

WORKING PAPERS

The Malayan Communist Party as Recorded in the Comintern Files

By Fujio Hara

Fujio Hara

Visiting Senior Fellow, ISEAS - Yusof Ishak Institute

Email: yuanbu9er@yahoo.co.jp

The ISEAS Working Paper Series is published by ISEAS – Yusof Ishak Institute.
© Copyright is held by the author(s) of each Working Paper.

Papers in this series are preliminary in nature and are intended to stimulate discussion and critical comment. The Editorial Committee accepts no responsibility for facts presented and views expressed, which rests exclusively with the individual author or authors. No part of this publication may be produced in any form without permission. Comments are welcomed and may be sent to the author(s).

Citations of this electronic publication should be made in the following manner: Author(s), "Title," ISEAS Working Paper on "...", No. #, Date, www.iseas.edu.sg

Series Chairman

Tan Chin Tiong

Series Editor

Lee Hock Guan

Editorial Committee

Ooi Kee Beng

Daljit Singh

Terence Chong

Francis E. Hutchinson

CONTENTS

Preface	2
List of Abbreviations	4
List of Tables	5
INTRODUCTION	6
I Communist Organizations Prior to the MCP	12
II Formation of the Malayan Communist Party (MCP)	34
III The MCP and the Comintern in 1930	48
IV The MCP and the Comintern in 1931	60
V The MCP and the Comintern from 1932 to 1934	79
VI The MCP and the Comintern from 1935 to 1939	97
VII The MCP and the Comintern from 1940 to 1942	117
CONCLUSION	128

Preface

This study of some aspects of the early history of the Malayan Communist Party (MCP) departs from most research on the MCP by drawing primarily on MCP-related documents and files of the Communist International (Comintern) that became accessible to researchers when the Soviet state archives located in Moscow were opened after the break-up of the Soviet Union (USSR). The Comintern documents used here are valuable as a new source of information that supplements and may be tested against other sources, including official documents kept by the governments of colonial and independent Malaya/Malaysia, the MCP's own publications, and various writings that have been published by former MCP members. It is the objective of this study to use this new material to further current understanding of several important issues related to the MCP's early history. Those issues include the party's organizational antecedent and establishment, its official relationship with the Comintern, and its internal disputes during the pre-Pacific War period.

At the outset, I should explain how I came to be able to consult the Comintern files related to the MCP. Around 1992 Professor Kurihara Hirohide and his group of Tokyo University of Foreign Studies researchers had gained access to the voluminous documents kept in the Russian State Archive for Socio-Political History (RSASPH, or, in Russian, Российский государственный архив социально- политической истории).¹ They studiously copied a large batch of documents by hand. Among the files that they obtained on various communist parties of Southeast Asia were a substantial number of documents relating to the MCP. Professor Kurihara very generously gave me a set of copies of those documents which totaled about 170 pages. I wish to record my deep appreciation of Professor Kurihara's kindness in making these precious historical documents available to me, an old retired historian. Thus I have been motivated by my fortunate gain of a new archive to conduct what may be my final research project on the MCP.

The Comintern files consist of documents in five languages. The majority of the documents were written in Russian, followed by English, Chinese, German and French. I cannot read Russian, German or French. Luckily for me, my eldest brother, Mr Hara Happo, can read Russian and German, and my second, elder brother, Mr Hara Motoo, can read French. Between them, my brothers did me the great service of translating relevant documents into Japanese. I have used their able translations and made summaries in English from them for this article. I am indebted to my elder brothers for their great help.

I would also like to thank Professor Khoo Boo Teik of The National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies, Tokyo, Japan, for kindly reading the draft of this study, profoundly improving its English and advising about its structure.

He also recommended me to complete this study at the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies – Yusof Ishak Institute (ISEAS) of Singapore, which accepted me as a Visiting Senior Researcher for three months, from 26 January till 25 April 2015. At ISEAS, its Director, Mr. Tan Chin Tiong, occasionally encouraged me to complete the work. I greatly appreciate ISEAS including its Library and all its staff, especially Mr. Tan Chin Tiong and Dr. Lee Hock Guan, for kindly giving me an opportunity and place to concentrate myself on completion of this research.

