

Jon Eugene von Kowallis

## Lu Xun's Death: A Postmortem

**Abstract** The death of Lu Xun (1881–1936), founder of modern Chinese literature, who later became the leader of the intellectual opposition to the Kuomintang government, has never elicited much discussion in Western scholarly circles. The author of this article suggests that may have been due to Lu Xun's own talent as a sardonic humorist, in that he effectively dismissed speculation on it with his memorable essay on "Death" (*Si*), written after he had recovered from a bout of illness, but before the days leading up to his actual death. By contrast, there has been contention on the subject in China for over eighty years, resulting in an international investigation that mustered a team of physicians to pour over the still-extant x-ray image of his lungs, learned scholars in both countries to quibble over whether the character *wu* (five) could be mistaken for *san* (three), if written cursively, and two worldwide sojourns by Dr. Izumi Hyōnosuke (1930–2018), a Japanese medical historian, in search of the descendants and the ancestral graves of Dr. Thomas Balfour Dunn (1886–1948), the American pulmonary specialist who examined Lu Xun in person. The author of this article was at several points engaged in this multinational project. The article traces the historical origins of the dispute back to the 1930s, continues into the 1980s, and concludes with the current state of affairs in China and Japan, reading the debate against historical evidence (Lu Xun's diary, correspondence, and the "record of treatment" by his Japanese physician) and the growing international tensions during Lu Xun's final years.

**Keywords** Lu Xun, Sudō Iozō, Izumi Hyōnosuke, Thomas Balfour Dunn,

Jon Eugene von Kowallis (✉)

Chinese Studies Program, School of Humanities and Languages, The University of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW 2052, Australia

E-mail: j.kowallis@unsw.edu.au

Zhou Haiying, Kokuryūkai (Amur River Society), Kitaoka Masako, Oda Takeo

---

## Lingering Questions

This article was inspired in part by the invitation I received from the Association for Asian Studies in the United States to do a pre-publication reading of Joshua Fogel's monograph *A Friend in Deed: Lu Xun, Uchiyama Kanzō and the Intellectual World of Shanghai on the Eve of War*. In that book Fogel traces the friendship that grew up in the Shanghai of the early 1930s between the founder of modern Chinese literature, Lu Xun 鲁迅 (orig. Zhou Shuren 周樹人, 1881–1936), who had by then become intellectual leader of the opposition to the Kuomintang government, and Uchiyama Kanzō 內山完造 (1885–1959), a Japanese Christian and commercial bookseller from a humble background, who had first come to China as the representative of a pharmaceutical firm. Fogel also discusses briefly the circumstances surrounding the death of Lu Xun. Reading his treatment reminded me that more could and perhaps should be said on the latter subject, especially nowadays when increasing emphasis is being placed on the importance of interaction between Chinese and Western scholarship on China and the fact that there are still markedly different understandings of this topic between China and the West.<sup>1</sup>

I will begin with a self-criticism, something which was common in China in the recent past, but is less common in Western academia these days. In a review article I published in the American journal *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews* on several books about Lu Xun,<sup>2</sup> including Zhou Haiying's 周海嬰 (1929–2011) bestselling *Lu Xun and I Over Seventy Years* (*Lu Xun yu wo qishi nian* 鲁迅與我七十年), I dismissed the contention by Lu Xun's son, Zhou Haiying, that (according to family legend he traced back to his uncle Zhou Jianren 周建人 (1888–1984), his mother Xu Guangping

---

<sup>1</sup> Judging from recent biographical writing on Lu Xun in the West, starting with David E. Pollard, *The True Story of Lu Xun*; Eva Shan Chou, *Memory, Violence, Queues: Lu Xun Interprets China*; and Gloria Davies, *Lu Xun's Revolution*.

<sup>2</sup> Jon Eugene von Kowallis, "Lu Xun: The Sexier Story," 151–66.

許廣平 (1898–1968) and an article Zhou Jianren published in *People's Daily* (*Renmin ribao* 人民日報) on October 19, 1949, Lu Xun's death had been either hastened or brought about by malpractice on the part of his Japanese primary-care physician, Sudō Iozō 須藤五百三 (1876–1959).<sup>3</sup> In fact, the tone and implications of what the Zhou family have consistently maintained since 1949 have led some readers to believe that Lu Xun was done in by his Japanese doctor(s).<sup>4</sup> Zhou Jianren wrote (in apparent haste) in 1949, that if Dr. Sudō were still in Shanghai, he hoped he could at least be questioned by the Central People's Government.<sup>5</sup> But in fact Sudō had already been repatriated to Japan in 1946 by the Kuomintang Government, setting up a private practice in his old hometown in Okayama Prefecture 岡山縣, where he lived out the remainder of his eighty-three years as a respected member of the community,<sup>6</sup> while at the same time falling off the map for China.<sup>7</sup>

---

## Too Good a Writer for His Own Good?

This much being said at the outset, I will now attempt to blame my dismissal of these suspicions mainly on Lu Xun's prowess as a writer. My first point in the present article will be that Lu Xun may have been too effective a writer for his own good, at least in this instance. Since I first read it by chance as a high school student growing up in a small town in

---

<sup>3</sup> Zhou Haiying, *Lu Xun yu wo qishi nian*, 58–64.

<sup>4</sup> The article by Zhou Jianren was titled “Lu Xun de bing yi bei Xuteng yisheng suo danwu” 魯迅的病疑被須藤醫生所耽誤, *Renmin ribao*, October 19, 1949.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> This is according to a chronology compiled by Izumi Hyōnosuke 泉彪之助 as part of the article “Sudō Iozō—Lu Xun's Last Primary Care Physician” 須藤五百三——魯迅最後の主治醫師 published in the journal *Fukui Kenritsu Tanki Daigaku Kenkyū Kiyō* 福井縣立短期大學研究紀要 (Bulletin of Fukui Prefectural Junior College), no. 10, 2003. The chronology was published in Chinese translation in *Lu Xun Research Monthly* (*Lu Xun yanjiu yuekan* 魯迅研究月刊), issue 12, 2003, 47–48 (endnotes on page 42). The date of Sudō's departure from Shanghai is given as May 25 in 1946 on page 48.

<sup>7</sup> In *Lu Xun yu wo qishi nian* (p. 62), Haiying wonders why Sudō, unlike other Japanese friends and associates of Lu Xun, including medical personnel, never came to greet Xu Guangping on any of her trips to Japan. But the first trip she made there (in August 1956) was rather rushed and by the time of the second in 1961, Dr. Sudō had been dead for two years already. See Wang Xirong, “Lu Xun siyin zhi mi,” in the journal *The World of Lu Xun* (*Lu Xun shijie* 魯迅世界), issue 4, 2002, reprinted in Jin Conglin et al., eds., *Lu Xun siyin zhi mi*, 315.

western Pennsylvania, I have always been taken with an essay Lu Xun wrote on September 5, 1936 titled simply “Death” (Si 死), which mocks the idea that he ever had a chance of beating the tuberculosis that had beset him since his twenties. In it he writes:

Not till my serious illness this year did I start thinking distinctly about death. At first I treated my illness as in the past, relying on my Japanese doctor, S—. Though not a specialist in tuberculosis, he is an elderly man with a rich experience who studied medicine before me, is my senior, and knows me very well—hence he talks frankly. Of course, however well a doctor knows his patient, he still speaks with a certain reserve; but at least he warned me two or three times, though I never paid any attention and did not tell anyone. Perhaps because things had dragged on so long and my last attack was so serious, some friends arranged behind my back to invite an American doctor, D—, to see me. He is the only Western specialist on tuberculosis in Shanghai. After his examination, although he complimented me on my typically Chinese powers of resistance, he also announced that my end was near, adding that had I been a European I would already have been in my grave for five years. This verdict moved my soft-hearted friends to tears. I did not ask him to prescribe for me, feeling that since he had studied in the West he could hardly have learned how to prescribe for a patient five years dead. But Dr. D—’s diagnosis was in fact extremely accurate. I later had an X-ray photograph made of my chest which very largely bore out his findings.<sup>8</sup>

The X-ray photograph still exists, kept in the Shanghai Lu Xun Museum 上海魯迅紀念館, where it was on public display until recently. What he wrote in the essay seemed quite convincing to most readers, especially those who remembered that he was an inveterate smoker, although one point to bear in mind at the outset is that Lu Xun did not have lung cancer.

---

<sup>8</sup> Lu Xun, *Lu Xun quanji*, 6: 611, hereafter LXQJ; English translation by Yang Xianyi and Gladys Yang in *Lu Xun Selected Works*, 4: 313–14, hereafter LXSW.

---

## The Japanese Search for Dr. Dunn—Fifty Years Later

In late 1985, when I was a graduate student not long returned from China, still doing research on my PhD dissertation at Berkeley, I received an airmail letter from a man in Japan, Izumi Hyōnosuke 泉彪之助 (1930–2018), who introduced himself as a medical doctor and medical historian with an interest in Lu Xun, who would like to come to Berkeley. I mistook the letter as a request for information on how to affiliate as a visiting scholar, so I replied advising him to contact the Center for Chinese Studies, which hosts academic visitors and added that I would soon be moving from Berkeley to Los Angeles where I would stand in teaching modern Chinese literature and late-Qing poetry at UCLA for Perry Link, who was going on sabbatical, so we might not intersect at all in Berkeley.

Another more detailed letter followed swiftly from Dr. Izumi, explaining that he was investigating the cause of Lu Xun's death and was anxious, not for an academic affiliation, but to speak with me in person, even if it meant following me to Los Angeles. He did not explain why. But Berkeley was to be first on his itinerary because that was the last place of residence of Dr. Thomas Balfour Dunn (1886–1948), the American tuberculosis specialist who had examined Lu Xun prior to his death. Dunn had passed away in California, after having been repatriated from Japanese internment in Shanghai during Second World War and Dr. Izumi was eager for information on his family, who had been in Shanghai with him, were repatriated during the war, took up residence in Berkeley, but then seemed to have completely disappeared. In September of 1986, while still in Los Angeles, I was contacted a third time by Dr. Izumi, who arranged for a meeting at a Japanese restaurant on top of his hotel in downtown Los Angeles.

