

EASTERN TURKISTAN'S STRUGGLE

For Freedom

AND CHINESE POLICY

PUBLISHER
Mohammed Emin BUGRA

OSMANBEY, MAT. T. L. Ş.

1954 — ISTANBUL

P R E F A C E

This small work, as you will see, forms a page from the history of literal campaign and does not cover the continued armed struggle in the course of Eastern Turkistan's war for independence.

As a matter of fact, we fought 41 armed uprisings to overthrow the 190 years old Chinese domination. Some of these insurrections continued for years while few won freedom for the country though of temporary nature. The uprising of 1931 bears a significant importance in our struggle for freedom, as it, besides events of dreadful bloodshed resulted in commencement of numerous peaceful political argumentations.

It requires volumes to account the story of the struggle going on unceasingly for the last two centuries. Through this small booklet, which contains three letters exchanged between Dr. Chu Chia Hua and me, I desire to acquaint the world opinion Turkistan's resolute effort for freedom, on one hand and, a clear example of Chinese colonistic policy, on the other.

I wished such correspondence continue, for I hoped it might evolve some peaceful solution of the Question of Eastern Turkistan. And this idea, so far, withheld me from releasing the correspondence. Nevertheless Dr. Chu was not pleased to reply my latest letter and published his own letter in a Formosa periodical under the caption «Open letter to Mr. Emin». Thus Dr. Chu provided me the opportunity to release the whole story. Unlike what Dr. Chu did I am presenting his letters as well as mine side by side.

I suppose I hardly need to introduce Dr. Chu to my readers as he has been minister in the Chinese Central Government several times and even once he was appointed vice premier. Being one of the top ranking nationalist leaders in Formosa, he is capable to reflect the mentality of Chinese statesmen in all respects.

I am quite sure that the readers of this booklet can easily reach the following conclusions:

1. That Turks of Eastern Turkistan are fighting against joint Russian and Chinese Communist ruthless occupation of their country.
2. That They endeavour to reach a peaceful settlement with Nationalist China to regain their freedom.
3. That in pursuence of the fact that the people of Eastern Turkistan never submitted to foreign rule in the past, they are firmly determined to achieve complete independence.

Mohammed Emin BUGRA

27 th Sept, 1951

Dear Dr. Chu Chia Hua;

Thank you very much for your kind letter dated 22 nd June, 1951. I am gratified indeed for your deep concern over our present situation and your valued invitation for my visiting Formosa.

Being quite confident of your interest in well being of my compatriots and proud of our personal friendship in all sincerity I have the privilege of stating my opinion frankly as follows.

No doubt value of my visit to Formosa can not be questioned as it enables me to see your honour and other leaders who are sympathetic to our cause. But as a matter of fact, as you will agree with me, the greatest duty, and responsibility on our shoulders today is to direct all our efforts for the rescue of the motherland from the Communist tyranny. How far the circumstances in Formosa shall permit us to discharge our responsibilities?, is the question which, as far as my knowledge goes, can not have a positive answer. Because leaders in the Central government unfortunately do not possess reasonable and fair understanding of the question of Sinkiang. Most of them contempt our just national demands and have got despising attitude towards our political out-look. I am sure you will agree with me to believe that it is not an offence with a patriot of democratic outlook if one strives for development and political freedom of his country and nation. But unfortunately the leaders in the Chinese Central Government, though all of them are patriots and democratic, do not believe so. They have never been prepared to consider just demands of the people of Sinkiang openmindedly. This has been and is a very unfortunate circumstance prevailing in the Central Government (Formosa).

I hardly need to describe the ruthless administration of Sinkiang by the Chinese administrators, without slightest improvement, for the last almost two centuries, the effect of which has eaten its way deep into the body and soul of the people of Sinkiang and brought about several armed uprisings causing heavy bloodshed and destruction. I may also point out here that the coalition Provincial Government of 1946 - 1949 was a total failure. All authority and power rested with military and civil Chinese officials who took undue advantage in oppressing the natives to meet their own ambition. People of Sinkiang are utterly disappointed of any improvement in Central Government's policy on Sinkiang.

There are two fundamental factors responsible for the conflict:

- I. That Sinkiang geographically, lies outside of the national boundaries of China.

2. That the culture of the people of Sinkiang is distinctly different from that of the Main Land of China, and therefore they make a separate nation. It is essential to adopt a policy based on these two factors if permanent peace and effective settlement is desired in Sinkiang. That is to say, the policy should meet the aspiration of the people of Sinkiang. What we wish is that Chinese Government should redress the hearts of the people of Sinkiang and create a strong tie of friendship between the people of the great China and the people of Sinkiang by freeing the latter and raising the status of their country to an independent sovereign state as United States of America and the Great Britain did in the case of India, Pakistan, Burma and Philippine, adding a glorious page to the history of democracy. I believe there is still time for the leading statesmen of the Central Government to explore openmindedly a solution for the question of Sinkiang and lay the foundation of an everlasting peace at the Western Gate of the Great China. I would be highly obliged if your honour could kindly study these facts unbiasedly and let me know your reaction and views. I may add here that nothing shall keep us from cooperating with the Central Government in all the fields if they effect a favourable shift in their policy on Sinkiang.

Mr. Isa is on a trip to the Middle East these days. I hope he might have written to you.

With best wishes,

Your most sincerely

Mohammed Emin BUGRA

**Dr. CHU CHIA HUA'S
LETTER**



June 17, 1952

My dear Mr. Emin;

Your letter dated September: 27, 1951 was read with much pleasure, coming, as it did from such a far - off friend. At the same time, however, I could not help being greatly surprised at the political views which you have stated and are holding.

As I understand it, you are inclined to the view that, aside from the anti - Communist and anti - Russian campaign, Sinkiang could sever its political connection with China and become independent.

I am sorry that I do not agree with you in this particular respect. As I have been interested in the well - being of your compatriots in the border Provinces for several decades and as I have enjoyed your friendship in all sincerity, I cannot allow myself to remain silent when I am confronted with opinions which I personally can not agree. In order to preserve our national independence and territorial integrity, to protect the best interests of Sinkiang, to ameliorate the present plight of our compatriots in the border Provinces, and to find a common denominator for our future efforts, I must tell you frankly what I think of the whole question. Considering the gravity of the issue and its far - reaching effects, I wish that you and your friends would be open - minded enough to listen to dissenting opinions, which I beg to state in the following paragraphs.

To begin with, you say that, geographically, Sinkiang lies outside of China and should therefore, be independent. Such a view is, as far as my knowledge goes, contrary to facts. It was this absolutely unfounded pretext which Russian and Japanese Imperialists often resorted to in the last hundred years to sow discord among us Chinese and wrest large chunks of territory from us for the realisation of their own colonial designs. Thus the Russians encouraged Outer Mongolia and Tannu Uryankhai to declare independence and the Japanese created the puppet Manchukuo, all on the pretext that the territories concerned lay outside of China proper.

Historically, the relations between Sinkiang and the rest of the country began over two thousand years ago and have been maintained ever since, except for a brief period between the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It will be recalled that General Chang Chien's exploration of the Western Regions was made under Emperor Wu of the Han Dynasty in the second century B. C. This exploration was only one hundred years later than the incorporation of Kwangtung and Kwangsi into the Chinese Empire, and

some two hundred years earlier than General Chuko Liang's penetration of Yunnan and Kweichow.

