

for every religious conviction offers the possibility of an accord and of collaboration with the democratic movement of Catholic workers, inspired by the single aim of destroying fascist barbarity forever, and of opening the way for the sacred triumph of the aspirations of the workers.

Responsible Catholic leaders should reflect upon these words. As for others, they should remember that, today, identifying the cause of anti-Communism with the cause of religion signifies rendering religion the worst possible service.

## CHINA'S DESTINY

by CHEN PAI-TA

*(As explained in an earlier issue, we are able to print only the more important sections of the critique of Chiang Kai-shek's book. The following section ("On the Kuomintang-Communist Relations") has a bearing on the present critical situation in China.—Ed. L.M.)*

**M**R. Chiang has disregarded all the main historical facts of the first Kuomintang-Communist co-operation and has made false, vicious accusations against the heroic and patriotic Chinese Communist Party. There are provocative words in this part of the book aimed at inflaming the people's enmity against the Chinese Communists. It is therefore necessary to bring to light once more pages of great importance in our history vitally connected with China's destiny.

In 1924, the Kuomintang was re-organised, 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 war-lords who practised counter-revolution under the revolutionary flag. And the Kuomintang did not have a single, healthy revolutionary organisation anywhere in China strong enough to help the revolution.

It was at that time and under these 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 forth sincerely to give Dr. Sun the aid, which together with help in every respect from the Soviet Union, made possible the reorganisation of the Kuomintang and created a situation completely new in the Chinese Revolution.

First, regarding the revolutionary banner and revolutionary programme, before this co-operation, the Kuomintang had no programme against imperialism and against the feudal system. The nationalism of the Three People's Principles was originally meant to oppose the Manchus, and it became deficient in content once the Manchus were overthrown. This historical fact has been stated in Dr. Sun Yat-sen's *Past Events of the Chinese Revolution* and has been proved by all his works. The revolution against imperialism—is one of the main principles of the Chinese revolution. Without the anti-imperialistic movement, China would never 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 im-

perialism and to abolish the unequal treaties were important events, enabling the Chinese revolution to advance 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 (Three People's Principles) before the reorganisation in 1924, was an expression of the old democracy which lacked the content of thorough struggle against the feudalistic system and for the liberation of the broad masses of 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 be mobilised in a revolutionary direction, and the Kuomintang proceed along a proper revolutionary way 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 reorganisation, the situation changed. The Kuomintang began to connect with the people and once more to draw the youth. Was this not because of the new programme against imperialism and feudalism? Besides, thanks to the brilliant far-sightedness 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 he not write down the page of history? Is it "justice" to disregard it? Is it "honesty"?

Furthermore, were there any troops under Generalissimo Sun Yat-sen which could be counted on as a revolutionary army before the reorganisation of the Kuomintang? Were there any troops which could stand a battle? Dr. Sun had attempted many Northern Expeditions; but was there a single expedition that was 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 did not even want to be the president.

This was how the first revolutionary troops came into being. They defeated Chen Chun-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 unprecedented. For several decades, Dr. Sun had failed in his quest for the right direction. But in co-operation with the Chinese Communist Party and the Soviet Union, great military successes were achieved within a few short years. By whose merit was it that the Kuomintang was capable of extending its power to Wuhan and Nanking and of holding its position today? 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 not use dextreous tricks and cruel intrigues at all, nor does it resort to self-interest and selfishness as its instinct of combination.

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 been 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 several fronts of the Northern Expedition while dashing forward at the head of their fellow soldiers? Mr. Chiang himself acknowledged that the blood sacrificed by the Communists and the Kuomintang members is inseparable when he wrote a preface to the Alumni Souvenir Album of the Whampoa Academy.

But what did the representatives of the big bourgeoisie offer the Communists as a "reward"? Having unified Kwangtung Province and gained a certain position, the representatives of the big capitalists doublecrossed the Communists, upon whom they had formerly depended. The so-called "Incident of the Gunboat Chung-san" was fabricated on March 20, 1926. The incident, according to the author, was plotted by the Communist Party. But historical examples are plentiful. Did not Hitler talk of a plot by the German Communist Party after he burnt the Reichstag? The reason the representatives of the Chinese big bourgeoisie carried out such a criminal plot on March 20 was that they wanted a pretext for driving the Chinese Communists from the Central Executive Committee of the Kuomintang, from the Whampoa Academy, and from the main posts of the National Revolu-

tionary Army. They wanted to 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 "reason"? Was that not playing "dextreous tricks or cruel intrigues"? Was that not "self-interest and selfishness"? Was that "justice"? Was that "honesty"?

