

The Aesthetic Activity in Modernist Fiction

Can Xue (Deng Xiaohua), whose pseudonym in Chinese means both the dirty snow that refuses to melt and the purest snow at the top of a high mountain, was born in 1953 in Changsha City, Hunan Province, in South China. She lived in Changsha until 2001, when she and her husband moved to Beijing. In 1957, her father, an editorial director at the *New Hunan Daily News*, was condemned as an Ultra-Rightist and was sent to reform through labor, and her mother, who worked at the same newspaper, was sent to the countryside for labor as well. Because of the family catastrophe during the Cultural Revolution, Can Xue lost her chance for further education and only graduated from elementary school. Largely self-taught, she loved literature so much that she read fiction and poetry whenever she could. In her younger days, she liked classical Western literature and Russian literature the best, and they remain her favorites today. Can Xue has studied reading and writing in English for years, and she has read extensively English texts of literature.

Can Xue, who describes her works as "soul literature" or "life literature," is the author of numerous short-story collections and four novels. Five of her works have been published in English, including *Dialogues in Paradise* (Northwestern University Press, 1989), *Old Floating Cloud: Two Novellas* (Northwestern University Press, 1991), *The Embroidered Shoes* (Henry Holt, 1997), *Blue Light in the Sky and Other Stories* (New Directions, 2006), and *Five Spice Street* (Yale University Press, 2009). A novel and a commentary book on Kafka are forthcoming from Yale University Press. She has also published books of commentary on Borges, Shakespeare, Dante, Goethe, Italo Calvino, and Bruno Schulz. She claims that all of her works are from the experiments in which she takes herself as the subject. Recently she completed a book of dialogues about Kant with her brother, the philosopher Deng Xiaomang, where in the Foreword she further explicates her unique aesthetic philosophy.

INTERVIEWER

You mentioned in the panel at the 92nd Street Y in April 2009 about your family's "extreme spirituality," as you called it, and its effect on you. In the interview with *Chinese Literature Today* (Summer 2010), you said in your childhood there was an "extreme attention" in your family to their spirituality. What do you mean by this? How did this "extreme spirituality" manifest? I think for many Westerners, this would be considered a negative influence. Yet you aren't saying this, are you?

CAN XUE

No. You are right. Actually, I know that the expression needs some explanation that is necessary not only for Westerners, but also for Chinese. The so-called “spirituality” in the fifties [in China] was actually a kind of cheating, an abusing of a certain dogma. And that’s not real spirituality at all. But today we should realize the influence dialectically. In my view, excluding enjoyment of material things made the children in our family concentrate more on spiritual things. And although the fifties were depressing and not good for developing a free character, it did bring a Western way of seeing the world (Marxism). Yes, it brought a logical way to realize things, a way that was totally lacking among us Easterners. (And it still is today.)

My father was among a few intellectuals who had some independent thinking. I think that some children in our family have, to a great degree, developed his way of realizing the world and turned it toward another direction. So it’s we children who have found a way to survive by our spirit, not our father. Father had failed long ago. But we are from Father. Today I still remember clearly what happened after Father was identified as an “Ultra-Rightist” during the Cultural Revolution. He sat at the desk, reading Karl Marx’s books, taking notes every day. He was like that for almost all of his life—calm, cool-headed, idealistic. Very few people in China could be like him. I would like to call the process of our inheriting Father’s way as “turning a dogma into real spirituality.”

Maybe that’s also why nowadays the best writers in China were born in the fifties and the sixties. They experienced the idealism. Then they had some degree of realization about the idealism. That generation of writers pays more attention to spiritual things than younger writers.

INTERVIEWER

I know that in reviews and commentaries about your work, it is often cited as being in opposition to the social realism then current in Chinese literature, but your opposition to realism as an aesthetic seems to run deeper than just a reaction to a literary movement. It seems rooted in your belief in the deep nature of human beings. In other words, it’s not a literary game. If so, how does your aesthetic reflect these beliefs?

CAN XUE

You are right. I never thought that my fiction writing should be in opposition to either social realism or classical realism. That's impossible when you are writing fiction. But today, from my perspective, I think pure classical realism could not meet the development of literature anymore. We artists have to explore the deep nature of human beings. Otherwise, we will come to a dead end.

