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Delex CSA
A Translation of General Liu Yuan’s Preface to Zhang Musheng’s Changing Our View of Culture and History

In May of 2011, Western media reported on the preface to 張木生 [Zhang Musheng’s] book [Changing Our View of Culture and History]. Written by People’s Liberation Army (PLA) General 刘源 [Liu Yuan], the preface gained significant attention inside and outside of China and was largely portrayed by Western media as bellicose in its depiction of the role of war in China’s national development, controversial in its characterization of the failings of Communist Party of China (CCP) General Secretaries, and intriguing in its call for a “new democracy to save the Communist Party of China.”

Coverage of General Liu’s preface juxtaposed with the May 2011 reportage of PLA Chief of General Staff Chen Bingde’s visit to the U.S., during which General Chen asserted “China never intends to challenge the U.S.” and downplayed Chinese capabilities.¹ General Chen’s statements were consistent with the “24 Character Strategy” former paramount leader Deng Xiaoping gave to China’s national security apparatus:

“冷静观察，站稳脚跟，沉着应付，韬光养晦，善于守拙，绝不当头”
[Observe calmly; secure our position; cope with affairs calmly; hide our capacities and bide our time; be good at maintaining a low profile; and never claim leadership.]²

General Liu’s writings in the preface, coupled with earlier statements, and his high status as a senior officer and “princeling” with rumored ties to likely future President Xi Jinping raise questions regarding the potential for a future shift from China’s current “hide and bide” strategy to a more assertive one, despite the challenges and vulnerabilities such a shift would present China. Moreover, his support of Zhang Musheng’s “new democracy to save the Chinese Communist Party” by resolving economic, social, and political “contradictions” presents the discussed possibility of slight and gradual intra-Party reform. Most importantly, General Liu’s preface clarifies the need for rigorous analysis of Chinese capabilities and intent.

Selected Quotes from General Liu’s Preface

On the Role of War in History

- War is the product of man’s desires; if man’s desires cannot be destroyed, war too can never be eliminated. [...] And this simple reality crystallizes the fact that military culture is the oldest and most important source of wisdom belonging to mankind.
- If war is not waged, how can unification occur? If one does not resort to arms, how can there be the union of nations, the union of races, the union of cultures, and the union of the North and South be achieved? History is a river of blood and tears that flows for all of time; the history of the Chinese people still forms, grows, and ends in this same river, and it is a history formed by different races coming and fusing together.
- The fusion of war and military power has influenced China’s “culture of peace and harmony”: from principles such as “the careful study of war”, to “the avoidance of war”, to “total victory”, “to engage in war to accelerate/achieve peace”, “to be different yet co-exist peacefully”, and “to know peace and therefore live in peace”… such notions sufficiently reflect the dialectical relationship between war and peace, and together they create a theory of war unique only to China and respected throughout the world.

On the Failings of the Communist Party of China

- First, regardless of whether the Party never surrenders, the Communist Party has suffered an incalculable number of mistakes and defeats!
- Truth be told, there have been many betrayals and defections on part of the Party’s General Secretaries, both outside and inside the country, in the past and in the present; there are so many betrayals that they cannot be listed individually here.

On “New Democracy to Save the Communist Party of China”

- If certain people wish to make such noise by implementing “democracy” (which has become a global trend), then one fears that such an “attempt to draw a tiger will instead lead to a dog being drawn.”3 Rather than trying to “use someone else’s stone to break jade”4, why don’t we do the right and proper thing instead, and assertively promote the indigenous and tested “New Democracy” theory that was put forth by Chairman Mao and put into practice by Liu Shaoqi?5
- China has advanced by leaps and bounds, yet it has also accumulated a great deal of internal contradictions along the way; as such we must guard against the enormous damage that can be caused by the extreme left, which can result from a coalition formed between the remnants of rebellious forces and young extreme nationalists. We must also be alert against the “explosive” consequences that may result from the far right, namely narrow-minded “nationalism” fusing with the mob violence. Our descendants must

---

3 Liu Yuan uses this phrase to mean China will only make a fool out of itself; its attempts to appear smart will instead end in failure.
4 Liu Yuan uses this phrase to mean borrowing foreign ideas to solve China’s internal problems will only lead to failure.
5 Liu Shaoqi, Liu Yuan’s father, was President of the People’s Republic of China under Mao until his purging and death during the Cultural Revolution.
remain aware of examples such as the Cultural Revolution, Japanese fascism, and German fascism.

- I can only sit there and silently think: within present society, “New Democracy” theory may well be the only thing that is capable of covering the “least common multiplier” created by the combination of the “mainstream and non-mainstream”. It may well be the only thing that can bridge the gap regarding the “highest common factor” desired by “left and right [-wing political] theory”.

- Today, [Chinese] society is much more democratic, free, and open. There is almost no one who “beats with a stick, tags a cap, or pulls one’s queue” anymore. […] Accordingly, the level of tolerance between government and people is higher, and we should say farewell to the era of “non-argument”.

---

6 These colloquialisms mean to engage in political intimidation [打棍子], assassinate one’s character [扣帽子], and exploit another’s weaknesses [揪辮子].

7 Deng Xiaoping promoted a policy of “non-argument” for the resolution of domestic disputes.
Selected Media Coverage of General Liu’s Preface


Brief Biography of General 刘源 [Liu Yuan]
General Liu Yuan (1951-) is the current Political Commissar of the People’s Liberation Army (PLA) General Logistics Department and director of the Academy of Military Sciences. He is also a full member of the 17th CCP Central Committee. Liu Yuan’s father, 刘少奇 [Liu Shaoqi], was President of the People’s Republic of China under Mao until his purging and death during the Cultural Revolution. Under the Deng Xiaoping government, he was posthumously politically rehabilitated.

His ‘princeling’ son Liu Yuan became vice-mayor of Zhengzhou, the capital of Henan Province in 1985. In 1988 he was promoted to vice governor of Henan. Liu served in the People’s Armed Police for a number of years and achieved the rank of lieutenant general and became the vice political commissar in the PLA’s General Logistics Department in 2003. In 2005 he was promoted to political commissar. In 2007 he was selected as a member of the 17th Central Committee of the CCP, and in 2009 he was promoted to general. As aforementioned, Liu is the current Political Commissar of the PLA General Logistics Department and director of the Academy of Military Sciences.

In addition to coverage of the book preface translated herein, Liu is also known for his response to remarks in Taipei about an alleged plan to bomb the Three Gorges Dam in case of a Chinese attack by telling the media that a strike by Taiwan "will provoke a retaliation [against Taiwan]"

---

8 Headquartered in Beijing, the Academy of Military Sciences [军事科学院] is the highest-level research institute of the PLA. According to Dr. Bates Gill and Dr. James Mulvenon, "AMS researchers write reports for the military leadership, ghost-write speeches for top military leaders, and serve on temporary and permanent leading small groups as drafters of important documents like the Defence White Paper. The AMS also conducts analysis on foreign militaries, strategy and doctrine, and has consistently taken the lead role in the study of the future of warfare.” [Bates Gill and James Mulvenon. "Chinese Military-Related Think Tanks and Research Institutions", *China Quarterly* (September 2002), 171.]
that will ‘blot out the sky and cover up the earth.’” Additionally, in 2009 Russell Hsiao cited Taiwanese media in naming Liu Yuan as the leader of the 少壮派 [“Young Turks faction”] in the PLA, consisting of realists, nationalists, and foreign policy hardliners. Liu’s ideas on domestic politics have been associated with those of Zhang Musheng.

Brief Biography of 张木生 [Zhang Musheng]

Zhang Musheng (4 April 1948- ), a retired CCP official, is a prominent intellectual and expert on rural development. In the 1960s, his book [The Problem Facing Chinese Peasants—Research Concerning the Socialist System] became very influential; however, during the Cultural Revolution he was labeled a “counter-revolutionary” and imprisoned. After rehabilitation, he became a leading Chinese expert on rural and agricultural development.

In his retirement from official posts, Zhang Musheng is an influential author. Notable works include his 2007 book Transcending the Political Left and Right [and] Speaking the Truth and the 2010 work Changing Our View of Culture and History: Reading Li Ling and Reflecting on the Fate of the Nation.

Standing apart from the neo-Maoist “left” and the pro-reform “right”, Zhang and his ideas have been seen by some observers as emblematic of a political force promoting the cessation of Deng’s policy of CCP “non-argument” for the resolution of domestic disputes. Facing mounting economic, social, and political “contradictions”, Zhang favors the adoption of “new democracy to save the Chinese Communist Party” (新民主主义救中共). “Only the Chinese Communist Party can save China; only new democracy can save the Chinese Communist Party.”

Zhang Musheng poses for a photograph with his new book at his Beijing office.
Translation of Preface

Read Zhang Musheng’s Book Changing Our View of Culture and History - Preface

Academy of Military Science, Liu Yuan

I always proceed slowly and deliberately whenever I read Musheng’s works, savoring and digesting what he has to say. And when I put down this book my head was awash with myriad thoughts; I am deeply affected by this book!

Time and time again, Musheng has requested that I write a preface for his book. The request undoubtedly reflects a great measure of thoughtfulness and respect on his part, yet it feels as if he is deliberately trying to make a fool out of me. Can I forcefully reject his request? To do so would be too disrespectful. I dare not; my heart is not willing to reject him. But can I just accede to his request? Doing so will be akin to “playing with swords before the presence of Guangong”\(^\text{16}\); I might as well just destroy myself! As a result, I feel deeply apprehensive.

In 2007, I acceded to Musheng’s request and wrote a 1000-word foreword for his book \textit{超越左 右说实话} [Transcending the Political Left and Right \& Speaking the Truth]. I have pasted the foreword that I wrote previously with this preface—I have become lazy and I haven’t touched my pen in a while, and I have exhausted all my thoughts. But in doing so, I have saved some ink and some effort, and the reader may find it convenient that he can read the foreword here too:

“At the start, it was Du Runsheng [杜润生]\(^\text{17}\) who said that when people from the Mainland go to Tibet for work, it is best that they establish reliable connections with the army. Not only is this step necessary in a materialist culture and for the safety of society, but also because the army is much more efficient when it comes to matters of security. I had transferred a hydropower security force from the People’s Armed Police, and it just happened to be in Tibet constructing several units of hydro-power plants there. As such, Du wired me requesting an escort for Zhang Musheng.

I am no stranger to Zhang Musheng. In 1965, three years before large numbers of educated youths were sent to countryside, Zhang—acting in accordance with his

\(^{15}\) 張木生 [Zhang Musheng], \textit{改造我们的文化历史观: 读李零, 思国运} [Changing Our View of Culture and History: Reading Li Ling and Reflecting on the Fate of the Nation], (香港) [Hong Kong]: \textit{大風出版社} [Strong Wind Press], 2010), http://www.strongwindpress.com/product/9789881838049.aspx.

N.B. Although \textit{改造} is usually translated as “transform”, the translated book title into English using “changing” has become more popular when discussing this book, hence the current translation. [Although Delex has labored to provide an accurate translation, this document does not constitute a certified translation. See Appendix A for the Chinese book preface.]

\(^{16}\) This expression means to overreach as a result of overestimating one’s abilities.