Izumi's trip to America followed in the wake of an international controversy that had broken out when an article in *Liberation Daily* (*Jiefang ribao* 解放日報) on February 23 in 1984 announced the conclusion of a group of twenty-three physicians who examined the chest X-ray photo of Lu Xun after a meeting at the Number One Clinic for the Treatment and Eradication of Tuberculosis in Shanghai (Shanghai shi di-yi

jiehebing fangzhiyuan 上海市第一結核病防治院) referred to as the Meeting to Interpret the X-Ray Photo (*dupianhui* 讀片會) was that Lu Xun had not died as a result of tuberculosis or bronchial asthma (which Sudō was treating him for)<sup>9</sup> but rather from a pneumothorax condition that brought on respiratory and ultimately heart failure. The wording of their statement was:

Everyone concluded that the direct cause of Lu Xun's death was that the left lung vesicle ruptured, causing air to enter the pleural cavity, which led to spontaneous pneumothorax that put pressure on the lungs and heart, causing death.<sup>10</sup>

大家認為魯迅先生的直接致死原因，是左側肺大泡破裂，使氣體進入胸膜腔引起自發性氣胸，壓迫肺和心臟而引起死亡。

This implied that his death could indeed be attributed to misdiagnosis and mistreatment on the part of his Japanese physician, Dr. Sudō.<sup>11</sup> The Japanese government and educational authorities were keen on challenging this finding and had allocated a considerable grant to Dr. Izumi for gathering and analyzing all the details relevant to the case. It may be important to note that Izumi, though a medical historian, had not previously been a Lu Xun scholar, of whom there were a good number in Japan who had attained great distinction for other contributions, but did not choose to take a stand on this subject.

Izumi performed meticulous research, producing at least five articles. What he wanted from me was some kind of lead about what happened to Dr. Dunn's family, who seemed to have disappeared from all records after the doctor's death in Berkeley in 1948 at the age of sixty-two. Izumi knew one detail that proved useful, though—that Dunn's daughter Margaret had graduated from Bennington College. A day or so later I phoned the alumni office at Bennington, identifying myself and the research project and was told that they did have a phone number and address on file for

<sup>9</sup> Again, see Wang, "Lu Xun siyin zhi mi," reprinted in Jin et al., eds., *Lu Xun siyin zhi mi*, 283–336.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>11</sup> See Zhu Zheng, *Lu Xun zhuan*, 384.

Margaret Dunn, although she had changed both her last and first names since graduation. I telephoned her residence on behalf of Izumi and explained his project to her, including the detail about her father having examined Lu Xun.<sup>12</sup> Her first words, after “No one has called me that name in over thirty years,” were:

It's interesting that the Japanese are doing this now because in my family it has always been said that my father died prematurely because of the privations he had suffered in detention during the Japanese occupation of Shanghai.<sup>13</sup>

She told me that he had been detained separately from and longer than the other members of his family and in worse conditions. Margaret was naturally more eager to tell her father's story than find out the details of who Lu Xun was. To her, Lu Xun's essay was a minor detail, of which she had no prior knowledge. She added that her mother, Dr. Dunn's widow,<sup>14</sup> had remarried (hence the name change) but was still alive and living nearby her daughter in New Jersey. Izumi then contacted them directly,

---

<sup>12</sup> The date of the telephone call would have been around September 23, 1986.

<sup>13</sup> Izumi stated this was “because Dunn had links to the U.S. Navy” in a lecture on Thomas B. Dunn delivered in 1986–87 to the Japanese Medical History Society which was later revised and circulated the speech at the the General Meeting of the Japanese Medical History Association on April 1986 (no. 87) and April 1987 (no. 88), and another speech is scheduled). This lecture has been translated into Chinese by Li Mingjun 李明軍 as Quan Biao zhizhu 泉彪之助, see Izumi Hyōnosuke, trans. Li Mingjun, “Tuomasi B. Deng'en—Wei Lu Xun zhencha de Meiguo yishi,” 51–65.

<sup>14</sup> A California newspaper, *The Times of San Mateo*, on November 10, 1944 carried an article about a talk Mrs. Dunn gave at the Burlingame Women's Club titled “Experiences in Shanghai,” naming her as Dorothy Allen Dunn, an American born in Vladivostok. “After graduation [from college in the US] she travelled to Shanghai where she met and married Dr. Thomas Balfour Dunn. At the beginning of the Pacific War, the Dunns were caught in Shanghai. In November 1942, Dr. Dunn was interned in the special political camp at Haihong Road. Several months later Dorothy Dunn, her 78-year-old mother, 16-year-old daughter and two and a half year old twins were interned in the Zhapei civilian assembly center in what remains of the Great China University bombed in 1937. Finally, through repatriation in September 1943, the family was reunited on the Teia Maru. They were exchanged at Goa where they boarded the Gripsholm and Thanksgiving 1943 found them headed toward America to join the oldest daughter who was in college in Vermont.”

visiting their home in New Jersey. Remarkably, he later travelled to Scotland and found the place Dunn’s ancestors came from.<sup>15</sup>

---

## Chinese and Japanese Scholars Weigh In

Peking University Professor Yan Jiayan 嚴家炎 (b. 1935), prominent Lu Xun biographer Zhu Zheng 朱正 (b. 1931) and other senior scholars in China have written that Dr. Sudō intentionally falsified the “records” of his treatment, claiming to have begun an important procedure—drawing fluid off Lu Xun’s lungs—as early as March 28, 1936.<sup>16</sup> Indeed, the entry in Lu Xun’s diary for that date does not corroborate what Sudō wrote down for that date. Lu Xun spent the day writing letters, receiving guests and even went to a movie that evening at the Lidu Cinema 麗都影戲院 with his partner Xu Guangping, their son, his third brother Zhou Jianren and four other friends, including the Writer Xiao Jun 蕭軍.<sup>17</sup> If drawing fluid off his lungs had taken place, he would have written it down, as he seems to have recorded every visit to or from Dr. Sudō and what was done. When Sudō produced his version of the “records” of Lu Xun’s treatment,<sup>18</sup> he would have had no way of knowing this because Lu Xun’s diaries were not published until 1951. According to one scholar’s analysis of the story, this procedure must have taken place on May 28, 1936,<sup>19</sup> two months later than Sudō claimed. The widely-respected Japanese Lu Xun

---

<sup>15</sup> This was possibly intended as a corrective to an endnote in the 1981 (and 1991) editions of the *LXQJ*, 6: 613 (n. 7) which stated “Dunn was a German with U.S. citizenship.”

<sup>16</sup> See Yan Jiayan, “Xuteng yisheng suo xie Lu Xun bingli weihe yu Lu Xun riji ji shuxin di-wu de zai tantao,” 67–69. Zhu Zheng, *Lu Xun zhuan: Xiudingben*, 410.

<sup>17</sup> *LXQJ*, 15: 289. Entry for March 28, 1936.

<sup>18</sup> Sudō authored an article “Mr. Lu Xun as Seen by a Scholar-Physician [i.e., himself]” (*Yixuezhe suojian de Lu Xun xiansheng* 醫學者所見的魯迅先生) which contained an appendix titled “The Course of Mr. Lu Xun’s Illness” (*Lu Xun xiansheng bingzhuang jingguo* 魯迅先生病狀經過). These were originally published in Chinese in the Chinese-language journal *Author* (*Zuojia* 作家), November 1936. It is important to note that the latter, which presents as a medical record, was written after the fact. These have been reprinted a number of times and are included in Jin et al., eds., *Lu Xun siyin zhi mi*, 38–46.

<sup>19</sup> This is Kitaoka Masako’s contention. See Kitaoka Masako, “Guanyu Shanghai ribao suo zai Xuteng Wubaisan ‘Yisheng suo jian de Lu Xun xiansheng’” 關於上海日報所載須藤五百三 “醫生所見的魯迅先生,” in Jin et al., eds., *Lu Xun siyin zhi mi*, 363.

scholar Kitaoka Masako 北岡正子 has suggested that the character for the number five 五 in May (*wuyue* 五月) was misread as a *san* 三 in March (*sanyue* 三月) “in the process of translation” [of the document from Japanese into Chinese],<sup>20</sup> but Lu Xun’s diary entry for May 28, 1936 does not bear that theory out either, stating merely: “In the afternoon, Dr. Sudō came to examine [me] and gave an injection.”<sup>21</sup> The fact that as major a Japanese authority on Lu Xun as Kitaoka Masako chose to weigh in on this offers an indication of the importance of the controversy in her eyes, which in turn only added fuel to the fire.<sup>22</sup>

Zhu Zheng writes that even if Sudō had drawn the fluid off Lu Xun’s lungs on May 28, which he did not do according to the diary, a two-month delay of the appropriate treatment would have already occurred. In fact, Dr. Dunn (Deng 鄧 or Deng’en 鄧恩), the American tuberculosis specialist, examined Lu Xun on May 31, 1936 and, according to Lu Xun’s relatives, suggested such treatment,<sup>23</sup> which was begun by Dr. Sudō only well after that. The entry in Lu Xun’s diary for May 31, 1936 reads:

In the afternoon Ms. Smedley brought Dr. Dunn over to examine me. He said it [my condition] was quite precarious [*shen wei* 甚危]. Mingfu 明甫 [Shen Yanbing 沈雁冰, i.e., Mao Dun 茅盾] interpreted orally. Hu Feng 胡風 came over. Dr. Sudō [then] came and examined me. In the evening [Li] Liewen 李烈文 paid a visit, talked for a bit, then left. At nine my fever had dropped to 36.9, a normal

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>21</sup> The original diary entry reads: 下午須藤先生來診並注射。See LXQJ, 15: 299. Entry for May 28, 1936.

<sup>22</sup> On March 19, 2003, Yan Jiayan published in *China Reader’s Report* (*Zhonghua dushubao* 中華讀書報), no. 7, a detailed comparison of Dr. Sudō’s records with Lu Xun’s diary and letters, discovering that Sudō’s claim that he drew fluid off Lu Xun’s lungs on March 19 and 28, 1936 did not match Lu Xun’s own accounts. Kitaoka then proposed the theory that the character *wu* 五 looks like *san* 三 when written quickly, therefore Sudō meant *wuyue* 五月 (May) not *sanyue* 三月 (March). Yan Jiayan’s response to this was published under the title “Another Enquiry into the Reasons for the Discrepancies between the Medical Record written by Dr. Sudō and Lu Xun’s Diary and Letters” (*Xuteng yisheng suo xie Lu Xun bingli weihe yu Lu Xun riji ji shuxin diwu de zai tantao* 須藤醫生所寫魯迅病歷為何與魯迅日記及書信抵牾的再探討) in the *Lu Xun yanjiu yuekan*, issue 2, 2004, pp. 67–69.

<sup>23</sup> According to Zhou, *Lu Xun yu wo qishi nian*, 59–60.

temperature.<sup>24</sup>

下午史君引鄧醫生來診，言甚危，明甫譯語。胡風來。須藤先生來診。夜烈文見訪，稍談即去。九時熱三十六度九分，已為平溫。

There is no record in the diary of Dr. Dunn having suggested any treatment, bearing out the account in Lu Xun's essay, which nevertheless could still have been "stripped down," for rhetorical effect.<sup>25</sup>

---

## **"I Went into a Cold Room in Search of Books and Caught a Chill"**

That much being said, the survival rate for patients with Lu Xun's condition was good, rated at percent 71.4,<sup>26</sup> according to Dr. Izumi. That means Lu Xun's chances of survival were far greater than his own account in the essay would have led us to believe. His explanation of the onset of this illness in a letter to Shen Yanbing 沈雁冰 (Mao Dun) dated March 7, 1936 is strikingly simple:

On Monday [March 2], because I went into a cold room to look for books, not exercising caution, I caught a chill and ended up wheezing so hard I had an apoplectic fit. This was treated by injection[s] but as of today I am still unable to go downstairs.<sup>27</sup>

禮拜一日，因為到一個冷房子裡去找書，不小心，中寒而大氣喘，幾乎摔倒，由注射治癒，至今還不能下樓梯。

---

<sup>24</sup> LXQJ, 15: 300. Entry for May 31, 1936.

