

# **CRITIQUE OF CHINA'S DESTINY**

by  
Chen Pai-ta

A Chinese Communist reviews  
Marshal Chiang Kai-Shek's book

**PEOPLE'S PUBLISHING HOUSE**  
BOMBAY

## CONTENTS

	Introduction .....	1
I.	On the Chinese Nation .....	2
II.	On Chinese History.....	5
III.	On the Modern Thought of China.....	9
IV.	On Kuomintang-Communist Relations .....	13
V.	Forward to A New and Democratic China.....	22

## PREFATORY NOTE

Early in 1943, Chiang Kai-shek's book, *China's Destiny*, was published. This pamphlet consists of an exhaustive review of the main ideas in Chiang's book written by a leading personality of the Chinese Communist Party.

This pamphlet is a companion one to the pamphlet, *Who Threatens China's Unity I* that was published by us in February 1944. While *Who Threatens China's Unity?* deals mostly with the dangerous political game that is being played by Chiang, this review of *China's Destiny*, deals more with the ideas behind Chiang's political moves, the philosophy that inspires them, the political objective that he has in view.

*China's Destiny* has been hailed in many countries, even before its publication, as a great book, a blueprint of modern China, written by the builder and unifier of the Chinese nation. Yet as Comrade Chen Pai-ta in his brilliant review shows, it is a dangerous and reactionary book. Far from helping the Chinese people forward on the path of victory over Jap Fascism, it harks back rather to those halcyon days for Chinese reaction, the days when in the name of destroying Bolshevism, vicious civil wars were waged and a regime of untrammelled dictatorship existed in Kuomintang China.

The publication of *China's Destiny* marks a new stage in the development of the Chinese Revolution, of the Chinese people's struggle for freedom. For the first time since the end of the civil wars and the establishment of Kuomintang-Communist unity to defend China against Jap aggression, reaction in China has come out with the name of Generalissimo to back its outdated dangerous policies.

We are publishing this pamphlet in India because it throws new light on trends in Chinese politics. We publish it because it is necessary for all Indian patriots, the future of whose country is so closely linked with that of China, to understand clearly just what is happening in China and to afford every assistance to China's forces of progress in their tight against reaction.

March 18. 1944.

Mohan Kumaramangalam

# CRITIQUE OF “CHINA’S DESTINY”

## INTRODUCTION

Ever since the publication of the book entitled\* *China's Destiny* in the name of Chiang Kai-shek, Director-General of the Kuomintang, many people in Chungking have suspected that the book was really written by Tao Hsi-sheng. In fact, many people wonder why Mr. Chiang, the leader of the Kuomintang, should allow his work to be written by a person so widely infamous for his association with the Nanking traitors, his constant advocacy of fascism and opposition to the United Nations, and his ideological links with Wang Ching-wei which continue even to-day. They wonder if the Kuomintang is really so hard-up for learned men that it can find no one else for this work.

Only a few days after the publication of *China's Destiny*, Tao Hsi-sheng himself wrote an article singing its praises which was published by the *Central Weekly* (organ of the Kuomintang) on its first page as a leading article. This again appeared strange to many people. Why should the *Central Weekly* esteem Tao's articles so highly? Was it impossible to boost Mr. Chiang's book without Tao's commendation? It is not. surprising, therefore, that people were astonished.

Since *Chinas Destiny* was published over the name of Mr. Chiang, it attracted the attention of the people for his sake. People thought at first that since Mr. Chiang had published such a book at such a critical moment in the war of resistance, it would contribute a great deal towards the burning question facing our people- how to prepare the counter-offensive against the enemy, or how to co-ordinate the operations of the Allies to win final victory, because, as everybody knows the factor that determines Chinas destiny to-day is the war of resistance and nothing else. But after having read *China's Destiny*, they were greatly disappointed, because the questions brought out in the book were entirely unexpected ones. Out of the 213 pages of the book, only twelve and a half pages deal with the war problem, while the bulk of it is on internal problems—opposition to Liberalism and Communism and advocacy of compradore-feudalist fascism or the New Absolutism (formally still wearing the mask of the Three People's Principles).

We Marxists usually despise those who try to conceal their political opinions, but Mr. Chiang does not conceal his opinions in this book, which we welcome. However, we cannot agree with what Mr. Chiang says, and we deem it our duty to make public our opinions for the consideration and examination of our compatriots. Once Mr. Chiang said himself: “Anyone who sees mistakes in the actions and attitudes of the Kuomintang should correct and mend them.” So it is a matter of necessity for us to bring forth our views and to discuss this work with its author and the readers. Since Mr. Chiang's book concerns China's destiny and questions of life or death, existence or destruction, for the 450 millions of the people of China, not only all Communists but indeed every patriotic citizen of China, should give it his full attention and by no means neglect it.

At present, the Kuomintang is plotting to dissolve the Communist Party and to abolish the Border Region. The official Central News Agency actually broadcast such news on July 6, 1943. It may be said now that we are approaching a period characterised by a wealth of peculiar opinions, to which, of course, we Communists cannot remain indifferent, especially when those peculiar opinions really play a part in shaping events, as can be seen by reading *Chinas Destiny* The criticisms here limit themselves to a few "fundamental propositions of the book. The criticism of other aspects and the review of separate questions in a more

thorough-going way, I shall leave to be done elsewhere by other comrades.

We hope that the author, the readers and all patriotic Chinese citizens who differ from us on these questions will express their views also, as truth is not afraid of controversy and that which is afraid of controversy is not truth. Countless Kuomintang publications have severely criticised Comrade Mao Tse-tung's *New Democracy* while we have not yet given them any reply. So now taking Mr. Chiang's book as a starting point, let us express some of our own opinions.

## 1. ON THE CHINESE NATION

What Mr. Chiang says in his book regarding the question of the Chinese nation does not fit in with the facts of history. For example, he writes in his book: "Our Chinese nation was formed through the amalgamation of many tribes of the same descent" and is composed of "big and small branches of the same blood." As we know, the theory of national blood relationship owes its origin to a shallow idea of the German, Italian and Japanese Fascists who have utilised it as an instrument to further their aggressions upon the world. It is really surprising and unexpected that Mr. Chiang should base his ideas on such a theory which can never serve to explain the history of the formation of the Chinese nation.

**The term "Chinese Nation" commonly used by us means in fact, the various nationalities in China, which, beyond argument, is inhabited by more than one nation.**

The anti-Manchu movement carried on by the revolutionaries of the Tung Meng Hui headed by Dr. Sun Yat-sen at the end of the Chiang dynasty was launched under the banner of nationalism, and in the declaration of the First Congress of the Kuomintang, personally edited by Dr. Sun the phrase, "the various nations within China's territory" was clearly written down. To deny this is to deny Dr. Sun and his principles.

The author of the book has always styled himself a true disciple of Dr. Sun, and now, having an idea of his own he insists that there is only one nation in China! What a shocking idea! If it is correct, then there was no reason for Dr. Sun Yat-sen to call the 1911 Revolution a national revolution, and the words written in the solemn declaration of the First Congress of the Kuomintang—that

"the right of self-determination of the various nations within China is recognised, and a free, united China, by the free association of the nations, will be organised after the victory of the anti-imperialist and anti-warlord revolution"

—had no meaning. Is it not clear that Mr. Chiang's idea is contrary to that of Dr. Sun's?

Let us examine the question more closely. Are the Chinese nation and the Mongolian nation really "big and small branches of the same blood"? Is this also true of the Chinese and the Tibetans? Of the Mohammedans who came from the west? Of the Miaos, the Yaos, the Lolos, the Yis? Whence came the proofs, for such statements?.

The author has quoted a sentence from the *Book of Odes*, which reads: "The offspring of the Wen Emperor branched out to a hundred generations." But can we say that all the nations now in China are descended from the Wen Emperor? It requires only common sense, not profound knowledge, to prove that it is not so, and the author, lacking this common sense, has filled his book with errors.

Another effort to prove the point of the book is the theory of the influence of "inter-marriage." But let us remind ourselves that the marriage of an Emperor's concubine, Wang Chao Chun, in the Han dynasty to a Hung King (and we should not forget that this was a historic tragedy for a Chinese ruler who presented his beautiful concubine to a ruler of the Huns in order to achieve a shameful peace) did not transform the Huns into a branch of the Chinese, nor did the marriage of a princess, Wen Cheng, in the Tang dynasty to a ruler of

Tibet produce the same effect. If it did, the Chinese nation would have become a branch of the Japanese nation, because many Chinese, including many prominent Kuomintang leaders, have married Japanese women!

If the nations within China are to be characterised in this way, all Chinese history would become a heap of incomprehensible and insoluble riddles. Thus war between the Chinese and the Huns in the Han dynasty could not be considered as a national war, but a civil war inside the same nation (or should we say a conflict between the big and small clans?); the same would be true of the aggressions of the five barbarian tribes against China, the war between the Chinese and foreign nations in the period of Northern and Southern Dynasties, and the war between the Chinese, the Ouigurs, the Tibetans, and the Sha To (Tadjik) tribes in the Tang dynasty. For the same reason, the struggles of the Chinese against the Khitans during the Five Short Dynasties, or that against the Khitans, Nurchen (Manchurians), Tartars and the Mongols during the Sung Dynasty, or those against the Mongols and Manchus in the Ming Dynasty, and even the struggle of the Taiping Revolution and the Tung Meng Hui against the Manchus could not be considered national struggles but internal struggles within a single nation.