\(^{17}\) Du Runsheng [杜润生] is a noted CCP economist and agricultural expert who has held positions on the Central Committee.
own theories and beliefs—‘went down to the countryside’. Zhang was therefore the first to be exposed to the Marxist principle of “linking theory with practice”, and he is one of the earliest forerunners and independent thinkers to explore socialism. During the early stages of the Cultural Revolution, Zhang Musheng became very well-known everywhere: an essay titled “The Problem Facing Chinese Peasants—Research Concerning the Socialist System” had been copied and distributed everywhere. Back then, the villages were organized into the People’s Communes, and they were poor and backward with many civilians facing starvation. Applying Marxist-Leninist principles and Mao Zedong thought to confront reality, Zhang suggested many original opinions and triggered a great deal of thought among his readers. For that, however, he was labeled as a “counter-revolutionary” and imprisoned. After the Cultural Revolution, Zhang Musheng returned from Inner Mongolia and became involved with researching development problems concerning the organization of agricultural communities. He also launched an extensive investigation into the fixing of farm quota outputs. He also participated in several grass-root discussions on the Party Central Committee’s “No. 1 documents” on agricultural production, where he became widely known as a “seasoned marksman” on Marxist-Leninist thought among party circles. When I was a mayor and a head commissioner in the Henan province, Zhang was employed by the PRC State Council Research Institution. I had long considered it to be an honor if I could meet Zhang Musheng; having had the opportunity to interact with him, I respect his talents even more.

Zhang Musheng is an upstanding person, whereas I am unknown. But Du didn’t care about such things. He had us promptly brought under his wing and then recognized us as his students/followers.

It was at my master’s urging that I escorted Zhang Musheng into Tibet. It was in Lhasa where we connected and got to know each other for the first time. Heading out of Lhasa, I escorted him to the town of Nagchu, 4,500 meters above sea level, to take up the post of Secretary for the Prefectural Party Committee. But even before he arrived at his post, he was reassigned to be a commissioner of the Nyingchi prefecture. Without missing a beat, I accompanied Zhang Musheng to the Ba Yi area. Our close association therefore started up in the summer of 1993, where both of us – two individuals from Beijing who shared the same desire to accomplish something on the southernmost frontiers of our country and in difficult and tough circumstances – talked about our work and discussed learning, theory, and life. There, we saw each other day in and day out, and we became very close to each other. There, we were both awed by the most majestic natural vistas in the world, our minds fighting at the limits of their endurance…

18 “Seasoned marksman” is used to mean expert.
Two years later, because of many complicated factors, Zhang Musheng stepped down and returned to the capital to manage the magazine belonging to the State Revenue Service. In a few years, he took a publication that was in deep debt and financial trouble and transformed it into the nation’s largest financial periodical. However, though he was at a different post, Zhang Musheng continued to persist in his faith in the original intentions of the Communist Party members, as well as in the fundamental principles of Marxist-Leninist thought. He never stopped thinking deeply about the path of socialism that China had embarked on.

As it has been said, “when one is an officer of the imperial court, one constantly thinks about improving the lives of the people. And even if one is exiled from the court, one still cares and works for the ruler and the people.”

This little booklet brings together all the investigations he undertook in the last several years. It looks at government behavior and conduct from the standpoint of the state revenue system.

It may be difficult to discuss ideas such as the revitalization of the Chinese nation and the path of socialism. It may not be easy putting these ideas into practice. But ever since the Communist Party seized and wielded political power, the sole measure of its success is in how it serves the people and the majority. And both feet must be planted firmly on the ground if these ideas are to be put into practice. As is evident from the tax periodical to the taxation system, and to examining the governance for the people, Zhang Musheng has an ability to grasp the bigger picture from paying attention to the details/individual components.

In Beijing, we had the chance to meet and ‘shoot the breeze’ together. When I briefly summarize Zhang’s views, I use only two sentences to do so, and I use it as a jest because Zhang and I know each other so well that we dispense with politeness: 1] : To stand firmly “on the position of the Boxers”; never to become a conquered people, never to be persecuted for a second time again. [2]: To walk the “path of the Eight-Nation Alliance”\(^\text{19}\); never forgetting the promises and dreams we made during our imprisonment in prison, and wishing that our country will become strong. According to Zhang, given that there is no dilemma requiring us to choose between either relying on the “Eight Nation Alliance” or the “Boxers”, then there is also no need to choose between being bitter and confused or pretentious.

What Zhang is urging is this: we have to construct a system in a concrete and methodical manner, rather than with sensational political slogans.

What is so brilliant about Zhang is that he has transcended the “new left” and the “old right”, and has risen above the “mainstream” and the “non-mainstream”. He returns to the past and observes the beginning and determines the most crucial

\(^{19}\) Liu Yuan refers to the joint foreign expedition that intervened in China during the Boxer Rebellion.
principles; likewise, the new modern age must first be defined clearly before it can be definitively fixed/managed.

The scholar officials of China’s past believed that “they must first cultivate virtue among themselves, in order that they may manage their household well, in order that they may govern their country well, in order that peace lasts throughout the realm.”20 They are a rich source of knowledge and wisdom.

From the time that he was a teenager when the essay <中国农民问题> [“The Problem Facing Chinese Peasants”] linked theory to practice, and from the 1980s when he launched an investigation into the reforms on the fixing of farm quota outputs, and from the foot of the Himalayas to the riverbank of Tibet, to the magazine press at the State Revenue Service, Zhang Musheng has been vocal in his views, admonishing without fear of breaching decorum, writing books out of a concern for the country, and remembering the fact that dangers even though they once may have disappeared.

Regardless of whether they are government officials or not, or whether they are senior or junior officials, the members of the Communist Party have persisted with the fundamental principles of Marxist-Leninist thought. Their jobs and their probing of Chinese socialist theory are one and the same, always steadfast and inalienable!”

I have read this book and studied 超越左右说实话 [Transcending the Political Left and Right [and] Speaking the Truth]. To “read” is to “speak”, and to read deeply is as having honest words. To read well is to speak the truth.21 To “investigate the starting point, and determine the most crucial principles” is to “transcend both the left and the right”. To “first define clearly, before definitively managing” our modern age, is also the main theme of this book.

**Changing Our View of Culture and History**

Why should we change our view of culture and history?

1. **Understanding War**

Several years ago, a famous television station show conducted a commentary on Wei Wei’s famous publication 谁是最可爱的人 [Who Are the Most Lovely People?]22. The host and the guest had condemned the PLA volunteer army’s slaughter of young American soldiers, saying that the Chinese are too barbarous. Their comments matched up with a “universal value” or belief that something which is “Communist” is associated with “terror.”

---

20 This is an ancient Chinese saying.
21 The sentences in this section cannot be precisely translated as the author is engaged in a play of words.
22 谁是最可爱的人 [Who Are the Most Lovely People?], published 11 April 1951 in 人民日报 [People’s Daily], is 魏巍 [WeiWei’s] propagandistic reportage after returning from the Korean War.
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The show generated a great hue and cry from voices outside the mainstream media in China. Surprisingly, the mainstream media sat there, unmoving in silence, mute in anger and swallowing what voice it had.

Today, too many self-proclaimed “peace activists” say they oppose war (with the exception of wars against anti-Communist forces and against terror)! Accordingly, they scorn military power and vilify the soldiery.

Nobody will disagree with the statement that one should oppose man killing each other.

This is especially so in China; where advanced and sophisticated ideas are years ahead of their time, and yet the more backward ideas are truly backward in every sense of the word.

Take as an example a slaughterhouse that happens to apply ‘humane principles’ to the killing of livestock. In order to grant the livestock a humane/merciful death, we administer an electric shock to the animal before we shed its blood with a knife. But while we consider such methods to be ‘humane’, we nonetheless feel that we are fooling ourselves. We feel fooled because even though we do not dare readily subscribe to the humaneness of such methods when dealing with livestock, there is little else we can say or do about it. Worse, in trying to apply ‘humane principles’ to a wider world that follows the ‘principles of the beasts’, we may unconsciously end up entrapped within a state of mind where we believe in a zero-sum game waged between different classes. It is a state of mind which we may never extract ourselves from.

Likewise, those who proclaim that they are the most anti-war and the most anti-violence may end up fighting to the death over clothing, food, places to live, jobs, mates, etc.

War is the product of man’s desires; if man’s desires cannot be destroyed, war too can never be eliminated.

Everyone fears war and hates war, but no one can escape from or hide from war.

And this simple reality crystallizes the fact that military culture is the oldest and most important source of wisdom belonging to mankind.

In writing this, I have no intention to criticize those arts or parts of our culture that seek to ridicule war—since our culture is so large and rich, there will always invariably be such views!

I only want to say that war and the participants in war are too glamorous! Too great and mighty! Too painful! Too profound! We are not permitted to show disrespect! We are sufficiently mature individuals, and we should be adopting a respectful and humble attitude, and adhere to propriety.
On those lines, however, we become helpless because we are ignorant of the world around us. We do not know how to distinguish between good and evil. But to know what is evil and to do what is good—while not easy to do so—is worthy of respect!

Many people will never understand the maxim that “war is about preparing and maintaining troops.” It is an ancient and universal maxim! But troops are never maintained solely for the purposes for war.

Armies specialize in violence, but that does not mean that soldiers revere violence. Quite the opposite, because man has but one life to give, because his heart is made of flesh, because he has an innate desire to preserve his own life that grows from an instinctive fear of death, and because the soldier faces the prospect of slaughter, it is the soldier who—deep inside himself—abhors violence the most.

This is why all soldiers around the world claim that they “revere peace”! China is no different. Since ancient times, China has believed that “all virtuous soldiers do not resort to arms” and “wanton slaughter is immoral”. Indeed, China’s ‘un-warlike’ military strategy of “achieving total victory without combat and without military casualties” has spread around and benefited the world.  

Sun Tzu said: “One must assess the advantages to be wrought before committing to war.” Carl von Clausewitz said: “war is the continuation of politics.” To put what they have said in simple words: war is put into the service of economic and political goals; it is a refined method of accomplishing those goals. These reflections are correct! However, it would be a huge error to conclude—on the basis of what they have said—that the army is also a vulgar, unrefined tool!

War is a savage and cruel demon that leaves corpses in its wake; it is something to be avoided at all costs. When war is waged, the lives of people, the survival of races, the fate of nations and even the destruction of mankind all lie at the stake. When all these are at stake, what meaning is there to politics, economics, culture and philosophy—for they are all ultimately but creations of man.

As war can destroy nations and peoples, it is never treated as a ‘typical’ method through which we accomplish things. War engulfs everything once it has been started. War transforms itself into a nexus in which everything revolves around and is bound to it.

How can armies be simply viewed as a mere tool when they grant one an incredible power to build or destroy? When one resorts to arms, one holds power over life and death, one will rule through a regime of bloodshed, one will forever be a conqueror.

To conquer is, namely, to tame/acclimatize. The fact that man tames his fellow man lies at the heart of all civilization, and man has already begun to do so from the moment he can

---

23 Liu Yuan includes a footnote describing his deep understanding of the world impact of Chinese ancient and modern military science through his part-time involvement in the Chinese Art of War Association.
crawl, and before he has even learnt how to tame animals and plants. Human society has evolved on this same path for generations, and as such this path is associated with and is inseparable from war. No matter where we come from or how we came to be, we all walk this same path; men are not doves.

There are many examples highlighting the fact that we know little about war even though we pretend to know a great deal about it. To use one example: we may assert that killing people is not a good thing. Yet most will agree that it is permissible to kill those people who are bad/evil.

