

發表人：黃雪蕾



黃雪蕾，英國愛丁堡大學東亞系副教授。德國海德堡大學博士，曾在台灣中央研究院、法國南特高等研究院和維也納國際文化研究中心從事博士後和研究員工作。研究方向為中國早期電影、印刷與大眾媒體、及近現代中國感官文化史。著作包括 *Shanghai Filmmaking: Crossing Borders, Connecting to the Globe, 1922-1938* (2014)，以及期刊論文發表於 *Modern Chinese Literature and Culture*, *Twentieth-Century China*, *Modern Asian Studies* 等。目前正撰寫一本有關氣味文化社會史的專書（暫題為 *The Cesspool and the Rose Garden: The Social Life of Smell in Modern China, 1840s-1960s*）。

更多資訊請掃描以下條碼



感官隱喻、感覺結構與集體記憶：以毛時代的政治語言為例

黃雪蕾

英國愛丁堡大學亞洲學系副教授

摘要

語言、修辭與話語在中國共產主義革命中扮演了至關重要的角色。大陸毛澤東時代的革命語言工程 (revolutionary linguistic engineering) 發展出了一系列的技巧和策略，其共同的根據是「政治權利的感情根基」 (the emotional roots of political power)。本文研究的案例是一個長期被遺忘的視角：毛時代政治話語中的感官面向。具體而言，本文試圖探討涉及香與臭的修辭策略如何連結情感，在身體感官層面增進「群眾」之間的紐帶：訴諸感官經驗的宣傳如何內化政治教義？香與臭的修辭隱喻如何增進崇拜與景仰，激化仇恨與憤怒？本文採納雷蒙威廉斯 (Raymond Williams) 的關鍵詞研究方法，將具體分析如下與氣味相關的政治語彙：「政治嗅覺」、與排泄物相關的髒話 (如屁、屎、糞)、「鬥臭／批臭」、「香風」、以及「香花／毒草」，並由此進一步分析革命文化中的神經質、粗俗化、無情化、愛恨兩極化等情感面向，及其在集體記憶中的角色。

Language, rhetoric and discourse played a pivotal role in the Chinese Communist revolution. A wide range of techniques and strategies of revolutionary linguistic engineering were developed during the Mao era, and a common foundation of such techniques was what may be called “the emotional roots of political power.” This paper provides a case study of the largely overlooked sensory dimension of political language and discourse in Mao China. It will demonstrate the ways in which rhetoric references to stench and fragrance engaged with emotions, forging the bond between members of the discourse community of Communist China at the biological/corporal level. How was sensory perception employed to internalise political doctrines? How did the imageries of the fragrant and the foul serve to stimulate admiration and worship, and to instigate agitation and hatred? Through an exploration of these questions, this chapter aims to shed some light on the Mao-era political rhetoric in the form of olfactory allegories on the one hand; on the other hand, it seeks to paint a further complicated picture of the social life of smell in modern China. I argue that the sense of smell goes far beyond the realm of sensation and

reaches a more sophisticated terrain of human life through language and rhetoric.

Language is political. Reflecting on the tumultuous modern history of the world, such towering thinkers as Raymond Williams, Hannah Arendt, and George Orwell have all devoted their critical interrogation to the intricate and intriguing nexus between politics and language. Language, rhetoric and discourse also played a pivotal role in the Chinese Communist revolution. As David Apter and Tony Saich suggest, “perhaps no other major revolution relied more heavily on revolutionary discourse than the Chinese” (Apter and Saich, *Revolutionary Discourse in Mao's Republic*, x). China was the laboratory, as Ji Fengyuan contends, in which Mao conducted “the biggest experiment in linguistic engineering in world history, and one of the most rigorously controlled” (Ji, *Linguistic Engineering*, 2-3). This subject has sparked a sustained academic interest, and scholars have explored such critical concepts as “formalized language as a form of power,” “revolutionary discourse in Mao’s Republic,” “linguistic engineering,” “rhetoric of the Chinese Cultural Revolution,” “revolutionary rudeness,” and “the language of the Chinese revolution.” All the studies seem to share the drive, to quote Ban Wang, “to rethink history through sedimented layers of meaning and associations in words and discourse.” (Wang, *Language of Chinese Revolution*, 8). At the same time, all the studies point to the power of words, symbols, metaphors, and rituals in forging and maintaining the so-called “discourse community” that took form initially in Yan’an and then in mainland China in general after 1949.