Nevertheless, the man who plotted the March 20 Incident was not yet prepared to annihilate all the Communists because he had not yet arrived at Nanking, because the Communists still had certain usefulness for him. We shall not discuss here the many serious faults within the Communist Party 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 line of the Northern Expedition. While holding this correct line, the Chinese Communists heroically participated in military operations. Among 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 plain-clothes squadrons throughout the country, organised three workers' uprisings in Shanghai to co-ordinate 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 for using the Communists and revolutionary workers and peasants to serve their own purpose of ar-

living at Nanking and securing the controlling position in the country. On the other hand, they prepared for the massacre under the name of the "purge" once they had succeeded in these objectives.

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 realisation of this counter-revolutionary scheme.

There is no past 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 peasants, as well as members of the Kuomintang who were really faithful to revolutionary principles and to the Three Policies of Dr. Sun Yat-sen, fell suddenly and unexpectedly under the executioners' swords of the big bourgeoisie.

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 would with justice and enthusiasm 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 élite 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 cannot make clear even today 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 were mutually-utilised:

This question which 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 look at 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 revolutionary, but also a "Chiang-Communist collaboration," when Mr. Chiang was still revolutionary. There was also a "Chiang-Wang collaboration" when Wang Ching-wei was still revolutionary. At that time, why should we not have collaborated with him? Just as at the time when you, Mr. Chiang, were still revolutionary, why should we not have collaborated with you?

As for "utilising," the matter of who utilised others is too clear a historical fact. The Communists have no need to utilise anyone; but they believe it is necessary to co-operate with certain people under the condition that such co-operation 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 their own aims, they murdered their friends. Wang Ching-wei did so and so did Chiang Kai-shek.

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 forth 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 C.E.C. 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 today 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 mutually 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 ten years Mr. Chiang blames 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 deprecates 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 to reaction. Did not the "purging movement" of Wang Ching-wei follow your "purging movement" against the Communists, Mr. Chiang?

The author's idea in the cited 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 any circumstance, the Communists can never be wiped out by slaughtering. The 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 many of the so-called "crimes" allegedly 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 élite and constituted 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 in slaughterings it is necessary to change 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; they know those self-appointed representa-

tives of "Benevolence, righteousness, superior conduct" and original morality as lord high executioners. The people know their hearts well. Where are the "benevolence, righteousness, and superior conduct"? It is more likely that their hearts are filled with greed and bestiality!

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 were 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 they not have done this? Is it true that the Governor has the right to burn houses while the people have no right to light a lamp? Is it necessary that Communists and revolutionaries should not take up arms in self-defence but should instead be willingly cheated, arrested, tortured and killed like lambs?

To help the peasants obtain the land and develop their own production was what we Communists did during the agrarian revolution. This constituted our "unpardonable crime of rebellion." But was it really a crime? Were we criminal when we sought prosperity for the peasantry, which constitutes more than eighty per cent. of the whole population?

Who is responsible for flooding Chinese territory with blood, as the army marched forward destroying 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 of 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." Cannon, airplanes 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 and pain the Chinese Communists have fought together with the people, led the Red Army, broke through "Punitive Encirclements" and succeeded in preserving the best representatives of the Chinese people. They have forged an army with experience in thousands of engagements, able to resist more than half 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 and which are fighting against the enemy troops in such great numbers, could the Kuomintang withstand the enemy attack independently? If the troops of the Kuomintang could not stand independently, then is it not possible that the enemy might already have driven straight into Chungking, Kuming, Sian and Lanchow? Then how could China have survived until 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 true. If there had been no Chinese Communist Party, the Three People's Principles would have had no new content (first of all, the principle of anti-imperialism, and of the abolition of unequal treaties in the Principle of Nationalism); if there had been no



Chinese Communist Party, the great revolution would not have arrived. This is also true for the Kuomintang of today. If there had been no Chinese Communist Party not only would the situation of the Great Revolution be unimaginable, but also the mighty war of resistance of the last six years. The Chinese Communist Party was born to fight for the well-being of the nation and the people, and to help everyone to work in the interests of the people. We do not intend to praise ourselves constantly, but the wolf-hearted reactionaries in the Kuomintang not only try to tread on the Communists after having used them, but also spread scandalous rumours against them. So long as a Communist still has a mouth to speak, it is necessary for him to denounce these counter-revolutionary libels.