If such were the case, it would inevitably follow that such historical figures as Yueh Fei, Wen Tien-hsiang Lu Hsiu-fu, Chu Yuan-chang, Hsu Ta, Yuan Chung-huan, Shih ko-fa, Cheng Cheng-kung, Li Ting-kuo, Hung Hsiu-chuan, Li Hsiu-chang and seventy-two heroes of the Yellow Flower Hill and Dr. Sun Yat-sen who have added lustre to their nation and country and have written pages in our history which have won many songs of praise as well as tears from the people, were a group of fools, who sacrificed their lives for nothing significant. And on the other hand, the hateful and unpardonable traitors of Chinese history, such as Hsih Chin-tang, Chang Pang-chang, Liu Yu, Chin Kuei, Hung Cheng-chou, Tseng Kuo-fan and Chang Hsun could then be “honoured in in the temple halls” or “worshipped with bowls and censers for a thousand autumns.” The whole of Chinese history would have to be re-written and our nation would have no historical background to distinguish it if the author's interpretations were accepted.

Mr. Chiang says: “As to how the common destiny of the various classes was realised in history, we must give credit to the original moral qualities of our nation, which maintained the inward affection of the various clans and influenced the morality they already possessed.” Let us examine this question for a while. The facts listed in the foregoing paragraph reveal that in history, the struggles of the Chinese nation against the outside aggressors had been extremely cruel and merciless. How can Mr. Chiang account for such facts if what he said here is true? Doubtless, there existed a fundamental difference between the kinds of people during the struggles of the Chinese nation against the invasions of foreign aggressors. The first kind were the broad Chinese masses who shed their blood and sacrificed their lives to resist aggression and contributed the strength by which their country was defended and lost territory recovered. The second kind were the corrupt rulers, who while facing aggression, adopted the attitude of “**preferring to give things to foreign nations rather than let them fall into the hands of their own slaves,**” or sacrificed even the honour of Son Of Heaven’s “to swallow the humiliation of calling themselves servants, sons, nephews or grandsons of the invaders; or offered gold and silks as tributes to the enemy;” or tried to please the enemy by executing the patriotic generals who insisted on resistance (refer, for instance, to the history of the Five Short Dynasties and of the Ming Dynasty). It was these emperors and premiers who used to rule their people by such magic spells as “loyalty, filial duty, benevolence, love, faith righteousness, harmony and peace”. Perhaps the way they kowtowed to the invaders was their practice of these virtues, but what is there in their virtues that is worth our pride?

Speaking scientifically, a nation is characterised by its common language, common territory, its common economic life and the common psychological expressions of its life revealed by its common culture.

National struggles are merely the historical results of the differentiation of societies into classes. They did not exist at the time of the emergence of human society, nor will they continue to exist forever in the future. The war we are carrying on now, as described by Comrade Mao Tse-tung, is a “fight for the permanent peace of mankind.” Not only that, but even before the realisation of a permanent harmony in mankind, nations originally antagonistic to one another, may be assimilated into one nation due to concrete historical conditions, as was the case with certain nations which settled down in the inland of China and were assimilated by the Chinese.

The Manchus in fact have been assimilated by the Chinese to-day, yet this is certainly not due to the so-called “original virtues” of the Chinese, but to the fact that the Manchus, dispersing themselves throughout the country, came among a people far more advanced than they were, and far superior to them economically, culturally and politically, to say nothing of their overwhelming superiority in numbers. Thus, after long and cruel struggles, they were assimilated by the Chinese.

To-day’s world is a world of science. The history of the nations of the world should, therefore, be approached scientifically. The trick of distorting, altering and fabricating the history of nations, which is practised by the fascists, cannot be an example for us; and to teach the people in such a way is to fool the people. The reason why the big landlords and big capitalists of China have had to fabricate such a chauvinistic theory is so that they can propagate the Tai Han Chu huyi (Pan-Sinoism) and oppress the weak minorities within China. Since we Chinese are a weak people ourselves, we should unite with the minorities within our country, democratically and on an equal footing, so we can resist the invaders together. If we resist the invaders on one hand, and oppress the national minorities on the other, we are leaving a loophole for the enemy to utilise to the disadvantage of our work of national liberation. Every clear-minded Chinese citizen should understand this.

The big landlords and the big capitalists of China and everywhere else, consider the nation their own property. “I am the nation and the nation is I,” is what they always think. But let us see, what constitutes a nation? Does not the overwhelming majority of our nation consist of workers and peasants? Without our 90% or more of labouring people, whence would come our clothing, foodstuffs and houses? Where would we get our troops for the war of resistance? And whence comes our culture? Is it not clear that the peasants and the workers are the main body of our nation, that what is good for them is good for the whole nation, and that it is only they who are qualified to represent the nation? And is it not presumptuous for those who oppress the workers and the peasants, to call themselves the representatives of the nation? Since the labouring people are the main body of the nation, is it not evident that the slogans “the nation is supreme”, “the country is supreme” can only mean that the labouring people are supreme? And is it not clear that to consider the labouring people as the lowest means to consider the nation and the country as the lowest?

What constitutes the main body of the nation? Only a correct answer to this question can enable us to explain the question of the nation, of its force, of its constitution, or why the Chinese nation can revive from the decadence and destruction of the past. Only a correct answer to this question can help us to understand either the problem of preparing the counter-offensive and winning final victory in the war (i.e. the question of mobilising or not mobilising the masses practising or not practising democracy), or of deciding who should be the master in the post-war China. Com. Mao Tse-tung’s *New Democracy* and many other documents of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party

answered this question several years ago, but the author of *China's Destiny* now considers a "minority of the people" and the "virtues" to be decisive factors of the nation. This is where our opinions and that of the big landlords and the big capitalists diverge regarding the question of China's destiny.

## II. ON CHINESE HISTORY

Now let us turn to the question of Chinese history, particularly of modern Chinese history.

**The history of China is in fact a history of the Chinese people, for without the Chinese people, there is no Chinese nation.**

In the past struggles of the Chinese nation against natural forces, backward systems and foreign invasions, the main force has always been the labouring masses. It is they who have fashioned the history of China. They have created all the achievements of the past and present, but have not enjoyed any of them. They have struggled amid greatest hardship and bitterness, but the fruits of their struggles have been , stolen by the ruling few while they themselves were left with hardship and bitterness as usual. Each time when the labouring people of China were most cruelly exploited and oppressed by the rulers, to the extent that they could not freely breathe, foreign invasions inevitably followed. And then the same labouring people would again rise and become the force that recovered what was lost. Mr. Chiang says: "After the Manchus entered the gates of the Great Wall, the national consciousness of the Chinese people gradually disappeared." This is untrue. The fact is that after the Manchus came to rule China, those who lost their national were only a few rulers and the upper circle of scholars and officials, while the broad masses of the Chinese people were forever rich in national thoughts, and continually carried on their national struggles . The closer history moved toward modern times, the greater was the conscious strength of the people. And the national thought of the Chinese people, after the Manchus came to China, became broader, more penetrating, and more lasting than in any previous period of subjugation. The widespread organisation of the Hung Society and its ability to survive for a long period without being eradicated is the best illustration of this fact. Dr. Sun, who recognised this, said:

"While the scholars and officials were indulging themselves in titles, incomes, and ranks, the so-called low-born society organised themselves into the Hung Society, preserving in it the thought of opposing the Ching dynasty and restoring the Ming dynasty."

This was one side of history of that era. The other side was the development of slave ideology, which found its most prominent representative in Tseng Kuo-fan (or Tseng Wen-cheng) whom the author of *China's Destiny* continually praises. (Let us not forget that "Wen-cheng" was a posthumous title bestowed after Tseng's death for his services in eradicating the Tai-ping Revolution against the Manchus.)

And see what the author writes about the Manchu dynasty! He says: "In the Ching dynasty, the scale of national reconstruction was so magnificent and farsighted, and the political structures and codes were so well and precisely planned, that it could actually compare with the traditions of the Han and the Tang dynasties, and surpassed those of the Sung and Ming dynasties, not to say the Yuan... If only the Manchus could have done away with the boundaries that separated the Chinese, Manchus, Mongols, Mohammedans and the Tibetans treated them all alike on an equal basis and recognised that our five branches are in fact one unified body... But they were limited by the time and thought of their era. We would be wrong to expect the Manchus to have put such policies into practice, and we should not find fault too caustically..." Not a trace of national consciousness is to be found

in what Mr. Chiang says here.

In the middle of the Ching dynasty, the Chinese nation met a new kind of invader, different from those of the past. They were the capitalist and imperialist countries which came along with their superior economic forces and broke through the "Great Wall of China." The Chinese people were not so powerless in resisting new aggressors against our nation. The weakness in China's power to resist was due, on the one hand, to the "prison of nations" created by the Manchus and, on the other hand, to the "prison of absolutism" in which they kept the people. The author of *China's Destiny*, on the contrary, says: "The decline of our national standing and the subsidence of the people's spirit in the past hundred years were generally caused by the unequal treaties." An interpretation of this kind is to turn everything upside down—to take the effect for the cause.

Why was the Chinese nation fettered by the unequal treaties? Was it not the result of the dark political despotism of the Manchus which suppressed the Chinese people and prevented them from rising against the invaders? If what the author says is true, then China must have been a prosperous and strong country, and the Chinese people all high spirited before the existence of the unequal treaties. But if China was such a country, how then could so many unequal treaties be imposed on her? However, the author admits at the same time that "as regards the cause of national humiliations, we must trace them to the corruption of the Manchus, to the deterioration of the politics, and especially to the decline of learning and society." Here the author has pointed out the "cause" at last! But if this be really the "cause," what of the other idea which we have quoted above? Are not the two ideas of the author mutually contradictory? What logic?