<sup>25</sup> Mao Dun's recollection says that Dunn recommended Lu Xun go into a foreign hospital for a complete check-up, for which he said he would take responsibility there. Afterward he "wrote numerous times to urge Lu Xun, through Smedley, to go into hospital," according to Izumi's summary in *Quan Biaozhizhu* [Izumi Hyōnosuke], "Tuomasi B. Deng'en," 53. There are also separate accounts of Dunn's examination on May 31, 1936 of Lu Xun written by Smedley and Feng Xuefeng, the details of which do not always match up. Mao Dun's is the most complete of the three.

<sup>26</sup> Cited by Wang in "Lu Xun siyin zhi mi" reprinted with updated addenda in Jin et al., eds., *Lu Xun siyin zhi mi*, 333. Actually, what Izumi wrote was "the fatality rate was percent 28.6," but from that one can infer a survival rate of percent 71.4.

<sup>27</sup> LXQJ, 13: 323–24. Letter no. 360307 dated March 7, 1936.

The Chinese term Lu Xun uses here “wheezing” (*qichuan* 氣喘) refers to breathlessness, panting or gasping for breath (as in a spasmodic asthma attack). According to Haiying's version, after Dunn examined Lu Xun he made the following pronouncement:

There is an accumulation of fluid in the pleura of the patient's lungs, which needs to be drawn off quickly. At that point the fever will break and his appetite return. Being able to get food down, his resistance will increase. If you start the treatment now and he can rest and recuperate, he could live for at least ten more years,<sup>28</sup> if not, he'll die within half a year. The treatment plan is quite simple, any doctor can perform it. Discuss among yourselves and choose a Chinese doctor. Have him come to me and I'll explain the treatment—all he needs to do is follow it. There's no need for me to treat him myself.<sup>29</sup>

病人的肋膜裡邊積水，要馬上抽掉，熱度就會退下來，胃口隨之就會開，東西能吃得下，身體的抵抗力就會增加。如果現在就開始治療、修養，至少可活十年；如果不這樣做，不出半年就死。治療方法極簡單，任何一個醫生都會做。你們商量一下，找一個中國醫生，讓他來找我，我會告訴他治療方案，只要照我說的去就成，無須我親自治療。

Now comes another twist, the account by Lu Xun's third brother, Zhou Jianren, published on October 19, 1949 in *People's Daily*, which says that Sudō rejected Dunn's diagnosis, denying that Lu Xun had fluid accumulated in the pleura or outer lining of his lungs<sup>30</sup> and only admitted that Dunn's diagnosis had been correct after the X-ray photo was made on June 15. If that were the case, then why would Sudō have even considered to draw off fluid in March or May, as he later claimed he had done on the “records”? More importantly, he did not.

---

<sup>28</sup> The idea, attributed to doctor(s), that Lu Xun “could still live another ten or twenty years” appears in a letter from Xu Guangping to Cao Bai 曹白 dated June 25, 1936, “about ten days after the X-ray photo of his lungs had been taken” in which she also mentions Dr. Dunn's having examined him. *LXQJ*, 13: 389. Letter no. 360625 dated June 25, 1936.

<sup>29</sup> Zhou, *Lu Xun yu wo qishi nian*, 59–60.

<sup>30</sup> Sudō insisted, we are told, “There is **no** fluid accumulated on the pluera” (*leimo li bing wu jishui* 肋膜裡並無積水).

## Comparing Sudō's Records of Treatment with Lu Xun's Diary

If we compare Sudō's "records" with what Lu Xun wrote in his diary, it becomes apparent that not only are Sudō's dates wrong, the treatment he says he administered on those dates was fabricated. Rather than drawing the fluid off Lu Xun's lungs, as Sudō claims he did on March 28, Lu Xun's diary entry for that date does not mention a visit either to or from a doctor, rather it indicates a busy day full of interactions with others from morning to night (as delineated above). If we are talking about May 28, as Kitaoka Masako suggests, the diary entry says: "In the afternoon Dr. Sudō came over, examined me and gave me an injection."<sup>31</sup> There is no mention of drawing off fluid on either date. Sudō was treating him with hormone injections. Injections of pectol, a medicine of Japanese manufacture used at the time in the treatment of tuberculosis, which gave the patient a sense of temporary relief, while doing nothing to treat the ailment; in fact it has been speculated that this only hastened its progression. In a letter of May 15, Lu Xun wrote to Cao Jinghua 曹靖華: "I haven't had any energy for the past few days. Today I saw the doctor who said it was a stomach problem, if I take medicine for seven or eight days I will get better" 日前無力, 今日看醫生, 云是胃病, 大約服藥七八天, 就要好起來了.<sup>32</sup> But he did not. In a letter dated May 23, again to Cao Jinghua, Lu Xun stated: "This time I stayed lying down for nearly ten days with a fever. The doctor has still been unable to diagnose the cause of the fever" 這回又躺了近十天了, 發熱, 醫生還沒有查出發熱的原因. After the X-ray made it clear that there was accumulation of fluid, Sudō began to draw off the fluid. He did this three

<sup>31</sup> Zhou, *Lu Xun yu wo qishi nian*, 63.

<sup>32</sup> Other medicines that appear in his diary and are commented on by Izumi are somatose (manufactured by Bayer), cerase (manufactured by Hakushindo 博信堂), and tacamol, both administered by injection. According to Izumi these were commonly used for tuberculosis—Izumi adds that cerase is the only one that could be considered a bit out of the ordinary. See Quan Biaozhizhu 泉彪之助 (i.e., Izumi Hyōnosuke), trans. Song Yang and Jin Conglin, "Lu Xun rijì zhōng de yìliào: Dì-yì bāo jìchū taolun," 30–42. Wang Xirong and other sources mention: Tacamol, Peetol and Corase. See Wang, "Lu Xun siyin zhi mi," reprinted in Jin et al., eds., *Lu Xun siyin zhi mi*, 323.

times on June 15, June 23, and August 7 (as corroborated by Lu Xun's diary). Lu Xun wrote the to artist Cao Bai 曹白 on August 27, 1936: "My illness fluctuates. At times my condition is good, at times bad. Ten days ago I coughed up ten mouths full of blood . . . . Yesterday it was determined that this fever comes from the pleura [accumulated fluid has been drawn off three times, but it keeps coming back] . . ." 我的病也時好時壞。十天前吐血數十口……昨已查出，此熱由肋膜而來（我肋膜間積水，已抽去過三次，而積不已）. . .<sup>33</sup> In fact, Lu Xun had been running a low-level fever since the beginning of the year. A check of the Mayo Clinic website tells us: "If the fluid on the lung becomes infected this is called empyema, which is often accompanied by fever."<sup>34</sup>

Now let's return to the essay Lu Xun penned just nine days later on September 5, 1936, titled "Death." He concludes:

. . . I did not draw up a will. I simply lay there in silence, struck sometimes by a more pressing thought: If this is dying, it isn't really painful. It may not be quite like this at the end, of course; but still, since this happens only once in a lifetime, I can take it . . . . Later, however, there came a change for the better. And now I am wondering whether this was really the state just before dying: A man really dying may not have such ideas. What it will be like, though, I still do not know.<sup>35</sup>

Lu Xun's condition obviously improved and it is likely that was because the treatment had been changed, in other words, Sudō finally did what we are told Dunn had recommended—for a while, at least. This can be corroborated by Lu Xun's own descriptions in letters to Cao Bai (Letter no. 360625 dated June 25, 1936); to his mother (Letter no. 360706 dated July 6); to Mao Dun / Shen Yanbing (Letter no. 360802 dated August 2, no. 360813 dated August 13, no. 360831 dated August 31) and to Cao Jinghua (Letter no. 360827 dated August 27).

---

<sup>33</sup> LXQJ, 13: 414. Letter no. 360827.

<sup>34</sup> See under "pleurisy" at the Mayo Clinic website. Accessed September 1, 2019.

<sup>35</sup> Lu Xun, LXSW, trans. Yang Xianyi and Gladys Yang, 4: 315.

## “I Want to Leave Shanghai . . . Staying Here Is Killing Me”

On July 17 he wrote in a proactive tone to Yang Zhihua 楊之華, Qiu Qiubai's 瞿秋白 widow (then in Moscow) that he would like to leave Shanghai at the end of July or in early August “for two or three months in order to have a change of venue for the purposes of recuperation. Being here is killing me.”<sup>36</sup> Of course part of these sentiments were due to his quarrel with “Zhou Yang and Co.” over the dissolution of the League of Left-Wing Writers (Zhongguo zuoyi zuojia lianmeng 中國左翼作家聯盟) and the escalation of the “Battle of the Slogans,” in which he opposed ordering all writers to fall in line behind the slogan of “National Defense Literature” (*Guofang wenxue* 國防文學). But where Lu Xun could have gone to get away from it all was not easily answered. That he intended to go to the West Lake he wrote off on July 6 as “pure rumor”<sup>37</sup>—Hangzhou would have been dangerous for him—Li Bingzhong's 李秉中<sup>38</sup> letter of July 13 in 1936 confirmed there was an arrest warrant from the Kuomintang authorities in his native province of Zhejiang.<sup>39</sup> He turned

<sup>36</sup> The entire quote in context is even more interesting. It reads: 當病發時，新英雄們正要用偉大的旗子，殺我祭旗，然而沒有辦法，愈令我看穿了許多人的本相。本月底或下月初起，我想離開上海兩三個月，作轉地療養，在這裡，真要逼死人 (When the illness struck me, those new heroes were just in the process of deploying their great flag and wanted to kill me off as a sacrifice to it, yet they did not do it right, making it possible for me to see the true faces of quite a few people. At the end of this month, or at the beginning or next month, I would like to leave Shanghai for two or three months in order to have a change of place to facilitate recuperation. Being here is really killing me). Letter quoted from Zhu, *Lu Xun zhuan*, 378.

<sup>37</sup> See Lu Xun, “To Cao Jinghua” (Letter no. 360706), in *LXQJ*, 13: 391.

<sup>38</sup> Li Bingzhong (d. 1940) was a student at Peking University in 1924 when he got to know Lu Xun. He attended Whampoa Military Academy in Guangzhou, studied in Moscow (1926) and later Japan. Returning to China in 1932, he joined the Kuomintang secret service, serving as a leading member of their underground organization The Restoration Society (*Fuxing she* 復興社). From 1924–32 he had corresponded with Lu Xun on friendly terms. In July 1936 he again wrote Lu Xun during an illness, offering to get the warrant for his arrest rescinded if Lu Xun would make his peace with the governmental authorities—an offer Lu Xun did not accept.