Maybe I'm a person who has an extraordinary sensitivity to spiritual things because I chose modernism as soon as I began pursuing my course. Before that, I had read a lot of classical realism and loved the books very much. I remember that was in the eighties. Then I read *The Divine Comedy*, Kafka, and *Faust* by Goethe. Suddenly, a brand-new world loomed in my mind. It engulfed me immediately. How exciting, how extremely enjoyable it was! I read and reread those books. Sometimes I was almost happy to the degree of craziness! I thought that I would like to write things like these masters. But I was still too weak to write like them. So I thought maybe I could try to write fiction like the writers in our country—Xiao Hong, Lu Xun (I still think these two are very good today). My first work, *Yellow Mud Street*, was the result of these efforts. I tried several times. At first, the manuscript was very near classical realism. I changed, and changed, and the text was moved further and further from realism. I was pursuing my natural course because I wrote from my heart, and I faintly sensed what sort of writing could satisfy my spiritual needs. Even today, I still consider *Yellow Mud Street* as one of my best works. One of the novel's character's name means "light" (Wang Ziguang). And the character never had a body. But he was the core of the whole story. In my mind he was really the light of my ideal. He came to my writing when I got halfway through the journey. And it was he who illuminated my writing. So when I finished the novella, I matured into a writer who had a special style early on.

I think that my literature is not a literary game. I would like to say that it belongs to the universal tendency in our spiritual development. And my aesthetic activities reflect that very tendency. This is my belief. And I was very happy when more and more of my readers around the world realized this.

INTERVIEWER

I want to ask about desire and its place in your work. It's certainly a recurrent theme. I'm thinking of *Five Spice Street* (published in 2009 by Yale University Press), your most recent book in English (though it was written in the eighties) where desire—

often hilariously—is one of the major topics of conversation on the street. Madam X seems to be the repository for all Five Spice Street’s desires and imagination. In previous comments you’ve said “realize your desire; protect it and let it exert rationally.” This statement seems very much like an artistic or spiritual credo. What is the source of this desire in your mind? What does it need protecting from?

CAN XUE

This question is a very complex question. I will try my best to answer it.

Usually if you say: “exert your desire rationally,” people will think this means pressing your desire down somewhat, or confining it within the limits of conventional morality. But I don’t mean that. What I mean is that one can exert one’s desire in an artistic way. And there is a system that works in aesthetic activities. Within the system one can exert one’s desire to the maximum. The system is the structure of humanity. There are two opposites in this contradictory structure. One is our original force, or emotion; another is our capability for control (or rationality, or Logos). When one is creating a work, one’s Logos asks one to exert one’s desire (or emotion, or original force) to the maximum. That means one has to discern—how can I do this? What is the sustainable way of an emotional development? Is it possible to exert one’s desire to the maximum in this way? Logos watches your exerting. But Logos doesn’t take part in the emotional activities. He just squeezes one’s original force, oppresses it, gives his instructions to it, such as “Go ahead!” “This way!” “No relief is permitted here!” “More energy!” and so on. So under the Logos monitor (he is a part of yourself, too), one can’t turn down a wrong path, and one’s life will be full of vitality. What is one’s freedom? I think if you enter the artistic system, exerting your desire to the maximum within the system, you will experience freedom.

Times have changed. As a modern person, you can’t exert your desire like an animal anymore. And that kind of desire is not a human’s desire, either. A human’s desire is forever under a kind of monitor. This kind of monitor (I call it Logos) will not decrease one’s emotional force. On the contrary, its function is to promote desire or emotional force, and to liberate one’s life force. Within this system you have to try your best to find a way that is the best way to exert your desire—a sustainable way, a way that can liberate yourself thoroughly. Of course in the course of exerting, you have to struggle with yourself—I mean you have to let your life force struggle with your Logos. Life force breaks through the controlling (Logos) again and again. She even occupies the castle. But at long last she finds that the castle is Logos’ castle. But she has made it.

I think a really modern person is one who has an artistic system in his or her emotional life. Here I would like to talk a little bit about Logos' crafty way. When Logos gives instructions in your heart, as I mentioned above, you have to use your life force to wrestle with those instructions. Only then will you understand what the instructions really mean. Things usually happen like this—when Logos says: "This way!" it means not this way, but that way. And that way is the very way of Logos. It's also the way you really want to go because you are struggling with the instruction. Some principal words that arise when working within the system are "struggling," "revolting," "opening a new path," "breaking down barriers," and so forth. But this sort of control by Logos that pushes one to exert one's desire to a maximum within this system, if one practices it often, will lead one toward virtue.

