat down in two rows at a table covered with a white tablecloth.

At first we were silent, reading Deng Liqun's report to the Central Committee. I read half of it and felt that it was not flavorful. Theoretical issues, how to fix people? Not moving is disciplinary action, and things and the process did not say clearly well, fortunately, the central government let us face to face to clarify the facts. After the Third Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee of the Party, so treated like Zhou Yang, the old comrades inside and outside the Party, both at home and abroad, and he is also a member of the Central Advisory Committee, the Central Propaganda Department adviser, is really overbearing!

Xu: How was Zhou Yang's reaction?

Qin: Zhou Yang looked faster. I noticed that he looked a little off, tried to stand up, and sat down again. Suddenly, he raised the report and threw it in front of Qiao Mu, saying in a loud voice: "You are doing this in an unorthodox way, unorthodox, this is unorthodox!"

Sitting opposite Qiao Mu shocked, very excited, said: "What did you say? That the center is unorthodox?"

Zhou Yang said angrily, "You're being immodest like this!"

The wide-eyed Qiao Mu stuck his head over to face Zhou Yang and rebuked in a stern voice, "You are against the Central Committee!"

Zhou Yang replied in response, "You don't wear a hat! I am opposing Hu Qiaomu, you specific member of the Central Committee."

Qiaomu lost his temper a little in anger: "You are against the Central Political Bureau!" The voice changed.

Zhou Yang, on the basis of reason, shouted, "I am only against you Hu Qiaomu, a specific member of the Politburo!" The atmosphere was suddenly tense.

I sat opposite Qiao Mu, saw this scene, rushed out to round off the situation: "You are all my old superiors, old leaders, or united to sit down and say it." Qiaomu probably also realized his own outburst, took over the words and said, "Yes, Zhou Yang and I worked together as early as in Shanghai."

Hu Qiaomu calmed down a little and asked, "I told you not to publish, why do you still want to publish?"

Zhou Yang said: "You did not say when you came to my home not to publish, you just said that the alienation part of the contact with reality, strengthened, revised and published. I couldn't revise it. Since the congress has spoken and the speech has been issued, why can't the newspapers publish it?"

Qiao Mu said to Zhou Yang, "I had agreed with you to revise it for publication in Philosophical Studies as an academic article. I am also talking to you on behalf of Yaobang. Zhou said, I did not hear the words on behalf of Yaobang. He also said, you this person words, today this way, tomorrow that way, I know what you talk about, I simply can not remember. Said the two men argued. Qiao Mu insisted that it was wrong to publish without listening to the greeting. Zhou Yang reiterated that he had

never heard of not being allowed to publish.

At this point, a comrade interjected, “We took notes at the time, and against the transcript, Comrade Qiao Mu said not to publish.”

Zhou Yang again defended himself, “What Qiao Mu said was that the issue of alienation should be linked to reality.”

He Jingzhi, who was Zhou Yang's student at Lu Yi, also took a stand, saying, “The Central Propaganda Department made the record, and I believe that the record is true, and I also believe that Comrade Zhou Yang will not tell lies.”

Xu: March 8, Hu Qiaomu talked at Zhou Yang's home, Wang Ruoshui, who was present, also made a record, the two records against it is not clear?

Qin: In fact, the record does not record, to this time has not matter. After the topic of records, the participants were silent for a period of time. At this time, Deng Liqun suddenly stood up, his voice was shockingly loud, in a tone of reprimand, said: “Comrade Zhou Yang, I have respected you for many years, you are an old comrade whom I respect--” This opening statement was followed by a number of head-splitting criticism. Finally, he snapped, “I hope that Comrade Zhou Yang will seriously study Comrade Deng Xiaoping's speech at the founding of the CAC and not interfere with the work of the Central Propaganda Department!”

XU: It seems that the atmosphere of the meeting was indeed tense. However, there was no major criticism of you.