<sup>39</sup> He referred to this already December 16 in 1932 in his “Preface to *Letters between Two Places*” (*Liangdi shu xuyan* 兩地書序言): “In 1930, when I joined the China Freedom League and the provincial Kuomintang authorities in Zhejiang asked the Central Government to issue a warrant for the arrest of ‘the decadent writer Lu Xun,’ before leaving home I was suddenly inspired to burn all letters from my friends” 待到一九三〇年我簽名于自由大同盟，浙江省黨部呈請中央通緝“墮落文人魯迅等”的時候，我在棄家出走之前，忽然心血來潮，將朋友給我的信都毀掉了。The English translation adopted *LXSW*, 3: 205. The Chinese text is from *LXQJ*, 11: 3–4.

down an invitation to the Soviet Union, ostensibly from Gorky, but actually extended through the chief Chinese delegate to the Comintern Wang Ming 王明 (1904–74) and conveyed to him that summer through Communist spymaster Pan Hannian 潘漢年 (1906–77), saying in reply that if he were that far away from China he could not continue his fight against the enemy.<sup>40</sup> He was also aware that Stalin's purges had begun in December 1935 and that his own position in the Battle of the Slogans, calling for "Mass Literature for the National Revolutionary War" (*Minzu geming zhanzheng de dazhong wenxue* 民族革命戰爭的大眾文學) sounded closer to that of the Trotskyists than the Stalinists, so much so that a Chinese Trotskyist spokesperson contacted him and invited him to consider joining them.<sup>41</sup> This resulted in a famous open letter titled "Reply to a Letter from the Trotskyists" (June 9, 1936), ascribed to Lu Xun, which rejected their position and endorsed "the proposal of Mao Zedong and others to unite against Japan" (*Mao Zedong xianshengmen de yizhi Kang-Ri lun* 毛澤東先生們的一致抗日論).<sup>42</sup>

After considering it as an option, Lu Xun also decided he could not go to Japan.<sup>43</sup> Zhou Haiying claims he did so in rather blunt language after

<sup>40</sup> This is according to accounts in Wang Ming's book *The Chinese Communists over 50 Years* (*Zhonggong wushi nian* 中共五十年) and the oral recollections of Hu Yuzhi 胡愈之 given at the Beijing Lu Xun Museum, December 25, 1972, as cited in Zhu, *Lu Xun zhuan*, 376–77.

<sup>41</sup> Nagahori Yūzō 長堀祐造, *Lu Xun yu Tuoluociji*, 179–235.

<sup>42</sup> In LXQJ, 6: 586–89. An English translation was included in the second edition of LXSW, 4: 279–82. This letter was written on his behalf and with his knowledge by his close associate Feng Xuefeng 馮雪峰 (1903–76), a writer, literary theorist and member of the League of Left-Wing Writers, who had been sent to Shanghai from Yan'an.

<sup>43</sup> See Lu Xun, "To Cao Jinghua" (Letter no. 360706 dated July 6); "To Shen Yanbing" (Letter no. 360802 dated August 2); "To Zhao Jiabi" (Letter no. 360807 dated August 7), which says that leaving Shanghai was suggested/ordered by his doctor [Sudō]: "My illness having improved a bit yet again, the doctor told me to leave Shanghai in the summer, so I may be leaving soon" 我的病又好一點，醫師囑我夏間最好離開上海，所以我不久要走也說不定。 Note that Lu Xun kept putting it off, and on August 27 he wrote: "Because of these [complications, i.e., his persistent fever and the need to drain off fluid] I cannot leave my doctor or go elsewhere to recuperate and have a change of atmosphere—this is frustrating; within the next few days I plan to discuss it with the doctor and see how this might be put into process." See Lu Xun, "To Cao Jinghua," Letter no. 360827. It is clear that Lu Xun wanted to go somewhere, but his hesitation about Japan (as expressed in his letters) had to do with 1) whether or not the authorities would permit him to land, 2) the prospect of being harried by reporters there, and 3) his fear that he would have to constantly act as an interpreter for Guangping and Haiying, hence no rest there. An article refuting Haiying (based on Lu Xun's letters) by Zhi An 止庵 titled "That Lu Xun 'Refused' to Go to Japan in 1936 to Recuperate Is not in Accordance with Fact" (*Lu Xun 1936 nian "jujue" fu Ri liaoyang bingfei shishi* 魯迅 1936 年 "拒絕" 赴日療養並非事實) was published in July 7 in 2014 issue of *Orient Morning Post* (*Dongfang zaobao* 東方早報).

Sudō had conveyed representations from Japanese official circles to invite him, saying: “Japan—I’m not going there!” 日本我是不去的！ Haiying speculates that this might have led to unspecified “decisions from certain quarters in Japan.”<sup>44</sup> Not long thereafter Lu Xun began planning to move to the French Concession and kept this up until he was nearly on his death bed<sup>45</sup>—he told Zhou Jianren that he would move his family into any quarters there that Jianren deemed suitable. Indeed, shortly after his death, Xu Guangping did move to No. 64 Joffre Terrace 霞飛坊 in the French Concession.<sup>46</sup> It was there that she was arrested by the Kenpeitai 憲兵隊, in the company of Vichy gendarmes (who simply stood by), on December 15 in 1941, less than a week after the outbreak of the Pacific War, incarcerated for seventy-six days and tortured.<sup>47</sup> The way they treated his widow says volumes about how hollow were the expectations of reverence many people thought the Japanese occupation would hold for such a major cultural figure and critic of the Kuomintang as Lu Xun. In

---

<sup>44</sup> Zhou, *Lu Xun yu wo qishi nian*, 61. One might take what Haiying wrote in 2001 with a grain of salt because he was angry at the refusal of a major Japanese publisher, Gakushū Kenkyūsha 學習研究社 (abbr. Gakken 學研), to pay him royalties for the publication of the Japanese translation of the letters between his parents, *Letters between Two [Places]* (*Liangdi shu* 兩地書), on which he still claimed copyright through his mother, Xu Guangping’s portion of the letters. In Haiying’s defense, he says he only wanted Gakken to give the royalties to Uchiyama Kanzō’s widow, see Zhou, *Lu Xun yu wo qishi nian*, 116.

<sup>45</sup> In a letter to Song Lin 宋琳 dated October 12 in 1936, Lu Xun wrote: “In the area I live in Shanghai a lot of people had been moving house. It was rumored there will be armed conflict, but China does not have any soldiers here, so who would they [the Japanese] fight with? Thus, things have calmed down, and there’s been no action in the vicinity of my humble abode—everything is at peace. But minor disputes [*jiuge*] still break out from time to time and that is a real irritation, so I have been hankering to move to the French Concession, choosing some quiet place, off-the-beaten-track, to recuperate from my illness, but I still have not found the [right] building” 滬寓左近，日前大有搬家，謠傳將有戰事，而中國無兵在此，與誰戰乎，故現已安靜，舍間未動，均平安。惟常有小糾葛，亦殊討厭，頗擬搬往法租界，擇僻靜處養病，而屋尚未覓定。 See LXQJ, 13: 444.

<sup>46</sup> Now Huaihai Zhong Lu 淮海中路, 927 Long 弄 (Lane). Xiao Hong 蕭紅 and Xiao Jun 蕭軍 found the apartment for her, which was near to where they were living at the time. See Zhou, *Lu Xun yu wo qishi nian*, 117.

<sup>47</sup> See Zhou, *Lu Xun yu wo qishi nian*, 140. Haiying also states that she burned a number of papers dating after Lu Xun’s death, suggesting that she may have been involved in activities the Japanese would have been incensed by, such as the anti-Japanese Fushe 複社, her alleged connection to which Haiying does not mention in his book.

fact, even his grave was desecrated when Shanghai was occupied by Japan and ostensibly under the rule of the Wang Jingwei 汪精衛 puppet government (the grave was repaired during the war by Uchiyama).

---

## Who Was Dr. Sudō?

At this point one begins to wonder who Dr. Sudō was and how Lu Xun became involved with him. Sudō was born in 1876 in Shimohara Village 下原村 (now Kawakami-gun 川上郡), a small place in Okayama Prefecture 岡山縣. He graduated from a medical academy in 1898 and became an army doctor for the 42<sup>nd</sup> Infantry Division. In 1903 Sudō was assigned to the 15<sup>th</sup> division of the Kenpeitai, which became infamous as a ruthless military secret police force. He was decorated in 1901 (by the Qing dynasty) for meritorious service on the field of battle in 1900 (for what the Japanese then called the Shinkoku Jihen 清國事變, i.e., the Boxer Rebellion) and reassigned to the First Artillery unit in Taipei in 1904; 1907 saw him back in the Chinese mainland, 1912 in Korea, and in 1918 he was promoted to “Military Doctor Second-Class” in the Infantry and eventually entered the reserves while going into practice as a physician in Shanghai, where he was initially affiliated with Fukumin Hospital 福民病院 on North Sichuan Road, later opening his own private clinic (also referred to as a hospital) in March 1936 in the Hongkew 虹口 District of Shanghai, near where Lu Xun lived.<sup>48</sup>

According to Izumi, “it is generally thought that Lu Xun accepted medical treatment from him as a result of an introduction by Uchiyama Kanzō.”<sup>49</sup> The entry in Lu Xun’s diary for October 20 in 1932 mentions that he sent a letter to Sudō. On April 23, 1933 Lu Xun included his name second on a list of nineteen people he invited to a banquet<sup>50</sup> that night

---

<sup>48</sup> The career progression of Sudō is based on Izumi Hyōnosuke’s chronology of Dr. Sudō’s life, translated into Chinese, see Izumi Hyōnosuke [Quan Biao zhizhu], “Xuteng Wubaisan—Lu Xun zuihou de zhuzhiyi,” trans. Jin Conglin and Song Yang, 47–48.

<sup>49</sup> From Izumi Hyōnosuke’s March 1985 article “Sudō Iozou: Lu Xun’s Last Primary Care Physician” translated into Chinese as 須藤五百三：魯迅最後的主治醫 in Jin et al., eds., *Lu Xun siyin zhi mi*, 136.