Before the development of navigation the passage leading through Sinkiang was the only one between China and the outside world, which has been aptly called by Europeans the «Silk Road». It was the road by which the two foremost monks of the T'ang Dynasty, Fah Hsien and Hsuan Chuang, went to India to study Buddhism and Marco Polo came to China to see and admire. In the first millennium of its historical relations with the rest of China, Sinkiang saw an unbroken stream of merchants, monks, scholars, ambassadors, and generals shuttling back and forth and served as a halfway station between the east and the west. Even down to this day travellers can see for themselves the many historic spots where men of the Han and T'ang Dynasties carried on their activities in the general region lying between the Yumen Pass and Suleh. If evidences were required to corroborate the written records concerning conditions in Sinkiang at the time under consideration, they are abundantly furnished by the excavations made by European scholars like Stein and LeCoq. All this leads to the same conclusion that Sinkiang has played a vital part in the development of the Chinese nation.

Large pieces of territory adjacent to Sinkiang, originally under Chinese jurisdiction, has been in modern times wrested by the imperialist Russia. This very fact can be verified by extant historical literature.

A school of modern historians believes that the Chinese people had come from the western part of the country. A certain degree of credibility is lent to the theory by the traditions associated with the name of Kwen Luen as well as the tribal names of Chi and Chiang, whose descendants ruled over China for several centuries. One of the implications of the theory is that the Chinese people's primeval habitat was in the west, of which Sinkiang formed a part.

Historical evidence is even more imposing than traditions. Emperor Hsuan of the Han Dynasty had established a margrave in the vicinity of Kulja as early as 60 B. C., which should be an irrefutable evidence to prove that Sinkiang constituted itself part of the Chinese Empire. A century later Emperor An founded the Garrison Settlement of Yihwu in the vicinity of modern Hami. These institutions remained intact through the Three Kingdoms (220 — 265 A. D.) down to the end of the Western Chin Dynasty (265 — 317 A. D.) In the period of the Sixteen Kingdoms (304 — 439 A. D.), the counterpart of the Barbarian Invasions in the European history, relations with Sinkiang were very well maintained during

the regimes of China's two kings, Chang Tsun and Fu Kien. In the early years of the seventh century Emperor Yang of the Sui Dynasty appointed a Military Governor to take charge of all the affairs in the Western Dominion, i. e., Sinkiang.

At the time of the division of China into Southern and Northern Dynasties in the fifth and sixth centuries, a Chinese family from the interior by the name of Chu had founded the Kao Chang Kingdom at Turfan, which was later incorporated into China by Emperor Tai Tsun of the T'ang Dynasty.

The political relations between China and Western Turkestan in 661 A. D. under Emperor Kao Tsung were carefully described in Volume 73 of «Important Records of the T'ang Dynasty» (T'ang Hui Jao), which says:

«On the 7th day of the 6th moon in the 1st year of Lung So, the Turkish lands were divided into counties and districts and Wang Min-yuan was commanded by Imperial orders to draw up a Map and Description of the Western Dominion for his Majesty's perusal. Governor - generals were appointed for the sixteen kingdoms lying in the west of Yutien and east of Persia, which were divided into 81 counties, 110 districts, and 126 military outposts... The Turkish chieftain was to live in the City of Ho Huan, where the Yuehchi Governor - General had his headquarters ... The Persian King was to live in the City of Chihling, where the Persian Governor - Generals were subordinated to the Governor - General for the Pacification of the West.»

It can be readily seen from the above that not only Sinkiang (the Western Dominion) itself lies in China, but even much territory beyond it has once formed part of the Chinese Empire. That is why all the Chinese people take it as a sacred inheritance handed down from their ancestors and attach as much importance to it as they do to the Northeastern Provinces. So long as China remains an independent nation, Sinkiang forms one of its integral parts.

How could any one be so blind as to say that Sinkiang lies outside of the Chinese territorial limits?

Secondly, you say that since the culture of the Sinkiangese differs from that of the interior people, they ought to be independent. But I am inclined to think that your view of culture is much too narrow. The predominant cultural trait of Sinkiang is, I should say, the belief in Mohammedanism. But you will please notice in this connection that there are in the interior Provinces of China over 40 million Mohammedan believers, or more than ten times the number of Mohammedans in Sinkiang. Indeed, many of the

former, especially those with the surnames of Ma and Ha, are descendants of the latter who have emigrated to the interior Provinces in the course of many centuries. If you would trouble yourself to make some historical research, you might find that the Chinese blood is a mixture of many stocks and that those known in Chinese history in the last three thousand years as Yi, Ti, Tung, and Maien are really all forbears of the Chinese people. The concept of One-Family-under-Heaven is not a mere rhetorical flourish which we bandy about for effect, but serves as a criterion of our daily conduct.

In the «Lives of Eminent Monks» (Kao Seng Chuan) there is an interesting account of how Jumolosh, a Sinkiang monk, had come to the court of one of the short-lived kingdoms in the age of Barbarian Invasions and how the local king had presented him with ten beautiful Chinese girls in order to perpetuate the best qualities of his mind through descendants. As the «Lives» have always been held in high esteem among Chinese scholars as an authoritative historical work, this happy transaction could not have been invented by enemies of Buddhism as a reflection on the morals of the monks but must rather be taken at its face value. It follows that Jumolosh's descendants, if any, by his pretty wives must have been absorbed into Chinese society and have formed part of the Chinese stock.

When the rebellious generals An Lu-shan and Shih Ssu-ming rose in revolt against the royal house of Tang Dynasty in the eighth century, they were eventually suppressed with the military assistance of Hui Hieh, an old term for the modern Uigurs. Among the generals commanding purely Chinese troops on the Government side at the time of the revolt were also Mohammedans, of whom Koshuhan was one of the foremost. A few decades later another Government general, Kao Hsuen-chih, led his men marching over the Pamirs and went as far as Atganistan, though Kao was a Sinkiangese by extraction, he has always been regarded by the Chinese as one of their national heroes. Any one of our Sinkiang brethren will find it as normal and easy as it has been, if he comes to the interior to engage in politics or to intermarry. Many of the minority groups have risen to prominence, both military and civil, in the Central Government throughout Chinese history, especially since the Republican Revolution of 1911. You and your friends must be well aware of the fact that China is a great melting-pot, in which all cultures blend to form one harmonious whole. I am quite sure you will not take as aliens those 40 odd million followers of the Mohammedan faith in the interior whose ancestors mostly came from the Western Dominion.

Thirdly, you say that Sinkiang is racially different from the interior.

But, as I have just mentioned, China is really a big melting-pot where cultures blend with each other to form one harmonious whole. What has come to be known as the »Han» people in modern times is but the collective name for a people who has inherited and blended many linguistic, literary, and cultural traditions of the past. The modern Chinese race is, therefore, the offspring of many racial elements, which accounts for the brilliance of the Chinese civilization and the continued vigor of the Chinese people as a nation. As the old saying goes, «The massiveness of Mt. Tai is the result of the accretion of small particles of soil; the immensity of rivers and oceans is due to the confluence of small streams.» Such is the spirit which has enabled the United States, by drawing upon and incorporating the best of many racial stocks, to assume the political and economic leadership of the world.