Now let us turn to something else. First, the author says that there was a "deterioration in politics." (The author is not willing to mention absolutism. We shall have something further to say regarding this point later.) This remark is contradictory to what he says in another place when he praises the Ching dynasty in the following terms: "The scale of national reconstruction was so magnificent and far-sighted and the political structure and codes were so well and precisely planned."

Secondly, according to the author, national humiliations were caused "especially by the decline of learning and society," but did not the author also say: "Between the reign of the Emperor Tao Kuang and Hsien Feng, such people as Tseng Kuo-fan, Hy lin-yi, Ten Tsung-teng, and Li Hung-chang all considered it their responsibility to change the social customs. Tseng Kuo-fan advocated firmness in the execution of law, and valued manliness and character in employing personnel. In the cultural sphere, he absorbed the thoughts of the Han and the Sung dynasties, with faith as the basis. In conducting himself and his affairs, he followed the spirit of "being careful when alone, emphasising respect, seeking for benevolence and practising labour." So the success of the Hunan troops and the Anhwei Militia was not something accidental?

If so, it seems that we should have had less national humiliations and yet our national humiliations were as plentiful as blackberries. The teaching of history is evidently contrary to what the author has said here. The reason why China was overwhelmed by national humiliations was precisely "the success of the Hunan troops and the Anhwei Militia" under Tseng Kuo-fan and Li Hung-chang. A reading of history will at once tell us so. The Tai-ping Movement had ruled many provinces for more than ten years and had come into contact with foreigners, but it had never concluded any unequal treaty with them. It was just because of that, they aroused the indignation of the imperialists who organised "Gordon's Ever Victorious Army" to attack them from the outside, collaborating with the Manchu troops, and caused the failure of this revolution. If the Tai-ping Revolution had been successful in crushing "such people as Tseng Hu, Tso and Li," overthrowing the Ching

dynasty, establishing the new regime arousing the people's spirit, and organising national defence, the imperialists would never have been able to bestow so many national humiliations upon us. This is why we say the success of the Hunan and Anhwei troops was the failure of the people and the victory of imperialism. National humiliations naturally piled up when the people had failed and the imperialists won.

Two sayings of Dr. Sun should be recommended here:

First, "The former weakness and decline of China was due to the harsh oppressions of absolutism."

Second, "Thirty years ago, our revolutionary' comrades resolutely decided that it was impossible to make China strong and prosperous without promoting the principle of democracy."

**Dr. Sun's words are concise and to the point. Is it not lamentable that the teachings he has left to his people should be discarded by his disciples?**

To save China, the people's rights must be developed, and old China must be reformed. This is an iron law. Why do we have to reform the old China? Is it not because the regime in old China was too dark, too cruel, too backward and too hypocritical? Is it not because the economic system of China mercilessly squeezes the broad masses, drinks, first of all, the blood and sweat of the peasants, makes them suffer hunger and cold, and renders the development of national economy impossible? Is it not because the methods of government of old China, from the Pao Chia system to the Central power stifled the life and the political activities of the people? Is it not because the cultural and educational systems and policies of old China were systems and policies for deceiving the people?

How can we stand on our own feet and resist aggression if the old China is not reformed? How can we achieve our final victory if we do not seek for progress but go backward always, in the anti-Japanese war today? Unfortunately the author of the *China's Destiny* describes this old China as a "golden world," the economic system of old China before she opened her doors to the West as ideal, her politics, her social customs and her ethics as ideal also. In a word, all these things were the best in the world. What we want to know is that if everything was so perfect, why did not China resist the imperialists but instead had to surrender and sign so many unequal treaties? This is only one of the self-contradictions in the book.

To let the readers see how the author has described the "golden world" of old China, I shall quote from the book. One glance alone will show how exquisite the writing is.

Regarding "economy":

"The foundations of our country lay originally in agriculture. The distribution of agriculture in the whole country was even and balanced, except in some border provinces and districts; so the density of the population in the country did not vary much. The government paid equal and universal attention to all parts in planning communications, and this tradition was carried down for generations and generations. Though economic development began from the rivers, and later spread to coastal areas, yet the progress of national construction did not show any sign of partiality and unevenness." (page 59, Chinese Edition.) Regarding the "social organisation":

"The original social organisation of China was based on blood relationship, it proceeded from the individual, to the family, and then to the clan. According to regions, it proceeded from the family, to the Pao Chia, and then to the village, etc. The two systems were quite distinct, and the education and training in both systems was the object of endeavour by the ancient virtuous men and philosophers. There were mottoes and rules of self-restraint for the individual to observe in his daily life; the family propriety and family instructions for the families; and pedigrees and clan rules for the

clans. This was also true of the Pao Chia, the village and rural communities all of which had their own rules and regulations to observe. This spirit of self-government brought about the actual effect of modelling individuals and the families, without waiting for the interference of the law; and the morality of mutual assistance led to public benefit, without requiring the supervision of the government. .

“There were also village schools for educational purposes, and public fields and public lodging houses for relief purposes. For storing grain against famine, we had public barns. For prevention and capture of robbers and outlaws, we had the binding mutual guarantees of the Pao Chia system. Even the repair and construction of dams and roads, and the deepening of rivers and ditches were all done by village social labour. This is what Manchus described as “mutual friendship when going out and coming in, mutual assistance when in trouble.” This is the “strict observance of the instructions- of schools and colleges to teach the meaning of filial duty and fraternity,” or what the book *Li Yun* described as thus: “The elders can pass the remainder of their lives fittingly; adults can be used fittingly; the young can be brought up fittingly; and the old bachelors, widows, orphans, elders without sons, and the maimed can be taken care of fittingly. The above ideals were always active in the old society of China” (page 61-62). Regarding “social customs”:

“For the past five thousand years, the ancient sages and the virtuous men of China have devoted their lives tirelessly to promoting social customs ... so we are still able to maintain in our social customs the elements of faith, honesty, hard work, plain life, esteem of propriety and righteousness, and comprehension of purity and modesty. This is the fundamental reason why the Chinese nation could survive in the world for a long time.” (page 62-63.)

Regarding “ethics”.

“Ancient Chinese philosophy and ethics revealed deeply and in detail how the relationships of mankind and society were maintained. Though social organisation is constantly evolving, the following are the unchangeable universal rules of social life, i.e. the way of fathers and sons, husbands and wives, brothers, and friends, and the order of the upper and the lower, superiors and inferiors, men and women elders and juveniles, as well as the principle of mutual assistance among neighbours and in adversity.” (page 67).

“The original philosophy of life of China, created by Confucius, developed by Manchus, and explained by the Confucian school of the Han dynasty, formed a lofty system of its own, and is superior to any other philosophy in the world. Despite this, however, the Chinese nation still humbly accepted foreign religions, absorbed their deep philosophical ideas and let them be mutually developed with the original philosophy of life of China.” (page 69).

How gorgeous! We have stepped into a paradise here! But if the feudal agricultural economy of China were so ideal for us, why do the Japanese fascist robbers propose “an agricultural China and an industrial Japan”? And why should our enemies be so anxious to preserve the feudal agricultural economy of China? Since the Pao Chia system of old China was so ideal and so beneficial to our people, why should the Japanese imperialist robbers impose such a system in the occupied territories? Since the social customs and ethical thoughts of old China were so ideal, and so superior to those of the rest of the world, why should the Japanese robbers promote every day in their occupied territories this same so-called “original culture” and the “original virtues of the Orient”? Is the reason for this that the Japanese robbers have really fallen in love with the Chinese nation, and consequently want the Chinese people to preserve and develop such “ideal things so that they can destroy

the aggression of the Japanese robbers?

Certain historical truths need to be discovered by thoughtful and meditative thinkers. Others are easily understood even by the most ordinary men and women. The reason why the Japanese imperialist robbers particularly want the Chinese people to preserve and develop all these rotten, old backward things is because these “virtues” are the instruments with which they want to strangle the development of China’s history, to strangle the resistance and national consciousness of the Chinese people.

**Why then should Mr. Chiang do his utmost to praise these things? What is liked by Mr. Chiang is also liked by the Japanese fascists. Is it because that “all mouths prefer the same flavours and all ears prefer the same sounds”? The idealist interpretation of history adopted by Mr. Chiang is something with which we completely disagree, though we cannot discuss it here on account of lack of space.**

### III. ON THE MODERN THOUGHT OF CHINA

As we know, in their aggressions against China, the imperialists have wanted the Chinese people to preserve all the old things, and did not wish them to be modernized economically, politically, or in their ways of thinking. That is to say, they have not wanted the Chinese people to accept the advanced development of the West or to have science, democracy and national consciousness, because the advanced development of the West science democracy and national consciousness would turn China into a strong modern nation, which would be obviously disadvantageous to the aggressors. Therefore, the unequal treaties became fetters on the Chinese people to prevent them from accepting and developing the advanced ideas of the West.

However, the idea of the author of *China’s Destiny* is the opposite of this. It seems to him that it was only through the unequal treaties that it became possible for the Chinese people to receive the advanced thought of Europe and America, and that for this reason the unequal treaties were bad. The author has tried his utmost to curse and scorn all the new culture that came after the May 4th Movement of 1919, and his talk of the deepening of the influence of unequal treaties” is aimed mostly at this.

What was the May 4th Movement? Let us quote a paragraph from *New Democracy* by Comrade Mao Tse-tung.

