

CHINA'S NEW DEMOCRACY

By MAO TSE-TUNG

With an Introduction by

EARL BROWDER

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS NEW YORK

NOTE

The text of this pamphlet originally appeared in the January 15, 1941, issue of the magazine CHINESE CULTURE, under the title "The Politics and Culture of New Democracy."

First Printing 7,500
Second Printing 5,000

Published by New Century Publishers
(632 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y., Feb., 1945 PRINTED IN U.S.A.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION, by Earl Browder 5
CHINA'S NEW DEMOCRACY, by Mao Tse-tung 11
FOR UNITY IN CHINA'S WAR OF RESISTANCE 54



MAO TSE-TUNG

Chairman of the Communist Party of China

Drawing by Hugo Gellert

INTRODUCTION

China's New Democracy, by Mao Tse-tung, outstanding spokesman for the Chinese Communists, is a work of historical importance. It was written toward the end of 1940 and published early in 1941, and therefore does not take into consideration the epoch-making developments that followed within twelve months, the spreading of the war to engulf the Soviet Union and the United States, and the creation of the United Nations coalition; it could not foresee the deep changes that produced and flow from the Teheran Conference of 1943. And yet, already in 1940, the Marxists of China had defined clearly their program which in the most essential points prepared them to lead their country fully into the main stream of world democratic development. This basic program is stated in this booklet. With very few further developments, which the Chinese Communist Party has made from time to time in its manifestoes and declarations, during the past three years, it is the democratic foundation for a China that fully takes her place as one of the "Big Four" of world affairs.

In the United States this work of Mao Tse-tung is four years late in appearing in print. This is due to the rigid blockade and censorship exercised by the Kuomintang regime in Chungking against the Communist-led areas of the Northwest Autonomous Border Region of China, a blockade which itself constitutes one of the major obstacles to the progress of the war against the Japanese invaders. The Kuomintang dictatorship has done its utmost to blot out the Border Region from the sight and hearing of the rest of the world. Only during the past months, and as the result of major diplomatic efforts, was this blockade and censorship broken through to some extent, and visits by foreign newspaper correspondents and military observers to the Border Region permitted, to reveal the democratic and progressive work that has made this Region a stronghold of the anti-Japanese war. This long delay in reaching the American public has not detracted from the basic importance of Mao Tse-tung's booklet.

This Introduction is being written at a moment of renewed crisis in China's foreign and domestic relations. Our American General, Joseph W. Stilwell, has just been withdrawn from the Chinese theatre of war upon the demand of Chiang Kai-shek. Such a conservative organ of opinion as the *New York Times* in its issue of Nov. 1, 1944, speaks of an "acute" situation in which "the

United States lost a battle, and the Chinese people may be said to have lost one, too." The *Times* sums up the roots of the crisis in the words: "Intrigue, ambition, jealousy and dishonesty have been in high places." The *Times* sees as minimum requirements for solution of the crisis, that Chungking shall accept American military guidance in return for American military help; that the whole weight of Chinese armies shall be thrown against the Japanese instead of holding a great part of them inactive or on guard duty against the Northwest Autonomous Border Region; that a genuine truce shall be concluded with the Communists, and the Chungking government be reconstituted to include representative groups and parties; and that freedom of the press and of discussion shall be permitted. When the conservative *Times* recognizes these items as indispensable to "a stable and prosperous China," this issue can no longer be dismissed as "Communist propaganda" as was done by the current propagandist for Dewey, Representative Clare Boothe Luce.

Thus the Kuomintang-Communist deadlock in China has culminated in a crisis and deadlock between the Governments of China and the United States. It is a world issue of the first order. It is an issue, therefore, upon which the American public must inform itself from the most authoritative sources.

"China's New Democracy" by Mao Tse-tung is one of the essential documents for evaluating the current Chinese crisis. This booklet may present a few difficulties to the average American reader, for it is thoroughly Chinese and at the same-time thoroughly Marxian, and proceeds from many assumptions and conceptions of Chinese and Marxian origin which may not be familiar to the reader. A careful study of the booklet, however, will disclose that these difficulties are easily overcome by any intelligent reader even if he is entirely without special training in Chinese tradition or Marxian modes of thought, for the address is made basically to the universal human intelligence and common sense.

It has seemed to me, however, that it would help the average American reader considerably to understand the main issues of the Kuomintang-Communist conflict, if they were restated quite simply and briefly in terms made familiar in our own national experience. I attempt this with the warning to the reader that my observations are intended not at all as a substitute for Chinese statements of the issues, but only as an aid toward assimilating

the issues into American modes of thought.

Chiang Kai-shek and his associates assail the Northwest Autonomous Border Region as a violation of the unity of the nation, and demand that it shall submit itself unconditionally to the authority of Chungking; one of Chiang's, apologists in America has written that he could no more accept the Border Region's regime than Roosevelt could accept a new Northwest Border regime under Communist leadership in the United States. The answer to such a comparison with America is that the United States has a constitutional democratic regime that has developed continuously for over 150 years, while China's Chungking administration is neither constitutional nor democratic, it is the self-constituted power of an extremely limited fraction of the Chinese population. To make any valid comparison with American experience, it would be necessary to go back to our pre-constitutional days, and assume that a provisional national government in America had decided to wipe out all State governments and in their place to appoint administrations for all States and localities. This would need further qualification, that America never had even a provisional national government so entirely unrepresentative as the Chungking regime in China, for our Continental Congress was at least the beginnings of representative national government; yet neither it, nor the succeeding constitutional Federal Government ever dreamed of wiping out local self-government and substituting for it governments appointed from the center. Yet that is exactly what Chiang Kai-shek is demanding in relation to the Northwest Border Region. The whole force of American experience goes to support the Northwest Border Region as against the extreme centralism and entire absence of democracy of the Chungking regime of Chiang Kai-shek; we know from American experience that our own nation could never have been united and become strong by applying the formula Chiang Kai-shek is trying to use for China.

In American experience it is true, however, that collisions between national and regional governments on policies, as outstandingly in our Civil War of 1861-65, were struggles in which the national government represented progress to a better future while the regional governments represented backwardness and even semi-feudal reversions that would have been fatal to our Country. Uncritically applying this experience by analogy to the

Chinese situation, Americans would automatically come to the support of Chungking against the Northwest Border Region. But such an analogy would be completely false. Chungking is more comparable to our Buchanan administration, that preceded Lincoln, if we would assume that Buchanan had abolished elections, prevented Lincoln from assuming the Presidency, and had proceeded to impose the slave order of the South upon the North and West of the United States. For it is Chungking which represents the semi-feudal survivals of China. the landlordism, the oppression, bribery, the denial of democracy, the suppression of capitalist industrial progress, the enthronement of speculation and usury; while the Northwest Border Region represents progress, democracy, self-government, and the economic rebuilding of the country.

Another chief issue of the Kuomintang-Communist deadlock in China is, that Chiang Kai-shek demands that the Eighth Route and New Fourth Armies shall be reduced from their present 600,000 soldiers to not more than 100,000, and that they shall not take any territories from the Japanese invaders except and until Chiang is ready to send in his own forces to control and administer them. If we want to compare this with American experience, during the formation of our nation, we would have to imagine George Washington, in 1776, denouncing Sam Adams as a "red" and demanding that Massachusetts armed forces should be reduced to one-sixth of their numbers, and that they should not take any positions from the British until Washington was ready to occupy those points with Virginians. Of course we know that if Washington had done anything of the kind the American nation would not have been born; we know that he did the opposite, he went personally and alone to Massachusetts to help raise greater armies there and to lead them, with never a thought of building his own personal or local forces for the future domination of the nation. That is why Washington was great, and that is why Chiang Kai-shek cannot properly be called the Washington of China.

Why should Americans support Chiang Kai-shek's demand for reducing the number of Chinese soldiers fighting against the Japanese? Why should any Chinese, for that matter, who puts the liberation of the nation above all private interests, demand the reduction of the fighting forces? Whose interest is served by such a demand? It is easy to understand why the Japanese should wish such a reduction of China's fighting forces, but why any patriotic

American or Chinese should join in such a demand is unimaginable! Especially when it is exactly those forces whose reduction in numbers is demanded that compose the armies which, against the greatest handicaps, have performed miracles of warfare against the superior forces of the Japanese invaders over many years.

Finally, Americans need to understand the historical background of the existence of two centers of armed forces in China. This arose out of ten years of civil war in China, from 1927 to 1937. From 1924 to 1927, the Kuomintang rose to power in China through applying the policies laid down by the great Sun Yat-sen, which included a coalition with the Chinese Communists and friendship with the Soviet Union. In 1927, Chiang Kai-shek broke with the Sun Yat-sen policies, and launched a civil war of extermination against the Communists. For ten years Chiang carried on this war, with all the resources of China at his command, and with the support, moral and material, of Japan and Germany, as well as of Britain and the United States, while he submitted to Japan's seizure of Manchuria and North China. But even though Chiang's armies killed hundreds of thousands and perhaps millions of Chinese citizens, he failed completely to wipe out the Chinese Communists, who grew stronger and entrenched themselves in a great territory of China in the Northwest area. The Chinese Communists could not be wiped out because they had the active support of the masses of people, peasants, artisans, and workers, as well as the best intellectual circles, and because they represented economic progress. In 1937 this ten-year civil war ended in a truce looking toward unification to fight the Japanese, when the Communists saved Chiang's life in the "Sian incident," with Chiang's recognition of the autonomous rights of the Northwest Border area and its armies, and the Communists recognizing the supreme leadership of Chiang. But early in 1941 Chiang again made an armed attack against the Communists, giving as explanation that there was danger that they would succeed in capturing the area between Shanghai, Hangchow and Nanking from the Japanese, and that this would give the Communists so much power that he could no longer control them. Chiang preferred to have the Japanese in possession of that area than that the democratic movement led by the Chinese Communists should control it. For the past four years Chiang has kept 500,000 of his "Best trained and equipped soldiers in the

Northwest blockading the border *I* of the Northwest Border Region, instead of at the front against the Japanese. At the same time he suppresses the democratic circles in the Kuomintang, as witnessed by the recent speeches of Sun Fo, the son of the famous Sun Yat-sen.

Now Chiang is threatening to try again to wipe out the Border Region and its armies. But if from 1927 to 1937 he failed in this, when he was ten times as strong as now and the Communists were much weaker, there is today absolute certainty of his-failure. Indeed, even to hold such a thought today Chiang must at the same moment be thinking of coming to some sort of terms with the Japanese, otherwise the whole idea is absurd. Without such an arrangement, a new military effort by Chiang against the Communists would only insure his downfall and destruction.

These are the hard facts which give the background necessary for an evaluation of Mao Tse-tung's booklet "China's New Democracy," presented here for the first time in the English language, containing the Chinese Communist's long-time program and perspective for the liberation and development of that great nation. It should further be read in connection with the critical evaluation of Chiang Kai-shek's new book *China's Destiny*, contained in an article published in the January, 1944, issue of *The Communist*, written by Chen Pai-ta, an associate of Mao Tse-tung.

EARL BROWDER.

November 1, 1944.

CHINA'S NEW DEMOCRACY

By MAO TSE-TUNG

I. Whither China?

After the war of resistance began, a cheering and inspiring air prevailed among our countrymen. The former brow-knitted faces were no longer seen, for all believed that our nation had at last found a way out. It is only the recent atmosphere of compromise and the tide of anti-Communism which grows higher daily, that has again created a state of bewilderment. This fact is especially obvious among young students and people of the cultural field whose senses are more acute than those of others. Thus, the question "How to proceed?" or "Whither China?" again stands before us. Because of this, it may be worth while to utilize the opportunity of the publication of the *Chinese Culture* magazine to say a few words about the trend of Chinese politics and Chinese culture. I am a layman in cultural problems. I wish very much to make a study of them, but in such work I have only taken the first step. However, many thorough-going articles have been written by our comrades in Yen-an on the subject, so this rough sketch of mine may be looked upon as a mere prelude. To the senior cultural workers of the country, our work here serves only as a humble suggestion, through which, we hope, joint discussion can be aroused and a correct conclusion that suits the needs of our nation drawn. A scientific attitude should be one that "searches for the truth from concrete facts," and problems can never be solved with vain, self-assertive and self-important attitudes. The catastrophe of our nation is grave. Only a scientific attitude and a spirit of responsibility can lead us to the road of emancipation. There is but one truth. This truth is determined not by subjective boasting but by objective practice. Only the revolutionary practice of millions of people can be taken as the gauge for measuring truth. Such is our attitude in the publication of the *Chinese Culture*.

II. We Must Establish a New China

For the many past years, Communists have struggled not only for the political and economic revolution in China, but also for the cultural revolution, all aiming at the construction of a new society and a new country for the Chinese people, in which not only a

new system of politics and economy but also a new culture will prevail. This means that we have not only to change politically oppressed and economically exploited China into a country politically free and economically prosperous, but also to change a country whose people are so ignorant, backward and long ruled by an old culture, into a civilized, progressive one ruled by a new culture. In brief, we must construct a New China. And to establish a new culture of the Chinese nation is the aim of our work in the cultural sphere.