You base your demand for the independence of Sinkiang on its racial difference from the interior. But the question of racial differences is really a knotty one, and, except a very small number of primitive tribes still extant, it is almost next to impossible, to-day, to find a people 100 % in one blood. Even the Chinese, who are traditionally but not quite correctly known as the Hans, are by no means pure in one blood. The case of Jumolosh's marriage with ten beautiful Chinese girls, to which reference was made in a previous paragraph, is only one among thousand others showing how people in the interior intermarry with outsiders.

You will probably say that the Turkish language which the Uigurs use is an unmistakable evidence of their racial difference from the Chinese. On this point, however, I should like to invite your attention to the following facts. The Uigurs, who were known under various names in the Yuan and Ch'ing dynasties, are all descended from Hui Hieh who lived north of the Tien Shan, before the ninth century and migrated, at a latter date, to the region south of the Tien Shan where many Chinese from the interior had already settled. The Turkish language which the Hui Hieh people used belongs to the Ural-Altai group, of which the Tungus, Turkish, and Mongolian are the principal languages. The Turkish language is in itself rather complicated in origin and may possibly contain elements of Tibetan or even ancient Chinese. But as its grammatical construction was relatively simple, it was quickly adopted by those Chinese who had already settled there. As both the Chinese settlers and many of the new comers were Buddhist, there soon developed a community of interest between them which contributed partly to the adoption of Turkish by the Chinese as their own medium of communication. It was not until the time of the Yuan dynasty, however, that all Turkish-speaking tribes in the region south of

the Tien Shan were converted to Islam, in which all Khans were devoted believers.

It can be readily seen from the foregoing facts that there is no sharply defined racial difference between the Turkish-speaking Mohammedans who are divided into Uigurs, Hassaks, Tartars, Kirghizs, and Uzbeks. These, if the Soviet practice be followed would constitute at least three independent Hassak, Kirghiza, and Uzbek (including the Uigurs) Republics and would, in addition to the Chinese proper, Manchus, Mogolians, and Tartars, make seven independent political units for the entire Chinese nation. How preposterous it would be, if we were to demand independence for every minority people with some local peculiarities in language and culture! There are in southwest China 2 million Lolo, 6 million Paiyi, and 2 million Miao and Yao, who have never thought of making themselves independent. For they know only too well that for centuries they have formed a part of the Chinese nation, that they have never been discriminated against, and that, being too weak to defend themselves, they would soon be enslaved by powerful neighbors if they were to be separated from China proper.

All constituent parts of the Chinese nation have become an integral entity through vicissitudes of good and bad fortune. They must remain one and indivisible both for their own individual benefit and for that of the country as a whole. Dr. Sun Yat-sen, whose teachings on the subject are most explicitly enunciated, had consistently advocated the freedom and equality of all racial groups. It is our national policy to strengthen the position of the minority peoples, raise their cultural level, and improve their standard of living. As you and your friends have taken part in the constitution-making National Assembly and as this policy has been written into the National Constitution, you must have known it as well as any other Chinese.

If Sinkiang should make good its claim to independence, the result could only be confusion and disaster, leading to incorporation by a powerful neighbor. The most important tasks facing Sinkiang at the moment are, as I see it, the dissipation of internal jealousies, the harmonization of interests, the promotion of education, the development of communications, the exploitation of natural resources and water conservancy. All these are aimed at the strengthening of internal cohesion, the diffusion of culture and education, and the enrichment of the people as a whole. These objectives must be attained before Sinkiang is fully ready for self-government and can become both a strong citadel guarding the western approaches of the country and a stabilizing factor in Asia.

Whether the future of Sinkiang be dark or bright all depends upon

what choice you are going to make. May you and your friends choose wisely!

Fourthly, you demand independence for Sinkiang for the same reason that India, Pakistan, Burma, and the Philippines have been granted independence. But as a matter of fact the circumstances are entirely different and there is no slightest similarity between Sinkiang and the other cases. It should be remembered that Sinkiang is possibly the cradle of the Chinese race (if one accepts the theory that the latter has originated from the general region of Kwen Kuen), that it has had more than two thousand years of historical relations with the interior parts of China, and that it is geographically contiguous with and historically shares in the glories and achievements of the rest of the country. Though there might be certain differences in blood and culture between Chinese and Moslems, their historical relations have been so close that they are in no sense comparable to the relationship between the British on the one hand and the Indians and Burmese on the other; India and Burma are geographically far away from the British Isles; the Indians and Burmese belong to an entirely different racial stock from the British. When the latter came to the East, they came as conquerors to exploit their natural resources and capture their markets. Before India and Burma were declared independent, they were merely colonial possessions of the British Empire, which could neither share in the political rights nor the material comforts and prosperity of the British people. On the contrary, the Britisher's well-being was built upon the physical privation and spiritual suffering of the Indian and Burmese peoples. Politically, they had no right to send representatives to the British Parliament. Even in matters relating to their own welfare, they had no right of direct control but could only appeal to the mercy of their rulers. The nationalist movement led by Gokhale and Gandhi received not only the enthusiastic support of the Indians themselves, but also the moral sympathy of the whole world, because it represented the cause of justice. The relations between Sinkiang and the rest of China being so close, the Chinese Government was doing everything in its power in the years after V-J Day for the development of Sinkiang, but was prevented from carrying out the project by the rise of the Communist menace. Since the country is now being overrun by the Reds, it is no time for Sinkiang to demand independence on the false analogy of India, Pakistan, Burma, or the Philippines. If it does make such a demand it will be courting disaster for itself. Even in point of population, Sinkiang's case for independence is not comparable to the other cases cited. Thus, there are more than 300 million in India, 70 million in Pakistan, 17 million in Burma, and 16 million in the Philippines, but only 3 million.

Uigurs in Sinkiang. With such a small population Sinkiang, if it were to become independent, would find it almost impossible to maintain its independence for any length of time. The sad experience of independence in the cases of Outer Mongolia and Tannu Uryankhai is a lesson that can not be ignored.

The principle of self-determination has become an important factor to be reckoned with international politics even since the First World War. But its over-emphasis in certain regions without taking into consideration local circumstance and the instability of the international situation has enabled dictators, demagogues, fanatics and other believers in violence to seize power on the pretext of self-determination. The result was the curtailment of almost all human freedom in these areas. Soviet Russian Imperialism, in particular, took advantage of the principle to sow discord, infiltrate, and create disturbances with the object of expanding its own influence. Owing to the economic and cultural backwardness of Asia, it is the weakest spot which the Soviet Union has been concentrating all her efforts to sovietize. The history of Russian encroachments on Sinkiang from Czarist days up to the Stalinist dictatorship is one long record of brazen pillage and secret intrigues. In the winter of 1949 the cradle of the Chinese race was overrun by Red troops. Confronted with a formidable enemy, the Western European nations are belatedly making a concerted effort to meet the Communist challenge. We are sorry that we are unable, for the time being, to do anything to set free our brethren in Sinkiang who are now living under Soviet oppression. I know only too well that you and your friends are bitter enemies of Communism and Russian Imperialism. But if you should advocate independence for Sinkiang at the present juncture, you would be dissipating our strength, creating dissension among ourselves, and giving the enemy an opportunity to divide and rule. I am sure that you would never allow such things to happen.