<sup>50</sup> Lu Xun invited him and 18 others, including Uchiyama Kanzō, Drs. Hamanoue and Tsuboi Yoshiharu as well as their partners and children, to a banquet. See the entry for Lu Xun’s diary on April 23, 1933, which lists Sudō’s name second among the invitees, in LXQJ, 15: 76.

and on June 2, 1933 he asked Sudō to treat a friend's (Miss He 何女士) illness.<sup>51</sup> Izumi dates Lu Xun's first treatment by Sudō as April 17, 1934.<sup>52</sup> On the night of July 1, 1933 Sudō made a house-call to examine Lu Xun's son Haiying for a stomach problem and followed up by coming again the next day.<sup>53</sup> After that, although not a pediatrician, he became Haiying's doctor. This was unusual, because Lu Xun had previously been taking Haiying to a pediatrician at Shinozaki Hospital 篠崎醫院.<sup>54</sup> By November 7, 1934 Lu Xun began taking medicine given him by Sudō for "pain in the intercostal nerves" (*lei jian shenjing tong* 肋間神經痛)<sup>55</sup> and on November 14 he went to Sudō for examination and treatment of his own condition. From then on Sudō became his primary care physician, although Lu Xun was also seeing another Japanese doctor, Matsui Katsufuyu 松井勝冬, the head of internal medicine at the Fukumin Hospital, for a heart condition.<sup>56</sup> Sudō made friends with Lu Xun, which is not entirely within the ethics of a physician-patient relationship.<sup>57</sup> In fact, when it was first suggested that Lu Xun be examined by Dr. Dunn, Lu Xun refused, probably not wanting to offend Sudō by suggesting he did not trust him. The actual visit by Dunn, when it finally came about, was something that Lu Xun was essentially tricked into accepting by Mao Dun and others, who blamed Agnes Smedley (the sometimes-useful pushy American) for pre-arranging

<sup>51</sup> Again, see the diary entry for June 2, 1933 in LXQJ, 15: 83.

<sup>52</sup> Jin et al., eds., *Lu Xun siyin zhi mi*, 135. Lu Xun's diary for that date states: In the morning I went to Sudō's hospital for treatment of a stomach disorder 上午往須藤醫院治胃病, see LXQJ, 15: 143.

<sup>53</sup> See Lu Xun's diary entries for July 1 and 2, 1933, see LXQJ, 15: 88.

<sup>54</sup> Haiying had previously been treated by Tsuboi Yoshiharu 坪井芳治 also referred to in his diary as Tsuboi Gakushi 坪井學士 (Dr. Tsuboi), a pediatrician at Shinozaki Hospital in Shanghai from 1931/1932 to July 1934. Lu Xun wrote out a poem for him in late 1931 or early 1932 titled "In Answer to a Gibe from a Guest" (*Da ke qiao* 答客諷): 無情未必真豪傑, 憐子如何不丈夫。知否興風狂嘯者, 回眸時看小於菟。See Jon Eugene von Kowallis, *The Lyrical Lu Xun: A Study of His Classical-Style Verse*, 178–80.

<sup>55</sup> See Lu Xun's diary entry for November 7, 1934, see LXQJ, 15: 179.

<sup>56</sup> Joshua Fogel, *A Friend in Deed: Lu Xun, Uchiyama Kanzō and the Intellectual World of Shanghai on the Eve of War*, 48.

<sup>57</sup> Zhu Zheng makes this point, in his *Lu Xun zhuan*, 371. Actually, some sort of social interactions between them had begun earlier, at least by October 20, 1932, when Lu Xun wrote him a letter, see LXQJ, 15: 76.

it.<sup>58</sup>

Another detail that was alluded to in Zhou Jianren's 1949 article comes out in Zhou Haiying's book, which asserts that in addition to remaining in the Army Reserves, Sudō also served as Deputy Chairman (*fuhuizhang* 副會長) of the Kokuryūkai 黑龍會 or Amur River Society (lit. the Black Dragon Society), an ultranationalist organization<sup>59</sup> bent on using propaganda, subversion and various extra-legal means to further the expansion of the Japanese Empire (the name went back to 1901, with their founding goal of keeping Russia north of the Amur River [Chinese: Heilongjiang 黑龍江, lit. "Black Dragon River"]). Haiying gives a source for this claim and Zhou Jianren's 1949 article says something similar, citing another source.<sup>60</sup> Zhou Jianren writes:

In addition, I heard from another source: There was an association in Shanghai for Japanese army reserves [discharged military men], an organization of an aggressive nature, for which Sudō served as the Deputy Chairman. It also came to light that few of Sudō's telephone conversations from home had to do with medical matters, rather they were mostly about interactions between China and Japan and the conflict. I then went and urged Lu Xun to stop seeking medical advice from Dr. Sudō. But I did so to no avail.<sup>61</sup>

我又從別處聽來：上海有一個日本在鄉軍人（即退伍軍人）的會，是一個侵略性的團體，須藤擔任副會長。又知道須藤家的電話裡所講的多半不是醫藥上的事情，卻多數是中日之間的交涉與衝突。我遂去勸魯迅不要再請教須藤醫生。但結果無效。

---

<sup>58</sup> Izumi says all this quite clearly. See Quan Biao zhizhu [Izumi Hyōnosuke], trans. Li Mingjun, "Tuomasi B. Deng'en," 52–53.

<sup>59</sup> Zhou, *Lu Xun yu wo qishi nian*, 62.

<sup>60</sup> Haiying writes that an employee of The Commercial Press 商務印書館 in Shanghai named Zhao Pingsheng 趙平聲 said this prior to the January 28<sup>th</sup> Incident, i.e., the Japanese bombing of Shanghai in 1932. See Zhou, *Lu Xun yu wo qishi nian*, 62.

<sup>61</sup> Zhou, "Lu Xun de bing yi bei Xuteng yisheng suo danwu." From this it would seem that Sudō's phone line had been tapped, in the 1930s. Zhou Jianren further cites an unsolicited letter he received from a Mr. Luo 羅 of Jiaotong University, which Jianren subsequently burned, as saying that Sudō was responsible for Lu Xun's death.

Lu Xun supposedly hesitated at first when he was told this but then said: “Just let him continue to treat me. That is probably unimportant” 還是叫他看下去。大概不要緊吧。<sup>62</sup>

Where does this all leave us? I have never seen any proof of Sudō’s membership in the Black Dragon Society. If the Society’s archives have been destroyed or were never opened to begin with, maybe this information would exist in the FBI files because the FBI was keeping watch over their activities, at least in the US, where they tried to influence Japanese residents to support the “Greater East Asian War” (even intimidating some Japanese Americans in the internment camps) and appealing to African Americans in the Nation of Islam during World War II.<sup>63</sup> Izumi states that Sudō became the comptroller (March 20, 1935) then deputy chairman (March 25, 1936) of a Japanese residents’ organization in Shanghai 上海居留民團民會副議長,<sup>64</sup> which makes sense, since he had been in practice there since 1918, but this also suggests he would have had frequent interaction with Japanese consular and other governmental authorities in Shanghai and bears out the political nature of the subject matter Zhou Jianren says was revealed in the phone taps.

What is my conclusion, thus far? The evidence is clearly there that Sudō falsified both dates and the nature of the treatment in his medical report. The obvious suggestion would be that he did so to cover up for his own ineptitude and misdiagnosis, after the fact. The question remaining is whether or not he intentionally mishandled the treatment, which is difficult to prove, but there may be indications of his having come close to this by insisting that there was no fluid accumulation on Lu Xun’s lungs when Dunn could tell that there was, even without an X-ray. Lu Xun

---

<sup>62</sup> Zhou, *Lu Xun yu wo qishi nian*, 63.

<sup>63</sup> The Black Dragon Society sent an agent, Takahashi Satokata (orig. Nakane Naka 中根中, 1870–1945), a retired major of the Japanese Imperial Army, to promote Pan-Asianism in the New World, claiming that Japan would treat colonized peoples (including African Americans) as equals. He became a patron of Elijah Muhammed, leader of the Nation of Islam as well as the “Pacific Movement of the Eastern World.” The Society influenced warlord Zhang Zuolin 張作霖, who was ultimately killed by the Japanese, made inroads in Manchuria, Siberia, the Muslim world (North Africa and Central Asia) and reportedly had contacts with Buddhist monks in Tibet.

<sup>64</sup> See Izumi’s chronology in Izumi, trans. Jin and song, “Xuteng Wubaisan,” 48.

listened to Sudō because Sudō had made friends with him, gaining his confidence (as indicated clearly in Lu Xun's essay "Death"), and had a better bedside manner.<sup>65</sup> Lu Xun was put off by Dunn's gruff and imperious tone, which comes as no surprise to those of us who have had experience with American doctors.<sup>66</sup> By comparison, Sudō was smooth. But Sudō was giving Lu Xun stomach medicine when his symptoms were obviously respiratory,<sup>67</sup> and delayed drawing off the fluid until after the X-ray photo had been made and the necessity for it could no longer be denied. These would have been deliberate and calculated decisions.

---

## Sudō's Decisions in the Final Twenty-Six Hours

On 18 October 1936, the day before Lu Xun died, Sudō told Xu Guangping: "If he makes it through tonight and tomorrow, he will be out of danger" 過了這一夜，再過了明天，就沒有危險了。<sup>68</sup> She later wrote: "At the time I

---

<sup>65</sup> Izumi implies the latter.

<sup>66</sup> In her partisan (and likely somewhat embellished) account in her chapter titled "Lu Hsün," Agnes Smedley implies Dunn was a racist. She writes: "The disappearance or death of his followers acted like corrosive poison on Lu Hsün's body and mind. He sometimes grew so ill he could not rise. He felt that his heart was failing and agreed to receive the best foreign doctor in Shanghai. After the examination, the doctor took me aside and said that he was dying of tuberculosis and only a prolonged rest in a cool, dry climate could halt the disease." The doctor added: "But of course he won't follow my advice. These old-fashioned, ignorant Chinese do not believe in modern medicine!" Lu Hsün did not listen to the advice, but hardly because he was old-fashioned or ignorant. "You ask me to lie on my back for a year while others are fighting and dying?" He asked us accusingly. When we answered such objections, he reminded us of his poverty, but when we offered to collect the money needed, he still refused. Maxim Gorky invited him to the Soviet Union as his guest for a year, but he would not go. He said the Kuomintang would shriek to all China that he was receiving "Moscow gold." "They say that anyway!" I argued. "They dare not," he cried. "Everyone knows they lie! Anyway, China needs me. I cannot go." We pleaded with him in vain. "Everyone cannot run away!" He said. "Someone must stand and fight." Agnes Smedley, *Battle Hymn of China*, 64.

<sup>67</sup> The language in Lu Xun's diary sometimes hints at skepticism toward this diagnosis: "[I] went to Sudō's hospital for treatment, [he] said it was a stomach problem" 往須藤醫院診，雲是胃病—the entry for May 15, 1936.