“*THE MAY FOURTH MOVEMENT* was an anti-imperialist as well as an anti-feudal movement. The outstanding historical significance of the May Fourth Movement lies in the fact that it possessed a feature that was not present in the 1911 Revolution, viz., that it opposed imperialism and feudalism in the most thorough and uncompromising way. The reason why the May Fourth Movement possessed this characteristic is that the capitalist economy of China had taken new steps in its development at that time, and that the then revolutionary intelligentsia of China have personally witnessed the disintegration of 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 had witnessed Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy in the grip of proletarian revolutions. All these things awoke in the people new hope that China would be free.

“Thus the May Fourth Movement broke out at the call of the world revolution, of the Russian Revolution and Lenin, and was a part of the world proletarian revolution of that time. Although we did not have a Chinese Communist Party during the May Fourth Movement, many intellectuals did possess primary Communist thought and approved of the Russian Revolution. At its beginning, the May Fourth Movement was a united front revolutionary movement including three kinds of people; the Communistic intelligentsia,

the petit-bourgeois intelligentsia, and the bourgeois intelligentsia (which formed the right wing)... The cultural revolution of the May Fourth Movement opposed feudal culture in a thorough-going way, and there was never 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.”

**Therefore, the May Fourth Movement initiated a great new epoch in the growth of the national consciousness of the Chinese people. Without the May Fourth Movement we could not have had the Great Revolution, the agrarian revolution and the war of resistance of the past six years. That is why the May Fourth Movement is so hated by all reactionaries and counter-revolutionaries.**

Imperialist aggression against China brought agony and bitterness to our people. It created within China many imperialist lackeys, from Tsang Kuo-fan, Li Hung-chang to our disciples and grand-disciples of Hitler, Mussolini and Tojo today. These lackeys have always served the foreign aggressors and can never avoid the stigma of traitors, no matter how hard they advocate the old culture, old ethics and old moralities of China. On the other hand, this same imperialist aggression forced the Chinese peoples to wake up from their dreams and compelled them to study the advanced thought and technique of the foreign countries—for the sake of opposing the aggressors and their lackeys. Such are the dialectics of history.

The reform of Chinese thought began from the ideas of liberty, equality and fraternity advocated by the Tai-ping Revolution. The “study of benevolence” preached by Tan Szu-tung represented a brave offensive against the spider web of old Chinese ethics and morality. At that time, lackeys of the Empress Dowager, such as Yeh Teh-huei and Chan Chih-tung and representative of reactionary ideologies cursed the reform movement and shouted that “ethics” and “the way of the sages” were unchangeable forever. Their ideas have been inherited by all the subsequent traitors and reactionaries of China, even up to the present moment. The May Fourth Movement is a mass movement in ideology, and many stubborn elements, reactionaries and foreign lackeys trembled like aspen leaves before this irresistible new force. However, a historical movement never travels in a straight line. Some of the participants of the May Fourth Movement continued going forward; others stopped midway, while still others changed their minds and ran in the opposite direction. To-day, only the Communists and revolutionary democrats of China still remain as the pillars and shock-fighters of the new culture. They are leading in the only direction that will revive the Chinese nation from its moribund state. These fighters do not change or compromise. They are the greatest source of national confidence and national self-respect of the people.

The author of *China's Destiny* writes as follows:

“Since the May Fourth Movement, the ideas of Liberalism and Communism have prevailed in China...with the result that people generally consider that all Western things are right and all that belongs to China is wrong. They worship this or that foreign country all in a similar manner. Different cliques exist among them only because there are more than one country and more than one foreign theory in the world. Each clique imitates one particular country and worships one particular theory”, forming a group of its own, proud before its countrymen but submissive before the foreigner. Since the theories of the various countries are forever changing, therefore, the theory of each of these groups has to change unceasingly in line with the changes in the foreign countries.

“As for the struggle between Liberalism and Communism, it is merely a reflection of

the opposition of Anglo-American thought to that of Russia. Such theories and politics are not only unfit for the national life and the people's livelihood of China and opposed to her original cultural spirit, but also reveal that their promoters have fundamentally forgotten that they are Chinese and have lost the standpoint of learning for China and applying their learning for China."

No doubt, the advanced ideas of different countries are not the same. There is one kind of advanced thought (e.g., democracy) which reflects a certain advanced stage (the anti-feudal stage) and is needed by a certain advanced revolutionary class at this stage; there is another kind of more advanced, or the most advanced, thought (viz., Communism) which reflects a more advanced stage (anti-capitalist stage) and is needed by a more advanced revolutionary class.

Modern China finds herself in a period of great world changes, and the struggles and various relations, internal and external, of the various classes and the various kinds of people in Chinese society are inter-woven one with another. Therefore, even at the same time, the various schools of advanced thought in the world may be accepted by representatives of our various social classes, and co-operation of a certain type may arise among them.

Here is one example. Dr. Sun Yat-sen, a revolutionary bourgeois and democrat, accepted the Western democratic ideas of Lincoln (of the people, by the people and for the people) together with the experience of the Russian Revolution (he said: "I take Russia as my teacher"), while the Chinese Communists, as the representatives of the proletariat, accepted scientific Socialism—Marxism-Leninism. Dr. Sun and the Communists co-operated with each other after 1924. This co-operation was in the interests of the nation which was proved by the events of the Great Revolution.

Again, there is another section of our people, the Liberals and the Democrats, whose thoughts reflect the ideology of certain classes or strata, and who, according to their needs, may co-operate with Communists in a certain period and on certain questions. Such co-operation is also in the interests of the nation, as has been proved by many facts. Whether this is fit for "the national life and the people's livelihood," depends upon one's views of the interests of the nation and the people. Other than these, all are false issues.

It is rather peculiar that Mr. Chiang should openly oppose the Liberal principles of Europe and America and the Communist principles of Russia. Do not all the fascist countries as well as their lackeys, like Wang Ching-Wei, shout madly that every one must oppose Liberalism and Communism?

**Can we help being afraid that as soon as they see Mr. Chiang's hoot Hitler, Mussolini, Tojo, Wang Ching-wei and others will think that Mr. Chiang is singing in unison with them? And that the book will shock and disappoint Roosevelt, Churchill, Stalin and all anti-fascists?**

Moreover, the various countries of the world not only have their advanced and revolutionary ideas, but also reactionary and counter-revolutionary ones. Since there are progressives and reactionaries, reactionary and counter-revolutionary thoughts naturally find a welcome and worshippers among certain Chinese.

There is no need for us to cite examples from afar. Here is one from our own country. Are not the official Kuomintang publications, *San Min Chu I* Semi-Monthly and *Central Weekly* propagating on a great scale the fascism of Hitler and Mussolini, and describing Hitler and Mussolini as two of the "six great leaders" of the world? Yet this is what appears only on the surface.

Besides this, there are certain groups who, fearing that fascism is too disreputable, too contrary to the national benefit, too unfavourable to the Allies, and too "hand in glove" with

the German, Italian and Japanese robbers, dare not openly advocate it; but who try to smuggle it in as contraband under every kind of camouflage, and to peddle it everywhere. This is done not only by the small men of the Kuomintang, but also by its important figures—as is now universally known.

As regards the remark “proud before one’s countrymen but submissive before foreigners,” one should sometimes look into the mirror. There is a gentleman in China who thought, at the time of the Russian October Revolution and the Chinese Great Revolution, that the Soviet Union might be helpful to him. So he went to the Soviet Union himself, humbly asked for advice, sent his son to study there, and declared that “China’s revolution must be led by the Third International.”

Later on, when he became anti-Communist and anti-Soviet, the same gentleman went to Tokyo to interview Mitsuru Toyama, the Japanese secret service leader, and declared that it was necessary for China and Japan to unite together. After that, he was converted to the “foreign” Christian religion. Later yet, as soon as Hitler came to power in Germany, he sent another son and a great number of his followers to study there—to learn Fascism. For ten whole years, he relied on foreign funds and ammunition to fight against the revolutionary Chinese people in a war that was planned and directed by foreigners, among whom were the famous General von Seeckt, leader of the Reichswehr, and a German Police Chief whose special task was to teach secret service methods.

Even after the outbreak of the war of resistance, he still relied on foreign powers and ammunition, and even expects the foreigners to fight the war for him. How shall we describe this? Are not such actions and thoughts “proud before one’s countrymen but submissive before the foreigners” and “the great hidden trouble of the national spirit.

Now let us say something about the Communists. The thought of the Chinese nation is the thought of Mao Tse-tung, i.e., Sinonized Marxism-Leninism. As far as the theory of Marxism-Leninism is concerned, the Chinese Communists not only have the same ideology as the Russian Communists but also the same as the Communists of the various countries of the world.

However, scientific Marxism-Leninism demands that the Communists of every nation work out their political programme and decide their policies according to their own national conditions, and rely on their own people for salvation. The Chinese Communist Party works according to this principle. It has created all kinds of progressive forces, entirely through its own efforts, without dependence on any “foreign country.” Not an ounce of ammunition was given it by foreign countries, nor has it ever relied on foreign funds to carry on its fight. It determines its own strategy, and is “self-resuscitating.”

The Eighth Route Army and the New Fourth Army, led by the Chinese Communists, have resisted more than half of the Japanese forces stationed in China, and have never dreamed that the foreigners would do all the fighting for our country. In the regions under the influence of the Chinese Communists, not a single unequal treaty, or even half of a treaty, has ever been signed with the foreigners—like the Tangku Truce, the Ho-Umetsu Agreement and the Shanghai Truce. The policies and actions of the Chinese Communists are welcomed everywhere by the Chinese people because they are identical with the benefits of the nation and the people. The Chinese Communists have never relied on one country to-day and another country to-morrow, with an attitude as changeable as showers in April, and have never been “proud before their countrymen but submissive before the foreigners.” These are the results of the work of the Chinese Communist Party which is in every way a revolutionary party of the Chinese people “learning for China and applying their learning for China.” Nothing else in China can be compared to it.