In view of the foregoing, it is perfectly clear that the relationship between Sinkiang and the rest of the country is exactly the same as that between the southwestern (such as Kwangtung, Kwangsi, Yunnan, or Kweichow) and the other provinces. At any rate, it can never be likened to the situation between the British Empire or the United States on the one hand and India, Pakistan, Burma, or the Philippines on the other. In British and American colonial history, you cannot find scholar-like Jumolosh or great generals like Koshuhan and Kao Hsuen-chih. No Chinese, whether he be in Government service or not, has ever thought of Sinkiang in other terms than one of homogeneity and equality with the rest of the country. Could you possibly point out any individual who has considered it as lying beyond the pale of Chinese civilization? The ancient

name for Sinkiang was «Western Dominion,» meaning that part of China lying in the west. You say, and it is a fact, that Sinkiang has been misgoverned in the last two hundred years. But we should also call your attention to the fact that both under the despotic Manchu rule and the regime of warlord and bureaucracy in the Republican period all China people have suffered in equal measure, and there has thus far not a single minority group ever been singled out for oppression. That was why Dr. Sun Yat-sen, in his resolve to liberate all oppressed peoples, had made it his life-time work with the overthrow of despotism and the establishment of genuinely Republican institutions. With the formation of the National Government at Nanking in 1927, a beginning was made at reformation. Unfortunately, however, civil commotions and foreign aggression had presented such serious obstacles that many weak spots remained and Government programs could not be thoroughly implemented in the farthest ends of the country. The situation, though deplorable enough, is almost an inevitable phenomenon in the process of national reconstruction; it does not mean that the Government has neglected the interests of Chinese citizens in the border provinces.

The history of the last two centuries is indelibly impressed upon the minds of all Chinese. No one who exercises supreme political authority in China can afford to ignore the importance of Sinkiang or to acquiesce in its severance from the mother country. In the case of the Chinese Nationalist Party, for example, its teachings of Nationalism by no means predicated on the supremacy of any single racial stock, but on the equal importance of all races, including those of Sinkiang and other provinces. All the races form the integral parts of the Chinese nation, who must work with each other in close cooperation before they can overcome the present critical period and see the dawning of a bright future. I wish you and your friends would study the history of Sinkiang's neighboring countries and try to find out whether the Sinkiang people had not shared their joys and sorrows with the Chinese. Your advocacy of independence for Sinkiang might be actuated by the best of intentions. But if you give the matter some maturer consideration, you will find that your proposed plan is really detrimental to the best interests of Sinkiang. Let us work hand in hand in this hour of our national crisis; let us hearten each other in our fight against Communism and Russian Imperialism. When we have eventually recovered the mainland, we shall introduce constitutionalism under which Sinkiang will, like all other provinces, elect its own magistrates and Governor and may even enjoy a higher degree of self-government. My reading of Dr. Sun Yat-sen's Teachings of Nationalism leads me to the conclusion that Sinkiang, along with other regions in the interior provinces where minority

peoples live, will one day become autonomous provinces or states in which the people will be completely self-governing except in such matters as national defense and foreign relations wherein union means strength, prestige and security.

Our brethren on the mainland are living behind the Iron Curtain and the prospects for humanity at large are dark, indeed. Living in a foreign country as you do, you must be sorry for the plight of our countrymen. Both the people and the armed forces in Free China are working with singleness of purpose and in complete harmony for the recovery of the mainland. Their achievements have attracted the attention of other democratic powers and Free China has become a citadel of freedom in the Western Pacific. I earnestly hope that you will make a trip to Taiwan, so that you may get more inspiration from your mother-country in your struggles for the cause of democracy and freedom. When, in my mind's eye, I summon a vision of the snow-capped Tien Shan, the Heavenly Mountains, my thoughts are with my old friends over there. All friends in Taiwan are thinking of you and your associates. Please take good care of yourselves. With best wishes.

Yours sincerely,

Chu Chia - hua

— 21 —

MOHAMMED EMIN BUGRA'S
LAST LETTER

Your Excellency Dr. Chu-Chia-Hua;

I offer you my deep respects. I received your valued letter dated March 3, 1952, which was in reply to mine of September 27, 1951, and read the translation many times. The deep concern that you showed to my ideas made me extremely happy. You were the only person among the Chinese high officials who continued to extend friendship towards me, my friends, and my country, and for this I give you my endless gratitude.

Confident of your sincerity I submitted my views about my country in a frank manner.

In the translation of your letter of reply, the following three points in particular drew my attention:

1. You showed astonishment and grief against Turkestan's claim for independence.
2. You mention the need of working with China in a combined front against communism.
3. You went point by point over the evidence stressing the need for the independence of Turkestan.

I welcomed with respect your valued opinions on these three points but, trusting that our discussions are based on the principles of good will, I deem it advisable to clarify these points once again.

I. I was plunged into amazement and sorrow upon seeing that an able statesman such as yourself should feel astonishment and grief at Turkestan's claim for independence. Because you are a reformist and revolutionary you are well aware that for many years Turkestan has lost hundreds of thousands of lives working with intention for political reforms and release from serfdom. In my opinion, to ignore this will not be an appropriate gesture on your part. On the contrary, it is necessary for your generous self to take into consideration the great sacrifices and driven resolves of the people of Turkestan.

II. Everyone knows that the struggle against our communist enemies was carried out by working with China on the same front for a long time, and you are well aware that when we were in our fatherland we were more in advance in the fight against communism than the Chinese. After we left our fatherland we increased our fight against communism, letting our voices be heard by the entire free world, as you must have heard. As you

particularly very well remember, we always remained together with China against foreign enemies, In the darkest period of China's defensive struggle against Japan we, ignoring Japan's strength and propaaganda, with our own free will went to China, remaining loyal to China and serving to the best of our ability.

The communists are the enemy of China as much as of Turkestan and all of mankind. In our struggle against this enemy it is as much to save our own country as well as China and all of mankind. Consequently, it is not correct to surmize that we are working on a separate front.

III. You minutely examined the points that I brought out as proof of Turkestan's claim for independence. By putting your analysis on a scientifically neutral scale I feel that it is necessary to examine it once more.

A. To my stating that «Turkestan geographically is outside China's natural borders», your opinion can be summarized with these two sentences:

1. You claim to characterize my words as having been learned from the imperialists.

2. You claim that since 60 B. C. Turkestan was part of China and, relying on this presumption, you try to prove this country of being but a province inside the boundary of China.

Honourable Minister, your first words, unfortunately, I consider in the nature of being an ugly tarnish on my twentyfive years of respected political life. I fully expected your acknowledgement that my colleagues and myself were never tools of an imperialistic policy and that it was impossible for us to be so. It is not necessary to learn from anyone that Turkestan is situated beyond the natural boundry of China, facts and nature are evidence. Is it not a fact that places outside the territories populated by the Chinese en masse should be outside the boundary of China? The territory populated by the chinese en masse ends in the districts of Anshi and Tung-huang, while in Turkestan 96 % of the population belongs to the Turkish race, an entirely different one from the Chinese. It is seen that my statement is nothing other than an explanation of facts known by everyone. With this statement, I did not profess that Turkestan at present is outside the political boundries of China but rather to lay stress on the freedom which is our natural human right.