Now take the example one step further: we assert that it is not a good thing to kill and take a life; some will even vehemently object to such acts. However, who can truly escape from the act of taking a life? No one—and this includes those who practice the Catholic faith, which preaches the doctrine of ‘turn the other cheek’, or those who have sworn off meat. For everyone must take medicine to treat their illnesses, in doing so they kill off the bacteria and germs. Everyone has to eat, wear, live, and walk. Can life not also be found in our fruits, vegetables, silkworms, and the animals from which we derive fur? Man could not have survived to the present if he did not consume life!

Regrettably, man would not have survived to the present if war did not exist.

War is the organized slaughter (of one’s enemies) on a grand scale. It is about intentionally and deliberately fighting against one’s enemies. No matter how advanced technology is, or how ‘smart’ the weapons are, the opponents we face in war are still humans, and those who kill and who are killed are still humans.

People living in the West are fond of concealing facts and truths; they will assert that the ‘enemy’ is not ‘human’, that ‘killing the enemy’ is not the same as ‘killing humans’. In Afghanistan and Iraq, the West may mourn the thousands of their own which they lost; but they could care less about killing several hundred thousand of the opposing side. America did not even blink when millions of Vietnamese and Koreans died; tens and hundreds of millions of Native Americans and Africans were forced from their homes, slaughtered, sold into servitude and mistreated. “Much death has occurred since the very beginning with bleached bones strewn throughout the wilderness.” Who accounted for them? Who felt hurt for them?

Apparently, Franklin Roosevelt said the following about Nicaraguan dictator Anastasio Somoza Garcia: “Somoza may be a son of a bitch, but he’s our son of a bitch.” When one understands this quote, then one can appreciate the notion of retaliation: the notion of using my ‘righteous power’ to combat your unrighteousness, to the point where I will pit my life against yours, and exchange my own worthless life for the one which you so cherish. To the point where, instead of spending time targeting your leadership at the top, I will blow up your mothers and children. To the point where I will crash planes into your buildings and send suicide bombers onto the streets.

---

24 This is a quote from an ancient Tang poem.
And those who employ such retaliatory tactics are also fond of concealing the facts and truths: These ‘tactics’ do not consider ‘killing the enemy’ the same as ‘killing humans’. People who employ these tactics consider human lives as mere currency in a sort of game. And these tactics generate—and have generated—much grief and hatred that lasts for generations to come.

It is astonishing that victories and defeats can be treated like wagers on a bet. It is difficult to tell the difference between an accomplished general and a rogue/idiot, regardless of whether they serve good or evil. For all will forget about being virtuous in the face of gain, or forget about danger in the face of gain, or that in seeking glory they will only end up with disgrace. Napoleon fled when he was defeated, yet Bin Laden can feel smug and self-assured. This goes to show that no one should be mocking anyone.

Everyone will admit that war is savage, dangerous, and horrible

The power of morality/ethics is incredibly weak compared to the incredible power of military force. During war, distasteful activities such as espionage and assassinations are regarded as proper ways of waging war, while hijackings/abductions and bribery/treachery are normal occurrences in war.

The objectives of war may be the extremely noble, but the means of achieving them are the most despicable: nuclear missiles, chemical warfare, biological warfare are part of war. Man will defraud, cheat, kidnap, lie, scheme, deceive, and steal in war. Armies will employ such means when they wage war; these means are the great ravagers of life and the destroyers of civilization.

It is the soldier who remains the most honest; he never deceives himself; the talented do not need to deceive, but can still adhere to Sun Tzu’s principle of gaining a victory through deception.

A lot of people have perhaps failed to realize that the history of human civilization is frequently drawn, in stages, from the cruelest and most tragic wars.

The nation-state is a powerful apparatus molded together from violence. History is full of blood and slaughter, and war often marks the beginning of the rise of new civilizations and cultures.

Life and death are interrelated with one another. It is difficult to explain to people this fact: that our epoch-defining history, civilizations and culture, so gloriously attained, in fact derives from the use of what everyone would recognize as violent methods and terror.25

The new China has been removed from war for the last several decades. Quite frankly, China’s soldiers find it hard to comprehend the horrors of war, and they simply accept many

---

25 Liu includes a footnote stating “China’s modern history is delineated by the evil of the Opium War.”
preposterous misconceptions of war without any further inquiry on their part. On the contrary, it is instead the Chinese people (civilians) that still remember and fear war.

What amazes me is the fact that Zhang Musheng, Li Ling, Zhu Xiaojian, and Yang Songlin are all not part of the military establishment. Yet these extraordinary men have the ability to show us the real face/nature of war and work it into a narrative of mankind’s development through history. This piece of work is brilliant and inspiring. Every sentence is precise. Every word is carefully selected. The references to world affairs are impeccable. The logic and arguments are sound. It is an elegant piece of literature, and of practical use to those in the military!

Historically, those who serve in the military may not have necessarily served as soldiers on the front. Numerous examples exist, in both China and abroad, of famous generals, military strategists, and great tacticians who have never been soldiers, and who have never gone through military service. We do not need to look far for one such typical example: Of the “five great leaders” that helped established the PRC, with the exception of Zhu De, the other four have never been soldiers! Yet all of them were accomplished men in both peace and war, and led millions of soldiers, and were illustrious military leaders.

We once adhered to a grand belief: that up until the present, the history of all human civilization is defined in terms of a class struggle. In the present, however, we no longer see history in Marxist terms; instead it is absolutely correct to say that the history of human civilization is a history of humans waging war against each other! When one reads the ancient/historical texts, one will then see that they are telling a tale of human struggle against heaven, nature, and each other. I posit this: shouldn’t any historical narrative that purports to narrate a ‘unity of opposites’ or a history of struggle and unification ought to be more comprehensive?

But regardless of which historical narrative one picks, the starkest and highest manifestation of our human history appears in the form of war!

War, “a large national affair”, is inseparable from the history of civilization or the history of culture!

And those who will be commanding troops—and who decide upon matters concerning the fate of individuals and nations—must make a serious effort to study and understand war! For an enormous cost will be extracted out from even the smallest degree of indifference and apathy towards war.

Therefore, should we not make a serious effort to examine and evaluate our view of culture and history?

26 The “five great leaders” that helped establish the PRC during Mao’s Era. Zhu De, founder of the Chinese Red Army (the PLA’s forerunner), was one of those leaders.
2. Understanding history

We experience a great deal of emotion whenever we sing the words “My ancestral country, my ancestral country, my dear motherland!”27 Singing those words is one of the most common methods in which we praise our country. But upon a closer inspection, the root of these words [in Chinese] are not without a certain fault: The character “ancestral” in Chinese derives from the adoration of the male gender. Strictly speaking, the correct version of the song should therefore be “My ancestral country, my ancestral country, my dear fatherland!”

Certainly, one example does not limit our view on culture and history, but a minute example can illustrate a far more significant principle at stake.

Marxist theory on historical materialism divides human development into five successive stages. But for the last several decades, Chinese historical perspectives have faced no greater problem than in trying to reconcile and fit the course of Chinese history with the middle stage of Marx’s theory on historical materialism. Namely, because it was a “slave society lacking in slaves” (there is little evidence that China practiced a system of slavery), and because it was a “feudal society that lacked elements of feudalism” (the Chinese feudal system lacked the main components of a feudal system as defined by Marx).

A unique aspect of China’s history is the ‘large scale unification’ of the country into a single political entity.

The Western Zhou and the Qin dynasty are two of the earliest instances of the ‘large scale unification’ taking place.

The Western Zhou dynasty is the classical example of Chinese feudal society, but there is no example of a Chinese slave society, and there is no record of widespread use of slavery as can be found in America. Our recorded history indicates that in Chinese history, Chinese society went through periods where it had a “post-slavery society”.28 How can it be? Is it possible that there was a society with few or no instances of slavery?

Feudalism during the Western Zhou period oversaw the reorganization of the country’s population on a large scale for the first time. The brand of feudalism practiced under the Western Zhou was markedly different from European feudalism, where the population lived in small communities, divided across many different, small kingdoms.29 In dealing with peoples from various nations, China adopted a policy of gentle diplomacy and a belief that “those who live on the four seas are one family”30 and “those living within the four seas are all brothers.”31 Confucius had said: “rebuild a fallen nation, restore a vanquished people, promote forgotten

---

27 These are the lyrics of a famous patriotic song.
28 Liu Yuan includes a footnote to explain, “There are theories that Chinese society went through slave society, and therefore there was a post-slavery era, which encompassed the time periods ruled by the Western Zhou, Spring Autumn Period, the Qin, Han, Wei, etc.”
29 Naturally, there were other differences between feudalism in the Western Zhou and Europe.
30 This phrase means all nations are all one family.
31 This phrase means all the peoples of the world are brothers to each other.
talents.”

In fusing with and intermarrying with various non-Han races, Han and non-Han become bound by ties of blood, and the Zhou dynasty was able to keep the country united.

During the Spring and Autumn period, these practices collapsed. It was a period where people breached the limitations of their authority and seceded from the system, and where individuals could win titles via military accomplishments instead.

Yet the way in which the ‘large scale unification’ of China was achieved under Qin Shi Huang was different from that of the Zhou’s method. Instead of relying on the forging of ‘warm’ bonds, blood ties, and relations, the Qin relied on the imposition of an ‘unfeeling’ legal system and standard.

When Qin Shi Huang abolished the Zhou and established the Qin dynasty as the successor, he suspended the feudal system and created a ‘unified system’: he eliminated the practice of communal land (among the farmers), opened up roads and pathways, abolished the position of the feudal prince and established the county/provincial government in its stead. He standardized the written script, the legal system, the system of weights, and the length of the axles of carts. He employed a huge bureaucracy of officials to administer the country. The “Qin National Highway”—a road of the highest quality—linked the capital to the country, while the “Qin Direct Road” was constructed as a high-speed highway used for war. Such great feats cannot be erased or forgotten; China led the world then in terms of technological feats. Tragically, Qin Shi Huang also committed many heinous acts: he burnt a great many books in order to unify the science and arts, and he buried-alive a great many scholars in an attempt to pacify them. These efforts were unsuccessful, as he was accused of overthrowing the natural order of things.

The Han dynasty overthrew the Qin dynasty, but while the Han dynasty essentially retained the Qin system, it adopted a range of subtle measures to regain and solidify the allegiance of the people. Under the Han, the intelligentsia set out to govern the country in accordance with Confucian principles. Scholars were respected again. Confucianism was given due prominence. Such measures—regarded as the hallmarks of virtuous rule—replaced the unsustainable, realist practices of the Qin, and to positive effect too. The Han re-established the rites and ceremonies, and engaged the in various religious practices and ancestor worship. Such rites—which utilized the deceased to control the living—were very ingenious methods of governance.

Chinese history is the “large scale-unification” of an empire. “Large” refers to the size of the national boundaries. “Unification” refers to the unification of the political system, unification of the system of government and the unification of culture. This phenomenon has lasted for 2,200 years and is unprecedented in the world.