III. China's Historical Characteristics

What is this new culture of the Chinese nation that we are going to establish?

Any given culture (as a form of ideas) is the reflection of a given political and economic system of society, though the former in turn exerts immense influence upon the latter; and politics is the concentrated expression of economy. This is our fundamental point of view toward the relationship of culture, politics and economy. Hence it is the given politics and economy that first determines the given culture, which only subsequently itself exerts influence upon the politics and economy. Marx said: "It is not the ideology of the society that determines its existence, but the existence of the society that determines its ideology." He also added: "Philosophers of former times only explained the world, but the important point is how to change and improve the world." This is the first scientific explanation in the history of mankind, correctly to answer the question of the relation between ideology and existence, and that became the fundamental starting point of Lenin's motive, : revolutionary theory of reflection which was developed from this Marxist point of view. In our discussion of China's cultural problems, this starting point should never be neglected.

It is quite clear then that the old culture which we wish to sweep away cannot be isolated from the old politics and old economy of our nation, and the new culture which we aim to establish cannot be isolated from our new politics ' and new economy. The old politics and old economy are the foundations of the old culture; and the new politics and new economy of the new culture.

What is the content of the so-called old politics and old economy of China? And what is the content of the old culture?

Since the Chow and Chin dynasties, China has been a feudal society. Her politics and economy have been feudal in character. So has her culture—the reflection of her politics and economy.

Nevertheless, since the aggression of foreign capitalism, and since some capitalist elements gradually grew within Chinese society, *i.e.*, in the hundred years from the Opium War to the present anti-Japanese war, China gradually turned into a colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal society. At present, in the occupied territories, the society is colonial in character; in the non-occupied areas, it is semicolonial; while in both of them the feudal system still dominates. This is the character of the present Chinese society, or the "national condition" of China. The dominant politics and economy are therefore colonial, semicolonial and semi-feudal in character; and so is the culture.

These dominant politics, economy and culture are the objects of our revolution. It is the old colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal politics, economy and culture that we aim to sweep away, and it is new politics, economy and culture, something exactly opposite to the old, that we are going to establish.

Then what should be the content of the new politics and new economy of the Chinese nation? And what should be the content of the new culture?

The historical process of the Chinese revolution must be divided into two stages: first the democratic revolution and then the socialist revolution—two revolutionary processes quite different in character. The democracy mentioned here is not the old democracy of the old type, but the New Democracy of the new type.

Therefore it may be concluded that the new politics, economy and culture of the Chinese nation are nothing other than the politics, economy and culture of the New Democracy.

This is the historical characteristic of the present Chinese revolution. Whoever, while engaging in revolutionary work in China, does not comprehend this historical characteristic will not be able to direct the revolution or carry it on to victory. On the contrary, he will be forsaken by the people and will inevitably become a pitiful failure.

IV. China's Revolution is a Part of the World Revolution

The historical characteristic of the Chinese revolution is that it is divided into two steps, that of democracy and that of

socialism. The democracy of the first step is not democracy in its general sense but a new special type of a Chinese style, the New Democracy. How then was this historical characteristic formed? Did it originally exist during these hundred years or was it generated only afterward?

A superficial study of the historical development of China and the world will reveal that such a historical characteristic did not exist in the days of the Opium War or in the period immediately following it. but took shape after the first imperialist world war and the Russian October Revolution. Let us now stop to study the process of its formation.

It is evident that if the present society of China is colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal in character, the process of China's revolution must be divided into two steps. The first step is to change the colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal form of society into an independent democratic ' society, while the second step is to push the revolution forward to establish a socialist society. What we are carrying on now is the first step of the Chinese revolution.

This first step may be said to have begun from the days of the Opium War in 1840, *i.e.*, from the time when the Chinese society commenced to change from its original feudal form to the semi-colonial and semi-feudal form. During this period, we had the Tai Ping Revolution" the Sino-French War, the Sino-Japanese War, the Reform Movement of 1898, the 1911 Revolution, the May 4th Movement, the May 30th Movement, the Northern Expedition, the Agrarian Revolution, the December 9th Movement, and the present Anti-Japanese War. All the above movements, to speak from a certain point of view, were for the realization of the first step of China's revolution. They were movements of the Chinese people in different periods and in different degrees to realize such a step—to oppose imperialism and feudalism and to struggle for the establishment of an independent democratic society. The 1911 Revolution was only its realization in a more concrete sense. This revolution, in its social character, was a bourgeois-democratic revolution and not a proletarian-socialist revolution. It is not yet consummated, and therefore needs our further effort, because the enemies of this revolution are still extremely strong at present. The word "revolution" in Dr. Sun's famous saying: "The revolution is not yet consummated, and our comrades must still exert their efforts" refers to this bourgeois-democratic revolution.

A change took place in the Chinese bourgeois-democratic revolution after the outbreak of the first imperialist world war and the formation of the socialist state on one-sixth of the earth's surface through the success of the Russian October Revolution in 1917.

Before that, the Chinese bourgeois-democratic revolution belonged to the category of the old bourgeois-democratic revolution of the world, and was a part of it.

Since then, the Chinese bourgeois-democratic revolution has changed its character and belongs to the category of the new bourgeois-democratic revolution. As far as the revolutionary front is concerned, it is a part of the world proletarian-socialist revolution.

Why? Because the first imperialist world war and the victorious socialist October Revolution changed the historical direction of the world, and drew a sharp dividing line between two historical stages.

At a time when world capitalism has collapsed in one part of the earth (a part occupying one-sixth of the earth's surface), while elsewhere it has clearly shown its symptoms of decadence; when the remaining part of the capitalist world cannot go on without relying more than ever on the colonies and semi-colonies; when the Socialist state has been established and declares its willingness to assist the struggle for the liberation movements of all the colonies and semi-colonies; and when the proletariats of the capitalist countries are being freed day by day from the influence of the imperialist social-democratic parties and also declare themselves willing to assist the liberation movement of the colonies and semi-colonies; at a time like this, any revolution of the colonies and semi-colonies against imperialism, or international capitalism, can no longer belong to the category of the old bourgeois-democratic revolution of the world, but to a new category. It is no longer a part of the old bourgeois or capitalist world revolution but a part of the new world revolution—the proletarian-socialist revolution. This kind of revolutionary colonies and semi-colonies should not be considered the allies of the counter-revolutionary front of world capitalism, but allies in the front of the world socialist revolution.

Although according to social character, the first stage of the first step of this colonial and semi-colonial revolution is still fundamentally bourgeois-democratic, and its objective demands

are to clear the obstacles in the way of the development of capitalism, yet this kind of revolution is no longer the old type led solely by the bourgeois class and aiming merely at the establishment of a capitalist society or a country under the dictatorship of the bourgeois class, but a new type led wholly or partially by the proletariat and aiming at the establishment of a New-Democratic society or a country ruled by the alliance of several revolutionary classes in its first stage. This kind of revolution, due to the variations in the condition of the enemy and in the conditions of this alliance may be divided into a certain number of stages during its process, but no change will occur in its fundamental character which will be the same until the arrival of the socialist revolution.

This kind of revolution is a great blow to imperialism, and therefore is not permitted but opposed by the imperialists. On the other hand, it is permitted by socialism, and is assisted by the Socialist state and the international socialist proletariat.

Thus, this kind of revolution has become a part of the proletarian-socialist world revolution.

“China’s revolution is a part of the world revolution.” This correct thesis was proposed as early as 1924-27 during the period of China’s Great Revolution. It was advanced by the Communists and was approved by all who participated in the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggle of the time. Only the meaning of the theory was not much developed then, and what we mastered was only a dim comprehension of the question. I remember that when Mr. Chiang Kai-shek spoke at Swatow in 1925 during his expedition against Chen Chiung-ming, he also said: “China’s revolution is a part of the world revolution.”

This “world revolution” is not the old world revolution of the bourgeoisie which has long become a matter of the past, but is the new world revolution, the socialist revolution. In like manner, the “part” means not a part of the old bourgeois revolution but a part of the new socialist revolution. This is an exceedingly great change, a change unprecedented in the world history and the history of China.

It is basing themselves on the correct theory of Stalin that the Chinese Communists advanced this correct thesis.

As early as 1918, Stalin said, in his article commemorating the first anniversary of the October Revolution:

“The following are the three most important points out of the

great world significance of the October Revolution.

First, it enlarges the scope of the national problem, from the partial problem of opposing national oppression to the general problem of the liberation of oppressed peoples, colonies and semi-colonies from the yoke of imperialism. Secondly, it widens the possibility and opens the true road for this liberation, greatly promotes the liberation work of the Western and Eastern oppressed peoples, and attracts them into the common, victorious anti-imperialist course. Thirdly, it forms a bridge between the socialist West and the enslaved East, *i.e.*, it establishes a new anti-imperialist revolutionary front connecting the Western proletariat and the Eastern oppressed peoples through the Russian Revolution.” (Stalin: “The October Revolution and the National Question,” *Pravda*, Nov. 6 and 19, 1918.)

Since the publication of that article, Stalin has again and again developed the theory regarding the colonial and semi-colonial revolution, its separation from the old type, and its transformation into a part of the proletarian-socialist revolution. This theory was most clearly and correctly explained in an article published on June 30, 1925, when Stalin carried on a controversy with the Yugoslavian nationalists of that time. The article, entitled “The National Problem Once Again” read in part:

“Comrade Semich refers to a passage in Stalin’s pamphlet *Marxism and the National Question*, written at the end of 1912. It says there that ‘the national struggle is a struggle of the bourgeois classes among themselves.’ By this he seems to hint at the correctness of his own formula for defining the social meaning of the national movement in present historical conditions. But Stalin’s pamphlet was written before the imperialist war, at a time when the national question had not yet assumed world-wide significance in the eyes of the Marxists, and when the basic demand of the Marxists concerning the right of self-determination was considered to be, not a part of the proletarian revolution, but a part of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. It would be absurd to ignore the fact that, since then, a fundamental change has taken place in the international situation, that the war, on the one hand, and the October Revolution in Russia, on the other, have converted the national question from a particle of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a particle of the proletarian-socialist revolution. As early as October 1916, Lenin in his article, ‘The Discussion on Self-Determination Summed Up,’

said that the main point of the national question concerning the right of self-determination has ceased to be a part of the general democratic movement, that it has become a constituent part of the general proletarian-socialist revolution. I shall not mention the subsequent works on the national question by Lenin and other representatives of Russian Communism. In view of all this, what significance can now be attached to Comrade Semich's reference to a certain passage in Stalin's pamphlet written in the period of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia, since, as a result of; the new historical situation, we have entered a new epoch, the epoch of the world proletarian revolution? The only significance that can be attached to it is that Comrade Semich quotes without regard for space and time, without regard for the actual historical condition. By that he violates the most elementary requirements of dialectics and fails to take into account the fact that what is correct in one historical situation may turn out to be incorrect in another historical situation."

From this we know that there exist two kinds of revolutions. The first, belonging to the bourgeois or capitalism category, has become a matter of the past since the outbreak of the first imperialist world war in 1914, and especially since the October Revolution of 1917. From then on, the second kind of world revolution commenced, the proletarian or socialist world revolution, with the proletariat of the capitalist countries as its main force and the oppressed peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies as its allies. No matter to what class or party the oppressed people who participate in the revolution belong, or whether or not they consciously or subjectively understand its significance, so long as they are anti-imperialist, their revolution is a part of the proletarian-socialist world revolution, and they themselves become its allies.

The significance of China's revolution is greatly magnified today, because it is happening at a time when the political and economic crises of capitalism have brought the world step by step toward the second imperialist war; when the Soviet Union has reached the transitional period from Socialism to Communism and has the ability to lead and to assist the proletariat, the oppressed peoples and all the revolutionary peoples of the world; when the proletarian forces of the various capitalist countries are growing stronger and stronger; and when the Communist Party, the proletariat, the peasantry, the intelligentsia and the petit-

bourgeoisie become a mighty, independent political power. At such a time, should we not estimate that the world significance of China's revolution has been greatly magnified? We should. China's revolution is a magnificent part of the world revolution!

This first stage of China's revolution (which again is divided into many sub-stages) according to its social character, is a new bourgeois-democratic revolution, not the newest proletarian-socialist revolution, though it long ago in the past became a part of the latter, and is a magnificent part, a magnificent ally of it at the present. The first step or stage of this revolution is certainly not to, and certainly cannot, establish a capitalist society dictated by the bourgeoisie, but to establish a New Democracy ruled by the alliance of several revolutionary classes. After the accomplishment of this first stage, it will be developed into the second stage—to establish the socialist society of China.

This is the most fundamental characteristic of the present Chinese revolution, the new revolutionary process of these twenty years (beginning from the May 4th Movement), and its living, concrete content.