So from the beginning of my writing career until now, my works are full of desires. Every time I sit at my desk (or my dining table in earlier times), I make my mind exert my desire to the maximum. The most important thing is that all my works are descriptions of the same desire. They describe what form the desire has; how many layers it divides into; in what way it struggles with Logos; how it transforms from one form to another; how it hides in the deepest layer in the work; and so on. Actually, when I describe my desire, I am describing my spiritual world too—because the desire has already metamorphosed into spiritual things. This is Logos' miracle. Desire is the core for my creating. It is also the dark mother of my imagination. I want to say that I will sing the praise songs of desire of human beings to the end.

I'm happy that you have seen this in my early novel *Five Spice Street*. I think that the whole story is a discussion about how sexual desires could exert in societies freely. And also it is a description of human beings' pain and struggling when they can't exert it freely. Although everybody seems to have failed in the story, I think that in a certain sense they have made it—in their discussions about sex; in their vulgar pursuing; and in their warm imaginations about Madam X. Yes, you are right. She is the repository for all of *Five Spice Street's* desires—that is because she is an ideal symbol, not a real person. If she wanted to change into a person, she would have had to become the widow (another character in the novel who finds her desires coming to the surface and expressing themselves in ways that disrupt *Five Spice Street* as well).

I think the source of the desire has to be from one's worldly life. As you have seen, my works are full of the breadth of worldly things. Yes, I love my worldly life so much—common people, common loving, and people's innumerable schemes and

intrigues. I believe that spiritual things depend on one's desire for their growth. If one has no interest in worldly things anymore, one's spiritual world will become smaller and smaller, and disappear in the end. Protecting one's desire means one should not give it up lightly. And one should be used to analyzing one's own emotion often. Of course, reading literature is one of the best ways to help.

INTERVIEWER

Your comment about Madam X's role in *Five Spice Street* brings up a question. In your work, readers will get frustrated if they read and try to apply a common understanding about character development that we're taught when we analyze works of fiction, won't they? Often the main "character" seems to be a whole situation that's trying to transform through the story's characters. Is this an accurate description?

CAN XUE

Yes, you are right. My fiction is not "common." I mean it belongs to the category of modernism (including some works that have the characteristic of modernist literature). Maybe what you are referring to is more realistic fiction, in which people are more comfortable talking about character development and such things. When reading modernist literature, one has to change one's orientation of both thinking and sense perception. And this kind of reading needs much more initiative. And one must use the system I mentioned above. I think that lazy readers and readers who have not got enough training on modernism had better not try these kinds of works immediately.

In some of my works (maybe not all of them; I think my fiction has a variety of forms), the main character does seem to be the highest being. This character watches all the others' performances from his or her or its superior position. And the character (she, him, or it) also understands the meaning of all the others' activities. A reader must learn to discern the layers of the spirit in the work first. Then maybe the reader can recognize the highest or deepest character. Otherwise, the reader will remain on the surface of the story no matter how hard he or she has tried.

I think my commentaries published in China and Japan have given readers an orientation about how to read modernist literature. And when I analyzed the classical writers like Dante, Goethe, Shakespeare, Kafka, Borges, and so on, I was also analyzing myself at the same time. My works have the same structure as their

works. Another important point to understand is for this kind of writer the same subjects appear in their works again and again. Their works are often about their writing activities themselves. (I think that's because a writer's writing is his or her spiritual activity.) So things become like this for the writers: They are writing about their writing activities. How wonderful the scenes are! And how moving!

INTERVIEWER

I think about your story "Blue Light in the Sky," the title story to the collection published by New Directions in 2006. On one level, it's an initiation story of the young girl, Sumei, who cuts her foot on sharp glass from bottles thrown in the yard by her father. And you can read the story purely as an initiation story, but on closer examination, the story becomes something much larger. The mundane, external "facts" of the story are transformed into an internal, spiritual, archetypal drama controlled by the "highest being," in this case the father. Everything "external" in the story is spiritually transformed. This creative act seems to be at the heart of Can Xue.

CAN XUE

Yes, I agree with you. The story is an initiation story. And it is a pure spiritual initiation story.