Wang Xiaiqiang once did an overview on ancient China’s sophisticated currency, remittances, paper currency, exchange of goods, and capitalist economy … it is an important publication full of historical facts! He grouped together the economic systems that came after the Qin and Han

32 Confucius said do these things in order to secure the allegiance of your people.
33 The Qin dynasty marked the end of the Spring and Autumn period.
34 王小强 [Wang Xiaiqiang] is a notable and popular economist.
dynasties for the next two thousand years and identified them as a ‘small agrarian economy with market features.’ He believed that this was completely different from the Western feudal model—which had large scale agrarian development and self-sufficiency—and that the Chinese model was far more advanced than the European feudal model. Regardless of how one evaluates Wang’s analysis, his analysis is creative (which is followed by Yang Songlin’s passionate dispute of Wang’s analysis, which can be found on the Internet\(^3\)), and it is an important foray into China’s cultural history.

Regardless of whether we resort to the European standard or the Chinese historical debate, the Qin and Han dynasties—the equivalent of the French Sun King’s centralized, autocratic state—should be recognized as belonging to the stage preceding the capitalist stage under Marxist history. Henry Kissinger also said that the unification of China preceded the unification of Europe by over two thousand years. And even though the dynasties that succeeded the Qin and Han dynasties—the Wei, Jin, and Northern and Southern dynasties—saw a periodic return to feudalism, feudalism in Chinese society was rapidly weakening, and the foundations of the “large scale unification” of China were already laid.

Though the Qin, Han, Sui, Tang, Song, Yuan, Ming, and Qing were originally seen as the successor to the feudal system, the dynasties were classified as a “mature feudal society” under the Marxist theory of history. But if we adopt the Marxist view, won’t there then be a situation where we have a “feudal system that lacked aspects of feudalism”

The “large scale unification” of China took place with the purpose of abolishing feudalism and with the belief “even kings and princes are born men.” Yet Marxist theory asserts that “large scale unification of the feudal system” took place—is this not a farce?

The advantages that resulted from the “large scale unification” of China outweighed any disadvantages, and every advantage comes with a disadvantage. A civilization can become decayed and conceited, and an advanced state of civilization can bring about an advanced state of decay. “Those who treat well will be well-treated, and those who oppress shall be punished.” [During the Cultural Revolution, Mao told students that] there is “merit to rebellion”, and those who employ violence will easily become violent!

Mao seemed to have said at one point that credit for a regime change must go to the peasants who rose up in rebellion. And as far as the “large scale unification” of China was made possible, credit must be given to the various tribes in the east, west, north, and south; if not for such pressure on the borders, and if not for the power to deal with the tribes, there would be no China.

Forgive me for bringing up the issues of war and military power again, including issues such as the challenges posed by the nomadic tribes, the suppression of unquenchable ‘wildfires’ within the border, the settlement of religious and political intrigue, dealing with invasions, looting,

rebellion, violence, betrayals, uprisings—these issues are relentless and unceasing. Barbarian tribes launch invasions, the peasantry launches uprisings—all these are incessant! The power to unify China derives from a never-ending series of campaigns. All know the damage that is caused, but all do not know that the resulting benefits are huge! It is war that created the “large scale unification” of China!

If war is not waged, how can unification occur? If one does not resort to arms, how can there be the union of nations, the union of races, the union of cultures, and the union of the North and South be achieved?

History is a river of blood and tears that flows for all of time; the history of the Chinese people still forms, grows, and ends in this same river, and it is a history formed by different races coming and fusing together.

The fusion of war and military power has influenced China’s “culture of peace and harmony”: from principles such as “the careful study of war”, to “the avoidance of war”, to “total victory”, “to engage in war to accelerate/achieve peace”, “to be different yet co-exist peacefully”, and “to know peace and therefore live in peace”… such notions sufficiently reflect the dialectical relationship between war and peace, and together they create a theory of war unique only to China and respected throughout the world.

Foreigners often do not seem to understand our notions of “harmony”, “peaceful relations”, and “peace”; they say that the notions lack clarity. But to any Chinese individual, the notion that “peace is precious” is ingrained in the mind and the heart; it is a concrete notion long infused in one’s body and spirit, and has become the guiding spirit of the Chinese people!

As such, it is not shocking to state that war is honored as a milestone bringing about history, civilization, and culture!

The other unique aspect of Chinese history is the clash and mergers of the Northwest against the Southeast [regions of the country], as well as the clash between the nomadic and agricultural cultures. With the exception of the Shang dynasty, which was established in the east and which destroyed the Xia dynasty, and Zhu Yuanzhang launching the northern expedition to oust the Yuan, Chinese history has always been one where the northwestern “wolves” and the northeastern “tigers” assailed the southeast to seize the imperial throne, thus seizing control of the realm. Examples of the Northwest subduing the Southeast include: the Zhou overcoming the Shang, the Qin kingdom destroying the other six kingdoms, the founder of the Shu Han dynasty coming from a western province, Sui and Tang forces gathering for the first time in the mountain passes of Gansu, the volatile period of the Three Kingdoms, the period of the Northern Dynasties, the Five Dynasties and Ten Kingdoms period, the Western Xia, the Khitans,

---

36 This is in reference to China’s North and South.
37 Zhu Yuanzhang was the first emperor of the Ming dynasty.
38 The Yuan Dynasty was a ruling dynasty founded by Mongol leader Kublai Khan.
39 This took place during the Spring and Autumn Period.
40 Gansu is a province in northwest China.
the Jurchens, the Yuan, Zhu Di\textsuperscript{41}, and even Li Zicheng\textsuperscript{42}. All of them came from the west or the north, and they subdued the Southeast. The Manchus\textsuperscript{43} are a northern tribe. Even Mao, in his quest to unite China, made his first strike from Yanan\textsuperscript{44}, and Liu Shaoqi\textsuperscript{45} was able to seize the Northeast after retracing the invasion route of the Manchu armies into China. How did all of these accomplishments come about?

Apparently, the western and northern powers enjoyed an advantage. Horses are deeply embedded in their culture, which allowed them to sweep—like a sudden “cold snap” or a current flowing from a “high-pressure area”—horizontally across the Southeast. Sima Qian once said, “all things begin in the east, and reach their prime in the west. Those who wish to rise up to achieve greatness start off in the southeast, and frequently accomplish them in the northwest.”

Ancient China was remarkably modern, and its unique geography created a unique and large country. Ancient China was made up of different peoples and the Han people are the product of the union of many other different peoples. People from different regions—the east or west—mingled and live together in a huge, swirling, melting pot. The uniting factor was not ethnicity, but culture. [As the saying goes,] “there is a part of me in you, and a part of you in me.” Chen Yinke\textsuperscript{46} once said, “[concerning] the difference between the Han people and the people in the north […] culture is much more important than bloodlines […] those who adopt Han customs are Han people, and those who adopt the customs of the north are the people of the north […] regardless of their bloodline.”

Indeed, the peoples of Asia can be said to belong to one family; one is created out of many as cultures fuse together—a fusion that is still in progress today.

There has never been a unifying religion in China; everyone was free to follow his own faith and religion as long as they did not revolt. Without any religious wars, the probability of a foreign invasion, compared to the West, was minor. The Chinese script has been passed down to generations in an broken chain for eons, and no part of Chinese civilization has ever been lost to history—a unique fact that cannot be found anywhere else in the world.

The West has a classic perception on the contrast between East and West: the West is democratic, while the East is autocratic. But this perception is biased. Throughout history, the West has been divided into many fractious groups that have only been united in recent times.

\textsuperscript{41} Zhu Di was the first Ming emperor.
\textsuperscript{42} Li Zicheng was the rebel leader who overthrew the Ming dynasty and briefly ruled before the Qing dynasty was established.
\textsuperscript{43} The Manchus are a northern tribe that established the Qing dynasty.
\textsuperscript{44} Yanan is a city in Shaanxi province near the endpoint of the Long March. Taken over by the Communists in 1936, the CCP celebrates Yanan as the birthplace of the Communist Revolution.
\textsuperscript{45} 刘少奇 [Liu Shaoqi] is the author’s, Liu Yuan’s, father. He was President of the People’s Republic of China from 27 April 1959 to 31 October 1968; at the time, he focused on economic reconstruction. During the Cultural Revolution, Mao viewed him as a threat to power, labeling him a ‘traitor’ and ‘Capitalist-roader’. After disappearing from public life, he died under poor treatment in 1969. Deng Xiaoping’s government politically rehabilitated him in 1980 with a state funeral.
\textsuperscript{46} 陈寅恪 [Chen Yinke] (1890-1969) was a Chinese Sinologist.
The West has been fractured far longer than it has been united, while we have been united for most of our history. As such, the West’s notion of “unity” allows for “confederations” and for “differences to exist within cooperation”, while our notion of “division” nevertheless contains a meaning that all are united by a “persistent system” of cultural and Confucian orthodoxy. Indeed, this system is durable and resilient: when the “barbarian” tribes in the West went down to the south, they retained and adopted barbarian customs, yet the barbarian tribes in the East ended up adopting Han customs. “As such, the Great Wall will never fall.”

Under the feudal system, the people and the territory of Europe were the private property of the leaders and kings. For more than two thousand years, the Han people have been their own masters; ownership of “the state” is associated “the people” and “the public”. In China, the ancient Confucian principle that “the people are supreme and their leaders are answerable to their welfare” has long been held as sacrosanct.

The confluence between Ancient China and modern China is at its closest point. The country is now united as one, and there are many diverse religions/beliefs; it is much more modern than America, a country of many different peoples united together.

In all of the world’s ancient societies, democracy represented primitiveness, while autocracy in fact represented advancement. This statement must also be examined.

The West has a tendency to look at our history in the context of its own experiences. But this analysis is confounding.

The West has always adopted “the mindset of small countries” to estimate “the intentions of large countries”. As great powers have shown for centuries, ideas such as having boundaries, borders, and nations united together are all recent concepts; for all the great countries throughout history, there has only been one answer/outcome: the division of one large entity into many smaller components. Taiwan, Tibet and Xinjiang are such small components that exist on each of China’s borders; and all of them seek to overthrow the status quo.

There are people who seek such divisions—and they attempt to do so either openly in public or secretly in private. The strong will do what they want while the weak do what they must, with the former relying as they do on the real, concrete power of imperialism and military might.

Li Ling opposes the use of the phrase “feudal autocracy” to denote a political system, because in Europe the converse of “autocracy” is “feudalism”, and both terms cannot be lumped together. While Musheng and I both understand Li Ling’s logic, we believe that the inconsistency between “feudalism” and “autocracy” is not very large in a Chinese context, and the phrase “feudal autocracy” cannot simply be cancelled out yet. Or else, if we cannot identify the system under Qin Shi Huang, the Sui Yang Emperor, Tang Taizhong, Empress Dowager Cixi, etc. as a feudal autocracy, what will we then call them? You must first find a synonym to replace the existing
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47 Liu Yuan is remarking on the durability of Chinese culture and identity, as the foreigners who invaded China gradually assimilated into its culture.

48 李零 [Li Ling] is a prominent Chinese sinologist.
term. Or—judging from a lack or reply—is Li Ling secretly just bickering with me? If these are two different issues, then we should not mix them together.

China’s feudal society—and by this one refers to the notion of feudalism, to feudal superstitions, to a system that is half-feudal and half-colonial—is conceptually different from western feudalism. Conceptually, it is also markedly different from the brand of feudalism as practiced by our ancestors. Often, things may receive the same label, but in fact mean different things entirely; the use of the word “feudalism” is neither accurate nor sufficient and as such, the word must be urgently replaced.