V. Politics of New Democracy

China's revolution is divided into two historical stages, its first stage being that of the New Democratic revolution. This is the new historical characteristic of China's revolution. But how is this new characteristic concretely expressed in the internal political and economic relations of China? We shall explain:

Before the May 4th Movement of 1919 (which occurred after the first world war of 1914 and the Russian October Revolution of 1917), the political direction of the Chinese bourgeois-democratic revolution was in the hands of the Chinese petit-bourgeoisie and bourgeoisie (their intelligentsia elements). At that time the Chinese proletariat had not yet participated in the political arena as a conscious independent class force, but only as a follower of the petit-bourgeois and bourgeois class. The proletariat during the 1911 Revolution played this role.

After the May 4th Movement, the political directors of China's bourgeois-democratic revolution were not only of the bourgeois class, but included some proletarian elements who participated in it. At that time, the Chinese proletariat, due to its own growth and the influence of the Russian Revolution, had rapidly changed into a conscious and independent political power. The slogan "Down

with Imperialism” and the entire, thorough program of China’s bourgeois-democratic revolution was introduced by the Chinese Communist Party, while the realization of the agrarian revolution was carried on by the Chinese Communist Party single-handed.

The Chinese bourgeoisie is a colonial and semi-colonial bourgeoisie, oppressed by the imperialists, and therefore, even in the epoch of imperialism, it still maintains, for a certain period and to a certain degree, the revolutionary characteristic of opposing imperialism as well as opposing the bureaucratic warlord government of its own country, examples being the 1911 Revolution and the Northern Expedition, when the bourgeois class was not yet in power, and can unite with the proletariat and the petit-bourgeoisie to oppose the enemy whom it is willing to oppose. This is the difference between the Chinese bourgeoisie and the bourgeoisie of Tsarist Russia. Tsarist Russia was a military-feudal-imperialist country, one that oppressed others. The Russian bourgeoisie had nothing revolutionary about it, and the task of the proletariat there was to fight against the bourgeoisie and not to unite with it. However, in China, a country that is colonial and semi-colonial in character and is oppressed by others, the bourgeoisie is revolutionary at certain periods and to a certain extent, and the task of the proletariat is not to neglect the revolutionary character of the bourgeoisie or the possibility of establishing a united front with it against imperialism and the bureaucratic warlord government.

At the same time, the Chinese bourgeoisie, being the bourgeoisie of a colonial and semi-colonial country, is extremely weak politically and economically, and exhibits another characteristic—the characteristic of compromise with the enemy of the revolution. The Chinese bourgeoisie especially the big bourgeoisie, even in the process of revolution, is never willing to break with the imperialists completely, and being closely associated with the rural land exploitation, it is also not willing, and is unable, to overthrow imperialism and feudalism thoroughly. Thus the two fundamental problems or tasks of China’s bourgeois-democratic revolution can by no means be solved by the bourgeoisie itself. Moreover, in the long period from 1927 to 1936, the bourgeois elements surrendered to the imperialists, allied themselves with the feudal forces, contradicted their former revolutionary program, and opposed the revolutionary people. Again, during the present anti-Japanese war,

a part of the big bourgeoisie, represented by Wang Ching-wei, surrendered to the enemy, illustrating a new betrayal of that class. This is also a difference between the Chinese bourgeoisie and the bourgeoisie of the advanced European and American countries, especially that of France in history. In European and American countries, and especially in France, the bourgeoisie was comparatively thorough-going at the time of bourgeois revolution, while in China this characteristic is wanting in the bourgeois class.

Revolutionary character on the one hand, compromising character on the other—such is the dual character of the Chinese bourgeoisie. This dual character was also seen in the European and American bourgeoisie according to history. To unite with the workers and the peasants to oppose the enemy when the enemy is endangering them and to unite with the enemy to oppose the workers and the peasants when the latter are awakening is a general rule for the bourgeoisie of various countries, only, the Chinese bourgeoisie shows this characteristic more vividly.

It is very clear in China that whoever can lead the people to overthrow imperialism and feudalism will be trusted by the people, because the deadly enemies of the people are imperialism and feudalism, particularly the former. Today whoever can lead the people to drive away the Japanese imperialists and carry out the democratic politics is the savior of the people. If the Chinese bourgeoisie can perform such tasks, it will be admired by everybody, but if it cannot, the responsibility in the main will surely fall on the shoulders of the proletariat.

Therefore, no matter under whatever condition, the proletariat, the peasants, the intelligentsia and other petit-bourgeois elements of China are the basic forces that determine the destiny of the country. The above classes, some of which have awakened already while others are in the process of awakening, will inevitably become the most basic part in the constitution of the power and the nation in the Democratic Republic of China. The Democratic Republic of China which we are aiming to construct now can only be ruled by an alliance of all anti-imperialist and anti-feudal people. It is a Republic of New Democracy, or a Republic of the genuine, revolutionary San Min Chu 1 that includes Dr. Sun's three revolutionary policies.

This Republic of New Democracy is different on the one hand from the old Western-style capitalist republics that are ruled by

capitalists and are already out of date. On the other hand, it is also different from the newest, Soviet-style socialist republic, that is ruled by the proletariat. Nevertheless, in a certain historical period, the Soviet-style republic cannot be fittingly practised in colonial and semicolonial countries, the national polity of which therefore must be of a third type—that of the New Democracy. This is a national polity for a certain historical period, and is therefore transitional in character, but it is a form indispensable and unalterable.

Hence according to their social character, the various national politics of the world may be fundamentally classified into the following three categories, republics ruled by the bourgeoisie, republics ruled by the proletariat, and republics jointly ruled by several revolutionary classes.

To the first category belong the old democratic countries. Certain countries ruled jointly by landlords and capitalists can be grouped under this heading.

The second form of republic is fermenting in the various capitalist countries, besides its realization in the Soviet Union. It will become the ruling form of the world in a certain period.

The third form is the transitional form in the revolutionary colonial and semi-colonial countries. To be sure, there are certain peculiar characteristics in each colonial and semi-colonial country, but these differences are only minor ones. So long as the colonial and semi-colonial countries are revolutionary in character, their national and governmental structures must be fundamentally the same, *i.e.*, they must be countries of New Democracy, jointly ruled by several anti-imperialist classes. This form of New Democratic Government in present China is a form of the united anti-Japanese front. It is anti-Japanese, anti-imperialist, and characterized by the alliance of several classes and the existence of a united front. But despite the fact that the war of resistance has been going on for a long time in China, the basic work of “democratizing” the country is not yet begun. Utilizing this fundamental weak point, Japanese imperialists have pushed into our territory with great steps. The destiny of our nation will be endangered if this situation is not taken into consideration seriously. We hope that the Constitutional Politics Movement which is now beginning will be able to remedy this danger.

What we are discussing here is a question of national policy,

which has been a question of dispute, without coming to any conclusion, for several decades, beginning from the end of the Ching dynasty. In reality it is only a question of the status of various social classes in the country. Bourgeois elements are accustomed to conceal the truth about class status, and resort to the term “nation” to camouflage the actuality of one-class dictatorship. Such concealment gives no benefit to the revolutionary people and therefore should be clearly exposed. The term “nation” can sometimes be used of course, but it does not include the traitors and the counter-revolutionary elements. It means a dictatorship of all the revolutionary people and revolutionary classes over the traitors and counter-revolutionaries. Such is our country.

The solemn declaration of the First Kuomintang Congress in 1924 says, “The so-called democratic system of the various modern nations is usually monopolized by the bourgeoisie, and has become their instrument for oppressing the common people, while the principle of democracy of the Kuomintang is shared by the common people and is not permitted to be privately owned by a minority of the people.” For sixteen years, the Kuomintang has acted against its own declaration, creating a situation of grave national calamity. This is a big mistake of the Kuomintang, which we hope will be corrected through the ordeal of this anti-Japanese war of resistance.

As to the question of governmental policy, this denotes the form under which a governmental power is constituted, or the form which certain social classes adopt in organizing their government for opposing the enemy and for self-defense. Without an adequate form of government, a country cannot be represented. In China, we can adopt the system of people’s congresses of various grades, from the national congress down to the village assembly, through which governments of various grades are elected; but a system of genuine, universal election, disregarding differences in sex, beliefs, amount of property, and standard of education in the suffrage, must be practised, so that it will be fit for the proper status of the various classes in the country, for the expression of people’s opinions, for the direction of revolutionary struggles, and for the spirit of New Democracy. Such a system is the system of democratic centralization. Only with a government based on such a system can we thoroughly develop the ideas and spirit of all the revolutionary people and

oppose the enemy of revolution with the greatest strength. The spirit of “not permitting a minority to monopolize” must be shown in the army as well as in the government, and such an aim can never be realized without a genuine democratic system. Its absence can be called incoherence between the national polity and the governmental polity. A national polity of the joint rule of several revolutionary classes, plus a governmental polity of democratic centralization—this is the politics of New Democracy—the Republic of New Democracy, the republic of a united anti-Japanese front, the republic of New San Min Chu I that includes Dr. Sun’s three revolutionary policies, and the Chinese Republic true in name and in reality. At present, our country is a republic nominally, but there is no reality in it. To realize the meaning of the name is the object of our work today. Such are the internal political relations that a revolutionary China and an anti-Japanese China should and must establish. Such is the only correct direction for our work of national reconstruction at the present time.

VI. Economy of New Democracy

The politics of such a republic, to be constructed in China, are the politics of New Democracy, and its economy, the economy of New Democracy.

Big banks, big industries and big business shall be owned by this republic. “Enterprises, foreign or Chinese, which possess a monopoly character or which due to their big scale are beyond the individual’s power to establish, such as banks, railways, aviation companies, etc., shall be run and managed by the state, so that private capital cannot manipulate the life of the people. Such is the main principle of capital restriction.” The above, being a part of the solemn declaration of the First Kuomintang Congress, is a correct guide for the economic constitution of the Republic of the New Democracy. The New Democratic Government will not confiscate other capitalist private property, nor will it restrict the development of capitalist production which “cannot manipulate the life of the people,” in view of the fact that the economy of China is still in a very backward state.

It will adopt certain measures to confiscate the land of big landlords and distribute it to the peasants who are without land or have too little of it, to realize Dr. Sun’s slogan “Land to those who till it,” and to liquidate the feudal relation in rural districts.

This is different from establishing a socialist agricultural system. It only turns the land into the private property of the peasants. The economy of the rich peasants' agriculture is allowed to run as usual. This is the direction of "equalization of land rights," the correct slogan for which is "Land to those who till it."

The economy of China must travel the road of "restriction of capital" and "equalization of land rights," and should never be "monopolized by a minority of the people." We can never let the few capitalists and landlords "manipulate the life of the people," nor can we construct a capitalist society of the European or American style. Whoever dares to act against this direction shall not be able to accomplish his work, and he himself shall find his head broken.

These are the internal economic relations that the revolutionary China and the anti-Japanese China should and must establish.

Such is the economy of the New Democracy.

And the politics of the New Democracy are the centralized expression of this economy of New Democracy.

VII. Refutation of the Theory of Bourgeois Dictatorship

Such a republic, with New Democratic politics and economy, will win the approval of over 90 per cent of the Chinese people. It is, as was said by Dr. Sun, "according to the law of nature, the reason of human beings, the current of the world, and the need of the people, and is decisively carried on by the forerunners, therefore it must ultimately succeed." In fact there is not a second way out for us, this being the only one.

Can we go the road of a capitalist society ruled by the bourgeoisie? No doubt, this is the old path of the European and American capitalists. But the international and internal environments do not allow China to do so.

From the standpoint of international environment, such a way is a dead alley. First, this way is not permitted by international capitalism or imperialism. The modern history of China is a history of imperialist aggression, of imperialist opposition to China's independence and to China's development of her capitalism. Revolutions in China failed one after another, because imperialism strangled them, and numerous martyrs sacrificed their lives, leaving their work unaccomplished. Now, we are facing the Japanese imperialists, big and strong, who fought their way into China wishing to change her into a Japanese

colony. The Japanese are indeed developing their capitalism in China, but do not propose to let China develop a capitalism of her own. They are practicing a dictatorship in China, ruled by their bourgeoisie, not to let the Chinese bourgeoisie rule. To be sure, this is a period of the last struggle of imperialism, which will soon pass away. "Imperialism is moribund capitalism." But just because of that, the maintenance of imperialism has to rely more and more on colonies and semi-colonies, and surely it will not allow the colonies and semi-colonies to establish a society ruled by their own bourgeoisie. It is because Japanese imperialism is bogged down in a serious economic and political crisis, and is in the moribund state, that it must fight against China, turn her into a colony, and block her way to establishing a bourgeois dictatorship or developing her own national capitalism.