That the Chinese Communists are loyal to their country is plain to all the world. Before the Sian Incident\* they repeatedly urged the Kuomintang to stop the internecine fighting, and to initiate a resistance through unity. Judging the Communists from its own selfish viewpoint, the Kuomintang thought 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 the opportunity for "looting during a fire," but, instead, for the consolidation of the nation, forgot the bitter enmity of the purging movement and the ten years' civil war and resolutely insisted on the release of Mr. Chiang. This brought about his release; 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, penetrating deeply into the occupied territories behind the enemy's lines with results known to the whole world. But what has been the attitude of the Kuomintang towards them? Not only does it block the war news of the two armies, but it also arrests the Communists on a large scale, rebukes them, attacks them, and kills them. Large numbers of secret service men conspire to penetrate into the Communist Party, attack it from the inside and outside so as completely to "destroy" it. Even in the occupied areas behind the lines, the troops led by the Kuomintang members have not attacked the Japanese troops but instead have attacked the Eighth Route and the New Fourth Armies. Since these two armies were really attacking the Japanese troops, they were subjected to blows by both the enemy and the Kuomintang troops. However, these are not called "dexterous 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 words. However, the author of *China's Destiny* centres his attacks upon the Chinese Communist Party; and recently the Kuomintang published the news of the demand for "disbanding the Chinese Communist Party" and "abolishing the Border Regions" through the official Central News Agency, and meanwhile has been preparing forces to invade the Border Regions. If, after all this, we still kept silence, we would

\* The kidnapping of Chiang Kai-shek by officers of the Northern armies in December, 1926.

\* The outrage by the Japanese military at Peking (now Pei-ping) in July, 1937.

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 our twenty-two years of party history.

## Book Reviews

### Debate on Africa

*Race and Politics in Kenya* by Elspeth Huxley and Margery Perham (Faber, 12s 6d).

MRS. HUXLEY may be labelled a Tory imperialist and Miss Perham a Liberal imperialist. The one approves of the settlement of white landowners in Africa, the other does not. This series of letters exchanged between them is instructive, because many of the consequences and possibilities of a policy of white settlement are set out in detail both from the "pro" and from the "anti" side. The reader will learn much about social and political conditions in East Africa as he goes along.

The ladies quarrel so vivaciously over such a multitude of matters that they almost give the impression of representing fundamentally opposed points of view. Actually, however, their agreements are more important than their differences. For both are at one in believing (in Miss Perham's words), "that Africans are not yet ready to play their parts as full citizens of a democratic State." Both hold that discrimination against white and black in the ownership and use of land should remain. And, although the book purports to work over the recent history of Kenya with a fine tooth-comb, both writers have a tacit understanding not to mention the most discreditable of all features of British policy—I mean the Kakamega gold ramp of 1932.\*

Apart from its direct interest as a description of the East African scene, the

\*In 1930 a Native Lands Trust Ordinance was passed which reserved certain specified areas "for the benefit of the native tribes for ever." Within a year or so gold was discovered at Kakamega in the Kavirondo reserve. The Kenya Government thereupon passed in 1932 an amending ordinance excluding the gold-bearing land from the reserve, without providing equivalent land elsewhere for the use of the tribe.

book deserves attention from Socialists as indicating the current state of mind of the imperialist intelligentsia (if such a phrase may be allowed). A study of this state of mind is one factor in the prediction of ruling class behaviour, and its results will have relevance to a far wider field of action than that of colonial affairs.

From this standpoint certain salient points come into relief.

(1) Confronted by modern social problems, even the very small-scale ones, that Kenya has to show, the imperialist mind loses the power of constructive thinking. Its efforts are directed to piecemeal adjustments of local tensions as and when they arise. The thought is fussy thought, all on the plane of tactics unshaped by any strategical conception.

(2) Absent also is any idea of an organic connection between Kenya's problems and those of the world economy as a whole.

(3) In the sphere of political and social organisation the imperialists can only divide. New forms of unification seem to be beyond them, not merely in practice, but even in idea. For example, both these authoresses favour territorial partition as a means of solving the racial problem in Kenya (compare Ireland, Palestine, India). They want to divide the colony into two areas, one for occupation by Europeans plus their African servants, the other as a parking-place for such Africans as are not needed or suited for employment by Europeans.

(4) Both writers are highly knowledgeable about African problems, yet both lack the gift of seeing them from an African point of view. It is well known that Mrs. Huxley and Miss Perham both have many African friends. But if it were not well known, it would be hard to believe on the evidence of this book. There is nothing here to suggest that either lady has ever had ten minutes' conversation with an African on equal terms. Neither thinks of African energy and African initiative as having any effective contribution to make now. In ten, twenty, thirty years' time—possibly. Now, no. For