Qin: Zhou Yang and I disagreed with the organizational treatment done to Wang Ruoshui, and we even argued for Wang Ruoshui a few times at the meeting. However, it was useless. The meeting's checking was not completed, so the meeting had to be adjourned. When we left the meeting, Qiao Mu patted my shoulder with a smile and said, “You have to live in peace.”

XU: That means that your responsibilities are clear and there are no more problems.

Qin: However, Zhou Yang and Wang Ruoshui were not satisfied with this treatment. After the meeting, Zhou Yang and Wang Ruoshui both wrote letters to the Central Committee. Zhou Yang wrote a letter to Hu, Deng and Yaobang. He forwarded a copy of the letter to me. The letter said, “The draft report of the Central Propaganda Department to the Secretariat of the Central Committee is somewhat at variance with the facts, and I would like to explain the situation to the Central Committee truthfully.” His note was attached to the letter:

In mid-February, the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences and the Central Party School wrote to me jointly, asking me to make a speech at the academic lecture on the centenary of Marx's death. At that time I was hospitalized because of a fall and fracture, and I happened to talk to Comrade Wang Yuanhua, who came to visit me, about this matter and hoped that he and Comrade Wang Ruoshui would help me draft it. After I was discharged from the hospital, I went to Tianjin to continue my recuperation because I still had hypothermia. After the Spring Festival in Wang Yuanhua, Wang Ruoshui, Guchong three comrades assisted to rush to write this speech, this time from the report will only be one day, the next day I was physically exhausted, asked the broadcaster to read such a speech. Such an important speech, although it is an academic discussion article, but in my capacity as a preacher, is not prudent enough. On the second day of the report, I immediately sent a clear sample of the speech to Hu Yaobang, Hu Qiaomu, Deng Liqun, He Jingzhi and other comrades for review.

On the morning of March 13th and 4th, Comrade Hu Qiaomu invited Xia Yan, Yu Wen, He Jingzhi, Wang Ruoshui and other comrades to talk at my home, mainly about my speech, Wang Ruoshui's article, and the opinions of the modernists in literature. My speech was mainly about the inadequacy of humanitarianism. Comrade Qiaomu said that he was a humanist, and thought that there was no strict distinction between socialist humanitarianism and bourgeois humanitarianism, which was more fully realized. In the text I referred to Marxist humanitarianism, which is not fundamentally different from the socialist humanitarianism favored by Comrade Qomu. At that time I also asked whether my speech should be changed before it was published, and he said that it could be changed and played out in more detail when it came out in a single volume. I did not hear Comrade Qiaomu say that he had come to talk to me officially on behalf of Comrade Yaobang, nor did Comrade Yaobang give such instructions when he returned the clear copy sent to him. Comrade Wang Ruoshui on humanitarianism article, mainly to criticize his "strange shadow" to improperly. To the modernists, I think it is necessary to criticize.

Because in my talk on that day, I linked the overcoming of "alienation" with institutional reform, thinking that this would not be empty talk and could be linked to the current implementation of the reform spirit of the central government. Perhaps it was inappropriate to make such a connection, so the second time he reminded me on the phone that "alienation" was an important and controversial issue and asked me to give it more thought, but he did not say anything different.

After Comrade Qiaomu's talk, Comrade Deng Liqun called to talk about the revision of my speech and asked me to make a summary of the talk. I said that the newspaper published has been a summary, I do not want to take off again, said very impatient, attitude is very nonchalant, which is not right.

I had no prior knowledge of the preview or the publication of the full text of this speech. As for this speech, although someone helped to draft it, the whole content and the structure of the article are my opinions, and if there are mistakes and irregularities, they are entirely my responsibility.

Xu: I had long heard that Zhou Yang had a note, but did not see it. In this note, Zhou Yang said that Hu Qiaomu also called him to talk about the issue of "alienation", do you know about this situation?