Secondly, such a way is not permitted by socialism. We cannot be separated from the socialist state or from the aid of the international proletariat, if we wish to seek for independence. That is to say, we cannot separate ourselves from the assistance of the Soviet Union or from the victory of the anti-capitalist struggles of the proletariat of Japan, Great Britain, the United States, France and Germany. Their victories help us. Although we cannot say that victory in China must be preceded by the success of revolutions of the above countries, or at least in one or two of the above countries, it is doubtless that we can only win our victory with their assistance. This is especially true of the aid of the Soviet Union, an indispensable condition for the final victory of China's war of resistance. To refuse Soviet aid will surely bring about the failure of the revolution. Is this not clear in the lesson of China's anti-Soviet movement after 1927? Is it not a dream to expect that China can establish a bourgeois society ruled by her own bourgeoisie after the victory of the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggles, in a period when the world is in the midst of wars and revolutions and when socialism is destined to prosper?

If, under certain specific conditions (e.g., like that of Turkey, where the bourgeoisie defeated the aggressive Greeks while the proletariat was not strong enough), a small Kemalist bourgeoisie-ruled Turkey had come into existence after the first world war and the Russian October Revolution; the same can never happen again after World War II and after the Soviet Union has accomplished her socialist reconstruction, especially when the "Turkey" in this case is one composed of 450,000,000 people. Owing to the

particular conditions in China (the compromising character of the bourgeoisie and the thorough-going character of the proletariat) there has never happened in the country before such an easy-won affair as that of Turkey. Did not the bourgeoisie of China loudly sing the song of "Kemal-ism" after the failure of the Great Revolution in 1927? But where now is the Kemal of China? And where is the capitalist society ruled by China's bourgeoisie? In the international environment of the fourth and fifth decade of this twentieth century, the "heroes" of the colonies and semi-colonies have to stand either on the imperialist front and play a role in the world counter-revolution, or on the anti-imperialist front and play a role in the world revolution. They must choose either one of the two. There is not a third road.

From the internal environment, the bourgeoisie of China should have obtained some necessary lessons. Fearing the strength of the proletariat, the peasantry and the petty-bourgeoisie, the bourgeoisie of China kicked out these people at the moment of the revolution's triumph, and reaped the fruits of the revolution for itself. After that, it carried on an anti-Communist crusade for ten years with all its might. But what result has it gained after all? Now, at a time when a strong enemy is penetrating deeply into our territory and we have resisted our enemy for two years, should we still copy the old, out-of-date program of the Western bourgeoisie? Should we still dream of the bourgeois-ruled society that the ten-year anti-Communist civil war of the past could not bring into realization?

To be sure, out of the ten-year anti-Communist campaign, a one-party dictatorship has grown, but that is only a dictatorship of semi-colonial and semi-feudal character. In the first four years of the anti-Communist campaign (from 1927 to September 18, 1931), a "Manchukuo" was formed; in the latter six years, Japanese imperialists marched into China Proper. If any one should now attempt to renew the campaign for another ten years, it will be an anti-Communist campaign of the new type somewhat different from the old one. Such new-style anti-Communist task has already been taken up and bravely proceeded with by a certain "quick-footed" person. He is none other than Wang Ching-wei, the well-known new-style anti-Communist crusader. Whoever wishes to enter into partnership with him may do as he pleases, but then would not he feel a little bashful in talking any more of bourgeoisie dictatorship, capitalist society, Kemalism, and

modern nation, “one party, one principle,” etc.? If he does not join the clique of Wang Ching-wei, he has to join the anti-Japanese people. He is only dreaming if he joins the anti-Japanese people and prepares to kick out these people to monopolize the fruits of the anti-Japanese war or to sing once again the song of “Long live One-Party Dictatorship.”

Ah! To fight against the Japanese, whose credit is it? You cannot advance a step apart from the workers, the peasants and the petit-bourgeoisie. Whoever dares to kick out these people will surely break his toes. Is this not common sense? But the stubborn elements (I say the stubborn elements) of the Chinese bourgeoisie seem to have learned nothing from these twenty years! Can you not hear them still shouting there loudly for the “restriction of the Communists,” “dissolution of the Communists,” and “opposition to the Communists”? Can you not see that after the issue of the “Regulations for Restricting the Activities of the Alien Party” there are again the “Regulations for Handling the Alien Party” and the “Practicing Plan for Handling the Alien Party Program”? Heavens! Where are they going to direct the destiny of our nation, if this “restriction” and “handling” are to go on incessantly? And how are they going to prepare for their future? We earnestly advise these gentlemen to open their eyes, have a look at China and the world, and see what the real situation is. Please do not repeat your mistakes. If such mistakes go on, they will do you no good either, besides being harmful to the destiny of our nation. It is certain, definite and true that if the stubborn elements of the Chinese bourgeoisie do not wake up, they will glean no benefit but will only commit suicide. This is why we hope that the united anti-Japanese front will persist, not through monopoly by any single clique but through the cooperation of all, in order to bring about victory in our anti-Japanese war. This and only this is the best policy. All the rest are unfeasible fancies. Such is the earnest advice of us Communists. “Do not blame us for not having warned you beforehand.”

“If there is rice, let all share it.” This was an old saying of ex-president Li Yuan-hung, and it is a very reasonable saying. Since we all share in the fight against our enemy, it is logical that we should share our rice, our works, or our books. “I-should-have-everything” and “nobody-can-harm-me” attitudes are merely the old maneuvers of the feudal landlords. They are not applicable in the fourth or fifth decade of the twentieth century.

We Communists never repel the revolutionary people (provided they do not capitulate to the enemy or oppose the Communists). We shall persist in the united front with all those classes, strata, political parties, political cliques and individuals who insist on fighting against the Japanese to the end, and shall cooperate for a long term with them. But we shall not allow others to repel us or to split the united front. China must keep on resisting, consolidating and progressing. Whoever wishes to surrender, to split, or to go backward will not be tolerated by us.

VIII. Refutation of "Left" Doctrinairism

If it is impossible for us to go the road of capitalism with a bourgeois dictatorship, would it be possible then for us to go the road of socialism with a proletarian dictatorship? No, it is just as impossible.

Without doubt, the present revolution is only the first step, and a second step—the step of socialism—will be developed in the future. It is only when China arrives at that stage, that she can be called really felicitous. But for the present, it is not the time to practice socialism. The present task of China's revolution is the task of anti-imperialism and anti-feudalism, before the accomplishment of which, it is empty verbiage to talk about the realization of socialism. China's revolution must be divided into two steps, the first being that of New Democracy, the second that of socialism. Moreover, the period of the first step is by no means a short one. It is not a matter that can be achieved overnight. We are not Utopians. We cannot isolate ourselves from the actual conditions right before our eyes.

Some ill-minded propagandists purposely mix up these two revolutionary stages, promoting the theory of "a single revolution," so as to prove that all revolutions are included in the San Min Chu I and that there is no ground for the existence of Communism. Armed with this "theory," they actually oppose Communism and the Communist Party, the Eighth Route and the New Fourth Armies, and the Shensi-Kansu-Ninghsia Border Region. Their aim is to annihilate fundamentally whatever revolution there is, to oppose the thorough realization of the bourgeois-democratic revolution and the anti-Japanese war of resistance, and to prepare "public opinion" for their future capitulation to the Japanese robbers.

Such a situation is deliberately created by the Japanese, who,

seeing that military force alone could not subjugate China even after the capture of Wu-han, have to resort to the aid of political offensive and economic enticement. Politically, they try to tempt the wavering elements within the anti-Japanese camp, to disrupt the united front, and to ruin the Kuomintang-Communist cooperation, while economically, they plan the intrigue of "industrial cooperation." The Japanese robbers permit the Chinese capitalists to invest 51 per cent in Central and South China, and 49 per cent in North China, of the capital in the "cooperating" industries, and return to the Chinese capitalists what has been confiscated from them, allowing the confiscated enterprises to be counted as their share of capital. Tempted by such a trick, some conscience-lacking capitalists, represented by Wang Ching-wei, jump at the trap, forgetting justice in front of private benefits, and surrender to the enemy. Others, who have been hiding in the anti-Japanese camp, yearn to go too, but they are timid, afraid that the Communists will stand in their way, and that the people will stigmatize them as traitors. Therefore, they assemble their fellows, and make decisions—to do some preparatory work beforehand in cultural and press circles. With such a plan fixed, they waste no time. Some "metaphysical devils" are mobilized, some Trotskyites are hired to take up their pens and madly bark at the Communists. The result is that a lot of "theories" are invented, such as that of "a single revolution," that Communism is not suitable for China, that there is no necessity for the Communist Party to exist, that the Eighth Route and the New Fourth Armies destroy resistance and sabotage guerrilla warfare, that the Shensi-Kansu-Ningshia Border Region is a feudal partition, that the Communist Party is not loyal to the Government, disrupts unification, ferments intrigues and tries to make trouble, and so on and so forth, in order to deceive those who do not quite understand the real situation, so that when opportunity ripens, the capitalists may have reasons sound enough to enjoy their 49 per cent or 51 per cent shares at the expense of the benefit of the whole nation. This trick of theirs is merely the preparation of public thought and "public opinion" before the realization of the capitulation. These gentlemen seem to be serious-minded indeed when promoting the "theory" of "a single revolution" to oppose Communism and the Communist Party, but in their hearts there is nothing other than the sharing of the 49 per cent or the 51 per cent! How they have racked their

brains! The theory of “a single revolution” is the theory of “no revolution.” Such is the real nature of the beast.

But certain persons who do not seem to be ill-minded are also fascinated with the theory of “a single revolution” and lend themselves to the subjective thought of “accomplishing both the political revolution and the social revolution by one stroke.” They do not understand that a revolution is divided into stages. We can proceed from one revolution to another revolution, but cannot “accomplish everything by one stroke.” Their erroneous point of view inevitably confuses the revolutionary steps, decreases effort in realizing the present task, and is therefore very harmful. That the first one is the prerequisite of the second, and that one must follow the other closely, not permitting a bourgeois dictatorship to be inserted between them, that is correct, and is the Marxist theory of revolutionary development. On the contrary, if we say that the democratic revolution has no definite task or definite period of its own, and other tasks that can only be accomplished in other periods, such as the task of social revolution, may be included in those of the democratic revolution, such an empty idea—the so-called “to accomplish all by one stroke policy”—should not be adopted by real revolutionaries.

IX. Refutation of the Obstinate Elements

The obstinate elements of the bourgeoisie then come forward and say: “Well, since you Communists have put aside the social system of socialism for a later stage, and since you have declared: ‘San Min Chu I is a necessity today, and our party is willing to struggle for its thorough realization,’ why then don’t you pack up your Communism for a while?” This argument, under the theme of “one doctrine,” has recently been magnified into a mad shout. The nature of these mad shouts is the principle of bourgeois dictatorship. It may also be described as lack of common sense if we wish to be polite.

Communism is the proletarian system of thought, and is also a new kind of social system. It is different from any other ideological system or social system in that it is the most complete, the most progressive, the most revolutionary, and the most rational system in human history. The feudal ideology and social system have now become fit for the museum of historical relics, and so has a part of the capitalist system (in the U.S.S.R.). And the remaining part of it is “like a setting sun, breathing its final

breaths,” and “not knowing in the morning whether it can still survive in the evening.” It is only the Communist ideology and social system that grow and spread in the world, with a mighty thundering force that can level mountains and overturn seas, and maintain their flowering youth. Since the time when scientific Communism was introduced into China, the outlook of the Chinese people has been much widened, and the appearance of the Chinese people has been much changed. Without the guidance of Communism, even the democratic revolution of China cannot be a success, not to say the final stage of the revolution. This is the real reason why the obstinate elements of the Chinese bourgeoisie shout so loudly and demand that Communism be “packed up.” Once it is “packed up,” China will face ruin. The world now depends on Communism for its salvation, and so does China.

Everybody knows that regarding the social system and the program for action, the Communist Party has a present program and a future program, or, the minimum program and the maximum program. At present, it is New Democracy, in the future, it is socialism—these are two organic parts, guided by the whole Communist system of thought. Is it not absurd to demand the “packing up” of Communism, simply because the minimum program of the Communist Party is fundamentally coincident with the political principle of San Min Chu I? On the part of us Communists, it is only because there are coincident points in the principle of San Min Chu I and in the minimum program of the Communist Party, that it is possible for us to recognize that “San Min Chu I is the political basis for the anti-Japanese united front,” and that “San Min Chu I is a necessity in China today, and our party is willing to struggle for its thorough realization,” otherwise there would not be such a possibility. This is the united front between Communism and San Min Chu I in the stage of democratic revolution, and it was in pointing out this kind of united front that Dr. Sun once said: “Communism is the good friend of San Min Chu I.” To deny Communism is to deny the united front. The obstinate elements are practicing their principle of “one party” and denying the united front today, so they utter such fatal absurdities as renunciation of Communism.

