



THE TRUTH about the CHINESE COMMUNISTS

“Agrarian Reformers” or Moscow Agents?

By ERIC D. BUTLER

First published c.1956

OTHER IMPORTANT WORKS by Eric D. Butler:

A Defence of Free Enterprise and The Profit Motive

Achilles Heal of the Conservative Movement

America, Roosevelt & The New Deal

Background to the Russian Revolution and the Middle East Crisis

Brain Washing

Censored History

Constitutional Barriers to Serfdom

Dialectics

Enemy Within the Empire

Essential Christian Heritage

Fabian-Socialist Contribution to the Communist Advance

Has Christianity Failed

Is The Word Enough

Money Power versus Democracy

Moral Implications of Centralised Power

Real Objectives of the Second World War

Red Pattern of World Conquest

Releasing Reality

Root of All Evil

Social Credit and Christian Philosophy

Social Dynamics

Steps Towards the Monopoly State

Truth about Social Credit

The Truth about the Australian League of Rights

They Want Your Land

Yarra Glen Report

*Printed and Published by the Australian League of Rights
PO Box 27, Happy Valley SA 5159*

THE TRUTH about the CHINESE COMMUNISTS “Agrarian Reformers” or Moscow Agents?

By ERIC D. BUTLER

First published c.1956

Contents

The Truth About Communist China	3
Introduction	3
Organization Of Chinese Communist Party	7
Subservience To Moscow	7
The Betrayal Of Chiang Kai-Shek	9
Communist Influence In America	14
The Chinese “Agrarian Reformers”	16
Conclusion	25

THE TRUTH ABOUT COMMUNIST CHINA

Introduction

If the Communist conspiracy against Western Civilization is successful — and there is a grave danger that it may — victory will have been accomplished not primarily by force of arms, but by a propaganda campaign which was designed to undermine potential victims’ beliefs in fundamental principles upon which their way of life has been erected.

As has been demonstrated time and time again, the real Communist menace is the manner in which conspiratorial methods have been used to influence and pervert the policies of all Western Governments and organizations. Even more menacing is the manner in which large numbers of influential members of the community, particularly those in the position to influence public opinion, are used unconsciously to disseminate propaganda which suits the Communists’ purposes.

A study of how the Communist victory in China was

achieved, and the manner, in which the Western peoples, including the Americans, have been confused about the real nature of the Chinese Communist regime, reveals just how successful the Communist conspirators have been.

Soon after the Chinese Communists, under the leadership of Moscow-trained Mao Tse-tung, had defeated the Chinese Nationalist forces, and compelled Chiang Kai-shek to retreat to the island of Formosa, the British Socialist Government recognized the Chinese Communist Government, and have since persisted with the view that the Chinese Communists will be encouraged to resist Moscow domination if treated “sympathetically.”

It is interesting to recall that even in America there was, early in the Chinese Communist regime, influential pressure exerted to have the Communist Government in Peking officially recognized by the U.S.A. and admitted to U.N.O.

Mr. Dean Acheson, American Secretary of State, and strongly opposed to Chiang Kai-shek, maintained that the Communist victory in China was merely the result of a “revolutionary ferment” which it was impossible to control. Right up until the time the Chinese Communists entered Korea, Mr. Acheson claimed that the Chinese were going to be Chinese before they were going to be Communists.

Mr. John Foster Dulles, U.S Special Investigator of the Japanese Peace Settlement, was another powerful advocate of American recognition of the Chinese Communists. If it had not been for growing American public criticism of the foreign policies of the State Department, there is little doubt that Acheson, accused of being influenced by pro-Communist advisors, would have been successful in his policy of recognition of Communist China. Any recent hardening of American policy against further Communist appeasement must be attributed to the 1950 American Elections, when Republican Senator Joe McCarthy and others, who had charged that Communists and Communist sympathizers were influencing American polices, were substantially supported by the American electors. Other countries have heard comparatively little about the frightening exposures of Communist infiltration into high places in America.

In Australia any reference by radio and press commentators to exposures of Communist infiltration in America have been misleading and, in some cases, untruthful. These same commentators have done all in their power to present the Chinese Communists favorably. Influential A.B.C. news commentators like Prof McMahan Ball and Prof Julius Stone have advised Australians to pay heed to the great wisdom of anti-British Pandit Nehru, who has played a leading role in advocating appeasement of Communist China.

On February 15, 1951, the Australian Council of the World Council of Churches, came out in favour of the Communist policy of recognition of Communist China, thus providing further unhappy evidence of Communist infiltration into some of the Christian Churches.

Those advocating “understanding” of the Chinese Communists never lose an opportunity of furthering the Communist propaganda “line” against Chiang Kai-shek, whose alleged corruption and other crimes turned the Chinese people against his regime in support of the Communists. In a special article in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of February 7, 1951, Barbara Ward, formerly an editor on the *London Economist*, furthered this Communist propaganda: **“Intervention from outside, either directly or in support of Chiang Kai-shek, would be defeated by the united resistance of the Chinese countryside.”**

This statement has been contradicted by the increasing number of reports from China and the Far East, which state that Chiang Kai-shek not only has a large following in China, but that large-scale guerrilla warfare has actually been waged against the Communists, particularly in South China.