Adopting the keywords approach initiated by Raymond Williams, this paper studies the following smell-related keywords and phrases: “the political sense of smell” (政治嗅覺), a range of scatological utterances (fart 屁, shit 屎, muck 糞), “to struggle against/condemn somebody until s/he stinks” (鬥臭, 批臭), “fragrant breeze” (香風), and “fragrant blossoms/poisonous weeds” (香花/毒草). In doing so, I explore the themes of revolutionary neurosis, rudeness, ruthlessness, the polarization of love and hatred as the necessary ingredients of revolutionary emotions and discourses.

“The Political Sense of Smell” 政治嗅覺：On Revolutionary Neurosis

Mao must have a keen sense of smell. In a famous speech delivered during the Yan’an Rectification Campaign in 1942, he called for opposing

“subjectivism, sectarianism and stereotyped Party writing/eight-legged essay” (主觀主義，宗派主義，黨八股) by developing “a good nose” (提高嗅覺), “tak(ing) a sniff at everything and distinguish(ing) the good from the bad.” This metaphorical use of the sense of smell became one of the meta-discourses related to smell in Mao-era politics. While this usage stresses political judgment built upon the basic function of the nose to discriminate between the good and the rotten, another smell-related meta-discourse is linked more to the nose’s instinctive role of alertness to danger and enemies. The enemy here Mao called upon the Chinese people to alert to, using their noses, was the so-called Hu Feng Clique. Mao said that the enemy had a “pretty good counter-revolutionary nose,” and therefore he urged, “We must study and heighten our class vigilance and make our political sense of smell keener (政治嗅覺必須放靈些).” Henceforth, the term of “the political sense of smell” developed a rich life in numerous political dramas in revolutionary China. Alongside the judging nose and the alerting nose, Mao also talked about what may be called the feeling nose. At a party conference in 1955, Mao urged the Communist cadres who tended to bury themselves in office work to go to the masses because otherwise, as Mao said, “you won’t be able to sense (smell) the political climate, your nose will become insensitive and you will catch cold politically. Once your nose is stopped up, you can’t tell what the climate is at a given time” (这样，就嗅不到政治气候，鼻子很迟钝，害政治感冒。鼻子塞了，什么时候有什么气候，闻不到。) In other words, it is an important skill to sense a problem “when it is in the bud,” and in this sense, the feeling nose needs to be developed.

Interestingly, Mao’s smell metaphors correspond with the main cognitive functions of olfaction based on modern science, and of course the judging nose, the alerting nose and the feeling nose overlap in their terrains of ruling. In his formal or informal speeches/writings, Mao also demonstrated his own use of smelling and instructed his comrades to apply the methodology of smelling in political life. For example, in his own denunciation of Hu Feng, he posed questions about some of Hu’s letters to his friend Shu Wu by referring to his own “political sense of smell”: “Can we smell out a tiny tinge of revolutionary air there? Don’t the letters smell exactly the same as such Nationalist Party’s counter-revolutionary journals as Social News and News World?” On 8 March 1957, in the middle of the Hundred Flowers Campaign, Mao attended a meeting for cultural workers. When Kang Sheng mentioned that some people had suspicion over the policy of “Let a hundred flowers bloom, let a hundred schools of thought contend,” Mao responded: “That’s why I’ve sniffed out this

smell in the meeting (所以我在会上嗅出这股味道).” This seemingly casual response reflects Mao’s characteristic trait of political sensibility, if not neurosis, by means of using his “feeling nose” to assess the political climate. He instructed his cadres to develop the same skill. He said to party secretaries at the provincial level in 1957: “A fart from above is not necessarily fragrant. There’s contradiction here too. Some are fragrant and some are foul (including those from Beijing). You must take a good sniff.”