<sup>68</sup> As quoted in Wang, "Lu Xun siyin zhi mi," in Jin et al., eds., *Lu Xun siyin zhi mi*, 323–24. This sentence first appeared in Xu Guangping's essay "The Last Day" (*Zuihou de yi tian* 最後的一天) published on November 15, 1936, in the journal *Authors*, vol. 2, issue 2, also reprinted in Jin et al., eds., *Lu Xun siyin zhi mi*, 36. A shorter version of the quote "If he makes it through today, he'll be alright" 過了今天就好了 appears in Zhou, *Lu Xun yu wo qishi nian*, 63.

was always trying to be optimistic, so I failed to reflect on the fact that this statement was double-edged.” Lu Xun died in the early morning of October 19. That begs the question—if Sudō realized his state was that critical on the 18th, why was not Lu Xun hospitalized. He was not then in palliative care and had not been expected to die. In fact, the day before (October 17), he was feeling well. In the morning he finished writing a substantial portion of his final essay on Zhang Taiyan 章太炎, then walked to Uchiyama’s bookstore alone and unaided, where he sat in his favorite rattan chair and held a conversation with a Japanese dentist, Okuda Kyouka 奥田杏花, about the prospects for avoiding war between Japan and China, concluding that he saw no hope for it now.<sup>69</sup> This does not sound as if he were fatally ill and Sudō just decided to let him die peacefully at home.

Lu Xun did not sleep well that night (October 17)—he had bad dreams and woke up gasping for breath; early on the morning of 18 October he got up before 6:00 a.m., sat down at his desk and, with considerable effort, wrote a letter in Japanese to Uchiyama Kanzō, cancelling a 10:00 a.m. appointment with a Japanese journalist from *Asahi Shinbun* and asking that Uchiyama phone Dr. Sudō, telling him to come over quickly (Lu Xun’s home had no phone). Uchiyama came in person and found Lu Xun sitting in a chair, half bent over, and having great difficulty breathing. Sudō arrived at 6:30 a.m., determined that he had a weak pulse, an irregular heartbeat, gave him an injection, which had no effect, waited a few minutes and administered a second, probably to something stimulate his heart,<sup>70</sup> which made him feel well enough to sit up and carry on a conversation with the doctor.<sup>71</sup> Sudō then left, saying just to bring Lu Xun a hot-water bottle to warm his feet and that he would return the next morning. Uchiyama left at 7:55 a.m.; he then called the chief of internal medicine at Fukumin Hospital, Dr. Matsui Katsufuyu 松井勝冬, but no one answered. This would seem to indicate Uchiyama was already concerned

---

<sup>69</sup> Fogel, *A Friend in Deed*, 47.

<sup>70</sup> The original Chinese text: 經檢查發現脈搏細弱，心率 120 次，而且“時常停滯”！他的緊急處置就是給魯迅注射（大約是強心劑），又命給他熱水袋暖腳，就走了！See Wang, “Lu Xun siyin zhi mi,” in Jin et al., eds., *Lu Xun siyin zhi mi*, 323. Fogel’s account lacks these details.

<sup>71</sup> Fogel, *A Friend in Deed*, 47.

about Sudō's apparent disregard of the necessity for treatment, despite these rather worrying complications.<sup>72</sup> Later Uchiyama saw another Japanese doctor from the same hospital, Ishii Masayoshi 石井政吉, whom he asked to go check on Lu Xun. After examining Lu Xun, Ishii said his condition was serious. He suggested bringing in an oxygen tank to make it easier for him to breathe, which Uchiyama arranged for, as well as sending a nurse and suggesting more injections, every two hours. The nurse did not arrive until 6:00 p.m. that evening.<sup>73</sup> Uchiyama stayed until midnight, when Xu Guangping urged him to go home and rest. Around 5:00 a.m. the next morning, Uchiyama heard someone call outside his window: "Come quickly and call the doctor."<sup>74</sup> I assume that would have either been Xu Guangping,<sup>75</sup> their servant, or the nurse. Uchiyama had someone call both Ishii and Sudō, then hurried to Lu Xun's home. By the time Uchiyama got to Lu Xun's bedside, it was 5:31 a.m., his body was still warm but there was no pulse. Both doctors arrived soon after that, but Lu Xun was dead. After the fact, they set the time of death at 5:25 a.m. on October 19, 1936. Nevertheless, that was conjecture—when Lu Xun had died, there was no physician in attendance.

---

## Immediate Cause of Death

Dr. Zhou Zhengzhang 周正章, a Chinese physician trained in Western medicine, has also weighed in on the debate with several lengthy articles. Dr. Zhou argued that Sudō was responsible, without a doubt, for Lu Xun's death both through misdiagnosis and through malpractice. In a more recent article, he concludes: "When Lu Xun had this attack,

---

<sup>72</sup> Haiying notes that shortly after Lu Xun's death, when Haiying fell ill and they asked Uchiyama for advice on where to take him, Uchiyama replied: "Let's not have Dr. Sudō look after Haiying's illness" 海嬰的病，不要叫須藤醫生看了吧。Haiying comments: "The implication was that his treatment had already been responsible for one death, so don't let him harm a second person" 那意思似乎是已經有一個讓他治壞了，別讓第二個再受害了。See Zhou, *Lu Xun yu wo qishi nian*, 62.

<sup>73</sup> Wang, "Lu Xun siyin zhi mi," in Jin et al., eds., *Lu Xun siyin zhi mi*, 324.

<sup>74</sup> Fogel, *A Friend in Deed*, 49.

<sup>75</sup> Fogel in an email to me dated March 1, 2019 expressed the view: "I'm certain this was XGP."

Sudō did not make a correct diagnosis, he treated acute pneumothorax as if it were a recurrence of bronchial asthma; he then misdiagnosed it as cardiogenic asthma.<sup>76</sup> The X-ray gave clear evidence that in the case of a tubercular suffering sudden spasmodic attacks of breathlessness, to ignore the possibility of pleurisy was at the very least highly questionable.<sup>77</sup> In the early morning hours of October 18, when Lu Xun suffered spontaneous pneumothorax, Zhou Zhengzhang continues: “At such a juncture the only correct treatment is to draw out air to reduce pressure. If the physician makes an accurate diagnosis and manages emergency treatment properly, draining the cavity in the pleura, venting and allowing it to decompress, the patient will pull through. Lu Xun’s spontaneous pneumothorax condition lasted twenty-six hours, leaving plenty of time and opportunity for successful emergency treatment, but Sudō lost the opportunity.”<sup>78</sup>

---

## Contextualizing Lu Xun’s Death

Medical considerations aside, at this point, we should put his death into its historical context and consider what was going on between Japan and China, the Kuomintang and the Communists, and within the Communist movement itself. In the early 1930s, the Japanese Kwantung (Kantō) Army 關東軍, had been itching to take over Manchuria. There was a minor explosion on September 19, 1931 on the South Manchurian Rail Line near Mukden (Shenyang 瀋陽), which the Kwantung Army commanders then used, without authorization from the civil government in Tokyo, as a pretext to invade and occupy all of Manchuria, proclaiming the puppet state of Manchukuo on February 18, 1932, which was officially recognized by Japan on September 15, 1932 after the assassination of Prime Minister Inukai Tsuyoshi 犬養毅 by right-wing ultra-nationalists. Inukai was the last democratic party politician to hold the Prime Minister’s office until after the Second World War. The Black Dragon Society had been vociferous advocates for the Japanese

---

<sup>76</sup> Zhou Zhengzhang, *Xiaotan ju wang—Lu Xun, Hu Feng, Zhou Yang ji qita*, 30.

<sup>77</sup> Zhu, *Lu Xun zhuan*, 411.

<sup>78</sup> Zhou, *Xiaotan ju wang*, 27.

take-over of Manchuria. As militarist influence increased within Japan, the civil government foundered. On February 26, 1936 radical ultra-nationalist army officers launched a coup-d'état, assassinating moderate politicians, including the Ministers of Finance, the Interior, and Education. The army headquarters first approved of the coup but later disowned it, because Emperor Hirohito and his cabinet took it to be a rebellion and issued orders for the military to suppress it. Though the coup failed and its leaders were executed, the civil government was even more weakened and the military consolidated its control over the political system.

How do we position Lu Xun vis-à-vis these developments? First, he had to survive the “January 28<sup>th</sup> Incident” in 1932, in which the Japanese military launched an attack on Shanghai. To protest Japanese aggression in Manchuria, the Chinese had organized a nationwide boycott of Japanese goods at significant cost to the Japanese economy. As tension mounted, fighting broke out at Shanghai and laid waste to large areas of the city, ceasing only in March 1932. During the actual fighting, Lu Xun found his flat in the line of fire and fled with his family first to Uchiyama’s Bookstore and then to a branch of the store in the British concession.<sup>79</sup> Although the Nineteenth Route Army resisted the Japanese valiantly and with more effect than had been anticipated, part of the city was decimated. Peace talks were convened only after almost two months of armed conflict, through the League of Nations.

Despite rumors to the contrary circulating on the Chinese internet in recent years,<sup>80</sup> Lu Xun was unequivocal in his condemnation of Japanese

---

<sup>79</sup> See Fogel’s account of how Uchiyama intervened several times to give Lu Xun and his family shelter from both this Japanese attack and Kuomintang persecution in *A Friend in Deed*. Zhou Haiying corroborates what Fogel says, adding a piquant comment on his Communist handlers in a footnote: “When tensions with Japan flared, Lu Xun wanted to discuss something with Feng Xuefeng and Zhou Yang, but neither showed up. My uncle [Zhou Jianren] told me Lu Xun was angry and said Feng, who lived nearby, had just disappeared without informing him of a thing . . . a few days later it was Uchiyama who brought a car to take our family to safety in his branch store, where we lived upstairs for forty days.” See, Zhou, *Lu Xun yu wo qishi nian*, 60.

<sup>80</sup> “Lu Xun never said a word against the Japanese aggressors”—this was for a long time the headline on a Chinese website that seems now to have disappeared. The Taiwan-based dissident writer turned television talk-show host Li Ao 李敖 posed a similar question “Did Lu Xun ever dare to revile the Japanese?” which he answered: “He never dared to say anything against them.”

aggression.<sup>81</sup> As early as December 1931 he had begun publishing miscellaneous short essays (*zawen* 雜文) in mass-circulation venues such as the non-aligned *Shun Pao* (*Shenbao* 申報) that were full of jabs at Japanese aggression and the Kuomintang's avowed policy of non-resistance in order to buy time. On February 3, 1932 he signed, along with Mao Dun and some forty other prominent intellectuals, an "Open Letter to the World from Shanghai Cultural Circles" (*Shanghai wenhuajie gao shijie shu* 上海文化界告世界書) decrying "the inhuman cruelty and slaughter perpetrated by Japanese imperialism" and another similar statement in September 1936 "Declaration of Members of the Literary and Art World to Act in Unity in Resisting the Enemy and Advocating Freedom of Speech" (*Wenyijie tongren wei tuanjie yuwu yu yanlun ziyou xuanyan* 文藝界同人爲團結禦侮與言論自由宣言). His essays in the collection *Two Hearts* (*Er xin ji* 二心集) and later collections contain numerous pieces advocating resistance to Japan, such as "On 'Shocking our friendly neighbors'" (*Youbang Jingcha* "論" "友邦驚詫" 論, December 25, 1931), "Floating Dreck" (*Chenzi de fanqi* 沈滓的泛起, December 11, 1931), "Strategic Considerations" (*Zhanlüe guanxi* 戰略關係, February 13, 1933), "Pacifying the Internal and Resisting the External" (*Annei yu rangwai* 安內與攘外, May 5, 1933), "The Chinese People's 'Lifebelt'" (*Zhongguoren de shengmingquan* 中國人的生命圈, April 14, 1933).