I shared an office-room with an eminent historian, Dr. Leon Comber. He kindly suggested to me that microfilms of the Shanghai Municipal Police Special Branch Files (SMPF) were kept in the Central Library of the National University of Singapore (NUS). NUS Library kindly allowed me to read these microfilms. I am grateful to Dr. Comber, the NUS Library and its staff.

At the last stage of writing the draft, I asked Ms. Larisa Nikitina, a Ph.D. candidate of University of Malaya (She took Ph.D. half a year later), to clarify uncertain portions of the original Russian-language documents and to correct Roman spelling of Chinese names which were originally written in Russian. I am deeply grateful to her.

This study follows the classification of the documents of the RSASPH employed by Professor Kurihara, such as Ф. 495 оп.62 д.30.

Notes

1. Its original name was the Institute of Marxism-Leninism. The name was changed to the Russian Centre for the Preservation and Study of Documents of Modern History in 2001. See Sophie Quinn-Judge, *Ho Chi Minh: The Missing Years, 1911–1941*, Singapore, Horizon Books, pp. 2, 260, which refers to the Archive as “RC”.

List of Abbreviations

Communist related organizations/ words

AAS	Anglo-American Secretariat of the Comintern
AIL	Anti-Imperialist League
ASHC	Association of Saving Home Country
CC	Central Committee
CCP	Chinese Communist Party
Cd	Comrade
CNLVC	Chinese National Liberation Vanguard Corps
CYL	Communist Youth League. Komsomol
EC	Executive Committee
ES	Eastern Secretariat of the Comintern
FEB	Far Eastern Bureau of the Comintern
FL	Federation of Labour
GC	General Committee
KMT	Kuomintang. Chinese Nationalist Party
Komparty	Communist Party
MCAJBS	Anti-Japanese Backing-up Society
MCP	Malayan Communist Party
MGLU	Malayan General Labour Union
MGSU	Malayan General Seamen's Union
NCYL	Nanyang Communist Youth League
NGLU	Nanyang General Labour Union
NLC	Nanyang Local Committee
NPC	Nanyang Provisional Committee
NRC	Nanyang Regional Committee
OMS	International Communication Division of the Comintern (Otdel Mezhdunarдни Svyazi. Отдел Международный Связи)
PKI	Partai Komunis Indonesia. Indonesian Communist Party
RILU	Red International of Labour Unions. Profintern
RTU	Red Trade Union
SC	Standing Committee
SSCP	South Seas Communist Party
TU	Trade Union

Others

CID	Criminal Intelligence Department
MS	Malayan State
RSASPH	Russian State Archive for Socio-Political History
SB	Special Branch
SMP	Shanghai Municipal Police
SS	Straits Settlements

List of Tables

Table 1	Membership of Trade Unions in Malaya (sic) Peninsula (Early 1930 ?)
Table 2-1	Persons mentioned in the Comintern Files
Table 2-2	Communist Leaders Referred by Yong and Cheah
Table 3	Membership of the Communist Organizations of Malay States. 3 Oct. 1930
Table 4	Chinese Members in Organisations of Malay Peninsula as at May 1931
Table 5	Leaders of the NPC & the early MCP: Comparison between the CI Documents and Yong's Book
Table 6	Exchanged Documents
Table 7	Secretary of the NPC & MCP

INTRODUCTION

Much research has been conducted on the history of the Malayan Communist Party (MCP). Prior to the Hadyai Peace Agreements that were signed in 1989 between the Government of Malaysia and the MCP and between the Government of Thailand and the MCP, research on the party mainly depended on government sources, that is, official documents and files belonging to the British colonial authorities and the Malayan/Malaysian government. After the Hadyai Peace Agreements, various MCP sources of information also became available to researchers and, about the same time, a few dozen former MCP members began to publish not only their memoirs but also historical party documents. The new materials have tremendously enriched the historiography of the MCP.