In a featured article in the Melbourne *Herald* of January 9, 1951, and published in the rest of his chain of newspapers throughout Australia, Sir Keith Murdoch came out openly in favour of the Communists and their fellow travellers, on the subject of Communist China. Sir Keith wrote:

“To bring China to the (U.N.O.) table by no means ensures peace. Much has made China antagonistic. But it is morally right, for the regime is thoroughly established, has the main

goodwill of China, and is recognized by American and other students of China as in every way better than its predecessor. If the United Nations is to function, China should be there.”

“Much has made China antagonistic!”

Here is the major Communist “line” being taken by one of the most influential newspaper men in Australia. Sir Keith infers that the Australian and other Western people are responsible for the aggressive activities of the Chinese Communists.

Closely following Sir Keith Murdoch’s powerful plea on behalf of the Chinese Communists, Sir Douglas Copland, vice-Chancellor of the Canberra University, and influential economic adviser to a number of Federal Governments, added his support to the pro-China Communist advocates. Speaking at the Melbourne Wesley Church Pleasant Sunday Afternoon on January 18, 1951, Sir Douglas said:

“We should recognize China and allow her to participate in world affairs instead of shutting her off and making Russia the only country to which she can turn. The Chinese Government is the strongest China has had for a hundred years. The leaders of the Chinese regime are more theoretical than those of Russia. They are men of great ability and integrity who have gone through a great revolution and emerged successful.”

When Australia’s Minister for External Affairs, Mr. P. C. Spender, criticized Sir Douglas Copland’s statement as “loose and ill-founded,” Sir Douglas replied by asserting that “I have more expert knowledge on China than Mr. Spender has or is probably ever likely to have.” Sir Douglas was Australian Minister to China from 1946 to 1948, and it is interesting to recall that, after his return to Australia, he publicly stated that the Chinese Communists were merely “agrarian reformers.” In making this assertion, along with many other so-called intellectuals, Sir Douglas demonstrated that, so far from possessing any “expert knowledge” on Chinese Communists, he was merely parroting Communist propaganda. The facts concerning the Chinese Communists demonstrate this beyond all argument. But the clamour of these influential people advocating appeasement of Communist China has so obscured these facts that it is urgently necessary that they be presented for

the use of all those desirous of exposing and opposing Communist propaganda.

Organization of Chinese Communist Party

Several extracts from the Chinese Communist Handbook on Party Organization (1938) (Tang Ti Chien Shek), is an excellent introduction to an investigation of the real nature of Chinese Communism:

“According to the Constitution of the Chinese Communist Party, all who recognize the Constitution and Rules and Programme of the Communist International and the Chinese Communist Party, join and actively work in one of the party organizations, obey all the decisions of the Communist International and the (Chinese) Central Council...” (Ch. 1, Par. 2).

“The Chinese Communist Party does not at present have its own maximum programme. What is carried out are the programmes of the Communist International and its own minimum programme.” (Ch. 1, Par. 3)

“The Communist International more than once directed us to watch over and adjust systematically and constantly the constituent elements of party membership.” (Ch. 1, Par. 1)

“The political line of Lenin’s and the method of organization of Lenin’s are the foundations of the Communist Party.” (Ch.11, P. 3)

“To carry out the international line and be loyal to the Central Committee of the Communist International is to guarantee the success of the Chinese revolution.” (Ch.11, Par. 3)

The above extracts make it clear that the internal policies of the Chinese Communist Party are dominated by Moscow. The Chinese Communist leader, Mao Tse-tung was a member of the Communist International until it was “dissolved” during the war years in order to try and fool the Western peoples concerning the objectives of the Communist leaders.

Subservience To Moscow

Mao Tse-tung’s views on Communism are to be found in his text book, *China’s New Democracy*, written in 1940. In describing China’s revolution as being part of a world revolution, Mao wrote:

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

revolution is a magnificent part of world revolution.”

Mao Tse-tung emphasized his subservience to Moscow in the following:

“We cannot be separated from the socialist states or from the aid of the international proletariat, if we wish to seek for independence. That is to say, we cannot separate ourselves from the assistance of the Soviet Union or from the victory of the anti-capitalist struggles of the proletariat of Japan, Great Britain, the U.S., France and Germany.” Mao said that aid from Russia was “an indispensable condition for the final victory of China’s war of resistance.”

It is important to note that Mao Tse-tung wrote his text book for Chinese Communists after having in 1937 faithfully followed the Moscow “line” by declaring that he and his supporters would cease working for Communism and collaborate with Chiang Kai-shek in establishing democracy. This policy was in line with the “United Front” technique being followed at that time by Communists in all parts of the world.

In his book, *Vigil of a Nation*, the famous Chinese writer, Dr. Lin Yutang, quotes extracts from Chinese Communist Tactics and Party Lines (1937) by a prominent Chinese Communist, Chang Hao, alias Lin Yu-Ying, to demonstrate the real policy of the Chinese Communists in temporarily collaborating with Chiang Kai-Shek:

“We are abandoning the former unworkable line (of openly advocating Communism) and seeking a workable line, a line that is convenient for achieving proletariat dictatorship”.

Going into detail: “Only by co-operating with the Kuomintang can we carry on the proletarian revolution, via the democratic republic, via a capitalist democracy, and pass over to a proletarian dictatorship and establish a socialist society...We are now making a compromise with the Kuomintang for the purpose of operating in the open and organizing a struggle for wide popular support...”

“We are now making a compromise with the Kuomintang for the purpose of immediately lifting the ban on the party, releasing political prisoners, obtaining freedom of the press and assembly...”