Qin: Hu Qiaomu called Zhou Yang to talk about "alienation", I'm not sure, but I know that Hu Qiaomu called Yu Wen the day after he came back from Zhou Yang's home and added that he talked about "alienation". I have the transcript of this call. Yu Wen's transcript is like this:

I forgot to talk about alienation. I think what Marx said about alienation in his early days is not necessarily the same as what he said in his later days. Whether it's the same or not, it's not right for a socialist society to apply it without distinction. The term is used to make a distinction. If because there is inhumanity in (socialist) society, it is mixed with inhumanity in capitalist society, it confuses the issue. One is a non-basic phenomenon, even illegal; the other is a basic phenomenon. I will write to them separately with this opinion. If the comrades concerned talk about this problem, they can add this opinion.

Xu: After Zhou Yang handed in his note, at what time was the report of the Central Propaganda Department approved?

Qin: As far as I know, Zhou Yang's report on the situation has not been followed up since it was submitted, and I have not heard of any instructions from the central leadership. This report from the Central Propaganda Department was also not followed up later.

XU: I saw that in the People's Daily in early April 1983 there was a news item reporting Zhou Yang's meeting with a visitor from the French newspaper L'Humanité. At that time, from what you have said above, Zhou Yang had already been criticized, so why did you make a point of reporting his meeting with the French newspaper Humanité?

QIN: You still look at the material in a more detailed way, and you have noticed this problem. It's good that you noticed. When the French newspaper Humanity visited, it was the People's Daily that was responsible for the reception, and it was mainly me who came out to receive it. It was I who purposely invited Zhou Yang to attend, I hosted it, he talked about it and sent the message.

Xu: I see, you are expressing your ideas in this way. Do you still remember the circumstances of the talks with the Humanist Newspaper?

Qin: The talks took place in Zhou Yang's apartment. Zhou Yang was very satisfied with the meeting. After the meeting, we went to the Sichuan Hotel to host a banquet for the French guests, and Zhou Yang was in high spirits.

Xu: Back to the report of the Central Propaganda Department. Later, the Central Propaganda Department on this issue still talked about it?

Qin: No. Only once, or Hu Qiaomu talked to us about this issue. It was at the beginning of August, when Hu Qiaomu asked me and Wang Ruoshui to talk about the work of the People's Daily and the rectification of the Party, and he criticized us again on this issue. He said that on the question of publishing Zhou Yang's article, Zhou Yang's attitude, though not quite resolute, was better than that of the People's Daily. The theoretical and political issues involved in the article were of such great importance that the People's Daily published it as a child's play, without any consideration of its repercussions. It is inconceivable that the organ of the Party Central Committee should disregard the interests of the Central Committee. At the present stage, if you leave the building of socialism (including the building of spiritual civilization) and the class struggle, and speak of humanitarianism in the abstract, and of human beings as the starting point of Marxism, you will join the anti-Party currents in society and become an important part of them. This is not appalling, it is a fact. He also said that although so many problems occurred with Zhou Yang's article, it was still necessary to take things slowly, slowly always, and there was no use in hurrying.

Xu: During this period, did you socialize with Zhou Yang much?

Qin: more, I often go to comrade Zhou Yang's home. Once, I went to Zhou Yang's home, only to hear his wife Su Ling Yang said: "small Hu (according to: refers to Hu Qiaomu) why? Should be (that is, Zhou Yang) in Shanghai for his restoration of party membership, then not like this ah! At night, he was always on the phone, urging him to publicly admit his mistakes in the newspaper, and he could not sleep well."

I was deeply disturbed by the publication of Zhou Yang's article, and I said, "I shouldn't have published this speech of yours!" He laughed and said, "It's not your fault. If you don't publish it, you will be criticized as usual. I am too familiar with it. What's repulsive is that calls keep coming in the evening, saying that the central leadership wants me to make public self-criticism."

XU: It seems that although the report was not approved, the treatment of Zhou Yang and Wang Ruoshui is still going ahead.