From their very beginning, communist organizations of Malaya, *inter alia*, the MCP, were guided and led by the Communist International (Comintern) which was established in March 1919 and dissolved in May 1943. Owing to difficulties in gaining access to the archives of the Soviet Union (USSR), the Comintern files kept in Moscow could not be consulted for a long time. After the collapse of the USSR, however, its archives were opened to foreign historians. In the past decade, a few scholars, such as Sophie Quinn-Judge,¹ Kurihara Hirohide² and Larisa Efimova³ have used Comintern files in research that made references to the MCP. For these scholars, however, the MCP constituted a rather minor portion of their work and they only used a small part of the available material. Thus, historical studies of the MCP that consistently and comprehensively use the Comintern files have not been carried out yet.

For its part, the present work uses Comintern documents mentioned in the *Preface* to revisit the early history of the MCP that remains an important area of inquiry because there are differing theories and viewpoints regarding several basic issues, as discussed below.

The MCP's Antecedent and Establishment

Prior to the MCP, a communist organization was formed that covered communist activities in the whole of Southeast Asia (the "South Seas" or Nanyang). For some time, it was commonly held that the antecedent of the MCP was formed in 1928 as the Nanyang Communist Party (NCP). Professor C. F. Yong (hereafter occasionally Yong), however, argued that this "established theory" was flawed. Mostly from his interviews with former Malayan communists who had settled in China after being deported from Malaya or had left Malaya on their own accord in the 1930s and 1940s,

Yong contended that the MCP's antecedent was in fact a branch (Nanyang Provisional Committee, which was set up in October 1926) of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP).⁴ The MCP's official record, which was published in 2010, also stated that the antecedent was formed in October 1926 as the Nanyang Provisional Committee of the Communist Party (sic).⁵ The organization was apparently renamed the Nanyang Communist Party in 1927 but this detail was itself derived from a dictionary⁶ published in Beijing in 1993.

As for the date of the foundation of the MCP itself, too, there still are two theories. All the official MCP documents proclaim that it was established on 30 April 1930. However, C.F. Yong argues that it was founded between early to mid-April 1930. Yong's crucial grounds is that key MCP founders who had participated in its inaugural meeting were arrested on 29 April in the so called "Nassim Road Incident".⁷

In short, both the antecedent and the date of the establishment of the MCP could not yet be confirmed beyond dispute.

MCP's Affiliation with the Comintern

Nor was it certain whether the MCP was officially a branch of the Comintern. On this matter, both Yong⁸ and Professor Cheah Boon Kheng (hereafter Cheah)⁹ have cited G. Hanrahan's pioneering work which referred to the 1934 (sic) MCP constitution which stated that the MCP was "an affiliate of the Comintern".¹⁰ Nonetheless, no one had so far been able to prove the official membership of the MCP on the basis of evidence supplied by the Comintern. This was an issue that could conceivably be resolved by consulting Comintern documents.

Correspondence and Relations Between the MCP and the Comintern

Hitherto the relations between the MCP and the Comintern on the whole have been analyzed mainly based on the contents of letters intercepted by the British colonial authorities (especially the Special Branch police, or SB) and information obtained from the seized documents as well as the interrogations of arrested communists. Although the colonial authorities very vigilantly monitored the international correspondence between the communists and intercepted many suspicious letters, other letters evidently reached their intended recipients without being noticed. Hence, comparing the relevant SB-intercepted documents (as cited in various research publications) with other

delivered documents kept in Moscow could reveal whether the documents were intact or detected. For that matter, detailed Comintern files could now provide a fuller picture of Comintern-MCP correspondence where only fragments were formerly available. This is especially important to clarify the instructions to the MCP that came not only from the Comintern but also from the CCP. Only thus can researchers accurately assess the influence of instructions delivered to the MCP and the MCP's responses to them.