As to your second point it is necessary to examine Turkestan's political history, not only from the Chinese, but from a neutral viewpoint, because only under such an examination will the glorious periods in Turkestan's history be understood. Even though the Chinese history books contain very rich information on Turkestan, this information is far from factual and mainly takes into consideration Chinese political interests, by trying

to show its neighboring countries as being inferior. Due to this, many of the true facts are concealed and, as such, do not have any scientific basis.

For the past thirty years I have studied hundreds of historical volumes - the old books written in my country, the translated Chinese historical books, Iranian, Indian, Arabic histories and numerous works of foreign scholars, and through various channels was engaged in research of the history of my own country and its neighbors. As a result of this comparative study I acquired an entirely neutral outlook and sufficient knowledge of my country's history.

Let us examine, from a completely neutral standpoint, the political relations or events between Turkestan and China.

Even though political relations existed between the two countries in the period B. C. it is not correct to assume that during that period Turkestan was part of China. Although Eastern Turkestan was occupied several times by Chinese soldiers, none of these occupations lasted for long. The following are the occupational events:

1. During the Wu-ti era, General Li-Kuang occupied Turkestan in 104 B. C. and in 86 B. C. the people of Turkestan, defeating the Chinese soldiers, regained their independence.

2. During the Hsuan-ti era, General Chang-chi, attacking Eastern Turkestan, captured it in 59 B. C. and in 10 B. C. the Khans of Turkestan, defeating the Chinese armies, won back their freedom.

3. During the Ming-ti era of the Second Khan dynasty, General Pan-Chao, attacking Turkestan in 73 A. D., started the internal war which lasted for 28 years. In 102 A. D. Pan-Chao returned to China, and a year later his son, Pan-Yung, escaped, after having been defeated by the Turkestan Khans, and thus Turkestan once more regained its security and independence.

4. During the Topa (Wey) era, the east part of Eastern Turkestan from 448 to 460 was obliged to submit to that state.

5. In 657 Kao-Tsung of the Tangs conquered Eastern Turkestan, and in 699 the Gok Turk Khans drove out the Chinese.

6. In 747 Hsuan-Tsung dispatched the Korean General, Kao-Sien-Chi, with command of a Chinese army, under guise of help to some of the khans who were fighting among themselves in Turkestan. This general, taking advantage of Eastern Turkestan's internal unrest and playing a very skillful and ruthless role, managed to incite a number of Turkestan people to kill each other, and in such a way subject Turkestan to China, but the inhabitants of Turkestan, obtaining help from the Arabs, destroyed the forces of Kao-Sien-Chi and won their freedom in 751.

During the Suy dynasty the famous Pei-Chu strove hard to conquer Turkestan, but with the defeat of Yang-Ti in 615 Pei-Chu's operation failed.

Thus, over a period of 855 years Turkestan was invaded six times by Chinese force and if we should add up these six invasions the total period would comprise 157 years. If we consider the facts given by the books of history, in none of these periods of occupation of Turkestan was a complete domination established, and during these periods there was continued resistance. The remaining periods of the 157 years of Chinese occupation, approximately 700 years, was Turkestan as a free and independent country. At times during these periods of freedom, there were friendly relations and business connections with China. Certain Chinese historical books, portraying these relations and connections in an unjust manner, try to use them as signs of Turkestan's subjection to China and some politicians attempt to benefit by it.

After the defeat and escape of Kao-Sien-Chin, a period of 1000 years passed until the conquest of Turkestan by the Manchurians. During this long period there was not a single important relation between the two countries, and for 207 years of this 1000 year period Turkestan was occupied by the Kara-Kitay and the Mongolians; while during the remaining period of approximately 800 years, Turkestan remained completely independent and attained great progress and happiness.

The Manchurian Chien-Lung, dispatching General Fu-Te and General Chao-Hu-Yi into Turkestan, strove to occupy the country, and in the face of violent resistance performed terrible massacres and during a three year period, after killing about one million inhabitants, succeeded in occupying the country. Since that time Turkestan was under continuous military rule and until that date the inhabitants, against the terrorist rule of the Chinese military governors, staged 42 armed revolts. (This means that one revolt falls for every four years of Chinese rule). All these revolts were suppressed by the massacre and terrorism of the Chinese troops. This is the short resume of the political relations which occurred between Turkestan and China.

Honourable Minister! Please, if you would, consider with a just and fair viewpoint the invasion and oppression of Turkestan by China. Was it not the most terrible practised by the old and new imperialists to the subjected nations? For the present democratic Chinese Republic to consider the invasion policy made in the old period by the imperialistic aims of the Chinese rulers as a foundation, or else to carry on this policy, will not be advantageous to China and perhaps result in harm, because the Chinese

administrators left a deep mark of aversion and hatred in the hearts of the people of Turkestan. To erase these marks it would consist only of recognition of Turkestan's independence by China. It will not be a loss but rather on the contrary a great gain for the Chinese nation and the government to bring Turkestan into the state of a friendly neighbor.

A. In your letter you stated that, «not only Sinkiang remains inside Chinese soil, but that many places situated outside the Northeast border of Sinkiang in the past were within Chinese soil.» Yes, these types of events are but examples of the great military invasions of the past. A long time prior to the coming of Chinese troops; that is, in 539 B. C., Turkestan was invaded by the Iranians, in 330 B. C. by the Greek, Alexander the Great, and in A. D. by the Arabs and Mongolians, but today none of these nations claim Turkestan. As evident, this means that none of the historic and forgotten invasion incidents constitute a basis for political claim.

B. In my letter I mentioned that «The culture and civilization of Turkestan's population are completely different from the Chinese,» and to this you invited my attention to the need of taking the words culture and civilization in a broader sense, and endeavored to assert that Turkestan does not possess a different culture and civilization. As proof, you pointed out that the Chinese Mohammedans and the people of Turkestans are of the same religion, that a Turkestan Buddhist priest, O-Mu-Ro-Shi went to China and married there, and that General Kushhan of Turkestan served in the Chinese army.

Honourable Minister! If we should take these examples as the basis for the unity of civilization and culture, then Turkestan would be nearer to the culture and civilization of the Iranian, Afganistan, Arabian and even to the Indian nations than to China because these nations, in addition to having the same religion as Turkestan, manner of living, marriage and burial customs, and general moral outlook, have almost identical characteristics. Thousands of Turkestan scholars such as Farabi, Mahmut, Kashgari, Goltekin, Sadettin, Shashi and Tirmizi, by going to Arabia, Iran, Afghanistan and India, rendered great scientific and religious services to these countries. At the same time, innumerable scientific and religious scholars of these countries settled in Turkesan. At one time there were hundreds of generals, like Tolun, Akshit, Akshin, Togach, Kutboga, Pechkam, Kotuz and Baypars, coming from Turkestan who served in the Arab countries. So much so, that a number of these generals were able to form independent states in the Arab countries like Egypt, Iraq and Syria. In India; Aybek, Ilitnish Sovuktekin and Babur, who were Turkestan generals, rose

to the rank of emperors. The Kashgar Division which accompanied Chingis Khan on its Iranian campaign, settled in Iran and now the descendants of this division, who exceed 100,000, reside in the Iranian province of Fars, speak with a pure Turkestani idiom and are called Kashgari.