Sumei is the first layer in an artist's spiritual world. She has very strong desires and wants to discern the world around her. As you know, if one wants to realize the world—or realize oneself, this is the same thing in artistic activities—one must do it through mirrors. Sumei's mirror is her sister, Sulin, in the story. So although full of pain and perplexed throughout the whole story, Sumei has to learn from her elder sister. The sister belongs to the second layer of the spiritual world. And she is much more experienced and has a deeper insight into things than Sumei. She guides Sumei and lets her experience the pain and horror of the spiritual initiation in this journey. As usual, a writer (here, Sumei) can't recognize his or her self at the beginning of an aesthetic activity. So Sumei can't recognize Sulin either. And she disagrees with her sister in almost everything. But although Sumei doesn't recognize Sulin (as herself, her mirror), she always listens to her from her natural instincts. And loves her. And as for the mirror, Sulin, her objective is to impel Sumei to reach maturity soon. So she must press her, drive her into a corner, and bring humiliation and horror upon her. Only by these tricks can she attain her goal. Sumei benefits from her sister in this sort of relationship. And she becomes more and more audacious. In the end, even though the people in the village (including her father and sister) hint that she will die soon from her wound, "she still felt that perverse desire: she had to walk to

the other end of the village." She knew that if she walked to the other end of the village, she would live forever!

It seems this is an initiation story, and also a story about a writer's writing, I think. I have made this statement in other places: "My writing is a neoclassicism." This story is a typical neoclassical story.

INTERVIEWER

I'm interested in the mirror that you seem to be presenting your reader, particularly in light of your comment above about the need for a mirror for a person to realize the world, or him or herself. The system that you are describing is simultaneously the subject, the meaning, of your work as well as your method of creating it. That's one mirror, perhaps the creative artist's mirror at the heart of Can Xue's work. But in this mirror is also simultaneously the place where the reader is forced to make meaning. Just as Can Xue's characters are forced to confront the mirror by finding themselves in untenable situations that obscure their own higher logic until they wrestle with it, so too are readers forced into untenable situations by having their sense of logic, of reality, pulled out from underneath them for a higher purpose. Has Can Xue—and now I am separating you from the creator of the work in a sense—forced you into untenable situations whereby you had to realize the world, or yourself? Is this an ever-present process for you?

CAN XUE

Yes. The mirrors are very interesting in the works of modernist literature. The characters not only see themselves in the mirrors, they also see how they look at themselves—one sees one's seeing. A very tricky relationship. When readers understand the relationship, they will feel that the works are very enjoyable. How exquisite the systems or structures of the spiritual kingdom are!

I think the mirrors are the ability of Logos. And they are also the treacherous props of Nous. As soon as a child can differentiate himself from his mother or his environment, the ability grows in his mind. And that also means he has used mirrors. The more mirrors in one's life or one's reading, the more self-realization one has. Modernist literature is full of mirrors. That's why I wanted to emphasize the function of Logos in this category of literature. The function of modernist literature or art is not only communication; it's also realization. The function is similar to philosophy. Because of the existence of the mirrors in the work, a good reader will often feel that he or she is forced to look into them. One has to face them; otherwise,

one can't enter into the works at all. When one looks into them, maybe the looking will become a journey. You continue your practicing (looking); you explore yourself deeper and deeper. Meanwhile, your spiritual world expands wider and wider. That's a transparent world. It has a beautiful structure, and it joins together with the spiritual kingdom of human beings.

An artist has to look into mirrors. And he or she has to enter the system. Once one enters it, one feels a pressing force. And one also feels that the ground one stands on is untenable. But the situation is the very one you seek. It means freedom. Since your being is untenable, a sham, you have to act to find reasons for your real being. And the reasons are in your acting. We live only when we are acting. So the actual situation is that we can't give in. We can't stop resisting Logos. The higher logic is only sensed while we are resisting. Yes, for me, as an artist, forcing myself into an untenable situation is an ever-present process.

INTERVIEWER

I am still struggling with Logos as something to resist. In fact, as you say above, "the higher logic is only sensed while we are resisting." If Logos is the controlling mind, the higher being, then it would seem you would want to fall in line with Logos, figure out what Logos is telling you and do this without questioning, but you are saying something else, aren't you?