Internal Disputes and the Split of the MCP

In their work, Yong¹¹ and Cheah¹² had cited significant disputes or splits among MCP members along political lines between 1932 and 1936. The MCP's own booklet published in 1946 also cited the emergence of a "renegade faction" in 1932 and 1935.¹³ Here, again, Comintern documents might provide new information and evidence on those internal disputes, and possibly others that had not come to light in existing literature.

Trade Union Movement and the MCP

Besides the above issues, it is also necessary to investigate the trade union movements to which the communist organizations from the very beginning made a great effort to expand their influence and to improve the lives of the marginalized working class of Malaya. We will examine the Comintern's instructions on labour movements and their effectiveness; how and when did the movements develop?

Thus, the analyses of Comintern documents should farther current understanding of the pre-Pacific War history of the MCP. Clearly, though, there may still be gaps in the documentary evidence. For instance, while drafting an article once, I became aware that documents concerning Lai Teck, who was Secretary General of the MCP between 1939 and 1947 and a British agent at the same time, were absent even though Krihara had referred to them in his book (see Note 1-3). As such, one can say that the Comintern did not dispatch Lai Teck as its representative, but one obviously cannot say how the Comintern regarded Lai Teck in his heyday. In any case, to re-visit the MCP's early history accurately, I have systematically compared the documentary evidence contained in the available Comintern files against the published findings of researchers such Yong and Cheah as well as information provided by the MCP's own publications.

While continuing my research at ISEAS, I could get access to the microfilms of the “Shanghai Municipal Police Files (SMPF), 1894-1949”. It was originally kept at the US National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, D. C.. The Central Library of National University of Singapore (NUS) keeps its SMPF microfilms (67 reels) and a volume of its guide (precise title of each file is shown in this guide). These files contain information relating to the MCP. The British Special Branch obtained these information through crackdowns of Comintern-related activities in Shanghai. To my disappointment and regret, the original files dealing with Hiraire Noulens and Joseph Ducroux, which were inscribed in the guide, were not printed in the microfilm. Noulens was the head of the clandestine Comintern office in Shanghai and Ducroux was dispatched to Singapore by him. Both were arrested in 1931. Nonetheless, various interesting information were obtained from these files.

In order to compare the Comintern documents and the Shanghai SB information, the latter will be examined after probing the former in the relevant year.

To recapitulate, Hara Happon translated the Russian and German—language documents into Japanese while Hara Motoo translated the French—language documents into Japanese. I translated summaries of the Japanese translations into English for the present work. Hence, unless otherwise stated, the summaries of most documents, including original English ones, were prepared by me. If summaries were considered too long, cruxes were shown first for each, and then followed by detailed summaries.

In summaries or direct quotations, notes by the original authors of the documents are placed within () while my own notes are placed within [].

It is difficult to precisely translate minzu (民族) into English. Usually it can be translated as nation, but “nation” means a state as well. When “minzu” is translated as nation, we cannot make out whether it means a group of people or a state. To avoid confusion, scholars are inclined to use “ethnic group” or race. The words “ethnic” or “ethnicity”, however, began to prevail comparatively recently. They were scarcely used in the period examined here. “Race” was a biological terminology that social scientists, especially Marxists including the MCP, have avoided using. In this work, the present author will use “national” to mean “minzu”, except specifically noted otherwise.

Two kinds of list of RSASPH documents used in this research, Russian-language and others, are affixed as appendix at the end of the book.

After my completion of the draft in mid- April, 2015, the late Professor Cheah Boon Kheng, who passed away on 25 July 2015, kindly sent me through email an article written by a Russian scholar, Anna Belogurova.¹⁴ Using the Comintern documents, it also deals with the relevant problems. I thought it must be necessary to supplement my article by taking important new points referred in her article into consideration. Therefore, at the end of each relevant portion, her arguments as well as views are referred to and analyzed.