Honourable Minister! I do not deny that my knowledge of the significance of culture and civilization is not as wide as it could be, but according to your letter you maintain that culture and civilization consist of religious unity and with one or two small relations thus losing its local character.

Please take into consideration that scientific facts show that cultures and civilization only unite as a result of great harmony. You also state that the majority of the Chinese Mohammedan ancestors came from Turkestan, and invited me to consider them in a different aspect. I am very well aware that the majority of Chinese Mohammedans are of my race, and proud of this fact. When I was in China I gave considerable lectures as well as publishing a couple of articles abroad on the subject that the Chinese Mohammedans were descendants of the Turks of Turkestan, but I did not understand the trend of your thought in asking me to look at the Chinese Mohammedans with a different viewpoint.

C. - You went into a lengthy analysis against my opinion that "The people of Turkestan and the Chinese are not of the same race." In this analysis you touched upon many important subjects. I beg your permission to give my opinion on some of these clauses. You claim that "The Chinese culture was formed by various nations inside the boundary of China and was brought to light by religion, culture and writings of these nations and that there are not many complications or prominent differences from the racial viewpoint.

I do not hold with these claims because the language, religion, script and other characteristics of the Turkish, Mongolian and Tibetan nations who are under the domination of China at present have nothing in common with the Chinese - the facts showing no relationship between them. I am convinced that you have noticed the outstanding differences by way of race and blood, and beg you to examine the neutral research of the ethnological scholars once again.

You stated that Chinese culture is in a position to enlighten the entire world and would absorb unto itself as the sea absorbs the small streams, or as the Tiyenshan mountains do not discard its grains of sand, likening it unto America with its assembly of various races.

No matter how large and splendid the Chinese culture is, the cultures of the Turkish and other nations possess a very large history and are of great

importance and cannot be compared to a small brook or grains of sand, as you have quoted.

You say that the Uygurs from the standpoint of their blood are not pure, I understood that not a single nation remains which is pure as regard to its blood. My purpose in stating that «the people of Turkestan and the Chinese are not of the same race» was only to stress the fact that there is as much difference between the Chinese and the Turkestan population as between the Anglo Saxons and the Arabs.

You mentioned that «The number of Uygurs speaking the Turkish language is three million; according to Soviet division there are also Kazakhs, Kirghiz and Uzbeks and in addition to this there are political unities such as Chinese, Manchurians, Mongols and Tadjiks, so should not Sinkiang then be divided into these seven political unities?»

The policy to artificially divide the Turkish population of Turkestan, which possesses the same blood, language, tradition and religion, into Uygurs, Kazakhs, Uzbeks and Tartars, is the invention of the Russian Red Imperialists. I regret very much that in your letter you openly took into consideration this poisonous policy. Is it not a curious fact that at the same time the Chinese politicians are trying to unite China, in Turkestan they are trying to follow the policy of disintegration and does it not remind you of the «Divide and Rule» principles of the imperialists?

You state that the minority nations situated within the Chinese Republic cannot demand freedom on the basis of language, culture and local characteristics. As an example you point out that «The Yi-i, Miao and the Kuo-Kuo nations, although numbering ten million in population, never desired freedom and that Sinkiang should share the same view.

I do not know whether the Yi-i, Miao and the Kuo-Kuo nations desire freedom, but while I was in China I heard of their complaints and revolts. At any rate, these nations are within China and do not constitute a majority in their environs and for this reason cannot demand freedom. But Turkestan is situated beyond the natural boundary of China in a separate geographical site with 96 % of its population being Turkish. Consequently, Turkestan should be independent.

You state that Dr. Sun-Yat-Sen's views regarding the minority nations subjected under China, was good, and that the basic character of Chinese law principles will confirm these views and that the work to be done in Sinkiang at present should consist of restoring peace, increasing the education, improving the economy, etc...

As you well know, Dr. Sun-Yat-Sen's views and law principles were never satisfactory to the Turkestan, Mongolian and Tibetan nations, and, as

such, his testaments and law principles were never put into practice, and it is now understood that they will never be executed.

At the close of your letter you state that some politicians attribute this to the opposition of militarists in China, the war with Japan and economic difficulties.

Honourable Minister! I am obliged to call your attention to the rightful grievances of the Turkestan people. Please consider them with your open heart.

In 1944 after the removal of Shien-Shi-Say from Turkestan that country came completely under the control of the Central Government. Not a single obstacle remained for the carrying out of Dr. Sun-Yat-Sen's principles but, unfortunately, work was started from a completely different outlook. For instance, Wu-Jung-Shin was appointed as governor, whose policy was to destroy nations subjected to China. An effort was made to separate the Turkish tribes who heretofore were united, our cultural and educational works suffered a drastic blow by giving promotions to non-progressive and corrupt persons and by crushing our young intellectuals, and economic works were crushed. This policy of Wu-Jun-Shin resulted in the revolt of the province. Ili and intervention by the Russians. Not one government official paid any attention when we tried to remind them of the errors of this sort of policy.

Is it not an unforgettable example that the Chinese government officials were very irritated and the Chinese press flooded General Jang with criticism when, as governor of Turkestan, he showed a little leniency towards the religious rights, national culture and press of Turkestan? In 1947, could we forget the fact that when trucks were given to Turkestan to help in her transportation difficulties they were stopped in Gansu when some government officials termed this as waste? How can we forget the time when money allotted to Turkestan from the sum given by America for the Chinese economic recovery went into the personal pockets before the eyes of the people of Turkestan? I am certain that you did not forget the time when you were Minister of Education. My project of sending some Turkestan youths to study abroad met with no results after having been refused in a curt manner, and in the En-lao Hotel in Nanking my requests on this matter were refused with definiteness and finality by you. How can I erase from my mind the action of certain persons who created obstacles for our economic recovery by not only tampering but furthermore curtailing the salaries of the unfortunate specialists whom I got after 5 months of effort in Nanking. Was it not the main policy of the Chinese authorities, by bribing ignorant persons with money and position, to co-

underact national recovery and inject hatred between the tribes? The efforts made by the Chinese authorities to use as puppets the local government officials do not remain a secret to a single person from Turkestan.

Honourable minister- We came to China believing the promises that the policies of Dr. Sun-Yat-Sen, and later a more advanced policy, would be put into effect, and during the war with Japan remained to the fullest degree faithful to the Chinese government. With complete sincerity we put down some useful ideas for both Turkestan and China, but unfortunately we were always comforted with distrust by government officials.

You recommended that my colleagues and myself take into deep and broad consideration your views. I thank you and greet your suggestions with deep respect and at the same time beg you to take into hand with a realistic view to the future our ideas and desires which were ignored for many years. I would like to point out once again that our ideas and desires are imperative for the security, well being and prosperity of both China and Turkestan, and are the only remedy for cooperation between the two countries.

,D. I wrote in my letter that «It will be profitable for China to act according to America and England who, by giving India, Pakistan, Burma and the Philippines their independence, received sincere friendship and devoted support from these nations». In your reply you endeavor to explain the geographic, historical and political conditions in these countries.