It is illogical too to bring forth the theory of “one doctrine.” So long as different classes exist in a society, different doctrines will exist according to the number of the existent classes, and even

within one class, different cliques may have different doctrines of their own. There is feudalism for the feudal class, capitalism for the capitalists, Buddhism for the Buddhists, Christianity for the Christians, polytheism for the peasants, and there are the recently-promoted Kemalism, fascism, Wei-sheng-ism, the “principle of distribution according to labour,” etc. Why cannot the proletariat have their Communism? And why should they only demand that Communism be “packed up” when there are so many doctrines existing at the same time? To tell you frankly, it is useless to urge us to “pack up.” It is much better to urge us to make a contest. If there is somebody who beats us in the race, we shall admit that it is our fate. If not, you had better “pack up” your anti-democratic, “one principle” style as early as possible.

For the sake of avoiding misunderstanding and widening the eyes of the obstinate elements, we deem it necessary for us to point out the difference and similarity between San Min Chu I and Communism.

There are similar parts and dissimilar parts in San Min Chu I and Communism.

First, the similar part: This is the fundamental political program of the two doctrines in the stage of bourgeois-democratic revolution. The three principles of Nationalism, Democracy and People’s Livelihood or the San Min Chu I revised by Dr. Sun in 1924 are fundamentally coincident with the Chinese Communists’ program of the stage of democratic revolution. It is only because of this similarity and for the realization of the San Min Chu I, that there could be formed the united front of the two doctrines and the two parties. To neglect this point is erroneous.

Secondly, the dissimilar parts: (1) First is the difference in certain points of the program during the stage of democratic revolution. In the program of the Communists, there are the eight-hour working day and the program of a thorough agrarian revolution, but these are lacking in the program of the San Min Chu I. If the Kuomintang does not amend this shortcoming, and prepare to put those things into realization, we can only say that the two democratic programs are similar fundamentally but not entirely. (2) Second is the difference regarding the two stages. Besides the stage of democratic revolution, there is also a stage of socialist revolution in Communism, therefore, besides the minimum program there is also a maximum program, i.e., the program for the realization of the socialist system. San Min Chu I

has only the stage of democratic revolution but not the stage of socialist revolution; therefore, it has only the minimum program but not the maximum program for the construction of the socialist system. (3) Third is the difference in the conception of universe. The Communist cosmic philosophy is dialectic materialism and historic materialism, while that of the San Min Chu I is “Wei-sheng-ism” or the life interpretation of history. The two are contrary to each other. (4) Fourth is the difference of thoroughness in the execution of the revolution. The theory and practice of the Communists are consistent, i.e., there is thoroughness in the Communists’ execution of the revolution, while in the Kuomintang, with the exception of those few who are faithful to the revolution and to the truth, their theory and practice are not consistent, i.e., there is a contradiction between what they say and what they do, and there is no thoroughness in their execution of the revolution.

Above are the dissimilar parts which form the cause of difference between the Communists and the Kuomintang members. It is erroneous to note only the unity but neglect the contradiction of the two.

Having understood this, we can understand now why the obstinate elements of the bourgeoisie demand the “packing up” of Communism. What can the meaning of such a demand be? If it is not the absolutism of the bourgeoisie, it must be the lack of common sense!

X. The Old and the New San Min Chu I

The obstinate elements of the bourgeoisie do not comprehend the changes in history. Their level of knowledge is so low that it can practically be described as “below zero.” They know neither the difference between San Min Chu I and Communism, nor the difference between the old San Min Chu I and the New San Min Chu I.

We Communists do recognize that “San Min Chu I is the political basis of the anti-Japanese national united front,” that “San Min Chu I is a necessity for China today, that for its thorough realization our party is willing to struggle,” and that the minimum program of Communism and the principle of San Min Chu I are fundamentally similar to each other. But what is this San Min Chu I that we Communists choose to recognize? It is the San Min Chu I that Dr. Sun Yat-sen revised in the Declaration of the First

Congress of the Kuomintang. I hope that the gentlemen of the obstinate clique will read this declaration once in their leisure hours after working proudly for the “restriction of the Communists,” the “dissolution of the Communists” and the “opposition to the Communists.” Dr. Sun pointed out in the declaration: “This is the real explanation of the San Min Chu I.” From that, we can see that only such San Min Chu I as explained by Dr. Sun in the declaration of the First Congress of the Kuomintang is the genuine San Min Chu I, while all those explained otherwise are false ones; and only such explanation as given in the declaration is the real explanation, all others being false explanations. This is not “another rumour” of the Communists, because many Kuomintang members as well as I myself personally witnessed the passing of that declaration.

That declaration of the First Congress of the Kuomintang serves as the watershed of the two historical periods of the San Min Chu I. Before that, the San Min Chu I was a theory belonging to the old category, of the old, semicolonial, bourgeois-democratic revolution, of the old Democracy. This was the old San Min Chu I.

After that, the San Min Chu I was a theory belonging to the new category, of the new, semi-colonial, bourgeois-democratic revolution, of the New Democracy. It is the New San Min Chu I. It is only this kind of San Min Chu I that is qualified to be the revolutionary San Min Chu I of the new period.

This San Min Chu I of the new period, this New San Min Chu I or genuine San Min Chu I, is one that includes Dr. Sun’s three revolutionary policies, namely, alliance with the U.S.S.R., cooperation with the Communists and protection of the interests of peasants and workers. Without these policies, or with any one of them missing, it can only be called false San Min Chu I, or incomplete San Min Chu I.

First, the revolutionary San Min Chu I, the New San Min Chu I or the genuine San Min Chu I, must be one that allies itself with the Soviet Union. We are now struggling with an imperialist power that has penetrated deeply into our territory. Without the help of the Soviet Union, final victory is beyond imagination. If we forsake the policy of allying with the Soviet Union and cooperate with imperialism instead, then the word “revolution” may be cancelled, and San Min Chu I will become a reactionary doctrine. There is no neutral San Min Chu I, but a revolutionary or a counter-revolutionary one. If you act according to what was once

said by Wang Ching-wei—"to struggle against offensives from two sides"—, and try to have a San Min Chu I that opposes Communism as well as imperialism, it is brave indeed! But what is pitiful is that even the inventor of this strategy, the traitor Wang Ching-wei, has forsaken (or packed up) this kind of San Min Chu I and changed to adopt one that cooperates with imperialism. Thus, the revolutionary San Min Chu I, the New San Min Chu I or the genuine San Min Chu I has to be one allying itself with the Soviet Union, and can never be one that allies with the imperialists to oppose the Soviet Union.

Secondly, the revolutionary San Min Chu I, the New San Min Chu I or the genuine San Min Chu I must be one that cooperates with Communism. If you do not cooperate with Communism, you cannot help opposing it, and anti-Communism is the very policy of the Japanese imperialists and Wang Ching-wei, who, seeing that you are their anti-Communist comrades, may invite you to join in their "Anti-Communist Company." But then is it not a little traitorous? You may argue: "I am not going to follow Japan." It is ridiculous just the same. No matter whom you are going to follow, so long as you are anti-Communist, you are traitors, because by doing so you cannot resist the Japanese any more. "Why can't I resist the Japanese independently?" No, that is talking in a dream. How can the colonial or semi-colonial "heroes" carry on such great piece of counterrevolutionary work without relying on the forces of imperialism? With the help of practically all the imperialist forces in the world, you fought against the Communists for ten years in vain before; how can you all of a sudden fight against the Communists "independently" today? It is reported that some people outside have expressed the following idea—"It is good to oppose the Communists but we cannot succeed." If what is said here is true, then the saying is only half wrong. What "good" is there to oppose the Communists? But the other half is correct, because really no anti-Communist campaign will succeed. The reason? It does not lie in the Communists but in the people. The people like the Communists. They do not wish to oppose them. And they never forgive. If you fight against the Communists while a national enemy is penetrating deeply into our territory, they will not spare your life. It is as certain as anything. Whoever prepares to oppose the Communists has to prepare to be crushed. If they have not so prepared, it is better for them to withdraw their hands before it is too late. This is the

sincere advice I give to the anti-Communist heroes. Upon this, it is very, very clear that San Min Chu I today must be one that cooperates with the Communists, or it will crumble. This is a question of life and death to the San Min Chu I. It will exist when cooperating with Communism, and expire when fighting against it. Who can prove that this is not true?

Thirdly, the revolutionary San Min Chu I, the New San Min Chu I or the genuine San Min Chu I must be one that adopts the policy of protecting the interests of peasants and workers. Those who forsake this policy of the true assistance to peasants and workers or the realization of the “awakening of the people,” as inscribed in the last will of Dr. Sun, will bring failure to the revolution as well as to themselves. Stalin said: “The question of colonies and semi-colonies is in essence the question of the peasantry.” That is to say, China’s revolution is a revolution of the peasantry; the present war of resistance against Japan is in essence a war of resistance of the peasantry; the politics of New Democracy is in essence the empowering of the peasantry; the New San Min Chu I or the genuine San Min Chu I is in essence the revolutionary principle of the peasantry; the content of popular culture is in essence the elevation of culture among the peasantry; why we all go “up to the hills,” assemble, work, study, publish, write and play in this hilly region is in essence for the peasantry; and finally, what we use to resist the Japanese and to maintain our living are in essence all supplied by the peasantry. We say “in essence,” which somewhat means “fundamentally,” because we do not neglect other elements. Stalin has explained this point himself. It is the common sense of a primary school student that 80 per cent of China’s population are peasants. That rate must have increased after the fall of the big cities. Therefore, the problem of the peasantry becomes the fundamental problem of China’s revolution, and the force of the peasantry, the main force of China’s revolution. Next to peasantry, the working people rank second in number among China’s population. China has millions of industrial workers, and tens of millions of handicraft workers and agricultural workers, without whom China cannot exist, because they are producers of the industrial economy, and China’s revolution cannot succeed without them, because they are leaders of the revolution and are the most revolutionary elements. Upon this, the revolutionary San Min Chu I, the New San Min Chu I, or the genuine San Min Chu I must be one that adopts the policy of

protecting and assisting the workers and the peasants. If there is such a San Min Chu I which does not adopt this policy, does not truly protect and assist the peasants and workers, and does not realize the “awakening of the people,” it must be extinguished.

From this, we can know that apart from the three revolutionary policies of allying ourselves with the Soviet Union, cooperating with the Communists, and protecting and assisting the peasants and the workers, no San Min Chu I can have a promising future. All those disciples of San Min Chu I who still have conscience at heart must really and seriously consider this point.

This San Min Chu I with the three revolutionary policies, this revolutionary San Min Chu I or New San Min Chu I or genuine San Min Chu I, is the San Min Chu I of New Democracy—the development of the old San Min Chu I, the great achievement of Dr. Sun, and the product of a period when China’s revolution is considered a part of the socialist world revolution. It is only this kind of San Min Chu I that the Communists recognize as “China’s necessity today,” and declare themselves “willing to struggle for its thorough realization.” It is only this kind of San Min Chu I that is fundamentally coincident with the minimum program of the Communists or the Communist political program for the stage of democracy.

As to the old San Min Chu I, it was a product of the old period of China’s revolution. At that time, Russia was an imperialist state, therefore, the old San Min Chu I could not have the policy of allying with Russia; and there was not yet a Communist Party in China, therefore, it would not have the policy of cooperating with the Communists; besides the workers and peasants movement then had not fully manifested its political importance and was not yet taken into consideration by the people, therefore, it could not have the policy of protecting and assisting the peasants and the workers. Hence, the San Min Chu I before the reorganization of the Kuomintang in 1924 is one that belongs to the old category, one that is already out of date. If it is not developed into the New San Min Chu I, the Kuomintang will not be able to go forward any further. The wise Dr. Sun saw this point, revised his doctrine through the assistance of Lenin and the Chinese Communist Party, filled it with new historical characteristics, established the united front between San Min Chu I and Communism and the cooperation between the Kuomintang and the Communists, and

the sympathy of the people of the country, and carried on the first great Revolution.

The old San Min Chu I was revolutionary in the old period. It reflected the historical characteristics of that period. But if one still persists in the old doctrine in the new period, when the New San Min Chu I has made its appearance,' or still, opposes the alliance with Russia when the socialist state has been established; or still opposes the Kuomintang-Communist cooperation when the Communist Party has come into existence; or still opposes the peasants-and-workers policy after the toiling masses have awakened and manifested their mighty political power; he is certainly a counter-revolutionary who has no sense of judgment. The reaction of 1927 was the result of the lack of such sense. A proverb says; "Those who have the power of judgment are wise people." I hope the disciples of San Min Chu I will remember it today.

There is not any fundamental resemblance between the old San Min Chu I and the Communist minimum program, because that kind of San Min Chu I is something of the old period, something out of date. If there is such San Min Chu I which opposes the Soviet Union, the Communists and the peasants and the workers, it is a reactionary San Min Chu I. It not only has nothing in common with the minimum program of the Communists, but is its enemy. No compromise of the two can be considered. This also the disciples of San Min Chu I should remember.