Take how we use the word “democracy”: today, the word is no longer used (as it once was) to draw a distinction or contrast with a “monarchy”. The West now widely regards monarchies such as the United Kingdom, Japan, and Thailand as “completely democratic countries”. Yet Nepal, which had just overthrown its monarch, is instead regarded as a “non-democratic autocracy”. But what is even more perplexing is this: even America, a country which is seen as having “patented” democracy, does not have a very precise definition of “democracy”. Some may define democracy in terms of the “three principles of the public square”; alternatively, we may define democracy as “the election of a master for the people”! Owing to such different ways of defining democracy, the notion needs to be urgently clarified.

Feudalism is an important political and historical concept, yet remarkably, it can be so poorly defined and understood. This is the same with the term “democracy”: it is a common term of our historical and political vocabulary, yet it remains so imprecise, muddled, and unclear!

Since all of us (including you and I) - want to “oppose feudalism” and “promote democracy!”, shouldn’t there therefore be a clear and unanimous standard and a common understanding of these terms?

At present, there are still many matters that require us to discern between what is true and false, because “no one seeks to understand the fundamental, sacred truths, yet everyone desires to follow the irrelevant and the fantastical.”

Should we not therefore return to our theoretical origins, clarify our definitions, and reconstruct and reshape our view of culture and history?

3. Understanding the Direction [Our Country is Taking]

Even in recent years, there are many people who import some new and novel “idea” from abroad. Without bothering to further expand on the idea’s contents and its practicality, these people proclaim it as the only successful example of a perfect ideal, and they enigmatically say, “the idea has never been ‘Sinofied.’”

49 The “three principles of the public square” are freedom of election, assembly, and speech.
50 This is a quote from an ancient Tang poem.
For a country such as China—with a large population, large territories, an ancient history, many issues to solve, and in the midst of development—an idea will doomed to failure unless it is modified, regardless of how successful it has been implemented in countries large or small, rich or poor. For even an idea put forward must first be translated into Chinese first, right?

If certain people wish to make such noise by implementing “democracy” (which has become a global trend), then one fears that such an “attempt to draw a tiger will instead lead to a dog being drawn.” Rather than trying to “use someone else’s stone to break jade”, why don’t we do the right and proper thing instead, and assertively promote the indigenous and tested “New Democracy” theory that was put forth by Chairman Mao and put into practice by Liu Shaoqi?

There are many illnesses that man cannot cure—much less those diseases that are incurable. When man suffers a serious illness, there is a frenzy to find any sort of doctor to treat the illness: if Western medicine is not effective, he will resort to Chinese medicine. And when Chinese medicine is powerless, he will resort to witchcraft. The tormented patient will therefore end up only finding himself going around in circles.

The road that the country has been walking down is full of twists and turns: the American, Japanese, and Soviet systems were rammed down China’s throat in their entirety. The Yugoslavian, Singaporean, and Hungarian models were treated as a sort of a quick-fix magic pill: shock therapy, color revolutions, dissolution, the changing of the flag … and other muck have been recommended to us like magic turtle soups. Musheng has drawn an analogy between China’s path and the Chinese myth about the Chinese Farmer God: that when the Farmer God tasted a thousand different types of grass on himself, he ultimately perished from food poisoning as a result.

Views on culture and history are like this too: modernization is sought when tradition fails, socialism is sought when capitalism fails to open doors, and when socialism hits a wall the search for tradition begins again, and the cycle keeps on revolving. Buddhism, Confucianism, Daoism, Legalism, Taoism … even the school of medicine, redology, and traditional schools of medicine and spiritual wellbeing are all partaking in the “fun” as well. They all sincerely profess that “not only can they save China, it can save the world as well!”

After 1840, China regressed behind capitalist civilizations. China was carved up and divided up by the Western powers in the same way that a large cake has to be cut up into pieces. Little Japan had the biggest ambition; it wanted to swallow China in one mouthful, [and] suffered the most tragic defeat.

---

51 Liu Yuan uses this phrase to mean China will only make a fool out of itself; its attempts to appear smart will instead end in failure.
52 Liu Yuan uses this phrase to mean borrowing foreign ideas to solve China’s internal problems will only lead to failure.
53 Liu Yuan means to say China should not experiment on itself.
54 This analogy extends the earlier analogy of the patient searching for a cure.
History has selected the Chinese Communist Party, and the great resurgence of the Chinese people [is such that] no matter how often they may be defeated and brought low, they will rise up and stand tall time and time again.

Over 30 years have passed since the implementation of Deng’s Reform and Openness policy, and economic reform has intuitively and automatically adjusted/merged with Mao’s New Democracy theory. This in turn has created an economic resurgence that is a miracle in this world. Yet people around the world say that while China is the “iron man/giant” of economic reform, it is still a dwarf in terms of social reform. We share a common consensus with government officials, cadres, scholars, and the media, in and out of the mainstream: we all oppose crony capitalism and we wish to solve the problems of inequality and corruption that exists in China.

The difference is in “how”. [To use an analogy:] the Hakka ethnic group could not resist taking a bold risk and comprehensively experimenting with the West’s “universal system”—despite the fact that the Eastern Soviet Bloc was facing imminent dissolution. The Tujia ethnic group wanted to revolt, having forgotten the fact that the “continuous revolution” of a socialist dictatorship is doomed to failure, and despite the fact that the group would end up endangering itself. My ethnic group [Han] believed/believes that economic and political reform can only be carried out correctly through tried and tested practices; and [thus] we should be guided by our own indigenous theories—that of “Socialism with Chinese Characteristics”.

China has advanced by leaps and bounds, yet it has also accumulated a great deal of internal contradictions along the way; as such we must guard against the enormous damage that can be caused by the extreme left, which can result from a coalition formed between the remnants of rebellious forces and young extreme nationalists. We must also be alert against the “explosive” consequences that may result from the far right, namely narrow-minded “nationalism” fusing with the mob violence. Our descendants must remain aware of examples such as the Cultural Revolution, Japanese fascism, and German fascism.

History is about the realistic description of the past, but it can never be completely real.

History is like a mirror; not only does it reflect the present, but it can illuminate the future to us as well!

On a secluded hill at the back of the Summer Palace in Beijing, Musheng asked:

“From the period of war to the period of construction—including the period of Reform and Openness up till the present—we always achieved victory and success whenever we sought “New Democracy” theory as a guiding point! And we always ran into problems whenever we did not adhere to the theory, whenever we made errors, or whenever we went off on a tangent. Can we make such a statement? What do you think?”

I can only sit there and silently think: within present society, “New Democracy” theory may well be the only thing that is capable of covering the “least common multiplier” created by the
combination of the “mainstream and non-mainstream”. It may well be the only thing that can bridge the gap regarding the “highest common factor” desired by “left and right [-wing political] theory”.

Although Musheng knew the answer, he still deliberately posed the question. I will take this opportunity to put Musheng’s question to the reader, and ask you to examine and think it over, and I welcome everyone’s response.

Is this not another pertinent issue that highlights the need for us to change our view of culture and history, and return to the drawing board?

Zhang Musheng, Wang Xiaoqiang, and others have distilled a great deal of the collective wisdom of many passionate individuals who bore witness to the last several decades. Among these individuals are the “counter-revolutionaries” that lived during the period when “China was sealed off from foreign contact”, as well as the “pioneers of liberation” during the “Two Whatevers” period. These individuals have been included, regardless of whether they faced hardship during the beginning of the Reform and Openness era, or whether they had constituted the “liberalizing” and “farseeing” elites [of that era].

At the turn of the century, these individuals accurately predicted the “bubble burst” and the “financial crises” that would be caused by the “new speculative economy”. They warned about the “challenges that are unprecedented in history” that we are facing today, the “three new mountains” and many other new problems as well, and they put forth a series of measures and strategies. Many of these have already been adopted, and they will also be validated in the future.

At every critical juncture, they stir/stirred up a whirlwind of thoughts—one that most people cannot hope to match.

Someone asked: since every aspect of daily life—with the exception of a pair of chopsticks—has been “Westernized” as far as the eye can see, what is the point of objecting to westernization? If this is truly “Westernization”, then no one will object. However, Joseph Needham once said that the majority of the world’s civilizations are built upon China’s ancient inventions and creations; China’s contribution to world civilization far surpasses that of any other country. Such a statement is commonly known throughout the world over, yet there are some people who label this phenomenon as “Sinoification”, and some even associate this phenomenon with talk that China is a threat!

Today, [Chinese] society is much more democratic, free, and open. There is almost no one who “beats with a stick, tags a cap, or pulls one’s queue” anymore.

55 The “three new mountains” are the social problems of healthcare, education, and housing.
56 British biochemist and China scholar Joseph Needham (1900-1995) initiated and edited a 27 volume series of books dealing with the history of science and technology in China titled Science and Civilization in China.
57 These colloquialisms mean to engage in political intimidation [打棍子], assassinate one’s character [扣帽子], and exploit another’s weaknesses [揪辮子].
There are many schools of thought, many different political views, and many multitudes of cultures that engage in heated and vigorous debate; they repeatedly clash with each other, then adjust and fuse with one another, resulting in a society that enjoys a more comprehensive and holistic mastery of the subject of debate.

In addition, the boundaries between social classes are blurry, human relationships are complicated, and differences are vague and overlapping. Even though there new contradictions that will present themselves, and which may be cause to incite, this does not mean that society will become one where “either you die or I live.”

Accordingly, the level of tolerance between government and people is higher, and we should say farewell to the era of “non-argument”.

And yet, the rapid spread of knowledge today will drown you. Television, the movies and the Internet will brainwash you. Power, wealth, food, and sex will tempt you … and it is so very difficult to persevere with the truth and correct your mistakes. But if one adheres strictly to the moderate path and attempts to “fire the bow with both hands”, one will certainly be unable identify with either side, and may offend people on either extremity, and may be held in ill regard by either side. It is not easy to transcend both the left and the right, and discard the mainstream and the non-mainstream!

At present, there are too many roads available for the country to choose, rather than a lack thereof. There are big streets and small alleyways, then there are crooked and straight paths, and then there are crisscrossed paths—a dizzying spectacle. As good as they look and sound, such roads lead to nowhere. Even if they become better, walking on such roads will take up too much time, and will be too difficult, and we will end up leaning on the side of the road!

Roads are made for people, and historically, choosing such a road has been a difficult problem. The only criterion should be: the delivery of practical results, in a good and swift manner, and scientific advancement!

The Chinese character for “speak” was used in [the title of Musheng’s] previous book, and the Chinese character for “read” is used in the present book. But regardless of whether we use the word “speak” or “read”, or whether we “return to original Marxist thought” or whether we do “change our view of culture and history”… the original intention of our revolution remains fundamentally the same: to fight for peace and for the liberation of the people! Our original objectives remain unchanged: to create a powerful country and a wealthy people in the service of the masses!

Chiang Kaishek once said: “The Communist Party never surrenders!”

58 Liu Yuan refers to a zero sum game.
59 Deng Xiaoping promoted a policy of “non-argument” for the resolution of domestic disputes.
60 左右開弓 [“To fire the bow with both hands”], this chengyu idiom means to hedge.
Most of what Chiang said is—ironically—quite erroneous. I love to hear those words, but I dare not say that they are correct. At the very least, I should reinterpret, amend, and explain what he said.