I know a little about these countries and my sole reason in giving these countries as an example was to bring to your attention the «Good results that the ruling nations obtained in giving back to the ruled nations their prestige and freedom».

You stated in your letter that «the bond between Sinkiang and China is tighter than the old attachments of India, Pakistan and Burma to England, and the Philippines to America». Let me point out that the bonds inspired by armed might were never shown as being too tight. Close bonds can only be obtained by mutual good will and sincerity.

You repeated several times that because the Uygur population of Turkestan is not more than 3,000,000 such a small population is not fit to have its independence. Let me point out that according to our minute research, in Turkestan—that is to say, in Chinese occupied Eastern Turkestan - there are more than 8 million Turks comprising of Uygurs, Kazakhs, etc. Do not heed the reports written behind doors by the Chinese employees living there. Secondly, let me point out that nations with a small population have a right to independence. There are more than 10 free nations in the world with less than a million inhabitants, and there are 20 independent states with a population less than that of Turkestan.

You state that in the event Turkestan should be independent she cannot defend herself. In my opinion, the matter of defense is very simple, because here are two great states on both side of Turkesian. At one time the Chinese State, by defeating the inhabitants of Turkestan by their superior forces, took it under her rule. At present, the Russian Red Imperialists have forcibly seized Turkestan from China. As long as the red empire does not collapse there is no hope of delivery for Turkestan. Consequently at present, Turkestan's defense is out of question. The matter of defence will come after the fall of communism and I anticipate that it will not be difficult for Turkestan, China and the other neighbors with mutual good will to settle it.

You say that if Turkestan is independent it might fall into the same position as Outer Mongolia, but if we should look at the actual situation, Turkestan, because of not being independent, falls into a more tragic fate than - Outer Mongolia. If she were independent perhaps she would have remained as secure as its neighbor, Afghanistan.

You maintain that «Before and after the second world war some nations, relying upon their principles (that nations should possess their own destiny) acted independently, but being unable to manage their problems and as a result of division in forces fell into the hands of the dictators. The Soviet imperialists, by exploiting these principles, are applying a penetrational policy by creating disorder and their influence everywhere.»

In my opinion, if we would consider this gaining of independence from an unbiased viewpoint the matter rests thus; only the newly freed nations who were neighbors to the Russian Imperialist State fell prey to Stalin's assault and thus fell again under captivity, but we notice that the 15 nations who gained their independence in North Africa, and Southern Asia which are situated far from the red imperialists, have continued to be independent and progressive without encountering danger either abroad or internally. This means that freedom does not give birth to disaster but instead brings happiness. Disaster only occurs as a result of having an aggressive and tyrannical neighbor.

You repeat once more your invitation for my colleagues and myself together with the Chinese Government and people to form a united front against communism.

Honourable Minister! We accepted it as our vital principle and until now remained by China against foreign foes. It leaves me with surprise that on one hand you appreciate this, while on the other you give criticism to our struggle against communism. Please, I beg you to explain your reason for this.

You stress that «both the masses and the upper classes of China do not look upon Sinkiang as being apart from China—that they consider Sinkiang as assimilated with China».

I believe that you exaggerated this. There exist in China true scholars and fair-minded persons who know that Turkestan holds a high place among the countries of Asia and that it possesses a completely different identity from China. The uneducated classes who know nothing of Turkestan, hear the invented Chinese names as «Shi-yu» or «Sinkiang» and therefore believe it is Chinese and its inhabitants Chinese. However, upon coming in contact with a native of Turkestan and noting their difference in mien language and other characteristics, they form the opinion that they are of a completely different nationality. When we were in China we met with this sort of incidents daily; in fact, when seeing us these classes would point us out to each other as «Indu-rin» (Ind. an) or else «Alabu-rin» (Arab). I am positive that the true scholars will not conform to your claims. Few people who place political interests above everything else will give frank opinions, but they will not be able to conceal the facts.

In closing, let me point out once again that my colleagues and myself have agreed to work together with China in our struggle against communism. We hope to solve Turkestan's destiny in a friendly and concrete manner, and we anticipate trust from Chinese government officials. If the Chinese government officials had trusted us in the past and would have recognized the importance of our rights, perhaps this misfortune could have been avoided, but there is still time.

I came to Turkey in search of a heaven for my compatriots who escaped from the communists. These people being in an unsettled state, the Turkish government agreed to settle 2000 of my countrymen in Turkey and resolved to help guarantee a life for them here by giving them houses, land and money. I am staying in Istanbul awaiting the arrival and settlement of my countrymen in Turkey.

Wishing you the best of health, and with my deepest respects.

Mohammed Emin BUGRA

12/7/1952



*Eastern Turkistan
Rejects
The Red Autonomy*

Mehmet Emin BUĞRA

İsa Yusuf ALPTUĞAN



Son Havadis Matbaası
ANKARA - 1936

EASTERN TURKISTAN REJECTS COMMUNIST OFFERED AUTONOMY

Nature of Autonomy :

Red China declared autonomy for Eastern Turkistan. This is the text of the declaration as broadcasted from Peking Radio. "Central Government of China has been practising so far a special system of administration in Sinkiang leading to self - Government for the province. Sinkiang attains autonomy on September, 1955. This decision was made by provincial assembly and accepted by the Central Committee, China's highest administrative body." At a big meeting held at the Provincial Capital Urumchi, the first speaker said, "By the grace of unlimited favour of the grand leader Mao Tse Tung and also as the consequence of policy of our great ally Soviet Union our province attains status of autonomy." This followed Chinese Nationalist communique from Taipeh, Formosa, demonstrating Nationalist Chinese reaction. The Communique said, "Communist autonomy for Sinkiang is another step towards strengthening Russian hold over China. This might follow self-rule for Manchuria, a further step to facilitate Russian supermacy in China."

Communist press and radio everywhere is trying to

make best out of it. It tries to convince the World Opinion that Eastern Turkistanians have achieved their cherished aspiration for which they sacrificed hundreds of thousands of their lives and suffered untold hardships.

Comments appeared on this subject in the Free World press are consistent with Nationalist Chinese communique. For instance New York Herald Tribune writes "Hope in the Western circles regarding weakening of Russian hold over China, is fading away by recent events that took place in the Far-East. Autonomy of Sinkiang and steadily increasing Soviet influence in Manchuria - the economic and industrial heart of China, are among the important developments leading to the same conclusion. This sufficiently indicates what the Russian jet fighters, anti aircraft guns, and other military equipments cost to Red China. The paper adds "In fact this autonomy means complete Soviet control over Sinkiang, conceding to Mao's claim of sovereignty over this region. Exactly the same policy was applied by Soviet Union in the case of Outer Mongolia. One can not deny that theoretically independent Outer Mongolia, today, is under total control of Kremlin. The Paper points out in conclusion, "Muslim Turks form absolute majority of Eastern Turkistan's population. This people has been fighting against communist aggression untill the end of 1951."

Official announcement of Red China and also comments appeared in communist press are purely false, propaganda and therefore not worth consideration.