However, before the task of anti-imperialism and anti-feudalism is accomplished, the New San Min Chu I will not be forsaken by those who have conscience. Those who forsake it are only such people as Wang Ching-wei. No matter how hard this Wang Ching-wei, Li Ching-wei or whatever Ching-wei it may be, push on their false anti-Soviet, anticommunists and anti-popular San Min Chu I, those who have conscience, or a sense of justice at heart will continue to support the genuine doctrine of Dr. Sun. If there were a great number of true disciples of San Min Chu I who continued to struggle for China's revolution after the reaction of 1927, there must be more of these true disciples today when a national enemy has penetrated deeply into our territory. We Communists shall cooperate with all those true disciples of San Min Chu I for a long period. We shall not forsake any friends provided they are not traitors or anti-Communist die-hards.

XI. The Culture of New Democracy

In the above, we have discussed the historical characteristics of Chinese politics in the new period and the question of the Republic of the New Democracy. In the following, we are going to deal with the cultural problem.

A given culture is the ideological reflection of the politics and economy of a given society. In China, there is imperialist culture, which is the reflection of the control or the partial control of the imperialist politics and economy over China. This kind of culture, besides being advocated by the cultural organizations run directly by the imperialists in China, is also advocated by some shameless people. All cultures with "slave ideology" belong to this group. There is also semi-feudal culture in China, which reflects the semi-feudal politics and economy of the country. Those who advocate the worship of Confucius, the study of ancient classics, the practice of old rules of propriety and old thoughts, and the opposition of new culture and new thoughts, are the representatives of this kind of culture. The imperialist and the semi-feudal cultures are intimate friends. They have formed an alliance of the reactionary cultures to oppose the new culture, and served the benefits of the imperialists and the feudal class, and they should therefore be unquestionably overthrown. Without the overthrow of these reactionary cultures, new culture can never be established. One cannot be established or extended if the other is not stopped or crushed. The struggle between the two is a struggle of life and death.

As to the new culture, it is the ideological reflection of the new politics and the new economy, and it serves the new politics and the new economy.

As we have pointed out in the third chapter, since capitalist economy made its appearance in China, Chinese society has gradually changed its character, it is no more a purely feudal society but a semi-feudal one, although in it feudal economy still predominates. This capitalist economy, contrasted with the feudal one, is a new kind of economy, along with which came and grew' the new political force, the force of the bourgeoisie, the petit-bourgeoisie and the proletariat. As political representatives of the awakening bourgeoisie, petit-bourgeoisie and proletariat, there are the different revolutionary parties, the chief of which are the Kuomintang and the Communist Party. And the new culture is

the ideological reflection of, and serves, this new political and economic force. Without the capitalist economy, without the existence of the bourgeoisie, the petit-bourgeoisie and the proletariat, without the political parties of these classes, there is no ground for the so-called new ideology, or new culture, to grow.

The forces of these new politics, new economy and new culture are the revolutionary forces of China, because they are the forces opposing the old politics, old economy and old culture. The old is composed of two parts—the semi-feudal politics, economy and culture of China herself, and imperialist politics, economy and culture—the latter being the controller of the alliance. They are all rotten and should be destroyed completely. The struggle between the new and the old in China's society is the struggle between the new forces of the people (the various revolutionary classes) and the old forces of the imperialists and the feudal classes. It is a struggle of revolution and counter-revolution. This struggle has lasted for a hundred years since the Opium War, and for thirty years if we count from the 1911 Revolution.

As said before, there is also the difference between the old and the new revolution. Things new in a certain historical period may become old in another one. The hundred years of China's bourgeois-democratic revolution can be divided into two stages—that embracing the first eighty years and that embracing the last twenty years, each having its fundamental historical characteristic. In the first eighty years, the bourgeois-democratic revolution of China belonged to the old category, while that of the last twenty years, due to the change of international and internal situations, belongs to the new category. Thus, we have the old democracy—the characteristic of the first eighty years, and the New Democracy—the characteristic of the last twenty years. This distinction is true in culture as well as in politics. In the following, we are going to explain how this distinction is manifested in the cultural sphere.

XII. The Historical Characteristics of China's Cultural Revolution

In the sphere of cultural ideology, two historical periods may be divided—that before and that after the May 4th Movement of 1919.

Before the May 4th Movement, the struggle on China's cultural front was a struggle between the new culture of the bourgeoisie and the old culture of the feudal class. The struggles

between the modern school system and the old monarchial Ko Chu examination system, between the old learning and the new learning, between the Chinese learning and the Western learning, all possessed this character. The so-called schools, new learning and Western learning of that time were fundamentally the natural and social science of the bourgeoisie (we say “fundamentally” here, because there were still remnant poisons of feudalism in them). Social sciences represented by the works introduced by Yen Fu—such as Darwin’s theory of evolution, Adam Smith’s classical economics, Mill’s formal logic, the French enlightener Montesquieu’s theory of society—plus the natural sciences of that time, were the ruling thoughts of the so-called new learning before the May 4th Movement. At that time, such thoughts played a revolutionary role in the struggle against feudal thoughts, and served the bourgeois-democratic revolution of the old time. However, because of the weakness of the Chinese bourgeoisie, and the fact that the world has already reached the stage of imperialism, this bourgeois thought of China could not stand for long, and was soon defeated by the reactionary alliance of the slave thought of imperialism and the antiquity-restoring thought of feudalism. A little counter-offensive of the reactionary alliance forced the so-called new learning to “pack up its flags and drums,” declare a general retreat, lose its soul and leave only the skeleton. In the period of imperialism, the culture of the old bourgeois-democratic revolution has become corrupt and powerless. Its failure is inevitable.

The May 4th Movement brought about a new phase. After that movement, there was produced in China a new cultural recruit force, the cultural thought of Communism led by the Chinese Communists, i.e., the Communist theory of social revolution and the Communist conception of the world. The May 4th Movement occurred in 1919 (and the inauguration of the Chinese Communist Party and the beginning of China’s labour movement took place in 1921, at a time immediately following the first world war and the Russian October Revolution, when the national problem and colonial movements commenced to change their old faces in the world. This relation between China’s revolution and the world revolution is very evident. Because of the appearance of the new political force—the Chinese proletariat and the Chinese Communist Party—in the Chinese political arena, the new cultural force too, with its new attire and new arms and with

the aid of all possible allies, displayed its power and launched a brave attack on the imperialist and feudal cultures. This new force, in spite of the fact that it has not had sufficient time to establish its basis in the sphere of natural sciences, and thus has to let such sciences be controlled temporarily by bourgeois cosmism, has aroused a great revolution in the sphere of social sciences—the sphere of the most important “arms of thought” in this period of colonial and semi-colonial revolutions. In the sphere of social sciences, no matter whether in philosophy, economics, politics, military science, history, literature or arts (again in drama, cinema, music, sculpture or painting), there have been colossal developments. For these twenty years, as far as the bayonet of this new cultural force reaches, a great revolution has been aroused, no matter whether in thoughts or in forms (as in language, etc.). The mightiness of its power is matchless, and the extent of its mobilization has surpassed that of any period in Chinese history. And Lusin was the greatest and the bravest leader of this new cultural force. He was the Commander-in-Chief of China’s cultural revolution. He was not only a great literary writer, but also a great thinker and a great revolutionary. Being firm as a rock, not the least bit slavish or flattering, he possessed the most precious character of the colonial and semi-colonial people. Lusin was unprecedented, the bravest, firmest, truest, most correct and most zealous national hero, who representing the majority of the people dashed forward at the enemy on the cultural front. Lusin’s direction is the direction of the new culture of the Chinese nation.

Before the May 4th Movement, the new culture of China was one possessing the character of the old democracy, and was a part of the capitalist cultural revolution of the world bourgeoisie. After that, it has become one possessing the character of new democracy, and is a part of the socialist cultural revolution of the world proletariat.

Before the May 4th Movement, the new cultural movement—the cultural revolution—of China was led by the bourgeoisie. At that time, there was still some significance in the bourgeois leadership. After the May 4th Movement, the bourgeois cultural thought became even more backward than bourgeois politics, and it is no more the leader of the cultural movement. It can only be a member of the cultural alliance, to a certain degree, in the revolutionary period, while the leadership of the alliance falls on the proletarian cultural thought. This is a fact as solid as iron.

Nobody can deny it.

What we call the culture of the New Democracy is the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal culture of the masses and the people. It is the culture of the anti-Japanese united front today. It can only be led by the cultural thought of the proletariat, i.e., the thought of Communism, and cannot be led by that of any other class. In a word, the culture of New Democracy is “the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal culture of the masses and the people that is led by the proletariat.”

XIII. The Four Periods

A cultural revolution ideologically reflects and serves the political and economic revolution. Thus in China, the cultural revolution, like politics, advocates a united front.

The history of the united front of the cultural revolution in these twenty years can be divided into four periods—the first period from 1919 to 1921, the second from 1921 to 1927, the third from 1927 to 1936, and the fourth from 1937 up to the present.

The first period was the period from the May 4th Movement of 1919 to the inauguration of the Chinese Communist Party in 1921, of which period the May 4th Movement was the chief banner.

The May 4th Movement was an anti-imperialist as well as an anti-feudal movement. Its outstanding historical significance lay in the fact that it possessed a feature which was not present in the 1911 Revolution, i.e., that it opposed imperialism and feudalism in the most thorough and uncompromising way. The reason why the May 4th Movement possessed this characteristic is that the capitalist economy of China had made new steps in its development at that time, and that the then revolutionary intelligentsia of China had personally witnessed the disintegration of the three big imperialist countries—Russia, Germany and Austria, the wounding of two of them, Britain and France, the construction of the socialist state by the Russian proletariat, and Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy in the grips of proletarian revolutions. All these happenings gave them new hopes for the liberation of the Chinese nation. Thus, the May 4th Movement broke out at the call of the world revolution, of the Russian Revolution and Lenin, and was a part of the proletarian revolution of that time. Although we did not have a Communist Party during the May 4th Movement, many intellectuals did possess primary

Communist thoughts and approved the Russian Revolution. At its beginning, the May 4th Movement was a united-front revolutionary movement of three kinds of people—the Communistic intelligentsia, the revolutionary petit-bourgeois intelligentsia, and the bourgeois intelligentsia (which formed the right wing). Its shortcoming is that it was participated in only by the intelligentsia, involving no workers or peasants. But as soon as it was developed into the June 3rd Movement, not only the intelligentsia but also the broad masses of proletariat, petit-bourgeoisie and bourgeoisie participated in it, and the movement became a revolutionary movement on a national scale. The cultural revolution of the May 4th Movement was a movement that opposed feudal culture in a thorough-going way, and there has never been such a great and thorough cultural revolution in the history of China. It achieved success under two banners: opposing the old morality and promoting the new morality, and opposing the old literature and promoting the new literature. At that time, the cultural movement was not yet able to extend to the workers and the peasantry. It did bring forth the slogan of “Popular Literature” or the “Literature of the Common People,” but then the so-called “common people” were in reality limited to the city petit-bourgeois and bourgeois intelligentsia. The May 4th Movement paved the way, in thought and in the preparation of cadres, for the inauguration of the Chinese Communist Party in 1921, as well as for the May 30th Movement and the Northern Expedition to come. The bourgeois intelligentsia were the right wing during the May 4th Movement, and when it came to the second period, the greater part of them compromised with the enemy and turned reactionary.

The second period had as its ensigns the inauguration of the Chinese Communist Party, the May 30th Movement of 1925 and the Northern Expedition. It continued and developed the united front of the three classes of the May 4th Movement, and realized this united front in the political sphere—i.e., in the first Kuomintang-Communist cooperation. Dr. Sun Yat-sen was great, not only in that he led the Great 1911 Revolution (though a democratic revolution of the old period), but also in that he was able to “adapt to the current of the world and meet the demand of the masses,” bringing forth the three revolutionary policies of allying with the Soviet Union, cooperating with the Communists and protecting and assisting the workers and the peasants, that he

revised his San Min Chu I, and established the New San Min Chu I that includes the above three revolutionary policies. Before this, San Min Chu I had very little to do with educational circles, cultural circles and the youth, because it had not brought forth the slogan of anti-imperialism and anti-feudalism. It was an old San Min Chu I, looked upon by the people as a mere banner to be temporarily utilized by a certain group of men to capture power, or "to climb to bureaucracy." In other words, it was considered a banner of pure political activities. Since then the San Min Chu I has become the New San Min Chu I with the three revolutionary policies attached to it, and, through Kuomintang-Communist cooperation and through the endeavors of the members of the two parties, has been greatly extended among the people of the nation, among a portion of the educational and cultural circle, and among the broad masses of youths. It could achieve this, because it had been developed into the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal San Min Chu I of the New Democracy. Without such a development, the propagation of the thought of San Min Chu I would have been impossible.