Notes

1. Sophie Quinn-Judge, *Ho Chi Minh: The Missing Years, 1911-1941*, Singapore, Horizon Books, 2003.
2. Referred in Chapter 1.
3. Larisa Efimova, “Did the Soviet Union instruct Southeast Asian communists to revolt? New Russian evidence on the Calcutta Youth Conference of February 1948”, in *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, Vol.40, No.3 (October 2009).
4. C.F.Yong, *The Origins of the Malayan Communism*, Singapore, South Seas Society, 1997, p.71. Referred in detail in Chapter 1.
5. Fang Shan, et.al., eds., *Magong Wenji, Di 1 Ji, Zhanqian Dixia Douzheng Shiqi (1)* (MCP Anthologies, Underground Struggle Era before the War. 方山 等编 马共文集第 1 辑 战前地下斗争时期 (一)), Kuala Lumpur, Penerbitan Abad 21, 2010, (2010a henceforth), p.155. Referred in detail in Chapter 1.
6. Zhou Nan-jing, et. al., eds., *Dictionary of overseas Chinese* (Shijie Huaqiao Huaren Cidian), 周南京 主编, 世界华侨华人词典, Beijing University, 1993, p.560.
7. Yong, op., cit., pp.128-147.
8. Yong, op., cit., p.152.
9. Cheah Boon Kheng, *From PKI to the Comintern, 1924-1941: The Apprenticeship of the Malayan Communist Party*, New York, Cornell University, 1992, p.18.
10. Hanrahan, G. Z., *The Communist Struggle in Malaya*, Kuala Lumpur, University of Malaya Press, 1971, p.151. In reality, that constitution was decided in 1939. See Chapter 8.
11. C.F. Yong, op., cit., pp.168, 169.
12. Cheah, op., cit., pp.22-25.

13. *Nandao zhi Chun* (Spring of South Island. 南岛之春), Singapore, Malaya Publisher, 1946, pp.9, 10.
14. Anna Belogurova, “The Chinese International of Nationalities: the Chinese Communist Party, the Comintern, and the foundation of the Malayan National Communist Party, 1923-1939”, *Journal of Global History*, Vol.9, Issue 03, Nov.2014, pp.447-470.

CHAPTER I

COMMUNIST ORGANIZATIONS PRIOR TO THE MCP

Until the establishment of the Nanyang Provisional Committee, an MCP's official document, published soon after the end of the Pacific War, outlined the party's antecedents as follows: in 1925, a Comintern branch was established as a branch of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP); in 1926, the Nanyang Local Committee (NLC, 南洋部委) was established; and in 1927, the Provisional Committee of the Nanyang Communist Party (南洋共产党临时委员会) was established at its First Representatives Congress.¹

A somewhat different history of the MCP's beginnings, derived mainly from interviews with numerous former leaders of the early communist movements in Malaya, has been provided by C .F .Yong. In October 1926, the CCP set up the Nanyang Regional Committee (NRC; 中共南洋区部委员会), subsequently renamed in April 1927 as the Nanyang Local Committee (NLC; 中共南洋部委), and in January 1928 the Nanyang Provisional Committee of the CCP (中共南洋临时委员会) was established.²

Utilizing the Comintern Files for the first time, Kurihara Hirohide asserts that the first communist organization of Malaya was formed as an overseas section of the CCP in 1925, and that the MCP set up its Siam Special Committee which was the first communist organization of Thailand in 1927. The Nanyang Provisional Committee of the CCP, or the Nanyang Communist Party (NCP), was formed first. The NCP became an independent party, the MCP, in May 1930.³

In fact, the Comintern files contained documents with detailed information. Three records are especially important here – two files in Russian, and one in English. One of the Russian language file, dated 7 February 1942 and bearing the names of three authors, namely, K. Vilkov (Вилков), A. Zhuzin (Зюзин), and Dashevskii (Дашевский), was entitled, "Research report on the activities among overseas Chinese in Malaya – made by reviewers of the Executive Committee (EC) of the Comintern based on the data of 1939-1940". This file was bound with another Russian language

document, dated 15 January 1942, signed by Dashevskii, and entitled, “Biographical information (биографические сведения) and evaluation of the leadership of the MCP”.