**It is evident that from the beginning, there have been two kinds of traditional**

**cultures in China. One belongs to the people and is revolutionary and bright. The other is against the people and is counter-revolutionary and dark.**

At the commencement of contemporary Chinese history the Tai-ping Revolutionaries and Dr. Sun were the representatives of the former, while Tseng Kuo-fan and all the anti-Communist and anti-popular elements of the present times represent the latter. Despite the fact that there was foreign ideology in the Tai-ping Revolution, the words “liberty equality and fraternity” truly represented the thoughts of the Chinese people and the Tai-ping leaders were real Chinese heroes. Despite the fact that Tseng Kuo-fan spoke constantly of “benevolence, righteousness, morality, the five ethical relations,” etc., he was still a “two-fold” slave to the Manchurians and to the imperialists.

The Chinese Communists have succeeded to all the progressive revolutionary traditions of China from ancient times down to Hung Hsiu-chuan and Dr. Sun Yat-sen, while the reactionaries have inherited the traditions of Tseng Kuo-fan and Yen Teh-hwei. The reactionaries want to abolish the progressive traditions and preserve the backward ones, while we want exactly the reverse. This is where we differ in our conceptions of Chinese thought and culture.

#### IV. ON KUOMINTANG-COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Mr. Chiang has disregarded all the main historical facts of the first period of co-operation between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party and has made certain false and extremely vicious accusations against the heroic and patriotic Chinese Communist Party. In this part of the book, there are extremely provocative words which are intended to inflame the people\*~ enmity against the Chinese Communists. It is, therefore, necessary to bring to light once more pages of great importance in our history which have very much indeed to do with “China’s Destiny.”

In 1924, the Kuomintang was reorganised and the first period of co-operation between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party was initiated under the direction of Dr. Sun Yat-sen. At that time, Dr. Sun was maintaining himself in Canton, in a tiny corner of South China. His revolutionary banner was not bright and his power did not extend beyond his own headquarters. All military, political, financial and other authority was in the hands of warlords who practised counter-revolution under the revolutionary flag. And the Kuomintang did not have a single healthy revolutionary organisation strong enough to help the revolution in any place.

It was at that time and under those conditions that Dr. Sun Yat-sen, with his brilliant farsightedness asked for the help of the Chinese and Soviet Communist Parties. The Chinese Communist Party at once came forward to give Dr. Sun the aid, which together with all kinds of help from the Soviet Union made possible the re-organisation of the Kuomintang and created a situation completely new in the Chinese Revolution.

First, regarding the revolutionary banner and revolutionary programme, before the period of co-operation, the Kuomintang had no programme against Imperialism and against the feudal social system. The nationalism of the Three People’s Principles was originally meant to oppose the Manchus, and it was deficient in content once the Manchus had been overthrown. This historical fact has been stated in Dr. Sun Yat-sen’s *Past Events of Chinese Revolution* and proved by all the work of Dr. Sun.

The Revolution to oppose Imperialism—this is one of the main elements of the Chinese Revolution. Without the anti-imperialist movement, China would never be able to get rid of her semi-colonial position, but on the contrary, would become a colony of Japanese Imperialism. The hoisting of the banner of anti-imperialist revolution and the carrying out of the revolutionary movement to oppose Imperialism and to abolish the unequal treaties

were important events which enabled the Chinese Revolution to step forward to a completely new stage, from the old democratic revolution to the new democratic revolution.

The Kuomintang's principle of democracy in the San Min Chu I, before the re-organisation in 1924 was a sort of old democracy which did not have the content of thorough struggle against the feudal system and the aim of liberating the broad masses of the working people. The principles of democracy and of people's livelihood had to be imbued with new content, by setting out clearly the anti-feudal slogans Only in this way could the revolutionary Chinese people again secure a revolutionary direction and be mobilised, and the Kuomintang tread along a correct revolutionary path and acquire new vitality through unity with the revolutionary people.

The questions should be asked: Who were the first to bring such a clear revolutionary policy to the Chinese people? Who helped Dr. Sun Yat-sen to turn this revolutionary programme into the programme of the Kuomintang?

Who other than the Chinese Communist Party? Since the Revolution of 1911, the Kuomintang had been isolated, ignored by the people and the youth. After its re-organisation, the situation changed. The Kuomintang began to come into touch with the people and once more to draw the youth into its fold. Was this not because of the new programme against Imperialism and feudalism? Besides, thanks to the brilliant farsightedness of Dr. Sun Yat-sen and his real supporters in the Kuomintang, should not the Kuomintang feel any gratitude to the Chinese Communist Party for this new programme? Should it not ascribe any merit to the Chinese Communist Party?

The author of *China's Destiny* himself experienced these events. Please reflect. Why does not he write down this page of history? Is it "justice" to disregard it? Is it "honesty"?

Furthermore, before the re-organisation of the Kuomintang, were there any troops under Generalissimo Sun Yat-sen which could be relied upon to fight as a revolutionary army? Were there any troops which could fight a serious battle? Dr. Sun had attempted many North expeditions, but was a single one of these expeditions successful?

Things changed after the reorganisation. ^ The Whampoa Academy was established to train revolutionary cadets. The men who initiated the foundation and organisation of the academy were Dr. Sun Yat-sen, Mr. Liao Chung-kai and the Russian advisers. The author of *China's Destiny* did not then recognise the importance of this academy, and even did not want to be its President.

This was how the first revolutionary troops came into being. They defeated, Chen-ming twice; they beat down Yang Shi-min and Liu Tseng-huan and were at last able to carry out the Northern Expedition. The foundation and achievements of the revolutionary army at that time were something new in history. For several decades, Dr. Sun had failed in his search for the right policy. But in co-operation with the Chinese Communist Party and the Soviet Union, great military successes were achieved within a few years. Whose merit was it that the Kuomintang was capable of extending its power to Wuhan and Nanking and thus holds its present position to-day? Please reflect! Why don't they write down this page of history? Is it "justice" to disregard these facts? Is this called "honesty"?

Mr. Chiang says:

"The Kuomintang arose from the original national moralities, with affection, faith, responsibility and duty as the basic principles of organising the party. Unlike other parties and groups, it does K dextrous tricks and cruel intrigues at all, nor does it resort to self-interest and selfishness to achieve its purpose."

Well, please look into history! History is the witness. The help which the Chinese Communist Party rendered to the Kuomintang was so great and so decisive, that since 1924, all the revolutionary achievements of the Kuomintang have become inseparable from

the name of the Chinese Communist Party. In the military sphere, for instance, how many Chinese Communists and members of the Communist Youth League sacrificed their lives in the two eastern campaigns and on the several fronts of the Northern Expedition while dashing forward at the head of their fellow-soldiers? Mr. Chiang himself acknowledged when he wrote a preface to the Alumni Souvenir Album of the Whampoa Academy, that the blood sacrificed by the Communists and the Kuomintang members is inseparable.

But what did the representatives of the big bourgeoisie offer the Communists as a “reward”? After having unified Kwangtung Province and gained a certain position, the representatives of the big capitalists double-crossed the Communists upon whom they had formerly depended. The so-called “Incident of the Gunboat Chung-san” was fabricated on March 20, 1926. This incident, according to the author, was plotted by the Communist Party.

But historical examples are plentiful. Did Hitler not talk of a plot by the German Communist Party after he burnt the Reichstag? The reason why the representatives of the Chinese big bourgeoisie carried out such a criminal plot on March 20th was because their aim was to create a pretext so that they could drive out the Chinese Communists from the Central Executive Committee of the Kuomintang, the Whampoa Academy and from the main posts of the National Revolutionary Army, and restrict the activities of the Communists within the Kuomintang. They created this plot because they knew well that the Chinese Communist Party did not want to break the united front and they expected that the Communists were honest enough to be easily cheated.

Was that called “reason”? Was that not playing “dextrous tricks or cruel intrigues”? Was that not “self-interest and selfishness”? Was that “justice”? Was that “honesty”?

Nevertheless, the man who plotted the March 20th Incident was not yet prepared at that time to annihilate all the Communists because he had not yet arrived at Nanking and because the Communists still had been useful in certain respects. We shall not discuss here the many important faults within the Communist Party that had already come into being under the opportunist leadership of Chen Tu-hsiu. But it was definitely correct for the Chinese Communists at that time to insist upon co-operation with the Kuomintang and to support the policy of organising the Northern Expedition.

**While taking this correct stand, the Chinese Communists heroically participated in military operations. Of the great number of Party representatives and political workers in all the main forces of the National Revolutionary Army whose victories amazed the world, were not the majority members of the Chinese Communist Party and the Communist Youth League? The Chinese Communists had also organised the people, organised civilian squadrons throughout the country, and organised three workers uprisings in Shanghai which were co-ordinated with the action of the military forces and created a Great Revolution unprecedented in China.**

On the one hand, the representatives of the big capitalists perceived the necessity of using the Communists and revolutionary workers and peasants to serve their own purpose of arriving at Nanking and securing the controlling position in the country, and on the other hand, they prepared for the massacre under the name of the “purge”, once they succeeded in these objects.