CAN XUE

This question is a very good one. I'm happy to explain the system at length. In the system, Logos doesn't move. All the performances must be given by characters (I call them "Nous") in a story. The characters form layers in the story (I call the layers "the layers of spirit"). So when Logos gives the tricky instructions, it is these characters (Nous) who receive them and give their performances. The way in which Nous receives the instructions is a very special one. It's not "fall in line with Logos." On the contrary, it should be wrestling against Logos, just as Kafka's K wrestled with the Castle, or Sumei with the father in "Blue Light in the Sky." Only in this kind of wrestling can the character experience the real will of Logos. Wrestling or resisting is the way Nous understands the meaning of her own acting, or Logos' will. Since Logos can't move, he must realize or embody himself through the characters. And meanwhile, Nous reaches a higher logic through her acting. In the story "Blue Light in the Sky," the father represents the deepest part of Nous. So he has the highest logic in his mind (that's why I say he is a Logos). He understands and arranges everything in the story. This part of Nous is the nearest to the Logos in Can Xue's

mind. Logos doesn't take part in aesthetic activities directly. He is an ability of a human. This powerful ability controls the whole situation. Nous resists him (Logos); this sort of resisting or struggling is semi-enlightened, and semi-ignorant. Why struggling? It's not because they are weary of the father, or abhor him. As I said above, all three are Nous—including the father. But each of the three also has some Logos. The father has the largest part. He acts as a small Logos; he must listen to the great Logos in Can Xue's mind. He is active, so he still belongs to Nous. And the two sisters are not at the same level either. One has more Logos, one has less. So their attitudes are different. When the reader thinks of the father, he should think of him as Nous first. But this Nous looks like Logos. And in the story he functions as Logos too (as well as functions as Nous). When they are struggling against him (Logos), they can always sense his real will. And this is their aim.

So we can say, the whole story is a writer's effort. She is trying to find her real will through a struggling performance against her Logos. In order to reach the aim, she breaks her Nous into several parts and lets the parts form three layers. And she lets Logos (this Logos is in her mind) direct a dramatic event between these parts. As you experience in the story, the deeper the character, the more Logos (the ability for controlling) she or he has. So usually the deepest character —Nous' most dark and essential part —unifies with Logos. The father in the story is somewhat like Beatrice in *The Divine Comedy*. But he is more active, more "Nous" than she.

INTERVIEWER

As you are writing, how much are you aware of the system unfolding? How do you know that you are in the right mental space?

CAN XUE

From the beginning, I felt that I was entering into a system when I wrote. At that time I didn't know clearly what happened inside me. I just practiced my writing, year after year. Then suddenly, one day (when I was forty-five years old) I recognized the system (or structure) in other writers' works. I thought they were the first rank, so they were my mirrors. That is to say, in a certain sense, I recognized Can Xue's system too. This is a very stern system. It presses you, squeezes you, and blocks all of your paths when you are writing. But it is in the very course of pressing, squeezing, and blocking that someone (I now call him Logos) lets you experience or discern what way is the right way. I would like to express the thing like this: Logos tells me that I have to deny all the possible paths, and the only path that is right is an impossible one. So when I'm breaking through, I am actually

revolting against Logos, because he has said that my creating was impossible, but I still do it. I have made the impossible become possible. And the possible thing (my acting, or works) is the very one that Logos wanted me to do, but pretended to be against. So the key word here is *acting*, or *performing*. I think the two have the same meaning in my expressions here, because in the most direct sense, aesthetic activities are performances.

My Logos is full of craftiness. And my Nous has to cheat when she gives performances. He denies her acting time and again. Meanwhile she cheats and still does it. This sort of tricky relationship forms the system in my creative life. It has become very clear to me today. But this kind of clarity doesn't mean I know what sort of characters or backgrounds or sentences or tones I should choose when I write fiction. Logos doesn't tell me that. He just gives instructions like: "NO!" "Choose the most impossible path!" "Do your utmost!" and so on. So I put myself in a very tense atmosphere and highly concentrate on my imaginative world when writing. The more impossible the things you write, the better. In order to pursue this kind of ideal creative life, I have to keep my mind very clear for at least one hour (my creative time) every day. So I run in the morning. And I sit at my desk after my running. When one's mind becomes very clear, one can discern spiritual things easily and choose the right direction or path. Meanwhile, your ability for controlling (Logos) becomes more powerful. And you can control the overall situation very well in the deepest sense.

Usually people believe that a good fiction writer should not know what she or he is writing. I think in a certain sense this is right. I also don't know what I am writing. And if I know the meaning of the story when I'm writing, then I have to stop it immediately, because that's a failure as fiction. But I do know that there is a system controlling me when I'm writing. And the system helps me to find the purest way to express my spiritual world. Year after year, my practicing has made me firmly believe this.