“All these are in the direction of the road to proletarian dictatorship and are at the same time preparations for the realization of proletarian dictatorship ...”

The Chinese Communists have faithfully followed Communist teachings as outlined in the following statement by G. Dimitrov, General Secretary of the Communist International:

“We are sometimes accused of departing from our Communist principles. What stupidity, what blindness! We should not be Marxist and Leninist revolutionaries, nor disciples of Marx, Lenin and Stalin, if we were not capable of completely altering our tactics and our mode of action as circumstances may dictate. But all the deviations, and all the ins and outs of our tactics are directed to a single end — the world revolution.” — (Address at the Seventh Congress of the Communist International.)

The Betrayal Of Chiang Kai-Shek

In the early period of World War II the Chinese Communists followed the international Communist “line”: the war against Hitler was a just war against Fascism. But no sooner had the gangsters of Moscow and Berlin made their evil agreement than the Chinese Communists lost no time in denouncing the Allies as “imperialist warmongers.” Moscow’s agreement with the Japanese resulted in the Chinese Communists openly opposing Chiang Kai-Shek, who was still keeping the fight against the Japanese going. It was only after the Germans attacked the Russians that the Chinese Communists suddenly re-discovered that the war against Hitler was just. However, Russia was still neutral so far as Japan was concerned, and the Chinese Communists spent far more effort in fighting Chiang Kai-shek and preparing to seize power in China than they did in fighting the Japanese. Whatever may be said about Chiang Kai-Shek — there is no doubt that much criticism can be directed against him and his Government — the fact remains that he was a loyal war-time ally, and in spite of Chinese Communist treachery, played an important role in defeating Japan. However, Chiang’s reward was President Roosevelt’s betrayal at the infamous Yalta Conference in February, 1945, when a secret agreement with Stalin ensured that Manchuria should fall to

Russia. It is ironic to recall that it was about the detachment of Manchuria from China that America pressed Japan to the point of war in 1941!

There can be no argument that it was Communist influence at the highest levels in the American Government, particularly in the American State Department, which was responsible from Yalta onwards, for American policies which made the Communist victory in China possible. It is a major victory for Communist propagandists to ignore this fact, and to suggest that the Communists defeated Chiang Kai-shek only because they gained the support of the Chinese people.

In a forthright article, "How We Won the War and Lost the Peace," in the American Journal *Life*, of September 27, 1948, Mr. W. C. Bullitt, well-known former American Ambassador to Russia, exposed in detail the betrayal of Chiang Kai-shek to the Communists. The following are notes on Bullitt's article:

Yalta, February 4, 1945, Roosevelt, sick and moribund, but still determined upon cajoling Stalin. Cordell Hull on October 30, 1943, reported Stalin's affirmation "unequivocally that once Germany is defeated Russia would join with them in defeating Japan, commenting, 'Stalin was sincere and wanted nothing in return.'

Roosevelt, Churchill and Chiang Kai-shek declared publicly at Cairo, November, 1943, that "...all territories 'stolen from China by Japan, such as Manchuria, Formosa...will be returned to the Chinese Republic". Yet at Yalta, February 11, 1945, Roosevelt and Churchill signed a secret agreement sacrificing Manchuria to Russian imperialism, granting Russia special privileges over Dairen and Port Arthur, with assurance of absolute control of the Chinese Manchuria railway. As a special Stalin bonus the Communist State of Outer Mongolia was detached from China, while South Sakhaline and the Kurile Isles, cutting the air route from Alaska to Japan, were handed over to Russia. And all for assistance already promised unconditionally to Cordell Hull. Roosevelt pleaded that the military experts had overestimated Japanese resistance and that Stalin's former offer of aid was not specific enough.

Autumn, 1945 **General Hurley, U.S. Ambassador to China, declared publicly on resigning his post, that Communists in the State and Foreign Affairs Departments had sabotaged his work. To smother up the scandal Truman sent out Marshall as special envoy. Marshall, who knew as little about China as Truman, sought the advice of State Department officials who still believed that Russia was a democracy in love with peace, and that Chinese Communists were agrarian reformers with no connection with Moscow. The General then drafted out his own instructions, which the President signed — to put a stop to the civil war by bringing about a reconciliation of Nationalists and Communists.**

Marshall's prestige was so great upon arriving in China that he succeeded in persuading Chiang Kai-shek to sign an armistice, January 10, 1946. The armistice proved a godsend to Soviet policy. At that moment there were no Chinese Communists in Manchuria, which Russia occupied under the Yalta agreement. Russia therefore planned (a) to send as many Chinese Communists as possible from North China to Manchuria to be armed with equipment and munitions taken from the Japanese; (b) to retain its Russian army in Manchuria until it could be replaced by Chinese Communists properly equipped.

On April 14, 1946, Chinese Communists, well-armed, broke the armistice and attacked Chang-chun in Manchuria. Marshall, furious, unable to touch the Communists took it out on the Nationalists — he stopped all military supplies to Chiang's armies. At the beginning of the summer, 1946, endeavoring to force Chiang to admit Communists into his Government, he instructed the State Department to refuse further export licenses for munitions to China. From the summer 1946, to February 1948, the Chinese Government did not receive a single cartridge for its American arms, during which period the Communists got all they needed from Russia and were able to occupy vast tracts of territory. In September 1946, Marshall deliberately broke the American contract to furnish aircraft, munitions and supplies for a period of three years, since then neither bomber nor fighter has been delivered against the contract. Chiang nevertheless, persisted

in refusing to admit Communists into his Government.