First, regardless of whether the Party never surrenders, the Communist Party has suffered an incalculable number of mistakes and defeats! If there are no mistakes and defeats, how is there a need to surrender! Yet what and who is there to surrender when the Party is disbanded, destroyed, gone? Chiang seems to be talking to himself here.61

Second, the fact that the Communist Party never surrenders does not mean that Communist Party members do not surrender. Truth be told, there have been many betrayals and defections on part of the Party’s General Secretaries, both outside and inside the country, in the past and in the present; there are so many betrayals that they cannot be listed individually here. Chiang’s statement seems rather bizarre!

Third, it can be said that “the Communist Party never surrenders”, because democracy exists within the Communist Party, and there are large numbers of loyal Communist cadres who are adept at reflection and evaluation: they will rectify the mistakes we make time and time again, and return to the crucial point in our history. These cadres strive to perfect the “principles for the liberation of the proletariat”, and return the party to the correct point of origin. They crawl from where defeat took place, and return the party to its actual starting point. They change the view of history culture and history, and return us to the aspirations that we all believe in.

Let us begin anew, and keep on fighting despite the challenges that lie in the way! “Be as tall as the mountains and as long as the rivers”; be lofty and bold!

As a situation becomes more difficult, bewildering, futile, and disappointing, the more it shall reveal a particular type of Party cadres: cadres who are independent, extraordinary “and who understand the relationship between nature and human society, and who grasp the linkages between the past and the present”62. In short, they are party cadres who refuse to surrender!

Zhang Musheng put in a great deal of effort when he penned the present book.

I earnestly recommend that you read Zhang Musheng’s book!

---

61 An interpretation of this paragraph is: the statement “the Communist Party never surrenders” is a logical fallacy because it cannot surrender if it is already destroyed first.

62 This is a quote by Sima Qian.
Appendix A: Book Preface in Chinese

The following appendix contains a copy of Liu Yuan’s book preface written in traditional Chinese, prepared by the CITIC Pacific Limited Economic Research Unit and posted on the Strong Wind Press website.

讀張木生
— 《改造我們的文化歷史觀》序言

軍事科学院 劉源

每讀木生書文，總要細嚼慢嚥，反覆品味；放下《我讀李零》，依然思緒萬千，感慨不盡！

他再三敦請作序，本是善意高抬，卻像蓄意拿我打鑐。堅決推辭吧？不恭、不敢、心又不甘；遂其所願呢？關公門前耍大刀，死定了不說，純屬自殘，還活該！為此，我五內焦慮。

2007年，遵木生囑，為《超越左右說實話》寫了篇千字前言。現將全文掛出湊數，足見我人懶筆拙、才思枯竭。好在，省些筆墨，也方便讀者：

起初，還是杜潤生杜老講的：內地人到西藏工作，最好要與軍隊建立可靠的聯繫，不僅為了物質文化和社會安全的需要，更由於在那裡，軍隊有較高的保障效率。我從河南調入的武警水電部隊，正巧在西藏承建幾座水電站。因此，杜老電令我，護送張木生。

對張木生，我並不陌生。1965年，在大批知識青年上山下鄉之前三年，他就為理想而到農村插隊，是最早用親身苦行的方式去理論聯繫實際的人，算最初以獨立苦思的方法來探尋社會主義道路

1 張木生：《改造我們的文化歷史觀 — 我讀李零》，（香港）大風出版社 2010年8月出版（http://www.strongwindpress.com/product/9789881838049.aspx）。
2 張木生：《超越左右說實話》，香港大風出版社 2007年。
的先行者之一。文化革命初期，张木生遐迩闻名，一篇《中国农民问题 — 關於社會主義體制的研究》长文，以多种手抄本的形式四处流传。當時，農村“一大二公”，貧窮落後，不少百姓挨餓。他用馬列主義、毛澤東思想面對實際，提出許多獨到的見解，引發讀者的思索，而這倒霉蛋兒自己則揹上“小反革命”罪狀，付出坐“大牢”的代價。文化革命結束，张木生從內蒙基層回來，參與組建農村發展問題研究組，發動縣縣包產到戶大調查，參加前幾個中共中央農村工作“一號文件”的起草討論，以“馬列槍法純熟”著稱園內。我在河南任鄉、縣長時，受聘為國務院發展研究中心研究員，對張木生，本來久仰其名，有機會接觸，更是欽慕其才。

他黃鐘，我瓦甓，杜老不挑不棄，統統拉到麾下，認作弟子。

遵師嘱，我引張木生入蔵。在拉薩，溝通一圓兒，結識一片；出拉薩，第一站送他到海拔4500米的那曲任地委書記，還未到職，又通知改任林芝地區專員。馬不停蹄，我迅即陪張木生趕往八一鎮。密切的交往，就始於1993年的那個夏天，兩個一心想幹點事情的北京人，遠在祖國西南邊陲，不懼艱苦環境，談工作，談學習，談理論，談人生，同醞促膝，不捨晝夜，被世上最為壯麗的美景震撼，拼胸中幾近極限的耐力抗爭……

兩年後，因爲種種複雜曲折，張木生掛冠而去，回京接手中國稅務雜誌社，幾年就把一個欠了一屁股債，連買紙錢都拿不出來的雜誌，辦成全國最大的財經期刊。然而，在不同的工作崗位上，張木生堅持共產黨員的初衷，堅持馬克思主義的基本原理，對中國社會主義道路的思索，一刻也沒有停止。

正可謂，時居廟堂，不愧忠智之士；或處江湖，常懷赤子之情。

這本小冊子，集中了他近年來從財稅制度角度對政府行為的探討。

中華民族的振興，中國的社會主義道路，無論說起來有多麼複雜，實踐起來有多麼曲折，為人民服務，為多數人服務，是共產黨奪取政權、掌握政權的惟一檢驗。實踐必須腳踏實地！從稅務雜誌
到财税体制，到政府执政为民，他见微知著。

在北京，我们有的人是机会，常扎堆儿神侃。或许是熟不拘礼，憨痴无言，最简约地概括张木生的观念，我只用两句玩笑话：站稳“义和团立场”，不亡国奴，不受二茬罪；走定“八国联军道路”，不忘狱中志，不改变国心。在他那理，仿佛并没有要摸透八国联军，要摸选择义和团的“两难”；更没有已满眼球的酸文腐语、装洋文雅。

他呼喊的，是实打实的制度建设，而不是嘴罩取宠的政治口号。

他高明的，是超出“新左”、“老右”，越过“主流”、“非主流”。回到老祖宗那理，察起点，定基点；对新新代这庙，先搞清，再搞定。

中国士大夫“修身齐家治国平天下”，放在哪理，都有丰富多彩的大学问。

张木生，从青少年时《中国农民问题》的理论联系实际到1980年代初包产到户的乡村改革调查研究，从喜马拉雅山麓、雅鲁藏布江畔到《中国税务》杂志社，鼓렑疾呼，直諷不忌触諷；爱国著书，而过不忘警觉。

有官没官，官大官小，共产党坚持马克思主义基本原理，本职工作与中国特色社会主义道路的理论探索，一脉相承，矢志不移！

从《我读……》，追考《……说实话》。“读”为“说”，“读”深为“话”真，“读”得好，就为“说”得“实”。“察起点，定基点”，为的是“超越左右”。“先搞清，再搞定”，也是本書的主题：改造我們的文化歷史觀。

為什麼要改造我們的文化歷史觀？
一、戰問

幾年前，一家著名電視臺評論魏巍的《誰是最可愛的人》。大腕主持人和名嘴嘉賓一唱一和，譴責志願軍殘殺美國少爺兵，意思是說中國人太野蠻﹗這話符合全球化“普世價值”：凡沾上“共黨”，都歸為“恐怖”。

此節目引起國內非主流輿論大嘩﹗主流媒體，倒挺沉得住氣，飲恨吞聲，不動如山。

現時，太多自封的“和平主義者”反對戰爭（反共、反恐戰除外）！連帶著，也就貶低武力，謗毀武士。

要說反對人類自相殘殺，恐怕沒有人不贊同。

特別在中國，先進的真超前，落後的夠邪性：某大屠宰場“人道先兵”，豬牛羊先“執行電刑”“安樂死”，再“過刀”放血。如此非暴力，總給人虛頭巴腦的感覺：雖不敢苟同，又能說什麼呢？然而，再“人道”、“畜道”的地方，或常會深陷“你死我活”的階級鬥爭潛意識，不能自拔；最“反戰”、“反暴”的人，或也為衣、食、住、行、搶配偶，打得昏天黑地、鼻青臉腫？

戰爭來自人的慾望，人慾不滅，消滅不了戰爭！

誰都怕戰爭、恨戰爭；可是，誰都逃不脫、躲不開戰爭。

由此，結晶出人類最古老、最重要的智慧 — 戰爭文化。我絕對無意指責那些調侃戰爭、遊戲戰爭等藝術形式，既然是大文化嘛，就篤定包羅萬象、豐富多彩。

我只想說，戰爭和戰爭中的人，太輝煌！太偉大！太沉痛！太厚重！不容我們所有人不尊重！作為足夠成熟的人，需懷有虔敬之心，應秉持膜拜之禮。

對此，不諳世故，很無奈；不知善惡，很可怕；知惡行善，
很不易、很可敬！

許多人，總不明白：
“養兵即為戰”，天經地義！但兵活著，絕非僅為戰。
軍隊，專司暴力；但不意味著戰士都崇尚暴力。恰恰相反，
人命就一條，人心肉長的，出於與生俱來的求生恐死本能，面對
血腥殘殺，兵的內心，最反暴力。

因此，全世界的軍人不約而同，都自稱“崇尚和平”！而中
國，自古更有“善士不武”、“樂殺不祥”的哲理，“全勝無門，
大兵無創”的“非戰”兵法，享譽全球。

孫子曰：“兵以利動”；克勞塞維茨說：“戰爭是政治的繼
續”。很簡明，戰爭服務於經濟和政治，是低一個層次的“手
段”。這沒錯！但由此想當然地誤認軍隊也是低俗一個檔次的
“工具”，則大謬！

戰爭這個最大的怪物惡魔，兇殘強暴，殺人盈野，萬事避讓。
當人的生命、民族存亡、國家興衰繫於旦夕，甚至人類毀滅在即，
政治、經濟、文化、倫理等等人造的一切，還有什麼意義？

戰爭，亡國旺族，絕非一般的“手段”！一旦開打，吞噬一
切，萬端環繞，自身變為中心；

軍隊，興邦滅種，豈可僅視為“工具”？一朝動武，生殺予
奪，鐵血統治，永遠是征服者！

征服，亦即馴化。“文明”的核心是人對人的馴化，沒開始
馴化動植物，就已馴化人，從“娃娃抓起”。人類社會走父系這
條路，和打仗有關，與戰爭有不解之緣，在這點上，什麼人種都
一樣。北京猿人、山頂洞人，也不是和平鴿。