However they manifest presence of sharp friction on the issue of Eastern Turkistan, between Soviet Union and Red China. Chinese press and radio refer to a sort of autonomy strictly within frame work of Chinese out Red China treats Eastern Turkistan as an integral part of Chinese National territory, and emphatically denies the socalled national autonomous status practised in territories conrolled by Soviet Union. On the otherhand Soviet press and radio take this new political status of Eastern Turkistan just like that of National Republics in Soviet Union. So far as the name of this new state is concerned, both Tashkent and Al-mata radios no longer call it Sinkiang; instead they use the word Uyguristan.

This lack of harmony can not be considered as result of simple misunderstanding. This phenomenon is nothing but indication of continuation of contest between Soviet Union and China started in 1871. This dispute continued all through this long period, some times openly and some times undercover according to changes of regims, and political relation. At the beginning, fall of Eastern Turkistan into the hands of Communist Chinese seemed very promising to Russians, but soon after Russia realized that she had confronted with an opposition far stubborn and dangerous than Nationalist China. Russia felt it necessary to conceal her designs as regards Eastern Turkistan from her prejudicial ally and convince Communist China of her "good intentions" by murdering prominent Pro-Russian natives like Ahmed Kasimi, Abdulkarim Abbasov Is-

hak Bey and Delil Khan. The dispute continued and as will be described in the following paragraphs, new tactics were adopted.

As Red Chinese army stepped into Eastern Turkistan violent uprisings broke out all over the country. Red Chinese faced great difficulties in suppressing the uprisings. Russia pretending to assist Chinese Communists in this task sent in its motorized divisions. Subduing the insurgents after much bloodshed, Russia stationed the same at the Northern districts of Altay and Ili as well as at Kumul near Chinese boarder. Not confined to this Russia sponsored setting up of the 5th Army corps, maned by local people and officers being Russians. By Sino-Soviet treaty concluded on Feb., 1950 Russia took possession of all mineral resources of Eastern Turkistan including petrol and Uranium, constructed giant ammunition factories in Ili and Altay regions and set up town size atomic plant and laboratory at Taklamakan and transferred this desert region into Nevada of Soviet Union. Today this place is well established as proving ground of Soviet Nuclear Weapons.

In order to undermine Russian activity to gulp Eastern Turkistan Red China transplanted Chinese families under the guise of dependents of Chinese troops stationed in Eastern Turkistan and also as families of those killed in Korean War. Within a quite brief Period number of Chinese emigrants exceeded half a million. Over and above this, Red Chinese Government brought into Eastern Turkistan more than 900,000 armed Chinese supposed to belong to Chinese

agricultural army, under the "Grow More Food" scheme. These units were settled in rural areas. Houses and farms seized from native farmers were allotted to them. Red China thus having consolidated her position, liquidated the 5th Army Corps and deported part of Russian citizens and agents spread through out the country.

A New Tactic :

By declaration of autonomy of Eastern Turkistan Sino-Russian dispute over this country enters a new phase. Whatever the actual nature of autonomy may be, it can be described as the victory of the new tactics adopted by Russia. Earlier Russian methods created much difficulties for them. Russia persuaded Communist Chinese to agree upon implimentation of the communist principle namely: solving problems of nationalities by creation of puppit national institutions and grant self government for Eastern Turkistan.

There is no doubt that by this tactic Russia aims at transferring administration from Chinese hands to young Eastern Turkistanians trained in USSR, and Pro-Russian elements infiltrated from Western Turkistan, and thus reduce this country to a Soviet Republic. The speaker at Urumchi did not forget to mention this Soviet plan. But as stated above Red China seems to be prepared to take all possible measure to undermine Russian tactics.

It reveals us that these two states, because of

this land of vital economic and strategic importance have forgotten their political relation and ideological unity, are engaged in hot dispute just like two hungry dogs fighting for a mouthfull of fat meat. They shall keep fighting until one or both of them perish.

While users fight among themselves let the readers listen to 8 million Turks-the real owners of the country.

What the real owners of Eastern Turkistan say?

Eastern Turkistan is a Turkic land, 97% of its population are Turks. They have been owners of the country since times immemorial. Through out the course of history this people never hesitated to sacrifice life and loved ones for the sake of freedom and stood fast against aggressors of far superior potential and managed to live at liberty for almost 80% of the past ages. In times subdued by powerful enemies they continued resistance until they regained freedom at the cost of hundreds of thousands of their lives. Eastern Turkistanians waged 46 armed revolts during the last 197 years of Chinese occupation, which begun in 1759. That is; one revolt in every four years. During the same period they regained freedom three times. One lasted for 17 years, another for two years and the latest for three years.

The last 25 years proved the most tragic period in the history of Eastern Turkistan's struggle for freedom. It was not only the Chinese to deal with, this time; but

Russia with its ruthless oppression has been involved. At the beginning Turkistanians did defeat Chinese forces a number of times. Russia could not tolerate a free Eastern Turkistan for she feared lest liberation movement in Western Turkistan should receive encouragement. Russia supported Chinese from land and air, to suppress this freedom loving nation.

People of Eastern Turkistan are continuing and shall continue thier struggle, untill thier charished goal is achieved.

We condenced the long and arduous strife of this nation, which has dedicated itself for the cause of liberty, into these few lines. They certainly do not accept a shadow status aimed at realization of evil intentions of the userpers and can not be fooled by demonstrations of political variegations. Eastern Turkistanians know enough what Red Chinese and Red Russian enslavement mean.

On behalf of 8 million Turks of Eastern Turkistan we beg to bring to the notice of all nations of the Free World the fact that independence in real sense of the word is our aim, and that the so-called autonomy, which is outcome of delebrations between Russia and its satellite Red China, does not interest us at all.

November I, 1955

Mehmet Emin Buğra
İsa Yusuf Alptekin

UPRISINGS AGAINST COMMUNIST CHINESE REGIME IN EASTERN TURKISTAN

According to informations received from reliable surces, wide spread popular revolt against Chinese communist regime in Eastern Turkistan has taken place last March. Center of gravity of the unrest is understood to be the southern region of the country. The *Daily Tasnim* of Lahore, Pakistan reports that the insurgents aimed at establishing an independent state to be called «Eastern Turkistan» or «Uyguristan». It is also reported that in a congress of provincial representatives held in Urumchi recently, intellectual Turkistanis urged the Communist China to accede to national aspiration i.e. independence, of Eastern Turkistan. They warned, if China failed to do so the Hungarian tragedy would be repeated in Eastern Turkistan.

The «*Sinkiang Daily*» published in Urumchi, capital of the Eastern Turkistan, in its 10th and 11th March issues report 378 high ranking government officials and members of provincial assembly have been found guilty as accomplice to an underground nationalist ring working to over-throw Communist regime and establish an independent anti-Communist republic.

The Radio Peking and the Radio Urumchi are still busy in their slanderous campaign against nationalists of Eastern Turkistan. This shows that the unrest in Eastern Turkistan has not been suppressed as yet.

On the other hand appreciable change in the tone of Tashkand Radio broadcasts beamed to Eastern Turkistan, is observed, recently. It is sympathetic towards Eastern Turkistanis and is encouraging. This may be interpreted as demonstration of Sino-Soviet friction over Eastern Turkistan, which hitherto both sides agreed to keep secret from outside world. As such, this point deserves carefull attention.