June, 1947 Marshall returned to the U.S.A. to become Secretary of State, embittered equally against Chinese Nationalists and Communists and equally blind to the mortal danger facing China, as also the fact that a Japan alongside a Communist China could only survive by becoming a Russian satellite. Truman, always under Marshall influence, refuses to see that the independence and integrity of China is the key to U.S. Pacific security.

“We are today exposed to a struggle,” concluded Bullitt, “not for our security but for our existence.”

How true Bullitt’s words are to-day!

Upon returning to America, General Marshall said:

“with one stroke of the pen I disarmed 29 Chinese divisions.”

In a series of articles published in 1949, one of the numerous Russians who have fled from the Communist tyranny since the end of the war, Lieut. Col. Grigori A. Tokoev, former Staff Officer of the Soviet Administration in Germany, dealt extensively with Communist aims in the Far East, and how “American policies had helped further those aims. Tokoev wrote: “The Politburo has achieved in China success on a scale that the West has not yet even begun to realize...No matter what happens elsewhere, the Politburo is basing its strategy upon the assumption that the war will be decided in Europe. As soon as Task Two (victory in the Far East) approaches completion...then the Politburo will return, with whetted appetite and confidence to Europe. Therein lies the true significance of China’s collapse.

From the Soviet strategic point of view, the fact that Mao Tse-tung has finally all but brought Chiang Kai-shek down after two decades of incessant struggle is only of incidental importance. The great thing is that the ever-vulnerable rear of the Soviet Union is in the process of being secured. China’s open door is closing against the West, which first prised it ajar. The collapse of China has advanced with a speed which must have surprised even the most optimistic Soviet military experts. Two mistakes have obviously helped to bring on the avalanche:

“The lackadaisical attitude of the West to the Soviet grip on

Outer Mongolia, which has since become the main Soviet arsenal in Asia, is the first and most outstanding reason for the present collapse of China. The second mistake was that through General Marshall's efforts to impose a coalition Government, the U.S. in effect championed the Chinese Communists as true 'agrarian Liberals' and contributed to the undermining of the established government.

"The attempts of General Marshall to reconcile Chiang Kai-shek with Mao Tse-tung proved that the Americans had not yet clearly understood the basic principles of Communism; that is, the fact that never or under any conditions would Communists accept loyal collaboration with non-Communists. **Inside the Soviet Union, Marshall's strange efforts to divide Chiang Kai-shek's power with Mao Tse-tung's Communist regime were followed with incredulous satisfaction. For one intoxicating moment it almost appeared that the distinguished American would actually succeed where even Nanming, a member of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, an outstanding Comintern personality and a close friend of Stalin's, had failed.**

"Though Marshall's coalition scheme finally broke upon the rock of Chiang's opposition, his withdrawal from China, accompanied by a virtual cessation of all U.S. aid to the Chiang Kai-shek government, in effect represented a strategic victory for Mao against Chiang.

With Chiang left to his fate, the way was open for a Soviet thrust into Asia at practically no risk. Soviet arms and military might flowed into the vacuum, and Chiang's unsupported armies were brushed aside.

"It would seem now that another mistake is to be added to the previous ones: Mr. Hoffman, of the Economic Co-operation Administration, has been quoted as saying in Shanghai that even in the event of the Communists coming into control of the Government, **U.S. economic aid to China would continue.** Is it possible that the Western diplomats have not yet understood that any kind of compromise with the Communists is a danger to world peace?"

Communist Influence In America

It is necessary at this point to deal briefly with Communist influence on American foreign policy, particularly when it concerns the Far East.

The story of how Alger Hiss, ex-President of the Carnegie Institute, personal adviser to President Roosevelt during the disastrous Yalta Conference, and principal organizer of the San Francisco Conference, to launch the United Nations Organization, was eventually convicted of being a Communist espionage agent in spite of powerful political opposition, is a fascinating and frightening revelation of how far Communist penetration has been successful in what is allegedly the greatest anti-Communist country in the world.

One of the most significant features of the Hiss affair was the number of influential people, like Mr. Justice Felix Frankfurter of the American Supreme Court, and Mr. Dean Acheson who publicly defended Hiss. Even after his conviction for perjury, Mr. Dean Acheson still supported Hiss, one of the facts which has caused Mr. Acheson to become the target for increasingly critical comment by competent American anti-Communist authorities. The most important aspect of the Hiss case, which stirred American public opinion, was the manner in which Presidential and other official influence was used — effectively for some time — to have a thorough investigation of the charges made against Hiss, by an ex-Communist colleague, thwarted. Similar obstacles have been raised against a thorough investigation of the “Amerasia Case.” As the “Amerasia Case” is directly connected with the Communist victory in China, it is essential to deal with it in some detail. Professor Louis Budenz, former editor of the leading Communist journal in America, has said that if the “Amerasia Case” were investigated, the disclosures would be the most startling in American history. What is the “Amerasia Case?” An excellent summary has been provided by the widely-read American journal, *The Saturday Evening Post*, in an editorial in its issue of July 1, 1950:

“On June 7, 1945, the country was surprised to learn that a group of writers and Government officials had been arrested and

charged with the possession of restricted documents obtained from the State and Navy departments and other Federal agencies. The documents were found in the New York offices of *Amerasia*, a magazine of about 1,700 subscribers, published by Philip Jaffe, a well-to-do left-winger with ramified communist affiliations. In the offices of this small and obscure publication, F.B.I. agents found full equipment for photostating documents. Among the hundreds of documents discovered, it has since been learned, was a report on the disposition of Chinese Nationalist troops and a long list of top-secret reports on subjects from the private life of Generalissimo and Madame Chiang Kai-shek to the State Department's plans for post-war control of Japan.