In this period, the revolutionary San Min Chu I became the political basis of Kuomintang-Communist cooperation and the cooperation of the various revolutionary classes. "Communism is the good friend of San Min Chu I." The two doctrines were consolidated into a united front. In terms of class, it was a united front of three classes, the proletariat, the petit-bourgeoisie and the bourgeoisie. With the Min Kuo Jih Pao of Shanghai and other newspaper organs in various places as weapons, the two parties jointly propagated the cause of anti-imperialism, opposed the feudal, Confucius-worshipping, classics-evangelizing educational system, opposed the ancient feudal literature and the old-styled language, and promoted the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal new literature and the Pai-Hua-style language. During the war of Kwang-tung and the Northern Expedition, anti-imperialist and anti-feudal thoughts were for the first time injected into the Chinese armies, which were thus fundamentally reformed. The slogans "Down with the avaricious officials," "Down with the landlords and the gentry" were for the first time spread among the peasantry, arousing numerous revolutionary peasants struggles. Because of all this, and also because of the aid of the Soviet Union, the Northern Expedition was brought to success. The workers and the peasants helped the bourgeoisie to climb to power, but the

latter sold the revolution, and the political situation turned to a new phase.

The third period was the new revolutionary period between 1927 and 1936. As we know, at the end of the second period, a change arose within the camp of the revolutionaries. The bourgeoisie deserted their former ally to join the camp of the counter-revolutionary imperialist and feudal forces. If there had been three classes inside the camp of the revolutionaries before, only two of them, the proletariat and the petit-bourgeoisie (which includes the peasantry, the revolutionary intelligentsia and other petit-bourgeois elements), were left now. China's revolution had to enter into a new period, in which the Chinese Communist Party became the sole leader of the revolution. This is a period characterized by the anti-Communist campaigns on the one hand and the deep penetration of the revolutionary forces on the other. There were two kinds of anti-Communist campaigns in this period—the military and the cultural. This time, there were two kinds of penetration by the revolution—penetration into the rural masses and penetration into cultural circles. For the two kinds of anti-Communist campaigns, all the reactionary forces of China as well as those of the world were mobilized under the direction of the imperialists, and a time as long as ten years was spent. The degree of atrocity is unprecedented in history. Hundreds of thousands of Communist members and young students were slaughtered. Millions of workers and peasants were sacrificed or suppressed. In the eyes of the rulers, after all these harsh campaigns, Chinese Communists must have been all killed and Communism suppressed forever, but contrary to their expectation, they suffered failures in both campaigns. As an outcome of their military campaign, the Red Army marched to the North to fight against the Japanese; as an outcome of their cultural campaign, the December 9th Youth Movement broke out; and the general result was to quicken the awakening of the people. The above were results in the positive sense. The negative result of the Kuomintang campaigns was the penetration of a powerful enemy into our territory. This is why the people of the whole nation still speak with abhorrence about the ten-year anti-Communist campaigns. The strangest thing during this period was that the Communists did not hold any position in the cultural organizations of the nation from which they could offer effective resistance to the Kuomintang cultural campaign, and yet the

Kuomintang campaign failed! Is this not worth our deep thought? And Lusin, the believer in Communism, grew to be the giant of China's cultural revolution amid the cultural campaigns of the Kuomintang.

The struggle of this period was between the firm persistence of the popular, anti-imperialist, anti-feudal New Democracy or New San Min Chu I on the side of the revolutionaries, and the absolutism of the Chinese landlord-bourgeoisie alliance under imperialist direction on the side of the counter-revolutionaries. The landlord-bourgeoisie absolutism politically and culturally dismembered Dr. Sun's New San Min Chu I as well as his three basic policies, causing serious catastrophes to the Chinese nation.

The fourth period is the period of the present anti-Japanese war of resistance. The curved movement of China's revolution has again brought about a united front of the three classes in this period. But the scope of the united front is much enlarged. In the upper class, it includes all the rulers: in the middle class, all the petit-bourgeois elements; and in the lower class, all the proletariat. In short, all the classes and strata of the nation become members of the alliance for the firm opposition of the Japanese imperialists. The first stage of this period was before the fall of Hankow. At that time, a sort of cheering and inspiriting air pervaded every walk of life in the nation. National politics showed a tendency towards democratization and the cultural circles were universally mobilized. After the fall of Hankow came the second stage, during which many changes in our national politics occurred. A portion of the big bourgeoisie surrendered to the enemy, while others wished and still wish to conclude the war of resistance. As a reflection of this condition in the cultural sphere, there are the reactionary speeches of Yeh Ching and others, and the deprivation of the freedom of speech and press.

To overcome this crisis, it is necessary to carry on a firm struggle against all those kinds of thought that are contrary to resistance, to unity, or to progress. Without crushing those reactionary thoughts, the victory of our resistance is unimaginable. The people of the whole nation have now in their minds the following question: "What will become the future of this struggle?" According to national and international conditions, no matter how many obstacles there are on the road of resistance, victory must belong to the Chinese people. In the history of China, the progress achieved during the twenty years after the

May 4th Movement not only surpasses that achieved in the eighty years before it, but also surpasses that achieved in the thousands of years of the past. Can we imagine the progress we shall be able to achieve if we continue our endeavor for twenty more years? The rampancy of the dark forces, national and international, has caused our national calamity. This rampancy not only indicates that the dark forces are still powerful, but also symbolizes the last desperate struggle of the dark forces and the approaching victory of the people. This is true of the Orient as well as of the whole world.

XIV. Partial Views Concerning the Question of the Character of Cultural Movement

All achievements come out of the forge of hard bitter struggles. The new culture is no exception. History has gone along three zigzag curves in the past twenty years, during which good and bad elements have been subjected to tests and distinguished.

The obstinate bourgeois elements are wrong in the question of culture just as they are wrong in politics. They do not know the historical characteristics of the new period of China, and do not recognize the culture of New Democracy or New San Min Chu I that belongs to the masses and the people. Their starting point is bourgeois absolutism, and this expressed in terms of culture is "bourgeois cultural absolutism." A portion of the cultural people of the so-called Europe-American clique (I say a portion) supported the Government's "suppression of Communist culture" before, and seems still to be supporting the Government's policy of "restricting the Communists," "dissolving the Communists," etc., at present. They do not wish the workers and the peasants to rise in the cultural sphere, just as they do not wish them to rise to political power. This road of cultural absolutism of the bourgeoisie is a dead alley, because, as in the case of their wrong direction in politics, there is no ground for it, nationally or internationally. It is better for them to "pack up" this cultural absolutism of theirs.

As regards the direction of national culture, it is not socialist culture that is ruling at present. It is wrong to assume that the present culture is, or should be, socialist. Such an assumption is to take the propaganda of Communist thought to be the practice of the Communist program, or to take the application of the

Communist standpoint or method to observe, study and handle questions for the direction of the national education and culture in the stage of China's democratic revolution. The socialist national culture must reflect socialist politics and economy, which we do not have at present. Therefore, we cannot have a socialist national culture. But because the present revolution of China is a part of the proletarian-socialist revolution of the world, the present new culture of China naturally becomes a part of the proletarian-socialist culture of the world, and is its great ally. China's new culture participates in the socialist culture of the world, not by the qualification of being a socialist culture itself, but as an anti-imperialist, anti-feudal culture of the New Democracy of the Chinese people. Just as the present revolution of China cannot be separated from the leadership of the Chinese proletariat, the present new culture of China also cannot be separated from the cultural thought of the Chinese proletariat, i.e., the leadership of Communism. But such leadership is to direct the people to carry on the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, political and cultural revolutions, and not to direct them to carry on the socialist revolution. That is to say, the character of China's present new culture is that of New Democracy, not of socialism.

Doubtlessly, we should now expand the propaganda of Communist thought and intensify the study of Marx-Leninism, without which we will not only be unable to lead China's revolution to the higher step of socialism, but also be incapable of directing and winning the victory of the present democratic revolution. However, it still holds true that the fundamental character of the present national culture is not that of socialism but that of New Democracy, because it is the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal culture of the people, not the anti-capitalist culture of the proletariat. We must separate the propaganda of Communist thought and the Communist social system from the practice of the program of New Democracy, and also separate the Communist method as a means of observing, studying and handling questions from the New Democratic direction of national culture. It is improper to mix the two.

From this, we can know, the content of China's New Culture at the present stage is not the bourgeois cultural absolutism nor proletarian socialism. It is the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal New Democracy or New San Min Chu I of the Chinese people, led by the cultural thought of the proletariat.

XV. A National, Scientific and Popular Culture

The culture of New Democracy is national in character. It opposes imperialist oppression, and advocates the dignity and independence of the Chinese nation. It belongs to our nation, and possesses its characteristics. It unites with the socialist culture and New Democratic culture of other nations, establishes with them relations of mutual absorption and mutual development, and serves with them mutually as part of the new culture of the world. But it can never unite with the imperialist culture of other nations, because it is a revolutionary, national culture. To be sure, China should absorb abundantly the progressive culture of foreign nations as raw material for her own cultural food. Such absorption was not sufficient in the past. What we find useful today we must absorb, not only from the present socialist or New Democratic cultures of other nations, but also from the ancient cultures, e.g. from the cultures of the various capitalist countries in the period of enlightenment. These foreign materials we must treat as we treat our food. We submit our food to the mouth for chewing and to the stomach and intestines for digestion, add to it saliva, pepsin and other secretions of the intestines to separate it into the essence and the residue, and then absorb the essence of our nourishment and pass off the residue. In somewhat similar manner, we should subject our cultural materials to the process of discrimination and should never absorb everything unconditionally. The idea of “unconditional Westernization” is a wrong one. China has suffered a lot by blindly absorbing foreign materials before. Chinese Communists should never break this rule even in the application of Marxism. We must unify appropriately the general truth of Marxism and the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution, i.e., we must adopt the national form before we can find Marxism useful and should never subjectively or mechanically apply it. Subjective and formal Marxists are only playing with Marxism and the Chinese revolution, and there is no place for them in the revolutionary ranks of China. China’s culture should have its own form, the national form. The national form, plus the New Democratic content, is our new culture today.

The culture of New Democracy is scientific in character. It opposes all feudal and superstitious thoughts and advocates “searching for truth from concrete facts,” it advocates objective

truth as well as the unity of theory and practice. In this point, the scientific thought of the Chinese proletariat may form an anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, and anti-superstition united front with the materialism and natural sciences of the bourgeoisie that are still progressive in character, but it can never unite with the reactionary idealism. Chinese Communists may form an anti-imperialist united front politically with certain idealists and disciples of religions, but can never approve their idealism or religious teachings. The long, long period of China's feudalism created some brilliant culture in the ancient times. To find out the process of development of the ancient culture, throw away its feudal residue, and absorb its democratic essence is a necessary condition for developing the new national culture and raising national self-confidence. But this should never be unconditional absorption. We must separate the rotten elements of the ancient feudal ruling class from the good popular culture or from those elements that are more or less democratic and revolutionary in character. Our present new politics and new economy are developed from our old politics and old economy, and so is our new culture from the old culture, therefore we must respect our own history and should not be isolated from it. But this respect of history means only to set history in its proper place among the sciences, to respect its dialectic development, not to worship the ancient times and disapprove the modern times, or to praise and esteem all the feudal poisonous elements. For this reason, what is important with the people and the youthful students is to lead them to look forward, not to look backward.

The culture of New Democracy is popular in character. It should serve the purpose of the toiling masses, which occupy more than 90 per cent of the whole Chinese population, and should gradually become their own culture. We should, from the viewpoint of standards, distinguish and unify the difference of knowledge required for educating revolutionary cadres and for educating the revolutionary masses, and distinguish and unify the standard-elevation of culture and its broad extension. Revolutionary culture is a powerful revolutionary weapon of the people. Before the outbreak of the revolution, culture paves the way for it by spreading revolutionary thoughts. During the revolution, it is a necessary and important front in the general revolutionary front, and revolutionary cultural workers are commanders of various grades on this cultural front. "Without

revolutionary theories, there is no revolutionary movement.” From that, we can see how important the revolutionary cultural movement is to revolutionary practice. And this cultural movement and revolutionary practice are the movement and practice of the people. Therefore, all the progressive cultural workers should have their own cultural troops in the anti-Japanese war, and these troops are nothing more than the people and the masses. Cultural workers or cultural thought that are isolated from the masses and the people are merely “troop-less commanders” or “commandants of castles in the air,” and their fires can never reach the enemies. For the realization of our aim, the language must be reformed under certain conditions, and the words we use must be in close touch with the masses. It should be understood that the masses are the boundless resources of our revolutionary culture.

This national, scientific, and popular culture is the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal culture of the people, the culture of New Democracy, the culture of New San Min Chu I, the culture of the Chinese nation.

The combination of New Democratic politics, New Democratic economy and New Democratic culture is the Republic of New Democracy. It is a republic true in name and in fact. And that is the New China we aim to establish.

The New China stands before every one of us. We should be ready to receive it.