Qin: Yes. After the Second Plenary Session of the Twelfth Central Committee, at the end of October,

Hu Qiaomu, accompanied by Deng Liqun, came to the newspaper and announced the central government's decision: to accept Hu Jiwei's resignation; and to remove Wang Ruoshui from his position as deputy editor-in-chief. Soon after, Zhou Yang was forced to give a self-criticism in the form of an interview with a reporter, published nationwide.

Xu: Before and after, “remove spiritual pollution” movement has formed a climate in the country.

Qin: Originally, I thought Hu Qiaomu and Deng Liqun should stop there, but I didn't think that Hu Qiaomu and Deng Liqun weren't satisfied with Zhou Yang and the People's Daily, they forced Zhou Yang to make a public review on one side, and then organized a group of “Great Criticism” articles and forced the People's Daily to publish them. They wanted to expand and escalate the struggle and proposed to “remove spiritual pollution”.

Xu: At that time, I was still in college, and we all had very deep feelings. At that time, the school made a number of rules, for example, no bell-bottom pants, no perms and so on, which made us very puzzled. It was a good thing that the campaign didn't last very long.

QIN: Deng Liqun was the originator of the phrase “remove spiritual pollution”. As early as June 4, 1983, Deng Liqun first used this concept in a speech at the Central Party School to denounce articles on humanitarianism and alienation.

Xu: This is the first time I have known about this situation, as you say. Was Deng Liqun's speech published publicly?

Qin: I don't remember this, but anyway, at that time I had a deep impression of this, so you can look up the information. By October, under Deng Liqun's propaganda, Wang Zhen came out with his speech. A report drafted by the Research Office under the chairmanship of Deng Liqun on the “need to carry out a campaign to remove spiritual pollution” was read out by Wang Zhen, the head of the Central Party School, at the founding conference of the Institute of Scientific Socialism held in Nanjing. This was an open call to the whole country to carry out a “clean-up campaign”. It shook the whole country and attracted international attention. As a result, the newspapers and magazines, and articles by well-known personalities, created a stormy situation. Later, in the central leadership of the comrades of the opposition, did not cause a major movement.

Xu: Some articles said that it was a movement that was not called a movement. Lu Dingyi said in a letter to Zhou Yang's daughter that Zhou Yang “died of anger”, was it related to his review and the campaign to remove mental pollution?

Qin: I am afraid there is a reason for this. Zhou Yang after the “Cultural Revolution” from the Qin City Prison, has been for the Third Plenary Session of the rectification of the situation, since Comrade Xiaoping resumed the presidency of the ideological line of work as “China's modern history of the third ideological liberation movement”. However, after the publication of his report, some people said that he was against the four basic principles. He could not figure this out. Therefore, after he had made a review, his body became weaker and weaker day by day, and he was so exhausted that he fell ill a year later until he passed away in 1989. For a long time, whenever I went to the hospital ward and saw Zhou Yang lying there motionless, my heart was throbbing. How did he become like this? I can't forget what Zhou Yang said to me, “Qin Chuan, we can no longer repeat the ‘left’ ..... In Qin City Prison ..... I thought about many, many things .....”

Xu: The reminiscence article I read said that after the argument, Hu Qiaomu wrote a poem to Zhou Yang, which included the words, “The sun will shine on the earth after the rain, even more beautiful:

embracing a pair of warriors”. However, such beauty does not seem to have appeared so far. Qiaomu later admitted that he had “over-politicized” the controversy, but did he also feel that something was wrong?

Qin: Qiao Mu wrote a poem to Zhou Yang, which I know and have read. But I'm not sure how he felt about the controversy. As far as I was concerned, it was very “politicized”, and the treatment of Zhou Yang and Wang Ruoshui was excessive. But at the time, we didn't know how we could help, so we could only visit Zhou Yang's house and chat with him.

Xu: Now that Zhou Yang and Qiao Mu have both passed away, perhaps people can discuss this issue more calmly.

Qin: This was originally an academic issue, and it's not good to talk about it because of politicization. I think you are right, it is now open for discussion.

XU: Thank you for your talk, it has helped me a lot.