From these two files, the following information on the brief history of the MCP (КОМПАРТИЯ МАЛАЙИ) may be obtained:

- 1925 The first communist group in Malaya emerged among the overseas Chinese.
- 1926 A committee was formed to set up the South Seas (Южные моря) Communist Party (SSCP).
- 1927 The First Congress (Съезд) of the SSCP was held and a Provisional Committee was set up. Owing to its youthfulness and a lack of guidance from the Comintern, the Party was weak.⁴
- 1929 Regarding the characteristics of the Malayan revolution, the SSCP received instructions from the Central Committee (CC) of the CCP.
- 1930 The Second Congress of the SSCP was held and the CC of the MCP was elected. From then on, the Party stood on its own. Even so, the national liberation movement in China and the tasks of the CCP always affected the tasks of the MCP.⁵

Filed between the two Russian language files was the English document, “The general conditions of the trade union movement”. Written in 1931, this document reviewed the activities of the Communist organizations in this period as follows:

The trade union movement in Nanyang (sic) began in 1925 and at the time the tu-s [sic. trade unions] were under the control of Kuomintang.... (T)here were organisational relations with the Chinese Party. Though delegates were sent to Wuhan [Wuhan 武汉?] to attend the conference, it took a long time to make regular connections with the All-China Federation of Labour. It was after the delegated conference of the All-NY [sic. Nanyang] Federation of Labour which was held in February, 1928,⁶ that there were reorganised (sic) the org-s of the trade unions. From February to April in 1928, there occurred uprisings of very violent nature It was at this time that the tus were reorganised from the left KMT, and its org.s (sic) were suddenly enlarged. The membership was then 4,000. But after the defeat of the shoe-makers strike and the committing of various mistakes on works, the tu mov. [movement] received a great blow and it was at a standstill for the

time being. With the basic correction of the past mistakes in 1929, the tu mov. began to walk along the right path.

Another defect is that the Party headquarters at 巴城 [Jakarta] and Borneo are under the guidance of the CC [Central Committee] of the M.

[Malay?] Party; really they should be guided by the Party at Java. This arrangement makes the directive work very inconvenient. ...

Should the CC of the Malay (sic) Party have relation with the Party at Kwangtung? How do we relate with it? (Because cds. [comrades] deported from the South Seas must pass through HK. If the Party at HK did not help them in finance, they must be very difficult or disappointed).⁷

A table of the membership of trade unions was affixed to this English document (see Table 1).

In an English letter, dated 28 December 1930, sent to the Far Eastern Bureau (FEB)⁸ of the Comintern, Wang Yung Hai (王永海?), who had come to Shanghai more than three months earlier, noted that:

(Cd.) Huang Moh Hang [Wong Muk Han] who was driven out by the Nanyang Authorities after being released from jail ... made a detailed report on the history & work of the Party in Nanyang from its establishment.

... All these have been sent to you thru (sic) the CC of the CCP. But according to the cd. who came to see me, all ... have not reached you!⁹

Two inferences could be made from the different records summarized so far. First, the author of the report on the trade union movement might have been a Chinese, or someone who could write Chinese characters (see 巴城 above). A report written by Huang could have been the document on the trade union movement shown above (details see Chapter III-4). Second, the Party was also called the *Malay* Communist Party (emphasis added). The name of the Party and other points regarding Wang Yung Hai and Huang Moh Hang will be further examined in Chapter III.

1. Establishment of the Nanyang Provisional Committee

The Comintern Files contained no document that precisely dated the founding of the Nanyang Provisional Committee (NPC). A Russian language report to the Comintern, written in August 1928, a month after the [2 July 1928] Plenum (Пленум) of the Provisional Committee (PC [‘Nanyang’ is absent from this file]), noted the following points. Prior to referring to these in detail, its cruxes are shown:

- (1) The Enlarged Plenum and the Plenum were held on 2 May and on 2 July 1928 respectively.
- (2) Name of the Party had varied.
- (3) Because of wrong, too radical lines adopted earlier, several top leaders were reprimanded, a few were dismissed and the leadership was reshuffled.
- (4) Based on Comintern’s instruction, radical line represented by shoemakers’ strike of early 1928 was criticized,
- (5) Appeal to Malays and Indians were stressed,
- (6) Requested personal and financial aid from the Comintern,
- (7) The Third Party Congress had been held earlier.