The mast of the ship New China is appearing on the horizon beyond. We should clap our hands to welcome it.

Raise both your hands. The New China is ours.

FOR UNITY IN CHINA'S WAR OF RESISTANCE

(Circular Telegram Issued by a Mass Meeting at Yen-an on the Occasion of the Sixth Anniversary of the War of Resistance, Appealing for Unity and for Opposition to Civil War.)

Today victory is within sight. Our nation has remained united and maintained the war of resistance for wholly six years. The initiative of the world anti-fascist war has passed from the hands of the Axis to those of the Allies. Failure and destruction are befalling the fascist bandits of Germany, Italy and Japan. Yet, at this time, unexpectedly, within the fighting camp of China, there exist some crazy, senseless fifth columnists of the Japanese who openly echo the anti-Communist appeal of Hitler, Mussolini, Tojo, Wang Ching-wei and Wang Ke-min. These elements are demanding the dissolution of the Communist Party of China and the abolition of the Shensi-Kansu-Ninghsia Border Region. They surround and persuade their military commanders to transfer the troops from the anti-Japanese battlefields to attack the Border Region, hoping to change the anti-Japanese war into a civil war. Thus, we see within this month the incessant transportation of troops from the river-defending positions toward the Border Region. This is in addition to the ten-odd divisions that have been originally stationed around the Border Region for blockade purposes. Reliable information reveals that the 78th and the 167th Divisions, the main force of the 1st Army, have been shifted from Huayin and Wei-nan to Pin-hsien and Chun-hua; the 28th and the 53rd Divisions of the 90th Army from Hancheng and Ho-yang to Lochuan; the 8th Division of the 57th Army from Sian to Chung-pu, the heavy-artillery battalion of the 16th Army from the river-defending positions to Yao-hsien; and the artillery brigade originally stationed in Sian to Chunhua. Besides the above, there are still more troops waiting for orders to move. The busy military transportation along the Lung-Hai Railway, the Sienyang-Yulin highway, and the Sian-Lanchow highway has greatly alarmed the inhabitants along those lines.

To coordinate with the military actions, the notorious Trotskyite and traitor Chang Ti-fei, chief of the anti-Communist special agents in Sian and a director for training of a concentration camp there, proceeded to assemble a meeting of his followers and in the name of "public opinion" barked for the dissolution of the Communist Party and the abolition of the

Border Region. Strangest of all, even the official Central News Agency broadcast these reactionary unity-splitting remarks on July 6, as a step to prepare their counterfeit “public opinion” for starting a civil war, the crisis of which is really within a hair’s breadth. Should this senseless attempt of the enemy’s fifth columnists and of the anti-Communist elements of China be realized, it will not only nullify all past achievements of the War of Resistance that we have painstakingly maintained for six years, but it will also seriously harm the collaborative actions of the anti-fascist Allies as a whole. The sole aim of these fifth columnists in trying to create civil war is to help the Japanese destroy China; hence, their action is not only against the interests of China’s war of liberation, but also against the common interests of the Allies in the struggle against fascism. The civil war agitators are merely the supporters of moribund fascism, the pro-Japanese elements and the traitors within our anti-Japanese camp, because no other result than the sacrifice of our national interests can be expected if a civil war is staged at this critical moment of the nation.

* * *

The Communist Party of China for six years has proved to be the most faithful defenders of China. The Communists are the creators and upholders of the united front policy. They achieved the peaceful settlement of the Sian incident and organized the national unity under the Generalissimo to carry out the war of liberation. The Communist Party members in the Eighth Route Army, in the New Fourth Army, and among the people of different localities were directed to unite closely with all the troops and civilians in the war theaters behind the enemy’s front in order to inflict blows upon half of the enemy forces in China. They did this without any replenishment of ammunition and funds from the Government. The New Fourth Army is now being called the “rebels”; but all Chinese citizens as well as the Japanese and the traitors know that these “rebels” are at this moment bravely resisting the enemy in the battlefields behind the enemy’s front in Central China and are still giving their full support to the Government without a sign of rebellion. The Eighth Route Army has been maintaining the resistance in North China through all hardships; to them, however, no encouragements or commendations have ever been given, but instead denunciations and hindrances.

The Shensi-Kansu-Ningshia Border Region is the only rear of the Eighth Route and the New Fourth Armies. There the small rear-guard establishments of the two armies work with their own hands for self-supply, illustrating a model troop that the world has never seen. There the party, government and mass organizations truly realize the Three People's Principles and carry on the famous "Triple Policy" that unites firmly the various strata of the anti-Japanese people. There the people are given the human, political and financial rights, the opportunity to speak, clothes to put on, rice to eat, work to do, and books to read, in short, each person is given a proper place under the sun. There the people fully enjoy the life of democracy, of liberty, and of sufficient food and clothing, a condition quite contrary to the miseries of the "great rear."

It is this Border Region, the model district of the practice of the Three People's Principles, that the National Government has not yet kept its promise to recognize, although the people in the Border Region are forever loyal to the Government. We, the people of the Border Region, swear to give our full support to the Chinese Communist Party, which has been so faithful to the work of national liberation, so persistent in carrying on the united front and the resistance, and has done so many good deeds for us. Likewise, we swear to defend with our lives this piece of land on which have been established nationally applauded democratic and progressive measures. These represent not only our own benefit, but also the reliable force for the maintenance of the war of resistance and for defense from the destruction of the intrigues of the Japanese and their fifth columnists.

Despite numerous abnormal misdeeds in our national politics, we have long kept silent, hoping that our tolerance might lead to the overcoming of our national difficulty. Unfortunately, encouraged by this toleration on our part, the oppression of the anti-Communist elements has become more intensified, and cruel outrages and malicious policies have been on the increase. Now these anti-Communist elements even defy the criticism of the world to remove the anti-Japanese troops for civil war intrigues, to place the anti-Communist policy above the anti-Japanese policy, to advocate oligarchy and one-party dictatorship, to oppose liberalism and communism exactly as the fascists are doing, and to forsake the principles of unity and united front, which means to condemn our nation to death. If today, they can direct their

special agents to counterfeit public opinion to propose the dissolution of the Chinese Communist Party and the abolition of the Border Region, why can they not tomorrow denounce and disband the Eighth Route Army? Their abnormal actions only expose the minds of the counter-revolutionaries, who always fear that the anti-Japanese war will bring about victory, that the Chinese nation will be liberated, and that the Chinese people will gain their freedom.

* * *

On the other hand, not a word of denunciation was directed at the thirty-three high-ranking Kuomintang military officers who sold their country and surrendered to the enemy. These elements sometimes even act as advocates for them. For such a notorious traitor as Wu Kai-hsien, who was sent to the war capital by the enemy to carry on his traitorous intrigue, no order of arrest is issued. Instead, Wu is allowed to remain at large, performing his task freely, still under the name of a central executive of the Kuomintang. Regarding the activities of such a fifth columnist of the Japanese as Chang Ti-fei, who counterfeited public opinion in Sian to demand the dissolution of the Chinese Communist Party and the abolition of the Border Region, no restriction of whatever nature is made. Instead, his message was broadcast by the official Central News Agency for the purpose of deceiving the people and preparing public opinion for the military invasions. In regard to the miserable livelihood of the people in the rear, their discontent and complaints, the discord between the people and the government, the numerous revolts of the masses in various localities, and all other critical conditions, not a word of regret is heard from the Government. Instead, there is highhanded oppression. The reason for the annihilation of the armies of Pang Ping-shun and Sun Tian-ying by the Japanese in North China is none other than that Pang and Sun had been secretly ordered by the Military Committee of the National Government and the Commander of the 1st War Zone in Loyang to exert their utmost to prepare for an offensive upon the Eighth Route Army in the Taihang-shan (of this intrigue the Eighth Route Army has some documents as proofs). Hence they did not take any precautionary measures against the enemy, who, taking advantage of their unpreparedness, annihilated their armies and captured their commanders. These anti-Communist generals, Pang and Sun,

have surrendered to the Japanese. But their misdeed was kept a secret; some people even act as advocates for them.

The Government dispatched two group armies, under the command of Wang Chung-lian and Lee Hsien-chow respectively, to try to annihilate the Eighth Route and the New Fourth Armies in North China and Shantung, which are carrying on bitter struggles against the enemy. They called the Communist Party “traitorous party” and the Eighth Route and New Fourth Armies “traitorous armies.” Is there anything in the world more illogical and nonsensical than this? Is today not the day when the Japanese, German and Italian fascists are facing the crisis of their downfall and we are required to intensify our resistance for the liberation of our people and for coordination with the antifascist Allies? Why is it that a great number of troops were withdrawn from the anti-Japanese front for the attack on the Shensi-Kansu-Ningsia Border Region? Why do we Chinese fight against our own countrymen and not the Japanese imperialists? Is it not yet clear that during the war of resistance all our forces should be united to strengthen the anti-Japanese front, and a second front against our own people within our country should never be created under whatever condition? Is it not yet clear that once the civil war breaks out, it will be protracted, both of us will be ruined, and only the Japanese will reap the harvest? And why do you hate the Communists, the Eighth Route Army, the New Fourth Army and the Border Region so intensely, and not our common enemy, the Japanese imperialists? Are you forgetting the existence of the Japanese, when you remove your troops from the river-defending positions for an attack upon the Border Region? What if the Japanese stab your anti-Communist crusaders in the back? Have you entirely forgotten the lesson of Generals Pang and Sun?

Attending a mass meeting here in Yen-an celebrating the sixth anniversary of our War of Resistance, we, the people of the various circles in Yen-an, earnestly appeal to the National Government, to Generalissimo Chiang, General Hu Chung-nan, the officers and soldiers who prepared to attack the Border Region, and the compatriots of our country to see clearly that the intrigue of the fifth columnists of the Japanese cannot produce any benefit to our nation, but only helps the aggression of the enemy. We demand that Generalissimo Chiang and General Hu shall immediately order their anti-Japanese troops to return to the

original defending positions, maintain the national unity and avoid the outbreak of the civil war. We earnestly advise those officers and soldiers who have been secretly ordered to carry on the civil war to note the disaster to our nation, to learn the lesson of the civil war of the past ten years. They must not attack the Communists, the Eighth Route Army or the New Fourth Army. They must point the muzzles of their guns toward the external enemy, not toward their own countrymen. What General Hu Chung-nan once said—"the anti-Communist campaign is a life sentence"—is quite true. Try to think deeply and calmly. What result can we bring if we are going to carry on the civil war for another ten years? In fact, we shall not have those ten years to fight against each other, because as soon as the civil war breaks out, our enemy will march in, and our country will be ruined.

We demand of Generalissimo Chiang and General Hu to arrest immediately the notorious Chang Ti-fei, Trotskyite traitor, and fifth columnist of the Japanese, and punish his counter-revolutionary actions of splitting the national unity and destroying the resistance. We demand that the National Government arrest Wu Kai-hsien, the secret missionary of the Japanese, and put him to public trial, and publicly order the punishment of the thirty-three high-ranked traitorous Kuomintang generals, namely, Pang Ping-hsien, Sun Tian-ying, Sun Liang-chang, Pi Tai-yu, Wu Hua-wen, Yung Tze-hen, Li Wen-li, Yang Yung-hsien, Lee Cheng-fen, Hou Kuan-wen, Wang Tin-yin, Yang Kuan-yu, Wang Jui-tin, Chao Hsing-tsai, Tse Hang-hui, Hou Ju-yung, Yang Chi-hsi, Chao Sui, Yang Cheng, Lee Chang-kiang, Hsu Chi-tai, Yang Chung-hua, Wu Su-chuan, Wang Ching-tsi, Su Cheng-tung, Pan Sheng-fu, Su Cheng-hua, Chang Hai-ping, Jen Lan-pu, Chao Tian-hsuan, Hsueh Yu-ping, Yu Huai-an, and King Yi-wu, and transfer the anti-Communist troops in Central China and Shantung for their punishment. We appeal for help from our countrymen, and all the anti-Japanese parties and groups to stop the civil war, and to realize the following demands. Our slogans are:

1. Persist in the War of Resistance and oppose the civil war.
2. Persist in the unity against splitting.
3. Persist in the anti-Japanese national united front.
4. Oppose the removal of troops from the river-defending positions for attack upon the Border Region.
5. Demand that the Government withdraw the troops that

are encircling the Border Region and dispatch them to the anti-Japanese front.

6. Demand that the Government punish the special service organizations that stir up the civil war.

7. Demand that the Government chastise the thirty-three capitulating generals.

8. Demand that the Government put the spy Wu Kai-hsien to trial.

9. Support the Chinese Communist Party.

10. Defend the anti-Japanese and democratic Border Region with our lives.

it. Firmly realize the Three People's Principles.

12. Mobilize all the people to defend the Border Region, to defend North China and the whole of China.

13. Down with Japanese imperialism and its hunting dogs, the fifth columnists.

14. *Long live the liberation of the Chinese people!*

July 9th, 1943