The fault of the Communists then was that they were too innocent. They paid no attention to the cruel counter-revolutionary intrigues of the big bourgeoisie while they were helping the Northern Expedition and launching the Great Revolution. And the guilt of the opportunist leadership of Chen Tu-hsiu lies in the fact that it actually helped the successful realization of this counter-revolutionary scheme of the big capitalists. There is no preceding

example in Chinese history, even in world history, of the horrors of the “purge” which began on April 12, 1927. Innumerable heroic and patriotic Communists, revolutionary workers and ants as well as members of the Kuomintang who were really faithful to revolutionary principles and the Three Policies of Dr. Sun Yat-sen, fell suddenly and unexpectedly under the executioners’ axe of the big bourgeoisie.

Brother people! Comrades! This is the “faith” of ally of yesterday! This is the “justice” and “honesty” of the big capitalist! These are not “dextrous tricks and cruel intrigues”! This is not “self-interest and selfishness”! And only those who were killed innocently are accused of “dextrous tricks or cruel intrigues” and of resorting to “self-interest and selfishness”! Who is it intended to deceive? The heavens?

We have long ceased to talk about the above-mentioned events. We have been tolerant indeed during, the war of resistance for the cause of the country. But now, Mr. Chiang has mentioned these events and made all kinds of vicious and slanderous accusations against the Communist Party. Indeed, we Communists and all the Chinese people with justice and enthusiasm would let those things be forgotten if they were not mentioned.

**But once they are mentioned, our hearts cannot help being filled with boiling anger, because the Chinese Communists have shed their blood! It is the blood of innumerable revolutionaries and able young men and toiling workers and peasants! It is the blood of the elite of this nation. Since the beginning of the “purge,” too many people died under the sword of the Kuomintang! Too many! Too many!**

Mr. Chiang says: “I am at a loss to understand even to-day the inside story of the Wang-Communist collaboration—whether the Communist Party was utilised by Wang Ching-wei, or Wang Ching-wei was utilised by the Communist Party, or whether they both utilised each other.” This question Mr. Chiang advances is a strange one indeed. But it involves a big plot. It is hinted that the Chinese Communists conspired with the traitor Wang Ching-wei. Well, let us come to history.

Everybody knows that in' the course of the Great Revolution of 1925-27, there was not only a “Wang-Communist collaboration” when Wang Ching-wei was still a revolutionary, but also a “Chiang-Communist collaboration,” when Mr. Chiang too was still a revolutionary. There was also a “Chiang-Wang collaboration” when Wang Ching-wei was still a revolutionary. At the time when Wang Ching-wei was still a revolutionary, why should we not have collaborated with him? Just as at the time when you, Mr. Chiang, were still a revolutionary, why should we not have collaborated with you?

As for “utilising,” who intended to utilise others is too clear a historical fact. The Communists have no need to utilise anyone but they are of the opinion that it is necessary to co-operate with certain people under certain conditions, when such cooperation is favourable to the revolution. But there were some persons who really intended to make use of the Communists. They made use of the situation when it was favourable to them, but if anything occurred to impede the attainment of their own aims they murdered their erstwhile friends.” Wang Ching-wei did so and so did Chiang Kai-shek too.

Let us put these questions to Mr. Chiang. After the Mukden Incident on September 18, 1931, Wang Ching-wei collaborated for a long time with Mr. Chiang. Wang Ching-wei had not signed treacherous agreements and become a traitor at the time of the “Wang-Communist collaboration.” But things were completely different at the time of the “Wang-Chiang collaboration.” As the president of the Executive Yuan and the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Wang Ching-wei put forward the treacherous policy of “negotiation while preparing for defence,” signed the Shanghai Truce, the Tangku Truce and the Ho-Umetzu Agreement, proclaimed a “good neighbour policy” and negotiated with Japan.

After the outbreak of the war of resistance, when Mr. Chiang became the Director-General of the Kuomintang, Wang Ching-wei became the Vice-Director and was appointed by the Central Executive Committee of the Kuomintang to the chairmanship of the People's Political Council and other posts. But he escaped from Chungking to Nanking and became the No. 1 Traitor. We cannot make clear even to-day the inside story of all these collaborations, whether Wang Ching-wei was utilised by Chiang Kai-shek or Chiang Kai-shek was utilised by Wang Ching-wei, or whether they both utilised each other.

Writing of the failure of the national revolution midway in its course and the split between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party in 1927, which aroused a civil war lasting for ten years, Mr. Chiang puts the blame for the whole crime on the greedy hands of the traitor Wang Ching-wei by saying that "it happened because of the tragedy of the split between Nanking and Wuhan." Here it seems that the author depreciates himself and honours the traitor Wang Ching-wei too much. Please have an eye on history and see how the split between Nanking and Wuhan really; took place. Was it not due to the "party purge" that began on April 12, 1927? Whose greedy hands were responsible for the "purge" of April 12? Was it not you Mr. Chiang who should have the credit?

It was after the split between Nanking and Wuhan not before the split, that Wang Ching-wei went to Wuhan and speculated in "Revolution." When Wuhan was menaced by the imperialists and the reactionary Nanking Government, Wang Ching-wei turned from wavering and went back to reaction. Did not the "purging movement" of Wang Ching-wei follow your "purging movement" against the Communists, Mr. Chiang?

The profound idea of the author in this paragraph seems to be that the Communist Party would have been annihilated once for all, and that the "Communist Problem" would exist no longer, had it not been for the Wuhan Government. The author is wrong.

**Under no circumstances can the Communists ever be wiped out by slaughter. Communists never die. The Chinese Communist Party is like "the wild grass which can never be burnt away and which will grow again under the spring breeze." History has proved this.**

Mr. Chiang Kai-shek further enumerates a large number of the so-called "crimes", alleged to have been committed by the Communist Party. But "crimes" cannot be manufactured so easily. Mr. Chiang has slaughtered without pity more than a million people who were the nation's elite and the momentum behind the Eastern Campaign and the Northern Expedition. So why should it be difficult for him to fabricate "crimes"? Is there any necessity to talk of "conscience"? The Chinese Communists know that when massacres are being carried out, it is necessary to transform all merits of the victims into crimes! This is, of course, the proper "logic" of "cruel intrigues". Chinese Communists have experienced innumerable and terrible misfortunes and known what kind of Lord High Executioners are these self-appointed representatives of benevolence, righteousness, superior conduct and morality! The people know their hearts well. Where are the "benevolence, righteousness, and superior conducts"? It is more likely that their hearts are filled with greed!

It is true that "the experiences of this period of revolution were too painful, the losses of the country were too heavy and the people's sacrifices too terrible." But where is the repentance of the executioners?

Who launched the ten years civil war? The Communists and the revolutionary workers and peasants were compelled to fight in self-defence. Should not they have done this? Is it really true that the Governor has the right to burn houses while the people have no right to light a lamp? Is it expected that Communists and revolutionaries should not take up arms in self-defence but instead, like lambs, be willingly cheated, arrested, tortured and killed?

**To help the peasants to obtain the land and develop their own production was what we Communists fought for during the Agrarian Revolution. This constituted our “unpardonable crime of rebellion”. But was it really a crime? Were we criminals when we sought prosperity for the peasantry, which constitutes more than eighty percent of the whole population?**

Who are responsible for overwhelming China with rivers of blood, while the army marched forward to destroy our peaceful villages? Please refer to the figures given in your official reports during the ten years’ civil war. You killed hundreds and thousands of “bandits” here one day, and killed hundreds and thousands of “bandits” there another day. The so-called “bandits” were none other than peaceful peasants in our peaceful villages. Towns and villages were burnt by the so-called “bandit-suppression army.”

Cannons, aeroplanes and machine-guns supplied by foreign countries were concentrated to bomb our peaceful villages. They were glad to burn down even the rice and wheat in the fields of our peaceful peasants. This is “honesty”! This is “benevolence, righteousness and morality”!

With fortitude in the face of grim suffering the Chinese Communists have fought together with the people, led the Red Army, broken through “punitive encirclements” and succeeded in preserving the elite of the Chinese People. They have forged an army with experience of thousands of engagements, able to resist more than half of the Japanese troops in China and defend half of China’s territories. If there were no Eighth Route and New Fourth Armies which were forged by the Communist Party in the course of a bitter struggle for existence and which are fighting against the enemy troops in such great numbers, could the Kuomintang withstand the enemy attack independently with the Kuomintang troops alone? If the troops of the Kuomintang had to fight alone, then is it not possible that the enemy would already have driven straight into Chungking, Kunming, Sian and Lanchow? Then how could China have survived up to now? How could China be counted as one of the four big Powers? And how could the authoritative gentlemen of the Kuomintang still sit safely and snugly in Chungking?

Mr. Chiang says, “If there were no Three People’s Principles, there would also be no resistance; if there were no Chinese Kuomintang, there would also be no revolution.” But in fact, the contrary is the truth. If there had been no Chinese Communist Party, the Three People’s Principles would have no new content (first of all the contents of anti-imperialism, and of the abolition of unequal treaties on the Principle of Nationalism); if there had been no Chinese Communist Party, not only would the situation of the Great Revolution be unimaginable, but so also the mighty war of resistance of last six years.

The Chinese Communist Party was born to fight for the well-being of the nation and the people, and to help every one to do what is good for the people. We do not intend to constantly praise ourselves, but wolf-hearted reaction that rules the Kuomintang not only tries to tread on the Communists after having used them but also tries to spread scandalous rumours against them. So long as a Communist still has a mouth with which to speak, it is necessary for him to denounce these counter-revolutionary scandals.