In sum, Mao’s smell metaphors build on the biological functions of the sense of smell. Sharpening “the political sense of smell” meant enhancing the level of sensibility, vigilance, and judgement over matters of political importance. The consequence, I would suggest, would be an increasingly sensitive revolutionary nervous system, a culture of political paranoia, or neurosis, when things were unfolding to extremes. A keen political nose got trained through education and punishment during a succession of political campaigns and “incidents” in the Mao era. Repetitive use of linguistic metaphors played a central role in the process.

Muck 糞, Shit 屎, Fart 屁: On Revolutionary Rudeness

Every major speech of Mao’s represents, as David Apter and Tony Saich aptly point out, “a strategy of intimacy.” His intuitive use of barnyard humour, classical allusion, and earthy remarks made his words “performatives,” exerting a strong emotional power of persuasion to his audience. Scatological metaphors are part of this strategy of intimacy, being intimate in both sensory/olfactory and linguistic terms. Being intrinsic to bodily functions of all living beings, excreta is involved in “dirty language” in most cultures and invariably associated with the language of the “lower” classes. The prevalence of scatological utterances in Maospeak makes rhetorical and political sense. The far-reaching consequence, however, was the widespread phenomena of “revolutionary rudeness” in Mao-era language. This section starts with an analysis of terminologies regarding fen, shi, and pi in Maospeak, and then looks at the use of them in different genres of political texts.

As early as August 1933 in Jiangxi, Mao gave a speech on mobilising the masses to undertake economic construction for the resistance against Chiang Kaishek’s onslaughts. One of the methods of mobilisation involves avoiding bureaucratic leadership. “The ugly evil of bureaucracy, which no comrade likes,” as Mao said, “must be thrown into the cesspit (糞缸).” The same

metaphor was employed to accuse American ambassador Patrick Hurley's policy of supporting the Nationalist government in July 1945. In his comment written for the Xinhua News Agency, he warned that if the Hurley policy continued, the U.S. government would get trapped deeply in "the deep stinking cesspool" (又臭又深的糞坑) of the reactionary Chinese government. Dog poop (狗屎) is another scatological metaphor Mao liked to use to depreciate his enemies. When talking about Zhang Guotao 张国焘, his long-term rival for power within the Party, he compared him and all so-called die-hards (頑固分子) to "dog poop that is beneath contempt by all human beings" (不齒于人类的狗屎堆). Fart (屁, 放屁) is also seen in a good number in Maospeak to express sarcasm and scorn. For example, with regard to criticisms from members of other political parties (so-called 民主人士, such as Liang Shuming 梁漱溟 in this example), Mao said: "if they want to fart, let them. That will be to our advantage, for everybody can judge whether the smell is good or foul, and through discussion the majority can be won over and these types isolated." With hindsight, this caustic comment made in January 1957 seemed to have foreshadowed the inevitable backlash that was evolving into the Anti-Rightist Campaign a few months later, as well as suggested Mao's tactic of allowing people the "freedom" to speak (to "fart"), and then punishing them for what they had spoken. Criticisms were encouraged under the slogan "Let a hundred flowers bloom," in reality, however, they were probably taken as "fart." The fragrant and the foul became an ironic metaphor of Maoist dialectic.

Examples of such "stinky" dirty language are numerous in Maospeak. Along with the development of Mao's personality cult, revolutionary rudeness became a revolutionary vogue. Scatological metaphors can be found in various "genres" of political texts in the Mao era, including official speeches, media articles, wall posters, different kinds of Red Guards writings, and confession materials. Senior officials spoke after the fashion of Maospeak or directly copied Mao's words. Official media also contributed to the making of the fashion of revolutionary rudeness. The level of vulgarity of media language escalated radically during the Cultural Revolution, and Mao's own dirty words were repeatedly quoted. Following the lead of Chairman Mao, revolutionary rebels and the masses, intellectuals who were subject to "thought reform" through manual labour felt the urge to use stinking terms, too, in order to demonstrate their closeness with the masses.