注3：筆者兼任中國孫子兵法研究會會長，深感中國兵法對戰爭理解闡述之精闢深奧，
深知中國古今兵學在世界上的影響。
關於戰爭，似知而又非知的“點”可不少。隨意拈來：
殺人，當然不好；可多數人認為殺壞人尚可。
進一步，“殺生”也不能說好，一些人反對得厲害，但誰離得開殺生？包括“打了左臉伸右臉”的大主教、持戒吃齋的大和尚，全得治病吃藥，殺菌滅毒打蟲子；都需吃穿住行，果蔬蠶裘不算生？不殺生，人活不到現在！
很遺憾，不打仗，就沒有人類的今天。
戰爭是有組織的大規模謀殺（敵人），是變著法兒的蓄意打（敵）人。不管科技多發達，武器多智能化，戰爭中敵對的還是人，打殺的還是人。
認為“敵”不是“人”，“殺敵”不算“殺人”，西方人最愛矯情：在阿富汗、伊拉克，自己死幾千、不得了，殺掉人家幾十萬、不算數；朝鮮、越南人死了幾百萬，老美眼睛都不眨；而千萬、上億的印地安人與黑人，被驅逐屠戮，被販賣虐殺，“黃塵足今古，白骨亂蓬蒿”，誰統計？誰心疼？
據說，富蘭克林·羅斯福描述尼加拉瓜獨裁者索摩薩時有名言：“也許他是狗娘養的，但他是咱們的狗娘養的。”知此，就明白什麼叫“同態復仇”了：
用我的對稱、打你的非對稱，用我的全接觸、打你的非接觸，用我不值錢的命換你值錢的命，以命抵命！不再費盡刺王公，就叫婦幼炸平民！飛機撞大樓、路邊人肉彈，同樣不拿殺敵當殺人，玩兒的就是這心跳；打得新鬼煩冤舊鬼哭，此恨洶洶無絕期！
不可理喻，千古勝負如賭博，無論善惡，名帥痞子難掂量：見利忘義、避戰毀國，圖利忘危、求榮得辱；拿破崙也鎩羽奔北，本·拉登却得意高歌，誰也別笑話誰。

4（唐）王昌齡：《塞下曲》。
大家都承認，兵兇戰危，侵略如火。

道德極差勁、兵法最厲害：用間、暗殺，兵之正法；劫持、收買，戰時常例。

目的極高尚、手段最卑劣：核彈、化武、生物戰……坑、蒙、拐、騙、謀、詐、搶，軍隊作戰，無所不用其極，是對生命的大摧殘，是對文明的大破壞。

兵最老實，不騙自己，才不厭詐，乃以詐立！

很多人或許沒注意到，人類文明史，往往由最殘酷、最慘烈的戰爭來劃定階段。

國家是強力機器，正由暴力鑄就；歷史寫滿殺戮血祭，新文明、新文化，往往以戰爭為起始。

寓生於死，生死相依。很難解釋，盡人皆知的殘暴“手段”、世人都恨的恐怖“繼續”，怎麼會屢屢榮膺歷史、文明、文化中劃時代的聖盃？

新中國遠離戰爭幾十年。坦誠說，即使軍人，對戰爭血淚也幾無感悟，對種種荒誕謬論，多聽之任之。倒是百姓，更念之憂之。

令我驚異欽佩的是，張木生、李零、王小強、楊松林，或許還有未曾謀面的丁力，都不是軍人。但他們卻把戰爭蘊涵的真諦，放在人類發展長河中回述，鴻篇巨著，大義凜然。不苛求句句精當、字字珠璣，端賴於大事無誤、大理公正。“文采風流今尚存”，實乃真軍人也！

史上真軍人，未必曾是兵！國內外著名的軍隊統帥、戰法兵學大家、軍事戰略大師，沒當過兵、沒統過軍的，比比皆是，何嘗鮮見？最典型的不用追遠，建國前後的“五大領袖”，除朱德

---

5 中國近代史的起端就是由罪惡的鴉片戰爭劃定。
6 （唐）杜甫：《丹青引贈曹將軍霸》。
總司令外，四位都沒當過兵！但哪個不是文武雙全、統兵百萬、叱吒風雲的偉大軍人？

我們曾迷信一個經典定義：迄今一切人類文明史，都是階級鬥爭的歷史。時下，“階級鬥爭”不願再提了，說歷史是人類鬥爭史，沒錯！古籍連牘，青史滿篇，與天鬥，與地鬥，與人鬥。我琢磨，稱之為人類對立統一的歷史（或鬥爭團結史），好像該完整全面些？

對立統一也罷，鬥爭團結也好，其最高級、最極端的表現形式就是戰爭！

戰爭，“國之大事”，與文明史，與文化歷史，密不可分！

兵者，“生死之地，存亡之道”，稍有淡漠恍惚，都意味著鉅大代價，“不可不察”！

我們不該認真檢討、仔細審視我們的文化歷史觀嗎？

二、史問

我們常滿懷深情地說、唱：“祖國啊祖國，親愛的母親！”這可能是最常見的讚美詞了，但細究追索，字義詞源上並非沒有毛病：祖國的“祖”，來自男性崇拜，專指男性長輩；祖、先，各指我們的男女來源。嚴格講，“祖國啊祖國，我們親愛的父親！”才名副其詞。

此例，絕不礙我們的文化歷史觀，卻能以小喻大。

中國史觀，近幾十年最大的問題，或許莫過於按蘇聯的唯物史觀“五種社會形態說”的中間一段：所謂“奴隸社會少奴隸”（奴隸制度佔主體證據不足）、“封建社會不封建”（分封建邑

7《孫子·始計第一》。
制度不為主）……

中國歷史的一大特色，是國家“大一統”。

西周封建和秦並天下，是中國最早的兩次大一統。

西周是典型的“分封建制”大一統，沒有典型的奴隸制，甚至沒有類似美國的普遍黑奴制記載。我們的正統通史卻講，社會形態“跨奴隸社會”。豈不是“奴隸社會少奴隸”，或謂“沒奴隸”？

西周封建是一次人口大重組、大融合，有天下共主；與歐洲封建的小國寡民無共主不同。中國傳統的民族政策是柔遠能彌，四海一家，子夏的“四海之內皆兄弟”，孔子叫“興滅國，繼絕世，舉逸民”。蠻夷戎狄、中原和親，親戚套親戚，可以連成一大片。

春秋禮崩樂壞，僭越濫封，亂世割據，始變貴族傳統，平民可憑戰功取爵。

秦始皇的大一統和西周封建相反，不是靠熱乎乎的血緣紐帶和親戚關係，而是靠冷冰冰的法律制度和統一標準。

秦始皇，收周秦千秋之功，罷“封建”，創“一統”：廢井田，開阡陌，廢諸侯，設郡縣，統一文字，統一法律，統一度量衡，統一車軌，用龐大的文官隊伍執政，秦馳道是高等級的國家公路，秦直道是戰備高速路，如此大功誰也抹不掉，引領世界先進。可歎，秦始皇也有砸鍋崴泥的地兒，他搞學術大一統（焚書），想收拾知識分子的人心（坑儒），被罵翻天，很不成功。

漢承秦制，骨子裡是秦始皇，但儒家陰法，攏取渙散的人心。知識分子交孔夫子管，尊儒尊孔是虛擬領導，代替活不長的真實

8 殷墟商王墓大規模人殉、“五奴匹馬束絲”的記載，遠不足論證奴隸制生產方式佔主體。農奴制則更是封建社會的產物。
9 認定中國有奴隸社會的理論，多把封建社會分期劃在西周、春秋、秦漢、魏晉。故稱（西周的社會形態）“跨奴隸社會”。

9
領導，其效甚好；興立祠堂，老百姓交各種祠堂宗族管，拜祖、
愚民，抬死人、壓活人，鬼得很。

“大一統”的帝國。“大”是國土大，疆域大。“一統”是制度統一，政令統一，文化統一。這種局面，一直維持了2200年，在世界上獨一無二。

王志強曾集中概述了中國古代發達的貨幣、匯兌、紙幣、商品交換和資本經濟……是回歸重要史實的大手筆！他把秦漢以後兩千多年的經濟制度，概括為“小農經濟加市場”，認為這絕不同於西方的領主莊園式“自給自足大農經濟”，並遠先進於歐洲的封建。不論怎麼評價，他的理論創新（或可加楊松林的網上激辯），都是對中國的文化歷史觀的一個重大探索！

無論按歐洲標準還是中國史論，秦漢相當於法國“太陽王”時期的中央集權專制民族國家，該屬於前資本主義階段。基辛格也說：中國的統一領先歐洲兩千多年。這以後，雖然魏晉南北朝復辟了一段，但中國社會中的“封建”已趨式微，“大一統”始成定基。

原本是封建制度的“禮崩樂壞”，然而，按“社會形態說”，秦漢、隋唐、宋元、明清卻叫“成熟的封建社會”，豈不成了“封建社會不封建”？

原本是“帝王將相寧有種乎”的“罷封建”大一統，倒叫成“封建大一統”，豈不荒唐？

大一統，利大於弊，有利必有弊。文明癢疾，腐朽自大，高度的文明帶來高度的腐敗。“撫我則後，虐我則仇”，造反有

10 許倬雲認為“編戶齊民的天下國家”。“經過春秋戰國的蛻變，古代的封建社會轉變”，“封建制度崩 filmes後，人民不再屬於諸侯領主，而是進入國家組織”（許倬雲：《歷史大脈絡》，廣西師範大學出版社2009年，第31、32頁）。
11 《尚書·周書·秦誓下》。
理，以暴易暴！

毛泽东好像说过，中国的改朝换代，要感谢农民起义。而中国的“大一统”，则要感谢东夷、西戎、北狄、南蛮，没有这些邻居的压力，没有应付“五方之民”的能力，就没有中国。

恕我这里又不得不扯上战争和武力，包括应对外族部落“胡未灭”的挑战，镇压国内“烧不尽”的野火，平息庙堂“吹又生”的廷变，侵略、劫掠、革命、暴乱、反叛、起义，无休无止；蛮族大入侵、农民大起义，没完没了！

统一中国的力量，来自无穷的征战。皆知其所害，不知其为利之大。战争造就“大一统”！

不战，哪来的大一统？不武，怎会有民族大融合、血统大融合、文化大融合、南北大融合？

历史——血流成河、泪流成河，不废江河万古流：中华民族的历史，仍是生於斯、长於斯、葬於斯，各民族共同创造融合而成。

战、武融合，还融出中国的“和文化”：从“慎战”、“不战”、“全胜”，到以战促和、和而不同、知和而和……充分反映出战争与和平的辩证规律，创造出只有中国才特有的战争理论，举世赞赏。

对今天我们提倡的“和谐”、“和睦”、“和平”，老外总吵吵不理解、“不透明”。而对任何中国人来说，“以和为贵”，於心於实实在在，早就融於血液和精神，成为中华民族之魂！

当之无愧！战争，荣为历史、文明、文化的里程碑！

中国历史的另一大特色，就是西北对东南、游牧对农耕的攻伐融合。除了商起於東而滅夏、朱元璋北伐撲走蒙元以外，都是西北“狼”東北“虎”衝向東、南，逐鹿中原而得天下。小邦周克大邑商，秦灭六国，是西北征服东南；汉之興自蜀漢；隋唐聚
起關隴；三國兩晉、五胡亂華、五代十國，烽火連天下；西夏、遼、金、元、朱棣，甚至李自成都是或北或西，擠壓征服東南；滿清更是北方夷狄；連毛澤東統天下也是在延安打下根基，劉少奇先期搶佔東北後，幾乎原樣走了大清入關的“龍興之路”，橫掃千軍。怎麼這麼巧？

原來西、北有個以騎馬民族為背景的“寒流”、“高壓槽”，總是從西北橫掃東南。司馬遷說：“或曰：‘東方物所始生，西方物之成孰’。夫作事者必於東南，收功實者常於西北。”