Details are summarized below:

- (1) The Plenum examined PC’s activities during the three to four months after its inauguration.
- (2) The PC made a mistake in approving a wrong strategy of launching an uprising in February and March.
- (3) Two months have already passed since we sent a report on our activities of April and May. Why didn’t you give us instructions?
- (4) The PC held a conference on the anti-imperialist movement of the Malay Archipelago on 3 August.¹⁰

The above information suggests that the NPC was established in early 1928. Moreover, this particular Russian language report referred to various matters related to and important issues discussed at the Plenum of the (N)PC of 2 July 1928, namely:¹¹

- (5) The Enlarged Plenum (Расширенный Пленум) was officially held on 2 May. This Enlarged Plenum lasted a full two weeks.
- (6) The Enlarged Plenum was attended by all members of the PC; representatives of the town committees of Penang, Seremban (Фу-жун. Fujung), Malacca, Kuala Lumpur (Ди-лунпо. Jilongpo) and Johor; and representatives of the special districts of Riau and Muar, local committees of East, West and Central Borneo, the special cell of seamen, the cell of rubber production workers, and the provisional committee of the Communist Youth League (CYL), Workers Committee and the Anti-Imperialist League. Attending the [Enlarged?] Plenum as observers were Zheng Ting Xing (Чжен Тин Син) and Chen Dan (Чень Дан. Chen Yan?). Guangdong Regional Committee did not send any representative. In all, 30 persons attended the [Enlarged?] Plenum.
- (7) Cd. Bo Yi (Бо-и. [Su Bi Yi = Su Pek-ngi?]), Cd.Bo Hai (бо хай [= Чень бо хай, Chen Bo Hai?]), Cd. Mu Heng (Му хэн [= Хуан му хэн, Huang Mu Heng = Wong Muk-han?]) reported on the political situations, the strategies of the Party of Malay Archipelago and the activities of that Party respectively.
- (8) The Plenum recognized mistakes in leading the strike of the shoemakers and in paying attention to workers' economic struggles.
- (9) The Plenum accepted that the Chinese Party of the Malay Archipelago was placed under the direct leadership of the PC.
- (10) In order to set up a national organization such as the one in Siam, a special committee should be organized.
- (11) A Commission would be organized to commence a nationalist movement.
- (12) The Chinese Party should appeal to as many Malays and Indians as possible. Under the leadership of the Comintern, all nationals should be united in the immediate future.
- (13) Owing to insufficient reorganization at the *Third* Party Congress (emphasis added) (Третий Партийный Съезд), our Party and its steering committee were weak.
- (14) Reorganization of the PC: All sabotaging, lagging and wavering elements were purged. Courageous, honest and devoted comrades were specially selected. Comrades who originated from workers and farmers were appointed to leading posts. The following people were covered by those measures:

- PC members, Wen Xin Ruo (Вень син жо [= Pan Xian-jia? Bun Sin-oan?]) and Feng Ning Guang (Фын нин гуан) were expelled.
- Huang Mu Heng was expelled from the Presidium [General Committee? Standing Committee?].
- Cds. Chen Xing Go (Чен син го. [= Chen Xing Guo?]), Chen Bo Hai, Chen Xiu Fang (Чень сю фан?) and Zhu Ping (Чжу пин) were seriously reprimanded.
- Tang Sen Sheng (Тан сен шен) was warned.
- Su Bo Yi (Су бо и. [= Su Bi Yi?]) and Ma Ye Bing (Ма е бинь) were criticized most seriously.
- Zhan Xing Xiang (Чжан син сянь) and Wang Yue (Ван юэ.[= Wang Yue Bo?]) were criticized.
- Huang He Qing (Хуан хе цин [= Huang Hai-ping?]) and Pan Ying Hou (Пань ин хоу) were additionally appointed to be PC members.
- Li Ji xiang (Ли цзи сянь [= Li Qi Xin or Li Sheng Xiang?]), Lai Chuang? Yao (Лай чуан? яо [= Li Guang Yuan?]), Zhang Zhen? (Чжан чжень?) and Huang Sheng Yu (Хуан шень юй = Huang Sheng Qu) were nominated as candidates of the PC.