鬥臭／批臭：On Revolutionary Ruthlessness

Scatological imageries discussed above invariably evoke stench/stink. Mao-era political discourse was also not short of more direct references to stink/chou, either as adjective or noun in a compound word. The most noteworthy terms may be douchou and pichou, two neologisms that carry the strongest Mao-era imprint and embody the spirit of “revolutionary ruthlessness.” As is widely known, “pidou 批鬥” (to struggle) is a distinctive political term that denotes the act of publicly denouncing “class enemies” in Mao China. So-called “struggle sessions” (pidou hui) became an indispensable part of the various political movements in the Mao era, culminating during the first few years of the Cultural Revolution in a way that the term almost became a byword of the political spectacles associated with the period in collective memories. A wide range of rhetorical and practical techniques were designed to humiliate class enemies in an as ruthless as possible manner. The “ingenious” invention of the terms pichou and douchou, which may be loosely translated as “to condemn/struggle against (somebody) till (this person) stinks,” embraced the same line of revolutionary ruthlessness, resorting to the power of sensory perception of stench. It is difficult to pin down the exact etymology of the two terms. They might have derived from the term gaochou 搞臭, a colloquial term that means “to make somebody stinking,” i.e. “to ruin someone’s reputation.”

Gaochou appeared only sporadically in political texts in the early 1950s. The frequency of the use of the term in People’s Daily increased dramatically from 1957 to 1959 during the Anti-Rightist Campaign, with 70 hits in the database among 306, while before 1957 there are only 2 and from 1960 to 1965 there are 10. Pichou and douchou were a more radical and political development from gaochou. Pichou and douchou were not widely used before the Cultural Revolution. On one occasion in January 1957, Mao said informally that the best way to treat such dissident intellectuals as Xiao Jun and Ding Ling was not to kill them, to put them into jail, or to control them; rather it was best to find out their shortcomings and wrongdoings and then “to criticise them until they stink” (pichou) among the masses. Pichou appeared in a more formal manner in an editorial of Jiefangjun bao in the peak of the Anti-Rightist Campaign in August 1957. “In order to achieve the ultimate victory in our struggle against the Rightists,” the editorial goes, “we must thoroughly demolish the bourgeois rightist thoughts and arguments within the PLA and criticise them until they stink.” Douchou seemed to be an accepted terminology in internal official documents during the Anti-Rightist Campaign. It appeared in a series of briefings about the campaign compiled by the CCP’s Central Committee.

The explosive use of the two terms in media started in the beginning of the Cultural Revolution. Pichou appears 972 times in People's Daily from 1966 to 1969 (out of 1350 in total 1946-2012), and douchou appears 568 times during the same period (out of 586). The first instance of using douchou in People's Daily during the period is an article to condemn Wu Han on 19 April 1966, a key incident that triggered the launch of the Cultural Revolution. The author wrote: "We must struggle against all anti-Party, anti-people, and anti-socialist monsters and demons (niu gui she shen) until they collapse and stink (doukua, douchou)." Pichou first appears in an article in early June regarding official instructions on conducting propaganda and education work to promote the Cultural Revolution. One instruction reads: "Anyone who violates or objects to Mao Zedong Thought, regardless of his rank or status as an 'expert,' must be uncovered, exposed under the sunlight, repudiated, and criticised until this person stinks." Browsing the bulk of articles containing the two terms, one can find that the two terms are used interchangeably, and they mainly appear in certain patterns in a highly repetitive way. The linguistic bombardment of stench illustrates revolutionary ruthlessness as a key component of Mao-era political culture.

Fragrant Breeze 香风 and Fragrant Blossom 香花 : On Revolutionary Dialectic

Fragrance metaphors are not as many as stench metaphors in the repository of Mao-era political language. The flowery texts and lyrics devoted to honouring Chairman Mao are replete with symbols associated with the sun—the colour of red, brightness and warmth, but metaphors of aroma rarely appear. It is contradictory to ancient Chinese moral thinking that normally associates aroma with morality and good governance. The reason might be the easy connection between aroma, perfume and bourgeois culture. "Fragrant breeze" (xiangfeng) and "fragrant blossom" (xianghua) are two exceptions, both being characteristic Mao-era political terminologies. While "fragrant breeze" was associated with decadence of bourgeois lifestyle and thus a target of curse, "fragrant blossom" appeared together with "poisonous weed" as a pair, standing as the positive pole of value in opposition to the harmful thought, artwork or class foes that are compared to "poisonous weed." The conflicting values attached to fragrance in the two terms illustrates, once again, the inner contradiction of revolutionary discourse that complicates the cultural meanings of smell in Chinese history.