中國古代特現代化，獨特地理位置產生獨特的大國。國家是多民族的統一國家，漢族是多民族的融合產物。夷夏雜處，如大漩渦，內外之辨，不在種族，而在文化，於農於牧，你中有我，我中有你。陳寅恪說：“漢人與胡人之分別”，“文化較血統尤為重要”，凡漢化即為漢人，胡化即為胡人，“其血統如何，在所不論”。

正可謂，一統之世，民族胡越一家：多元一體，文化水乳交融。這種融合還在進行中。

中國從沒有統一的宗教，老百姓只要不造反，各信各的教，各有各的廟。沒有宗教戰爭，對外侵略性肯定比西方小。中國文字一脈單傳，沒有失落的文明，全世界又是獨一無二。

西方的古典對立：西方民主，東方專制，這個說法是偏見。西方歷史，古代四分五裂，近代才有統一民族國家。他們聚少散多，我們聚多散少：他們的合是合中有分，聯是邦聯，我們的分，有“天下共主”，有文化道統“一貫制”；他們的蠻族南下、被漢化，我們的蠻族南下、被漢化，萬里長城永不倒。封建制下，歐洲的領土和人民是領主封君的私產；我們自漢以降兩千多年，

12 陳寅恪：《隋唐制度淵源略論稿·唐代政治史述論稿》，三聯書店 2004 年。
“國”與“民”、“公器”也，“民貴君輕”被奉為聖訓圭臬。中國傳統和現代趨勢最接近，國家一元化、宗教多元化，比近代美國多民族統一國家還現代化。

全世界的古代社會，民主代表原始，專制反而代表進步，此不可不察也。

西方一向是以他們的“前後”當我們的“前後”，這對解釋中國歷史一竅不通。

西方一直以“小國之心”度“大國之腹”。列強說了百年：邊疆、國界、統一的民族國家都是近代概念，對歷史上的大國，只一個法兒，大卸八塊。臺獨、藏獨、疆獨、七塊、八塊論，一邊一國，一切都待推倒重來。

前臺、後臺有人家的分工。強盜邏輯，才是不折不扣的硬道理，靠的是帝國主義的硬實力、硬武力！

李零反對用“封建專制主義”詞組。因為在歐洲，“專制”的反面是“封建”，倆詞兒不能捏一塊兒。我託木生轉告，他的道理咱明白，但在中國，詞義矛盾不大，這個詞組還取消不得。否則，秦始皇、隋煬帝、唐太宗、慈禧……不叫“封建專制”，叫什麼？你們得先找出個同義詞代替。哥兒倆沒回音，估計私下跟我抬槓：兩碼事，別擱一勺兒燴。

中國的封建社會，所謂封建主義、封建迷信、半封建半殖民地……的“封建”，與西方概念不同，與咱老祖宗的“分封建邑”原意，也早已風馬牛不相及。常常，稱其名、不逮其意，名不副實；用其詞、生發歧異，詞不達意。——所以，急需換換。

正如今日之“民主”，早已沒有與“君主”對應的那個原詞的原味兒了。西方公認：英國、日本和泰國這樣的君主國，是“完全民主國家”；而推翻國王的尼泊爾，卻算“非民主專制國
家”。更怪誕的：就連視民主為“專利”的美國，對“民主”都沒個準確的定義。時髦說，叫“廣場三原則”；咱們說，那叫“為民選主子”！所以，急需澄清。
“封建”，如此重要的政治、歷史概念，竟這般撲朔迷離、無所適從；“民主”，如此常用的歷史、政治辭彙，都這樣離題萬里，含混不清！
我們，包括你和我，都“反封建”、“舉民主”！總要有個明確一致的座標、共識吧？
時下，如此這般的虛實之事，多矣！正是，“真源了無取，妄跡世所逐”。
我們不該返回理論原點、澄清定義，重塑、改造我們的文化歷史觀嗎？

三、路問

近年，仍常有人從國外搬個什麼“主義”新名兒忽悠，甚至連理論內容和實際業績都懶得介紹，就捧為完美理想的惟一成功範例，並神祕地說：從沒經過中國化“變味兒”。
對中國這樣人多、地大、古老、事稠的發展中國家，不論是學習超強大國的終極經驗，還是套用寡民小國的頂峰實踐，不變味兒，肯定行不通！即使是口頭推薦，也得先翻成中國話呀？
若是想借全球化的“民主”魔力扇哨兒，恐怕會畫虎類犬，弄巧反拙。與其借他山之石以攻玉，我們何不名正言順、理直氣壯地，舉起土生土長、百試不爽的，中國共產黨人毛澤東提出、劉少奇實踐的新民主主義？

13 簡言之，在中心廣場上選舉、遊行、言論自由。
14 （唐）柳宗元：《晨詣超師院讀禪經》。
人有許多病都治不好，更不要說絕症。病篤亂投醫，西醫不靈找中醫，中醫傻眼找巫醫，病人總是在三者間轉磨。

國家走的路，我們可沒少折騰：美國、日本、蘇聯制度，都是生吞活剝、全套照搬；南斯拉夫、新加坡、匈牙利模式，當作佛腳靈丹、又抱又啃；休克療法、顏色革命、解體易幟，炒成烏龜王八大補湯，全推介過。木生比喻：神農嚐百草，拿自身試驗到上吐下瀉的地步！

文化史觀上也如此：傳統不靈求現代化，資本主義沒門兒投社會主義，社會主義撞牆再尋回傳統，也是轉磨。釋、儒、道、法、陰陽術……甚至醫學、紅學、養生學都來湊熱鬧，信誓旦旦：不僅救中國，還能救世界！

1840 年之後，面對資本主義文明，中國落後了。蛋糕太大要切著吃，西方列強瓜分豆剝，小日本大野心，要一口鯨吞中國，敗得最慘。

歷史選擇了中國共產黨，中華民族的偉大復興，儘管屢戰屢敗，卻屢踣屢起。

改革開放 30 年，經濟改革自然自覺地順應了新民主主義理論，創造了世界奇蹟。但世人都說中國是經濟改革的鉅人，社會改革的侏儒。

我們與官產學媒、主流非主流的共識，反對權貴資本主義，解決中國的兩極分化和貪污腐敗。

分歧是，客家想驚險一躍，儘管有蘇聯東歐解體災難在前，仍擋不住要全面實驗西方的“普世價值觀”；土家想造反再亂，儘管曾自陷崩潰被否定，還記不住階級專政“不斷革命”是條死路；我家認為，社會與政治改革，要用經過實踐驗證為正確的、我們自己的理論創造 —“中國特色社會主義理論體系”來指導。
在突飛猛進而又積累了巨大矛的中國，我們必須嚴防造反
餘孽與民粹主義“憤青”合流的極左大破壞；又需警惕狹隘自大
民族主義加“暴民”造勢的極右大爆發！“文革”之鑒，德、日
法西斯之鑒，後人必要鑒之。

歷史是過去的真實描述，然而絕不可能完全真實。
歷史是一面鏡子，既照著今天，又照出明天！
在頤和園幽靜的後山，木生問：

從戰爭年代到建設時期，包括改革開放至今，我們凡是用新
民主主義為指導，就勝利、成功了！而沒有真正遵循那套理論的，
或犯錯誤、或走彎路，都出了問題。你認爲，可不可以這樣說？

我只悶頭默想：在當下的社會中，能夠涵蓋“主流非主流”
合成的“最小公倍數”，能夠彌合“左右理論”求得的“最大公
約數”，可能非“新民主主義”莫屬了。

他是明知故問，我則借題發揮 — 將此問題留給讀者們考證
思索，請大家一塊兒來回答。

這不是改造我們的文化歷史觀、回歸新起點的又一重大課題？

幾十年中，從“閉關鎖國”年代的“小反革命”，到“兩個
凡是”環境中的“解放先驅”；不論在改革開放初期挺身陷陣，
還是作為先知先覺的“自由化”精英，張木生和王小強們，凝聚
了多少熱血志士的共識。

世紀之交，他們準確預見了“投機賭博新經濟”造成的“泡
沫破滅”和“金融危機”，警告了今天面臨的“史無前例的挑
戰”、“新三座大山”和諸多問題，提出了一系列大對策、大戰
略，很多今天被採納，明天也將被驗證。

每逢關鍵，他們捲起的思想旋風，今人難以企及。
有人說，看看眼前，除了一雙筷子，日常所用的一切，都已被“西化”了，還反什麼？如果管這叫“西化”，所有人都不反對。然而，李約瑟說過，當今世界大部分文明，都是建立在中國古代發明創造之上的：中國對世界文明的貢獻，遠超於其他所有國家。這話遠非全球共識，卻還有人說是“中化”，甚至聯繫到“威脅論”！

當今的社會，民主、自由、開放多了，幾乎沒人“打棍子、扣帽子、揪辮子”。

多種思潮、多極政見、多元文化甚囂塵上，反復碰撞、磨合雜交、融會貫通。

加上階級界限模糊、人際關係繁複，差別含混重疊，雖有新的矛盾凸顯、激化，倒也並非你死我活。

按說，官場、民間的容忍度該高些，該告別“不爭論”的時代了！

然而，也是今天，知識爆炸淹沒你，影視網絡淘汰你，權錢食色誘惑你……堅持真理，修正錯誤，還真難！堅守中庸、左右開弓，確實可能兩面不認同、兩端得罪人、兩頭不落好。能超越左右，擯棄主流非主流，何其不易！

眼前，不是沒路，而是路過多：大街小巷，曲徑天路，阡陌縱橫，眼花繚亂。說得再好，走不了；行不通，瞎掰；看著再靚，走太慢，行路難，邊兒靠！

路，是要人行走的。選路，歷來作大難。惟一的標準就是實踐的結果，又好又快，科學發展！

前書的《說》，現書的《讀》，無論“說”的，還是“讀”的，“返回馬克思的原基點”也好，“改造文化歷史觀”也罷，我們革命的初衷，根本如一：為了和平，為人的解放奮鬥！我們
建設的目的，始終沒變：強國富民，為了多數人服務！

蔣介石說：“共產黨是從來不投降的！”

老蔣的話，很多都錯得弔詭。他這話，我愛聽，但絕不敢說正確。起碼要加不少匡定詮釋、修正說明。

首先，不論是否投降，共產黨犯的錯誤，海了去了；經歷的失敗，大了去了；垮臺被消滅，多了去了！不敗、不錯、不垮，何來投降？黨都散了、亡了、沒了，誰來認栽、投降？老蔣好像自說自話。

其次，共產黨不投降，不等於說共產黨員不投降。事實上，黨的總書記都有不少背叛、變節的。國際國內，早年近年，不勝枚數。老蔣這話，忒詭異！

第三，要說共產黨能夠不投降，就因為有黨內民主，有大量忠誠的黨員善於反思：一次、再次地糾錯，回到歷史的基點；探索完善“無產階級解放條件的學說”，回到正確的原點；從失敗的地方爬起，回到現實的起點；改造文化歷史觀，回到我們信仰的初衷。

重新幹起，百折不撓！山高水長，嵯峨浩蕩！

越是困難、迷茫、挫敗、失望之時，越顯出這樣一批：獨立不倚，卓而不群，“究天人之際，通古今之變”的——永不投降的共產黨人！

為什麼讀李零？李零講的理兒和事兒透徹、先進。
張木生下大力寫出：《我讀李零》。
我使大勁鄭重推薦：讀張木生！

15 蔣介石曾親手勾決槍斃了變節的中共總書記向忠發和不少共產黨叛徒；也饒了沒投降的陳獨秀；還收了已投降的張國燾……