Lu Xun was likewise a critic of the Japanese occupation of Manchuria, repeatedly mocking the puppet state and getting in jabs at the Kuomintang government for what amounted to polite acquiescence regarding Manchukuo and non-resistance to Japan. He wrote prefaces for refugee writers from the northeast China: Xiao Hong's *Theater of Life and Death* (*Shengsi chang* 生死場, December 1935) and Xiao Jun's *Village in August* (*Bayue de xiangcun* 八月的鄉村, August 1935) and other anti-Japanese works of fiction, editing their works, finding publishers for them and giving them money to survive on in Shanghai.

Several of his classical-style poems allude to the January 28

---

<sup>81</sup> The charges against Lu Xun were refuted in an interview with journalist Song Lei published in *Changjiang Daily* (*Changjiang ribao* 長江日報) on December 14, 2016, titled "Aodaliya Lu Xun yanjiu zhuanjia Kou Zhiming: Lu Xun de lishi jiazhi yuelaiyu zhongyao."

Conflict—the heartache and the human suffering it caused and several more to Japanese aggression as it continued in the north.<sup>82</sup> These are treated at some length in my book *The Lyrical Lu Xun: A Study of His Classical-Style Verse*, where I discuss some of the veiled (and some not so veiled) references to Japanese aggression, as well as his indignation at the Kuomintang's weak-kneed policies vis-à-vis Japan. One of the more specific examples is his January 31, 1933 classical-style poem “A Lament for the College Students” (*Diao daxuesheng* 弔大學生) which mentions Japanese aggression in its final couplet: “The rising Sun presses down upon Yu Pass, whither our resistance? / Out [in the brothels] among ‘misty flowers,’ no one is alarmed” (*Ri bo yuguan hechu kang? Yanhuachang shang meiren jing* 日薄榆關何處抗，煙花場上沒人驚).<sup>83</sup> Yet Lu Xun still held out hope for peaceful coexistence between the people of China and Japan after the war. His June 21, 1933 classical-style poem “Inscription for the Stupa of the Three Fidelities” (*Ti Sanyi ta* 題三義塔), for instance, ends with the couplet: “We brothers will yet see the day when kalpa surges all abate; / On reuniting, with one smile, we’ll wash away the hate” (*Dujin jiebo xiongdi zai, xiangfeng yi xiao min enchou* 度盡劫波兄弟在，相逢一笑泯恩仇). This is a reflection of his humanism and internationalist spirit, but certainly no expression of pro-Japanese sentiment (as has been asserted by internet commentators of late, who deliberately misread the poem)—the poem itself focuses on the ravages of war caused by the

---

<sup>82</sup> These are the July 11, 1932 poem “Written After the January 28<sup>th</sup> Incident” (*Yi-er-ba zhanhou zuo* 一二八戰後作), see Kowallis, *The Lyrical Lu Xun*, 198–201; the December 31, 1932 “Hearsay” (*Suo wen* 所聞) in *The Lyrical Lu Xun*, 219–22; “Two Untitled Poems” (*Wuti er shou* 無題二首), also dated December 31, 1932, see *The Lyrical Lu Xun*, 223–28; the June 28, 1933 “Untitled” (*Wu ti* 無題) poem beginning “O’er the realm of Yu, many Flying Generals . . .” (*Yuyu duo feijiang* 禹域多飛將), see *The Lyrical Lu Xun*, 272–77; the May 30, 1934 “Untitled” (*Wu ti* 無題) poem beginning “The dark and haggard faces of a countless host, sunken in the bushes, living still, at most . . .” (*Wanjia momian mo haolai* 萬家墨面沒蒿萊), see *The Lyrical Lu Xun*, 311–15; the September 29, 1934 poem “Feelings on an Autumn Night” (*Qiuye you gan* 秋夜有感), see *The Lyrical Lu Xun*, 316–25; the December 5, 1935 poem “Composed on an Impulse in Late Autumn of 1935” (*Hai nian canqiu ouzuo* 亥年殘秋偶作), see *The Lyrical Lu Xun*, 331–37.

<sup>83</sup> Yu Guan 榆關 marks the entry-way to China proper through the Great Wall. “Misty flowers” is a conventional metaphor for prostitutes and the final line is aimed at Kuomintang officials, depicted as shameless panderers.

Japanese military in the January 28 Incident.<sup>84</sup>

Although his most common rhetorical tools were satire, irony and innuendo (since direct attacks on Japan were then banned in the Chinese media), there were a number of points at which he spoke more directly. When students delivered petitions to Nanjing calling for resistance to Japan, for example, the central authorities arrested demonstrators and responded with a telegram to all local military and civil authorities, accusing the students of “disrupting public order” by “shocking our friendly neighbors.” In response, Lu Xun penned an essay in December 1931 titled “On ‘Shocking Our Friendly Neighbors’” (“*Youbang jingcha lun*”), in which he wrote in part:

Fine “friendly neighbors”<sup>85</sup> these! They were not shocked when the troops of imperialist Japan seized Liaoning and Jilin provinces and shelled government offices. They were not shocked when these soldiers cut railways, blew up passenger trains, arrested officials and shot people. They were not shocked by the years of civil war and record floods, the children sold through dire poverty, the display of decapitated heads, the secret assassinations, the confessions extracted by electric shock under the rule of the Nationalist Party of China. But when students sounded a note of protest—then they were shocked!

Fine “friendly neighbors” of the Kuomintang government! The bastards! Even if the crimes so enumerated are true, these things exist in each and every “friendly-neighbor land.” The prisons they use to maintain “order” have torn the masks off their “civilization,” so how can they still have the gall to maintain those fake expressions of shock?

But as soon as our “friendly neighbors” are shocked, our government trembles: “If this goes on, the country will be ruined!”

---

<sup>84</sup> The full text of the poem: 奔霆飛標殲人子，敗井頹垣剩餓鳩。偶值大心離火宅，終遭高塔念瀛洲。精禽夢覺仍銜石，鬥士誠堅共抗流。度盡劫波兄弟在，相逢一笑泯恩仇。 Again, for a treatment in English, see Kowallis, *The Lyrical Lu Xun*, 265–71.

<sup>85</sup> The “friendly neighbors” would have been the Western powers: the US, Britain and France.

Apparently losing the three north-eastern provinces makes Kuomintang China more like a country than before. Nobody uttered a word when they were lost, except for the few students who sent in petitions, and our Party-State won the praise of our “friendly neighbors” for making China more like a country than before—long may it last!<sup>86</sup>

好個“友邦人士”！日本帝國主義的兵隊強佔了遼吉，炮轟機關，他們不驚訝；阻斷鐵路，追炸客車，捕禁官吏，槍斃人民，他們不驚訝。中國國民黨治下的連年內戰，空前水災，賣兒救窮，砍頭示眾，秘密殺戮，電刑逼供，他們也不驚訝。在學生的請願中有一點紛擾，他們就驚訝了！

好個國民黨政府的“友邦人士”！是些什麼東西！即使所舉的罪狀是真的罷，但這些事情，是無論那一個“友邦”也都有的，他們的維持他們的“秩序”的監獄，就撕掉了他們的“文明”的面具。擺什麼“驚訝”的臭臉孔呢？

可是“友邦人士”一驚訝，我們的國府就怕了，“長此以往，國將不國”了，好像失了東三省，黨國倒愈像一個國，失了東三省誰也不響，黨國倒愈像一個國，失了東三省只有幾個學生上幾篇“呈文”，黨國倒愈像一個國，可以博得“友邦人士”的誇獎，永遠“國”下去一樣。

---

## How Would Japanese Intelligence Have Viewed Lu Xun's Underground Activities?

On September 30, 1933 when the CPC underground in Shanghai organized in secret the Far Eastern Conference of the World Committee against Imperialist War, Soong Ch'ing-ling 宋慶齡 was elected chair and Lu Xun honorary chairman. But Lu Xun's relations with the underground CPC leadership in Shanghai were not particularly smooth. In December 1934 he described his political position as *heng zhan* 橫站 (lit. “standing horizontally”) meaning that he wanted to keep his independent positions.<sup>87</sup> Most notably during the so-called “Battle of the Slogans” in

---

<sup>86</sup> First published in the periodical *Crossroads* (*Shizi Jietou* 十字街頭), issue no. 2 (December 25, 1931), Lu Xun included it in *Two Hearts*, in *LXQJ*, 4: 360–362. I have modified the Yangs' translation in *LXSW*, 3: 159–61.

<sup>87</sup> From a letter to his editor Yang Jiyun 楊霽雲 dated December 18, 1934. Lu Xun felt at the time that he was being attacked from within his own camp by Shao Bo 紹伯 (Tian Han 田漢), who said he was publishing in the same journals that carried anti-Communist articles.

1936, when he rejected, as capitulationist, the Moscow-inspired line on the role of “National Defense Literature”, as articulated by Zhou Yang 周揚 (1908–89), proposing instead the adoption of Hu Feng’s (1902–85) slogan “Mass Literature for the National Revolutionary War”). “National Defense Literature” was supposed to encourage a united front with the Kuomintang in the face of the Japanese threat. Hu Feng’s slogan, which Lu Xun presented as his own (in order to shield Hu Feng), also advocated resistance to Japan, but had class, anti-Kuomintang, and internationalist implications. This debate is still a historical issue today, as some accuse Lu Xun of “misunderstanding the change in policy,” others regard Lu Xun’s position as nearly the same as that of the Trotskyists (which he himself denied, although he refused to join Zhou Yang’s new Writers Association after the dissolution of the League of Left-Wing Writers). Others in the Party looked at it simply as another example of Lu Xun’s insubordination and sought, in the 1950s, to blame Hu Feng and Feng Xuefeng for alienating him from the Party.<sup>88</sup>

Because of these factors, I am not convinced that Lu Xun’s position in this debate in 1936 was interpreted by the Japanese military intelligence as divisive<sup>89</sup> and therefore to Japan’s advantage. Indeed, in Lu Xun’s public statements he became increasingly opposed to Japan. For example, in his “Reply to Xu Maoyong and On the United Front” (*Da Xu Maoyong bing guan yu Kang Ri tongyi zhanxian wenti* 答徐懋庸並關於抗日統一戰線問題) written between August 3–6, 1936 he stated:

To my mind, we should unite writers under the banner of “opposing Japanese aggression” or “national defense,” but we cannot ask all writers to unite under the slogan “national defense literature” because some of them do not write works “with national defense as

---

<sup>88</sup> Zhou, *Lu Xun yu wo qishi nian*, 310.