“Fragrant breeze” acquired its symbolic political meaning due to a highly popular stage play (and a film shortly afterwards) called “Sentinels under the Neon Lights” (霓虹灯下的哨兵), first performed in 1962. It was part of the propaganda efforts associated with the political campaign for Emulating the Good Eighth Company of Nanjing Road (向南京路上好八连学习), whose name alludes to an army unit that participated in Shanghai’s liberation. In line with the political campaign, Sentinels tells a story of the soldiers who are entrusted with guarding Nanjing Road after Shanghai’s liberation, centring on “their struggle against counterrevolutionary activities and other more subtly subversive elements.” Along with the metaphors of the “big dying vat” (da rangang) and “sugar-coated bullets” (tangyi paodan), “fragrant breeze” became another key metaphor in this play to denote the city’s depravity, vice and allure. It is a powerful trope grounded on the historical basis of perfume culture prior to 1949, as well as on the biological and cultural dimensions of perfume’s alluring power. In other words, “fragrant breeze” encapsulates, in an olfactory imagery, the subversive forces of Western capitalism, consumerism, and hedonism, i.e. the enemies of revolution. Only by withstanding the allures of “fragrant breeze” can one’s revolutionary resolution be fully demonstrated and developed.

The political discourse revolving around “fragrant breeze” was embedded in dialogues, stage design, film techniques, and a discursive linguistic trajectory of the term in press. Dialogues related to the term include: “The die-hard capitalists in Nanjing Road are indeed detestable, but even more annoying is the perfume that assails the nostrils.” “The fragrant breeze has blown into our bone.” The “fragrant breeze” was also rendered visually by stage design. The set designer created in the second act of the play “a peaceful atmosphere of Nanjing Road” where “revolutionary songs, jazz, glittering neon lights, and fragrant breeze that caresses your face” co-existed. But the real purpose, according to the designer, was to put in sharp contrast “the complexity of class struggle” – the spirits of the imperialists still haunted, attempting to use the poisonous “fragrant breeze” to sabotage our revolutionary determination. At the same time, the term of “fragrant breeze” also developed its own trajectory in media used in a variety of political contexts.

While “fragrant breeze” was cautiously placed in quotation marks in order to restrict its detrimental power, the “fragrant blossom” was on the positive pole of the Maoist value system. Mao introduced the concept together with “poisonous weeds” as a pair of metaphors in the context of the Hundred Flowers

Campaign. It probably first appeared officially in a speech by Mao at a party conference in January 1957. In order to elucidate the policy of the Campaign, Mao said: “Some comrades hold that only fragrant flowers should be allowed to blossom and that poisonous weeds should not be allowed to grow. This approach shows little understanding of the policy of letting a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend.” He continued to explain that only by allowing poisonous weeds to grow can one “wage struggles” against them. Moreover, poisonous weeds can be useful because “when ploughed under they can be turned into manure.” Then he concluded that just like the fact that peasants must weed their fields year in year out, intellectuals must weed out poisonous thoughts in the ideological field and the struggle will last long. In short, as he put it concisely, “fragrant flowers stand in contrast to poisonous weeds and develop in struggle with them.” This argument typically reflects the characteristic dialectic thought of Mao. This pair of metaphors appeared later in a more well-known and significant speech, “On the Correct Handling of Contradictions among the People” (关于正确处理人民内部矛盾的问题, February 1957), a speech that harbingered the imminent Anti-Rightist Campaign. In this speech, Mao gave more emphasis on how to define “fragrant flowers” and “poisonous weeds.” It is clear that now Mao would not allow any “liberal” discussion, letting a hundred flowers blossom; rather, he would wield his authority on defining what is fragrant and what is foul/poisonous by his own standards. Following Mao’s speeches, the terms xianghua and ducao, as other terms discussed above, developed their own rich lives in Mao-era political discourse and played key roles in the Anti-Rightist Campaign and the Cultural Revolution.

關鍵字：感官史、記憶、政治語言

發表人之會議資料皆為初稿，如需引用須徵得本人同意。

Presenters’ materials are working drafts;
to cite, please ask for their permissions.