“The public did not know at the time that Philip Jaffe, editor of *Amerasia* and the centre of the group, was an influential left-winger, whose connections with Earl Browder, then head of the Communist Party were known to the F.B.I.. Indeed, the public learned little about the case before it was hustled out of sight. Two of the accused — Jaffe and Emmanuel Larson, a minor State Department official, were fined small amounts after a brief court appearance on a Saturday morning. The charges against the others, John S. Service, of the pro-Chinese Communist group, in the State Department's Far Eastern section, Mark Gayn, a free-lance writer, Lieut. Andrew Roth, of the office of Naval Intelligence, and Kate Mitchell, an editor of *Amerasia*, were dropped. Speculation as to who inside the State Department was passing secret papers over the transom died with the end of the case.

“Apparently the only tangible result of the exposure at the time was that Under Secretary Joseph Grew, who had stumbled on the thievery, resigned from the State Department, as did Assistant Secretary Julius Holmes, who insisted that the five be prosecuted as the F.B.I. had recommended. Messrs. Grew and Holmes were, of course, subjected to the conventional shellacking in the radical-liberal press as “reactionaries” and “crypto-Fascists.” Mr. Dean Acheson got Mr. Grew's job as Under Secretary.

“It seems plain now that the principal purpose of the *Amerasia* group was to set up propaganda on behalf of the Chinese

Communists, and thus help Stalin achieve his objective of making all Asia a Russian dependency. The magazine's circulation is hardly an indication of its influence. As Larson, the State Department functionary, told the Hobbs Committee, which first looked into the case in 1946:

“Do not let the figures fool you. It (*Amerasia*) goes to Naval Intelligence. They buy seven copies every month.... It goes to the State Department. It went to the Office of Strategic Services, every agency.”

“It also went to editors, professors, clergymen, leaders of internationalist groups, and so on. Undoubtedly, the material published by *Amerasia* seeped down in diluted form to the level of the ordinary reader, gradually persuading him that in China Communism was not Communism at all, and that Chiang Kai-shek was corrupt and immoral, and intent on appeasing the Japanese”.

“Propaganda for a Communist Asia was the secret objective of the *Amerasia* document ring and few Americans remained entirely immune to the injections. The *Amerasia* case may be the clue to the important phase of Communist penetration in the U.S.A. — the propaganda attack on the intellectuals and the middle class. There isn't much to be said for the morals, or even the political shrewdness, of those who have been trying so desperately to keep the truth from the American people. No matter whom they are protecting, they really ought to open it up.”

The Chinese “Agrarian Reformers”

The “*Amerasia* Case” demonstrated the manner in which a large number of influential individuals in a community, although not Communists themselves, can be used to further Communist propaganda. It was *Amerasia* which helped pioneer the idea that the Chinese Communists are merely “agrarian reformers.” Sir Douglas Copland and others, who use the term “agrarian reformers” to describe the Chinese Communists, are therefore spreading Communist propaganda much more effectively than the Communists could do themselves.

Lieut. Col. Tokoev, the former Russian Staff Officer, already quoted, has commented on the Chinese “agrarian reformers” as follows -

“There is a myth, fostered with consummate skill and assiduity by Soviet propagandists, that the Chinese Communists, far from owing allegiance to theoretical Marxism or the Cominform, are only simple Oriental agrarians hungry for land and democracy. I have also heard the hope expressed by otherwise intelligent people in the West that ‘Mao Tse-tung, though a self-avowed Communist, is really an agrarian nationalist, who, if pressed hard by the Kremlin, would rebel as Tito has done ... Mao himself is a dedicated Communist, a true Believer. ‘He has never deviated from the Party line, and was the first of the non-Soviet’ Proconsuls to denounce Tito’s heresy. If his victories continue he will certainly go down in Asiatic history as the Lenin of China.’”

While it is undoubtedly true that the land reforms promised by the Chinese Communists did result initially in many of the peasants supporting the Communists, it is a grave disservice to the anti-Communist cause to suggest that the Chinese peasants are strongly behind the Communist Government. All the evidence available indicates that, as the real significance of the Communist “agrarian reformers” has become apparent to the Chinese peasants, they have become progressively more anti-Communist.

In an article published in *The Readers’ Digest*, of February, 1951, the most factual account of Communist methods that has emerged from China reveals how the Communists, “welcomed as ‘liberators’ by a Chinese village, step by step revealed themselves as bloody terrorists.” A study of this article, based upon first-hand observations by an eye witness, demonstrates that the Communist technique for enslaving the Chinese peasants has been the same as that applied in Russia and European countries. Reports of large-scale famine in China which began to be publicized early in 1951 are undoubtedly related to the policies of “agrarian reform” imposed upon the unfortunate Chinese peasants.