<sup>89</sup> Takeuchi Yoshimi had enough insight to interpret it as such in 1943, see Takeuchi Yoshimi 竹內好, *Rojin* 魯迅, 7–8. But he wasn’t working for the Kenpeitai in 1936—at that time he was the leader of a group of younger scholars in the Japanese sinological world interested in modern China. The “Battle of the Slogans” was actually initiated by Zhou Yang’s unilateral dissolution of the League of Left-Wing Writers, of which Lu Xun had been the titular head since 1930, without consulting Lu Xun.

the main theme,” yet in other respects they can still join the united front against Japanese aggression.<sup>90</sup>

---

## Conclusion

From the perspective of the Japanese militarists, who were rattled that the Chinese Nineteenth Route Army had resisted their attack on Shanghai with more effect than had been anticipated, by the mid-1930s Lu Xun would seem to have become at best a loose cannon and at worst their potentially most damaging critic. If we compare the weight his views carried in the eye of the Chinese public with those of, say, Wu Zihui 吳稚暉 (1865–1953) or Hu Shih 胡適 (1891–1962), Lu Xun had the potential to become a far greater thorn in Japan's side than any spokesperson in China. In fact, from the public positions he put forth, that was already the case. Gone forever was the moment when someone like his first biographer, Oda Takeo 小田嶽夫 (1900–1978) could conclude that in light of Lu Xun's acerbic criticisms of the myriad abuses by the rulers of his country, “it becomes obvious why Japan had to take up this injustice to the people and make its incursion into China.”<sup>91</sup> This would have been a big loss in terms of public relations for the cause of Japanese militarism. By March of 1936 Lu Xun was a sick man—and that is when the treatments began to be botched. No proof has emerged that Dr. Sudō intentionally killed him or that Sudō was a member of the Black Dragon Society, but it is a fact that dates and actions in the medical record were falsified, and that alone constitutes something more than circumstantial evidence. Given the heightening tensions, it is no surprise that scholars in China continue to speculate on the reasons for his death. After all, wouldn't there have been a sigh of relief from multiple quarters if he had gone some place where he could not write or, better yet, if he simply dropped dead? As Takeuchi Yoshimi describes the aftermath of his death:

---

<sup>90</sup> LXQJ, 6: 531; LXSJ, 4: 289.

<sup>91</sup> Oda Takeo, *Rojin Den*. This a 178 page biography was translated into Chinese by Fan Quan as *Lu Xun zhuan*. This is just one of four Chinese translations. It was the earliest biography of Lu Xun and first came out serially in Japanese in 1940 in the journal *New Tide* (*Xinchao* 新潮).

From the seventh year of the Republic [1918] when at the age of thirty-eight he published “Diary of a Madman” until the twenty-fifth year of the Republic [1936] when he died in Shanghai at the age of fifty-six with his translation of [Gogol’s] *Dead Souls* unfinished—a period of about eighteen years—Lu Xun never once backed away from the central position he held in China’s literary world. But the fact that he had been the center of the literary world was only universally recognized after his death. Although he had been the constant focus of attention (*hōhen* 褒貶, lit. “praise and condemnation”), for the most part people kept their distance from him (*sogai suru* 疎外する). Lu Xun died before the crack of dawn on October 19 [1936], but still at the moment of his death he belonged to a minority in the literary world. While he was alive, he stuck tenaciously to his own positions. Rather than saying his opposition to the majority at this time was rendered meaningless by his death, it would be far better to say that his death saved him from such meaningless opposition. By this, the thing he had most wanted to accomplish as part of his enlightenment project, but yet which ran counter to his very nature as a man of letters—the unity of the literary world—was achieved. His funeral on October 22 spontaneously drew thousands of participants, becoming the first “mass funeral” (*minzhong zang* 民衆葬, as Ba Jin 巴金 called it) in Chinese history. Wrapped in white cloth, on which the characters *minzu hun* 民族魂 (“The Soul of the Nation”) were written, his coffin was interred at dusk in the ground of the International Cemetery by a group of young writers. Possibly due to the high emotions accompanying the ceremony, quite a few leading writers hugged his coffin and wailed. In the following month, all of the literary journals came out with memorial editions. **That marked the first time since the advent of the “literary revolution” that there was no argument in the literary world.**<sup>92</sup>

So I would end, not by simply pointing the finger at Japan, but rather by

---

<sup>92</sup> Takeuchi Yoshimi, *Rojin*, 7–8. See also *Takeuchi Yoshimi zenshū*, vol. 1, 3–4. Emphasis is my own.

calling for a reappraisal of the actions of all the “stakeholders” at the time. In so far as later-day scholarship goes, it is regrettable that Dr. Izumi spent his time and grant money searching for the graves of Dr. Dunn’s ancestors in Scotland, rather than locating and going through the membership files of the Kokuryūkai and other archival information in Japan about Sudō’s activities in China. Again, this suggests a deliberate choice was made to look in one direction and away from another. How many of Lu Xun’s letters remain unpublished and why? What do the KMT Military Bureau of Statistics and Investigation intelligence archives say about Sudō and, even more importantly, Lu Xun? Those files, if they exist on Chinese Taiwan, have never been revealed to the scrutiny of researchers.

**Acknowledgments** The author would like to thank the Australian Research Council (ARC) for support toward this research in project DP110105120.

---

## References

- Chou, Eva Shan. *Memory, Violence, Queues: Lu Xun Interprets China*. Ann Arbor: Association for Asian Studies, 2012.
- Davies, Gloria. *Lu Xun's Revolution: Writing in a time of Violence*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012.
- Dunn, Dorothy Allen. “Experiences in Shanghai.” *The Times of San Mateo*, November 10, 1944.
- Fogel, Joshua. *A Friend in Deed: Lu Xun, Uchiyama Kanzō and the Intellectual World of Shanghai on the Eve of War*. Ann Arbor: Association for Asian Studies, 2019.
- Izumi Hyōnosuke. “Sudō Iozō—Rojin saigo no shujiishi” 須藤五百三——魯迅最後的主治醫師 (Sudō Iozō—Lu Xun’s last primary care physician) published in the journal *Fukui Kenritsu Tanki Daigaku Kenkyu Kiyō* (Bulletin of Fukui Prefectural Junior College), no. 10, 2003. The chronology was excerpted and published in Chinese translation in *Lu Xun yanjiu yuekan* (Lu Xun research monthly) 12 (2003): 47–48.
- Izumi Hyōnosuke [Quan Biaozhizhu]. “Tuomasī B. Deng’ēn—Wei Lu Xun zhencha de Meiguó yishi” (Thomas B. Dunn: The American physician who examined Lu Xun). Translated by Li Mingjun. *Shanghai Lu Xun yanjiu* (Shanghai Lu Xun researches) 15 (2003): 51–65.
- . “Lu Xun riji zhong de yiliao: Di-yi bao jichu taolun” (Medical treatments recorded in Lu Xun’s Diaries: Report number 1, a basic discussion). Translated by Song Yang and Jin Conglin. *Lu Xun yanjiu yuekan* (Lu Xun research monthly) 1 (2004): 30–42.
- Ji Weizhou. “Jiekai Lu Xun siyin zhi mi” (Solving the puzzle of Lu Xun’s death). Supplement.

- Nanjing ribao* (Nanjing daily), May 5, 1984.
- . “Lu Xun siyin yinqi de fengbo” (The controversy ignited by [questioning] the cause of Lu Xun’s death). *Shanxi wenxue* (Shanxi literature) 5 (2005): 83–86.
- Jin Conglin, et al., eds. *Lu Xun siyin zhi mi* (The riddle of the cause of Lu Xun’s death). Taipei: Renjian chubanshe, 2014.
- Kowallis, Jon Eugene von. “Lu Xun: The Sexier Story.” *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews* 27 (2005): 151–66.
- Lu Xun. *Lu Xun quanji* (Complete works of Lu Xun). Beijing: Renmin wenxue chubanshe, 1991.
- . *Lu Xun Selected Works*. Translated by Yang Xianyi and Gladys Yang. Beijing: Foreign Languages Press, 1980.
- Nagahori Yüzō. *Lu Xun yu Tuoluociji: Wenxue yu geming zai Zhongguo* (Lu Xun and Trotsky: Literature and Revolution in China). Translated by Wang Junwen. Taipei: Renjian chubanshe, 2015.
- Oda Takeo. *Rojin Den* (Biography of Lu Xun). Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1941.
- Pollard, David E. *The True Story of Lu Xun*. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 2002.
- Smedley, Agnes. *Battle Hymn of China*. London: Victor Gollancz, 1944.
- Song Lei. “Aodaliya Lu Xun yanjiu zhuanjia Kou Zhiming: Lu Xun de lishi jiazhi yuelaiyue zhongyao” (Australian Lu Xun researcher Jon Eugene von Kowallis: Lu Xun’s historical significance only increases). *Changjiang ribao* (Yangzi river daily) December 14, 2016.
- Takeuchi Yoshimi. *Rojin 鲁迅* (Lu Xun). Tokyo: Miraisha, 1961.
- . *Takeuchi Yoshimi zenshū* (The complete works of Takeuchi Yoshimi). 17 vols. Tokyo: Chikuma shobō, 1980.
- Wang Ming. *Zhonggong wushi nian* (The Chinese Communists over fifty years). Beijing: Dongfang chubanshe, 2004.
- Wang Xirong. “Lu Xun siyin zhi mi” (The riddle of the cause of Lu Xun’s death). *Lu Xun shijie* (Lu Xun’s world) 4 (2002): 35–50.
- Yan Jiayan. “Xuteng yisheng suo xie Lu Xun bingli weihe yu Lu Xun riji ji shuxin diwu de zai tantao” (Another enquiry into the reasons for the discrepancies between the medical record written by Dr. Sudō and Lu Xun’s diary and letters). *Lu Xun yanjiu yuekan* (Lu Xun research monthly) 2 (2004): 67–69.
- Zhou Haiying. *Lu Xun yu wo qishi nian* (Lu Xun and I throughout seventy years). Haikou: Nanhai chuban gongsi, 2001.
- Zhou Jianren. “Lu Xun de bing yi bei Xuteng yisheng suo danwu” (It is suspected that [treatment of] Lu Xun’s illness was held up by Dr. Sudō). *Renmin ribao* (People’s daily), special column, October 19, 1949.
- Zhou Zhengzhang. *Xiaotan ju wang* (A standing joke). Taipei: Xiuwei zixun keji gufen youxian gongsi, 2009.
- Zhu Zheng. *Lu Xun zhuan* (Biography of Lu Xun). 2008. Reprint, Hong Kong: Sanlian shudian, 2014.
- . *Lu Xun zhuan: Xiudingben* (Biography of Lu Xun: Revised edition). Beijing: Renmin wenxue chubanshe, 2018.