That the Chinese Communists are loyal to their country is plain to the world. Before the Sian incident they repeatedly urged the Kuomintang to stop the civil wars, and to take the initiative to build up national resistance through unity; but judging the Communists from their own selfish viewpoint the Kuomintang thought that the Communists were compelled to do this because they had come to a dead end. Nevertheless, when the Sian Incident broke out the Chinese Communist Party not only did not take advantage of this to “loot during a fire” but instead, for the consolidation of the nation, it forgot the bitter enmity of the purging movement and the ten years’ civil war and resolutely insisted on the release of Mr.

Chiang. This was the reason for his release and yet he still tries to destroy the Eighth Route and the New Fourth Armies.

To return evil for good has always been the philosophy of the big capitalists of China.

The Marco Polo Bridge Incident occurred, the war of resistance broke out, and the Eighth Route and the New Fourth Armies went immediately to the front and penetrated deep into the occupied territories behind the enemy lines with results known to the whole world. But what was the attitude of the Kuomintang towards them?

Not only did they seal off the war news of the two armies, but they also arrested the Communists on a large scale, killed them, rebuked them and attacked them. Large numbers of secret service men try to penetrate into the Communist Party, aiming at attacking it from within and without so as completely to “destroy” it.

**Even in the occupied areas behind the enemy lines, the troops under the leadership of the Kuomintang members have not attacked the Japanese troops but instead have attacked the Eighth Route and the New fourth Armies, who really attacked the Japanese troops, thus subjecting the two armies to blows from both the enemy and the Kuomintang troops. However, these are not called “dextrous tricks” or “cruel intrigues, self-interest and selfishness,” but rather “utmost justice,” “utmost honesty” and “utmost unselfishness.”**

All the things mentioned above, we have “endured for the nation.” We have mentioned them neither in speeches nor in written works. However, the author of *Chinas Destiny* concentrates his attacks upon the Chinese Communist Party, and recently the Kuomintang published through the Official Central News Agency the news of the demand for the “disbandment of the Chinese Communist Party” and for the “abolition of the Border Regions,” and meanwhile, have been preparing forces to invade the Border Regions. If, after all this, we still keep silent, we would feel sorry not only for all the Communists who have sacrificed themselves, but also for all our fellow countrymen, for the Chinese nation and for the twenty- two years’ history of our Party.

Chapter VII of *China’s Destiny*—“The Artery of Chinese Revolutionary Reconstruction and the Pivot where China’s Destiny is Determined” is the nucleus of the whole book. The central idea of this book is actually “one party, one principle, one leader,” or that the Kuomintang is China and vice versa. The idea, “I am the State,” of the French tyrant Louis XIV is completely revived here. To the citizens and youth of the whole country this chapter is full of words of threat and enticement, compelling them to join the Kuomintang and the San Min Chu I Youth Corps. In relation to all Communists, however, it is a pretext for slaughter. Those accusing words, “the new feudalism” and the “camouflaged war-lords” are clearly meant for the Eighth Route and the New Fourth Armies and all the anti-Japanese democratic bases.

“If this behaviour of the feudal warlords is not corrected thoroughly and the idea of military partition is not given up fundamentally, any leniency towards them would be fruitless and I cannot see that it will be possible to devise any reasonable measures.”

First, let us make a study of the “leniency” of Mr. Chiang and the Kuomintang authorities. We wonder if it can be called leniency to arrest the Communists, to kill them, to attack them and to dispatch large numbers of secret agents to penetrate into the Communist party.

Well, you may say that the Communists deserve to be killed a thousand times. But how about other parties—the various social groups, the cultural and economic organisations, non-Party people with a sense of justice, the pure youth, and even the genuinely patriotic Kuomintang members who are entirely non- Communist and not connected with the two Armies and the anti-Japanese democratic bases? What kind of “leniency” have they ever

got? Have they had any freedom to publish their own views? Any freedom of assembly or association? Any freedom to refuse to act as secret agents? Have such Kuomintang members as Madame Sun Yat-sen (Soong Chin-ling), Madame Liao Chung K'ai (Ho Hsiang-ning), and thousands or tens of thousands of others any freedom of speech or action?

In economic life, besides the fact that the people in the rear have no freedom to demand the reduction of interest or rent, that the workers have no freedom to earn a living wage, can we say that the medium and the small capitalists or the small producers have any freedom to increase their output? Are not all the enterprises exclusively monopolised? Monopolised to such an extent as not to permit the small producers to get back their capital, resulting in the gradual decline of production? Can all this be called "leniency"?

However, Mr. Chiang and the authorities of the Kuomintang are certainly lenient with some people.

**That is to say, they are lenient with the local bullies and the oppressive gentry, with those dirty and avaricious officials, lenient with the several hundred anti-revolutionary secret service organisations—the rascals and outlaws of the whole country, lenient with the Fifth Columnists of the Japanese, lenient with the thirty-three generals who capitulated to the enemy, lenient with Miss Kung Lin-i who flew to America with a large dowry to be married there.**

There is really too much leniency, but pray, is it beneficial to the nation, to the country? What are its results—apart from the destruction of the enthusiasm, self-confidence, self-respect and resourcefulness of our anti-Japanese people, and apart from leading the country astray?

Next, let us examine the "camouflaged warlords." The Eighth Route and the New Fourth Armies are engaged in continuous battles behind the enemy lines over half of the enemy troops. Without any replenishments of guns, bullets or funds from the National Government, they fight with unprecedented valour as the most courageous volunteers of the nation. Can they be called "camouflaged warlords"? The Eighth Route and the New Fourth Armies came from the people, and are beloved by the people, because of their policies of uniting soldiers and officers, soldiers and the civil population, of supporting the government, of loving the people and of production for self-sufficiency.

If somebody has to call them "camouflaged warlords," what harm do these "warlords" do to the country and the nation? And what losses do the people suffer from them? On the contrary, would it not be better to have more of them? **The more we have of them, the better, the more powerful will be our resistance, and the better protected will be the people.** We must inquire who is a real warlord? Are not all the anti-Communist and anti-popular elements the real warlords? The real warlords flaunt their violence and lawlessness throughout the whole country and yet they are so shameless as to dare rebuke the Communists as "camouflaged warlords."

Further, let us examine this "new feudalism." Shall we take the Shensi-Kansu-Ninghsia Border Region as example? We have a democratic political structure there. The people live in peace and enjoy their work: the soldiers and the civil population are unanimously and enthusiastically developing production many labour heroes are appearing; the people and the government, the functionaries and the masses, soldier and civilian are warmly united as members of one family; the savagery and poverty that are results of control by militarists, the worst elements in the Kuomintang and secret agents, have been abolished during these several years; and the people are gradually treading the road of plenty in food and clothing.

Can this be called the "new feudalism"? What harm to the country and the nation is

there in it? What losses will the people suffer from it? On the contrary, it is better to have more of it. The more we have of it, the more broadly will the Three People's Principles be realised and the more quickly and completely will the last will of Dr. Sun Yat-sen be carried into effect.

But let us now look at the old feudalism in the rear of the main "Chinese lines." The cruel and heartless oppression and exploitation, the oligarchic despotic polity, a hundred times worse than those of the Emperor Chin the First, several hundreds of bandit-like anti-Communist secret service corps throughout the whole country, are not all these the familiar signs of compradore-feudal fascism of the Chinese style?

We are wondering what Mr. Chiang means by the statement: "I cannot see that any reasonable measure can be devised." Does it mean that a civil war is the only solution of this problem? If this is true, for the sake of the nation and the people, we call a stop to it. Were the experiences and lessons of the last ten years' civil war not sufficiently cruel?

Mr. Chiang says: "Formerly China's destiny relied on the foreign policy... Hereafter it will depend on the internal policy....." The spirit of Mr. Chiang's book may be summarised in two words, "internal problems." Nevertheless, everyone knows well that up to the present, a great part of our beautiful country is still in the hands of the enemy and though Great Britain and the United States have abolished their unequal treaties with China, most of those rights were in the occupied areas and we can reap no benefit from their surrender without a final victory over the Japanese robbers.

There are still many handicaps to overcome. The fundamental problem of to-day is one of opposing the invaders—to vanquish the enemy with unity, and not to attack one's fellow-fighters and prepare for a civil war. Mr. Chiang has suggested that the choice is between "consolidating sincerely, to serve the public and to obey the law" and "practising deception and falsehood, disobeying regulations and misbehaving." This he considers the "watershed of China's destiny which will be decided in the period of the resistance and within two years."

But there are still many questions to be asked. Are the preparations for friction, the instigation of a civil war and the attitude of "yours is mine and mine is also mine"—are these methods of "sincere consolidation"? Those who capitulated to the enemy are free from chastisement; those who effectively resist the enemy's invasion are not rewarded. Avaricious elements and wolf-hearted scoundrels are in authority; feudalism, absolutism and selfishness prevail. Is all this "to serve the public and to obey the law"? To force and entice the youth to spy for the secret service, to compel them to penetrate into the Communist Party, into all other "alien" parties and groups, and into mass organisations and intellectual and educational circles, to bring them up not as upright people but double-dealing men—is not this "deception and falsehood"?

To refuse to put into practice the Three People's principles and the Programme of Resistance and Reconstruction, to do what is exactly contrary to them—is not that "to disobey regulations and to misbehave"? Does the sentence "China's Destiny will be decided in the period of resistance and within two years" mean that an internal front line will be organised within two years in order to destroy all "alien" parties?