INTERVIEWER

I know you've talked in the *Chinese Literature Today* interview about the "repelling force" in Can Xue's works. What do you mean by your work serving as a repelling force?

CAN XUE

What I mean by "repelling force" is that for a modernist reading, you will meet repelling force in every plot. This force is the very craftiness of Logos. If you resist it,

or cheat Logos, you may enter a deeper level, and create a meaning for the plot. And that is a successful reading. But if you just wait for the writer to give a meaning to the superficial plot, you will fail. That is a passive reading. That's why I say the "repelling force" is the ability of language to renew itself. Language is a phenomenon of spirit. I think its law is very similar with the law of humanity. At the beginning of your reading, whatever you read, it repels you. You have to be used to the repelling. And you should exert your initiative, and revolt against it. And in the course of your struggling, you are imperceptibly giving meaning to what you read. You are also building up your "self."

This is like Kafka's *Trial*. At every stage K had to struggle with the law. The law said he had to die. But he cheated the law, and overcame the repelling force. However, it was precisely K's struggling that demonstrated the will of the law (Logos).

The repelling force is from the very nature of human beings. In my works, all of the "meaning" hides in deeper levels. The works don't want to tell realistic stories. Their stories are the ones about souls, humanity, and writing itself. They are full of exploring spirit, and their reading requires great initiative on the part of readers.

I think that there are layers in spirit. When a reader begins to read a story, the superficial layer in the reader's mind will react first. And the two parts (the story's surface layer and the reader's layer) will have a skirmish. After that, if the reading is a successful one, the reader will form a structure in his or her mind gradually, and at the same time, the story will reveal its deeper layer before the reader's eyes. The skirmish (I call it "the absorbing of information") is sometimes long, sometimes short. But the forming of the structure takes quite a lot of time. And it usually divides into several stages. At every stage you absorb information again. If you grasp the whole structure at last, you will enter into the deepest layer in the story.

INTERVIEWER

The "skirmish" that you talk about is a key metaphor of your work, isn't it? Can Xue sees human beings existing with a contradictory nature, squeezed between the original force (Nous) and the supra-rational (Logos). And through the soul's "skirmish," which after all is the result of the splitting of our souls—the soul putting the internal parts of ourselves seemingly outside of us to be wrestled with and reincorporated—human beings gain ground against the untenable nature of our being, of our "nobodyness," a term you used in an interview about *Five Spice Street*. These "skirmishes" are both Can Xue's subject and method in a sense. But in the skirmish, humans are often tossed out or repelled, but you have to jump in again

Can Xue Interview

and again and exert! Is that an accurate description of the reading process in modernist works?

CAN XUE

Yes, your description that “humans are tossed out and repelled, but you have to jump in again and again and exert” is wonderful! Reading is just this kind of resisting activity. I practice it every day.

But I’m not sure if I understand what you said about “nobodyness.” I think those nobodies in my fiction always represent my nature. And they are evocative of dialogues with readers. Those dialogues are the “skirmishes” I mentioned. The untenable things are our old being, our “self.” We change our being, our old, untenable “self” through the “skirmishes” with those profound nobodies. It’s they who tell us the truth about our real situations. Usually these nobodies that appear in my stories look like “negative” characters. But if you stare at them for a long time, maybe you gain another perspective, and they change into “positive” characters.

INTERVIEWER

Could you give some clues about Logos and Nous in your conception of literature?

CAN XUE

I think as an Easterner and maybe our cultural tradition brought me some advantages to discern the system in literature works. We Easterners are used to seeing the world as a whole. So when I had accepted the Western outlook on the world, and understood humanity as a contradiction, it became much easier for me to unify the opposing parts of the contradiction than it is for Westerners.

My key words “Logos” and “Nous” are from Greek philosophy. One is the highest principle, the light; the other is the deepest original force, the dark mother of imagination. These two parts act on each other, form a “field”—my field of aesthetic activities. And the practice gives rise to my fiction writing. This is a very rough sketch of the system. I plan to write a book about this topic someday.

What I want to emphasize is that the two parts constitute one thing: our humanity. Neither of them can act without the other, although each has its own laws. I think that revealing the relationship between them is the key for revealing the truth in aesthetic activities. That’s the work that I’m going to do.

Can Xue Interview