Another aspect of Communist planning in China is the manner in which the Chinese Communists are faithfully following the Moscow “line” concerning religion. During the desperate struggle for survival during the war years, the Communist leaders were forced to grant a greater degree of religious freedom to the Russian

people than in the past, thereby demonstrating that twenty years of skillful propaganda had not been able to kill religion in Russia. Having grudgingly accepted this fact, the Communists have since attempted to exploit religion for their own purposes. Thus the establishment of the Russian Orthodox Church firmly controlled by appointees of the Communists. The Communist leaders place great importance upon the function of the Russian Orthodox Church in their propaganda work amongst Christians. It is therefore interesting to note that already (February, 1951) the Chinese Communists have made plans to form a Chinese "Christian" Church which will be linked with the Russian Church.

It has been announced that all foreign Christian missionaries are to be deported from China by the summer of 1952. In force of the overwhelming evidence of Moscow-Peking collaboration already presented, well may it be asked how any reasonable individual could suggest that the Chinese Communists were anything but ardent members of an international conspiracy seeking complete world domination? But even after Chinese Communists actively entered the Korean incident, and inflicted a major defeat upon General MacArthur's forces, powerful propagandists continued to support Mr. Dean Acheson's claim that the Chinese Communists were Chinese first and Communists second.

It was suggested that a division could be created between Peking and Moscow. Excuses were made for Chinese entry into Korea. Writing in his Melbourne *Herald* on January 22nd, 1951, Sir Keith Murdoch echoed the sentiments of many other credulous victims of Communist propaganda: **"There was, I think, a great deal to be said for the Chinese reaction to the appearance of the American Army on the Manchurian frontier. The main industrial area was threatened; the historical door of invasion opened...To stamp the Chinese as aggressors at that stage would be silly. Revolutionary China was an outcast, an untouchable, repudiated by the United Nations. And the American unilateral declaration of 'hands off Formosa' warned the Peking Government that a discredited and unwanted Chiang Kai-shek might again be unleashed with American arms."** Sir Keith later made the observation that,

“revolutionary China has the germs of great good.”

It is almost incredible that nearly every influential press and radio commentator in Australia should not only have attempted to excuse Chinese Communist aggression, but even branded General MacArthur as the villain of the piece. He allegedly “provoked” the Chinese Communists! Here again Sir Keith Murdoch supplies a classical example of non-Communists furthering Communist propaganda. In, the Melbourne *Herald*, of January 9th, 1951, Sir Keith praised the British Socialist Government’s recognition of Communist China, and then went on to say: **“It was the obstinate right wing pro-Chiang American thinking that directly caused the disaster to the United Nations cause. This movement was led by General MacArthur, supported at home by the extreme anti-Communists, the bitterest anti-Trumanists and the Chiang Washington lobby, still a virulent and numerous body, living on some of the millions of dollars given long ago.”** It would be interesting to learn how anyone can be too “extreme” in his opposition to Communism!

Those who contend that the Western Powers should have done all in their power to appease Communist China in order to try and prevent a “full working partnership with the Kremlin,” have tried to contradict obvious facts. The first major act of the Chinese Communists was to enter into an agreement, February 14th, 1951 with Soviet Russia, and to then indulge in an aggressive propaganda campaign against the British and Americans.

The Russo-Chinese Agreement provided for a Russian loan of 300,000,000 dollars to China. On February 14th, 1951 Lin Hai Yun, head of the Foreign Trade Department of the Communist Chinese Ministry of Trade, told the *New China* newsagency that developing trade between the Soviet and China over the past twelve months had been one of the major factors contributing to the rapid restoration of China’s industrial and agricultural programme.

Writing in the Soviet newspaper, *Pravda*, early in February, 1951 on the anniversary of the 1950 Soviet-Chinese treaty, the Chinese Communist Premier, Chon En-lai, made the observation that, with a total population of more than 700,000,000, Russia

and China constitute an invincible force in the world. **This observation recalls Lenin's statement that the shortest way to Paris and London is through Peking.**

The Communist leaders acted upon Lenin's observation and during the 20's had highly trained agents in China endeavoring to build up the Chinese Communist Party. In an article in the December, 1950, issue of *The Readers' Digest*, American Congressman Walter Henry Judd, ten years a medical missionary in China and a specialist on Far Eastern Affairs, stressed the importance of China to the Communist leaders:

“More than half the people of the world live in Asia. Which way they go is likely to be the decisive question of this century.”

At the end of the last war the Soviets had about 200,000,000 people under their control. Now, with their satellites in Europe and what they have seized in Asia, they have almost 800,000,000. We of the free Western world are almost 800,000,000 people. The two roughly balance. Who determines which way the balance is to tip? The remaining 700,000,000, of course. And where do they live? On the periphery of China - in Korea, Japan, Formosa, the Philippines, Indonesia, Indo-China, Siam, Malaya, Burma, India, Pakistan. These 700,000,000 people, who can tip the balance of power between the Soviet world and the free world, are still on the fence. Which way are they to go — with us or with the Soviets? All the other problems on the international front depend on that.

“And in determining which way they are to go, China has always been and still is the crucial area. The Communists have always realized this fact. Back in 1927 U.S. Communist chief Earl Browder was in China with other leaders of the Communist hierarchy to help the Reds seize complete control as the Bolsheviks in Russia had done ten years before. Chiang Kai-shek was scheduled to be to China what Kerensky had been in Russia — an interim leader — to be overthrown by the Reds as soon as he had defeated the war lords in southern and central China. But Chiang was strong enough to block the 1927 Red rebellion in China.