We hope that these questions will be answered by Mr. Chiang. Because we know very well, since Fascism appeared openly or secretly on Chinese territory, it has been served up under various names. If this *China's Destiny* eventually becomes a tool of civil war, how will Mr. Chiang express himself before all our countrymen? It is no wonder that after the publication of the book in March, 1943, the rumour began to spread that it was a proclamation of war to the Chinese people, that it represents a preparation of ideology and general opinion for a civil war. "To decide the fate of China in two years" is clearly written

down in this book.

Yes, there is certainly a group of gentry which intrigues to disband the Eighth Route Army (the New Fourth Army has already been disbanded) and to dissolve the Shensi-Kansu-Ninghsia Border Region, and who are preparing for a large-scale civil war. They have even ordered one of their secret service organs composed of the vilest Trotskyites to bark in Sian about the disbandment of the Communist Party, and the news was spread by the official *Central News Agency*.

**But the Chinese Communists and the Chinese people have their own clear brains and hot blood. They will continually develop their daring spirit, struggling to prevent the outbreak of another civil war, struggling for national consolidation as against national disruption, struggling for the maintenance of the anti-Japanese united front for the resolute realisation of the Three People's Principles, for the ultimate victory over Japanese Imperialism, and finally for the liberation of the Chinese people.**

It is precisely for these objects that they will stand up in self-defence should the reactionaries dare to challenge them. We would like to tell all these intriguers that the Chinese Communist Party can never be annihilated, that all the anti-Japanese democratic bases can never be annihilated, because the life, happiness and heroism of the Chinese nation can never be annihilated. The twenty-two years of history of the Chinese Communist Party is a clear proof of this. The Chinese people will surely advance along the road of progress and light, not retreat along the road of backwardness and darkness. Whoever dares to stand in their way will certainly have his pitiable little head broken.

Are the Communists "selfish"? The Chinese Communists give up their families and their homes for the nation and the people and they are ready to give up their lives for the nation and the people. There is not a Communist who has grown rich as a result of becoming a Communist. They endeavour to work for the people but not to become officials, especially officials of high rank. Who "takes his individual lust as the premise"? Who "takes his individual benefits as the centre"? Please make a study of internal conditions in Kuomintang China. Apart from the genuinely patriotic Kuomintang members, are there not many who accumulate private fortunes by squeezing the people? Are there not many who were penniless before, but became millionaires as soon as they got official position, and who are dissipated and shameless though rich and of high rank? Are these not known to all?

Alas! All these crimes are committed under the name of "justice," "honesty" and "unselfishness." There are certainly gentry who are planning the disbandment of the Chinese Communist Party and the abolition of the Border Regions, and are preparing for a large scale civil war under this same flag of "justice," "honesty" and "unselfishness." What is all this, if it is not "to take one's individual lust as the premise" and "to take one's individual benefit as the centre"?

## V. FORWARD TO A NEW & DEMOCRATIC CHINA!

The kind of country China ought to be after the war has been pointed out in the *New Democracy* of Comrade Mao Tse-tung and in the Manifesto of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China on the occasion of the fifth anniversary of the war of resistance. But after reading *China's Destiny*, we find there is room for suspicion that things are going differently and that it is necessary to make an appeal for justice in time. There is such an appeal, in the Communist Party's manifesto of July this year, opposing a split and civil war and insisting on unification and carrying war of resistance to a successful conclusion.

Politically, *China's Destiny* has taken the old despotism as its pattern. The author eulogises the Ching Dynasty, saying:

“In the Ching Dynasty, the scale of the national reconstruction was so magnificent and farsighted and the political structures and codes were so well and precisely planned that it could actually be compared with the traditions of the Han and Tang Dynasties and surpassed those of the Sung and the Ming Dynasties, not to say the Yuan.”

Again he says:

“So far as the politics of the various dynasties of China are concerned, a policy of ‘leniency’ was generally adopted towards the people. The people retained almost no connection with the government except to pay their taxes. The Chinese People have enjoyed ‘full freedom’ from the earliest days. It is unnecessary for them to fight for freedom.”

According to the author:

“Since the unequal treaties were concluded, the cultural circles of China lost their self-confidence. They followed blindly the theories of the foreigners and some introduced the European thoughts of the eighteenth century to destroy the spirit of the ‘rule by law’ among Chinese citizens.”

We, on the contrary, know that since democratic thought was introduced into China, it opened the eyes of our people and roused them to rise up to fight for the overthrow of despotism. Dr. Sun Yat-sen was one such fighter. Yet according to the author, all their efforts were wasted because China was already well organised under the “rule of law” of early days. Does this not imply that if these were no unequal treaties every point of the old politics of China could be entirely good and right? Such an opinion is not only opposed to the democratic thought of Dr. Sun Yat-sen but is also contrary to the hope of the Chinese people at the present hour and the aims of the Allies in the Anti- Fascist war.

The author says again: “It ought to be realized that the democratic system of China should not take the democratic system of individualism and the class theory of Europe and America of the nineteenth century as its pattern.” That is to say, the author not only wants no new democracy but he also wants no old democracy. He would not permit the people to enjoy any freedom. What is this if it is not a combination of Fascism and old absolutism—or new absolutism? What is this, if not compradore-feudalist fascism of the Chinese pattern? The so-called democratic system which the author proposes is nothing but another name for this kind of fascism or new absolutism. Is not “fascist Germany” still called the “German Republic”?

Furthermore, the author has distorted the essence of the “Sun Yat-sen Theory,” the theory that “understanding is difficult, action is easy” propounded by Dr. Sun and has given an opposite explanation for it. He eulogises the old saying of Confucius, “to enable the people to follow but not to understand.” He eulogises the execution of Shao Tsen-mao by Confucius. The people-fooling philosophy of Confucius has been taken up openly.

But Confucius’ cruel intrigue in executing Shao Tsen-mao has been exposed clearly by Chang Tai-jen. Is it not clear that Mr. Chiang is actually insisting on the execution of all his opponents when most of the Allies are advocating freedom of thought in the anti-fascist war? Mr. Chiang has given a warning to those who do not believe in the compradore-feudalist fascism or new absolutism. He would take all these people like Shao Tsen-mao and execute them.

**The fundamental content of the so-called “Fundamental Problems of Revolution and Reconstruction” mentioned in the sixth chapter of *China’s Destiny* is, firstly, opposition to democracy and secondly, opposition to freedom of thought. This is the real crisis destroying the spirit and thought of the Chinese people.**

Everybody knows that the central aim of Dr. Sun Yat-sen, derived from his experiences of forty years, was to raise the standard of living and standard of culture of the masses of

people. This viewpoint is the exact opposite of the central thought of *China's Destiny*. Either to support the people or to oppress them is the fundamental problem of the Chinese Revolution, the fundamental distinction between the revolutionary and counter-revolutionary political lines, the fundamental distinction between the national and anti-national political lines. The central problem of improving the well-being of the masses is the problem of democracy and of freedom of thought, by which the forces of the people can be developed. The counter-revolutionary line is definitely opposed to this and demands that the forces of the nation be killed. This is also the problem of government policy, and the problem of the destiny of the nation and the future of the country.

That we are weak and have been insulted by the enemy is the result of the oppression of our people by despotic policies. If, after the war, our people are still oppressed by despotism, China will never be liberated. All reconstruction will be fruitless. This is not an exaggerated statement. The history of the past several decades has proved it to the hilt.

The secret service controlled education which the reactionary representatives of the big capitalists and the big landlords have imposed in the Chinese rear is a tremendous injustice to the youth. The masses of the youth with their fresh and open minds, enjoy no freedom to choose their line of thought basing themselves upon their own reason. Moreover some of the reactionary elements have taken "left thought" as a bait to lure the youth, especially the more vital and capable youth. As soon as they are tempted to swallow this bait, they are compelled even to give their families or relations as hostages for their own lives. This policy has been imposed on the children of 13 or 14 years. All this is quite out of the range of man's imagination. These intrigues are not only no different from those of Hitler, Mussolini and Tojo, but they even surpass them.

This is the policy of "protecting the youth and not utilising the youth." This is the policy of benevolence and sincerity. We dare to cry loudly to all the people of the whole country: this is the slaughter of our youth and children. This is a tremendous spiritual calamity for Chinese youth which has never suffered so before. This is a tremendous spiritual calamity for our whole Chinese nation. We do not know whether the so-called social customs of sincerity and honesty suggested by the author of *China's Destiny* are customs of this kind or not. But it should be pointed out that these social customs are directly imposed by the secret service, propaganda, educational and organisational organs of the Central Executive Committee of the Kuomintang and by the San Min Chu I Youth Corps.

*China's Destiny* has been described as a "bible" to be read by all the youth and children in the rear. How brutal it is to compulsorily burden the brains of youth and children with such fabrications and distortions of history, with such reactionary principles of ethics? Is this not a grievous and critical portent for the future of our nation?

We appeal in the name of the future of the Chinese nation, the future of the Chinese people—the youth and children and the younger generation! We demand of Mr. Chiang Kai-shek, of all the patriotic members of the Kuomintang, of all anti-Japanese political parties and of all our patriotic countrymen that they oppose the civil war, that they insist on the war of resistance, that they insist on the theory of the Three People's Principles, that they oppose compradore-feudalism, fascism—the new absolutism!

**Let the Chinese people breathe freely. Give the youth and children of China the opportunity to choose their line of thought by the light of their own reasons. Save the young generation of the nation. China must not go along the old road of despotism, civil war, darkness, slaughter and secret services. Let the new democracy in which the people are their own masters be born.**

**Long live China.**

*July 1943.*