“If the Communists had succeeded in their plans, it would have advanced their programme of world conquest by at least a decade.

Naturally they have hated Chiang fiercely, seeking always to weaken and discredit him and the Chinese Government until they could take over China.”

Communist China’s aggression against Tibet was a blow to apologists for Mao Tse-tung and his associates, but this incident was soon brushed aside, and every effort made to demonstrate that, if permitted to put her case concerning Korea before the United Nations, Communist China would enter into a sensible agreement. Not only did the Chinese Communists make it clear that they would not accept any “agreement” which did not at least clear the way for the removal of Chiang Kai-shek from the island of Formosa, but that all those who had suggested a possible division between Peking and Moscow were deluding themselves, and all those who paid attention to their wishful thinking. In his final address at Lake Success, the Chinese Communist delegate, Wu Iliuchuan, said:

“The great unity between China and the Soviet Union is unshakeable. All your conspiracies of driving a wedge are futile, doomed to failure and have already failed.” This is surely a devastating answer to the wishful thinking of Sir Douglas Copland and other apologists for the Chinese Communists.

One of the first steps taken by the Communist leaders to use Communist China as a base from which to further their international revolution was to instruct prominent Communists from many countries, including Russia, to establish themselves in Peking. Australians might recall how Ernest Thornton, leading Australian Communist, was one of those instructed to take up residence in China.

The following report from the well-informed *English Tablet*, of December 16th, 1950 reveals that the Chinese Communists are actively engaged in furthering the anti-British campaign in Malaya.

“The Chinese guerrillas who continually make their way into Malaya to wage this war of attrition against one of the key economic strongholds of Britain, are spoken of in Peiping in language all too reminiscent of Hitler’s language about the Sudeten Germans, ‘these tortured people,’ when he was preparing to attack the Czechs.

“Earlier this month the Director of the Commission of Overseas Chinese, Ho Hsiang-ning, welcomed a party of deported Chinese from Malaya, who then held a rally organized by the Chinese Communists. The general theme was that Malaya was developed by the Chinese but that now the cruel imperialists are imprisoning, torturing, and flogging them; and that these crimes must stop.

“If the ‘American aggressors’ come in for the major share of abuse, the ‘British Imperialists’ are not far behind. This December 4th rally was held in Peking, and several hundred returned Overseas Chinese protested against the British persecution of Chinese citizens in Malaya. National Committees, Democratic Leagues, Women’s Federations, Peasants and Youth Leagues were all represented, and the meeting followed the pattern of similar gatherings in Eastern Germany today, in the Henlein-meetings in the Sudeten yesterday. Hu Yu-chih, Vice-Chairman of the Returned Overseas Chinese, said that the British were ‘employing all kinds of measures to harm the Chinese residents in Malaya in every way, because their political consciousness is comparatively high.’ While recognizing the Chinese People’s Republic, they always follow U.S. imperialism in becoming the stubborn enemy of the Chinese people, and they had intensified their persecution of the Malayan Chinese since the U.S. aggression on Korea. The Chinese people in China and their countrymen abroad are united as one. They can never stand idly by when the British imperialists in Malaya are conducting such atrocities by arresting, jailing, slaughtering and deporting the Overseas Chinese. If the British colonial authorities in Malaya pay no heed to this solemn warning and go on persecuting our countrymen, they will reap what they sow”

The defeat of the British in Malaya would be a major disaster for Australia.

However, the first major strategical aim of the Chinese Communists has been to obtain control of Formosa. As General MacArthur and other military leaders have insisted, Formosa is not only essential for defense in the Far East; it is essential for the defense of America itself. Its importance to Australia cannot be overestimated. And yet it is not so long ago that Mr. Dean

Acheson and the American State Department openly proclaimed that they would not help Chiang Kai-shek hold Formosa against the Chinese Communists. Openly defying Mr. Acheson and his pro-Communist advisers, General MacArthur in August, 1950 sent direct to the newspapers and news agencies a statement emphasizing the vital necessity of defending Formosa. **President Truman tried to have his statement suppressed.**

In his article already quoted, Congressman Walter Judd charges Acheson's policy as being directly responsible for the Korean incident:

“That brings us to the biggest error of all — the announcement by the President on last January 5, 1950 that we were not going to provide any military aid or advice to Chinese forces on Formosa, those Chinese who have been fighting Communism for 23 years — most of the time alone — and who still have the courage to fight it. The Secretary of State enlarged upon the President's statement in a press conference:

“We are not going to get involved militarily in any way on the island of Formosa.”

“Those statements gave public notice to the Kremlin that the door to Formosa was open as far as we were concerned, and they could walk right in.”

“Then on January 12, 1950, the Secretary of State was reported as saying that our security line runs from the Aleutians through Japan and Okinawa to the Philippines. The occupants of the Kremlin looked at the map and found that Korea, like Formosa, was beyond our line and therefore would not be defended by us. So they moved in. Why should anyone be surprised?”

Pointing out how the Korean incident stemmed from Yalta and the ridiculous agreement to divide Korea in the worst possible way, Judd also mentions how the American military leaders decided to withdraw from Korea because it had no strategical value. It has yet to be satisfactorily explained why, having invited the Communists to take Korea and Formosa, Mr. Acheson should suddenly reverse his stand and insist that Americans should lose not only large numbers of lives, but also prestige, in a Korean campaign which, at the time of writing, appears like ending in a stalemate.

Mr. Acheson has opposed any assistance from Chiang Kai-shek and the large number of battle experienced troops still under his command. It is not surprising that American public opinion has become increasingly restive about American State Department policies, particularly when it has been proved that these policies are still being influenced by pro-Communists like Professor Owen Lattimore, adviser on Far Eastern Affairs. Former Communist leader Louis Budenz publicly testified that Lattimore was a secret Communist like Alger Hiss. However that may be, the following items reveal clearly the pro-Communist views of this important adviser:

“...Those who feel mystified about the McCarthy-Lattimore affair would do well to consult the Record of March 30, containing the Wisconsin Senator’s long speech. In some passages (Record, p. 4448), McCarthy quotes freely from Lattimore’s books on Asia (*The Situation in Asia, The Solution in Asia and Manchuria; Cradle of Conflict*) to show the Professor’s views on China and Asia. These emphasize his long-held convictions that Soviet Russia has “been fated to win all Asiatics to its side, that this is not Red Imperialism, that Russia is ‘creative’ (while Western nations are not) and has irresistible dynamism, and that there is not and has ‘not been anything we can do about it save submit to Russian victory. A very recognizable ‘line.’”

“One newspaper, the *Chicago Tribune*, took advantage of this searching analysis in the Congressional Record. In an inimitable editorial (April 6) entitled ‘Lattimore’s Vision of Destiny,’ the *Tribune* quotes copiously from the Professor’s books, including a veritable Lattimore gem: ‘To be progressive in politics means to be on the side of that which is going up and against that which is going down.’ The *Tribune* winds up: ‘Senator McCarthy suggested that this last statement explains Mr. Lattimore. By his every account, Soviet Russia and Communism are bound to triumph. It is historically inevitable — the Marxian view. So, said the Senator, Mr. Lattimore has chosen his side. If the investigating committee finds that Mr. Lattimore is not what Senator McCarthy says he is, will it kindly tell the American people just what he is?’” - From the American Journal, *Not Merely Gossip*, of April 12, 1950.

“... it has been established that, despite a sizeable Congressional appropriation of funds available to Korea, since last October, none had been sent or even allocated up to the end of March. The key to such tragic anomalies may be found in a statement given by Professor Owen Lattimore on July 17, 1949, in the *Compass*: **“The thing to do, therefore, is to let Korea fall, but not to let it look as though we pushed it.”** Was the withholding of the arms from Korea a deliberate ‘pushing’—similar to the failure to give arms ‘to Chiang’s ‘Nationalist armies in the last four years? - *Not Merely Gossip*, June 28th, 1950.

As competent American anti-Communist specialists have pointed out, it is significant that Acheson, after virtually giving the Communists the “all clear” signal in the Far East, and by so doing aroused a storm of criticism against himself and his Communist and pro-communist friends, should have supported military action under the worst possible conditions. The results of this military action only led to increasing criticism of the policies of the Truman Administration, and the American Elections late in 1950 were fought around the question of how much Communist influence was being exerted on American Foreign Policy. Perhaps one of the most hopeful signs that the international Communist conspiracy can be defeated is the awakening of American public opinion as the result of courageous exposures by the genuine patriots of both American Parties.

They are demanding no further appeasement of the Communists, the removal from office of Mr. Acheson, and all other officials who have followed the Communist “line” in the past, and a more positive and constructive approach to the whole Communist question.

Conclusion

The conclusion is inescapable, that the Communists have in China and the Far East made a big stride towards their ultimate objective of world conquest. **But it must never be forgotten that this stride was only made possible because of the treacherous activities of traitors in high places in the Western democracies — particularly America. And these traitors have been helped immeasurably by the evil propaganda of Communist fellow-**

traveler's and wishful thinkers who apparently have not the courage to face the reality of the Communist challenge.

If the Communist conspiracy against Western Christian Civilization is to be defeated, it is first essential that genuine patriots everywhere learn to detect and reject Communist propaganda under whatever guise it appears. They should note carefully those false prophets who have been contradicted by events in the past, and pay no further attention to what they have to say. When, under the guise of "tolerance" and "impartiality," Church leaders, radio and press commentators, confuse or mislead on the Communist issues, "they should be subject to the severest criticism." Christian patriots must realize while there is still time, that they must fight as never before to retain their precious heritages of individual liberty and dignity. They must shut their ears against the subtle but deadly suggestion that there can be any compromise with the doctrines or the advocates of Communism. They are confronted with a great struggle which they must either win completely or eventually be destroyed. There may be yet time to learn the lesson of the Communist victory in China and what it really means.

A SPECIAL ANTI-COMMUNIST OFFENSIVE IS LAUNCHED A Call to All Christian Patriots

This booklet is the first of a special series of anti-Communist booklets which will deal exhaustively with all aspects of the Communist conspiracy against Western Christian Civilization. The following are a few of the booklets to be issued in this series:

HOW THE COMMUNISTS WON THE SECOND WORLD WAR
COMMUNISM CAN BE DEFEATED WITHOUT A THIRD WORLD WAR
POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC POLICIES WHICH AID COMMUNISM

Donations are urgently required to publish this series of booklets, and to place them in the hands of as many people as possible.

The League of Rights appeals to all Christian Patriots to help them intensify their growing offensive against the Communist conspirators.