A list of punishments was secretly kept, but it was later lost.

1. In Singapore (Син-чжоу Xing zhou), too, all regional leading organizations were being reorganized and all the leading staff re-investigated.
2. As a result of the recent correct leadership of Tan Yao Tai (Тань яо тай), trade unions of Kuala Lumpur were reorganized and totally transferred to Selangor Trade Union Soviet. Hence, Tan's Party membership was restored.

(15) Changes to the staff of the PC and the Presidium

- Cd. Ma's request to resign from the Presidium staff was accepted.
- Cds. Li and Zhan were appointed as staff of the Presidium.
- Cds. Fang Cai Cheng (Фан Цай чен) and Yuan Zhuang Qi (Юань Чжуан ци) were appointed as succeeding staff of the PC.

- Cd. Zeng (Цзэн) was elected as secretary. He returned to the CCP and was replaced by Cd. Chen (Чен).

(16) Requests to the CC of the Comintern

- Send back comrades who were called back for training.
- Send personnel to investigate and research the activities in Malay Archipelago.
- Send personnel for labour as well as women's movements.
- In a timely manner, provide necessary funds for the Party and the Trade Union.¹²

2. Instruction from the CCP in 1929

The resolution adopted at the Congress of the Communist Party of Malay Archipelago in 1930 referred to an instruction received from the CCP. The resolution, written in English and entitled “The Character and Driving Force of Malay Rev (sic)”, may be summarized thus:

The III Congress (sic) of the Malay (sic) Party fully agreed with the instruction on the estimation of character of Malay (sic) rev. [revolution] made by the C.C. of C.P. of China in January and October 1929.

- Malay (sic) rev. is a bourgeois democratic rev. because (a) Malaya (sic) is a colony. Its peoples require to establish Malay Federation of Republics, (b) It is necessary to eradicate feudal remnants, (c) The first rev. movement is to secure the prospect of development of capital.
- To drive out imp-ts [imperialists] is the present greatest task of Malay rev. Only by this can the feudal remnants be eradicated.

Only by way of armed insurrection under the hegemony of pro. [proletariat], we can overthrow imperialist and establish the federated republican state.¹³

The CCP's instruction was also said to have advised the Malay Party not to rely on the victory of Chinese revolution but to be independent and act under the leadership of the Comintern.¹⁴ And the instruction also did not offer any advice to the Malay Party to change its violent, extremist policy. That might mean that the change from the violent policy was not due to the CCP's instruction but the Comintern's.

According to Anna Belogurova, the instruction dated 22 January 1929 was written by Li Li-san, the then de facto CCP leader. In his diary entry for 1 January 1929, Li criticized the Nanyang Communists for making a Chinese revolution. He advocated a 'Nanyang revolution', that is, a revolution based on local conditions (indigenization). These conditions included the Nanyang's colonial status, the 'many nationalities' present and a more developed industry. The principal task of our party [NCP] is to make all the oppressed unite and strive for the national emancipation.

Belogurova also comments that these points were discussed in the sixth congress of the Comintern (17 July – 1 September, 1928) in Moscow, in which Li participated. Unwilling to assume full responsibility, the CCP sent the draft to the Comintern for approval. She concluded that it was the CCP leadership that first suggested the organization of a Nanyang party under Comintern leadership.¹⁵

3. NPC after the Plenum

No document on the PC conference held on 3 August 1928 was filed. Instead, the files included a Chinese language report dated 15 March 1930 that was sent to the Comintern. Below is a summary of the report:

- (1) NPC received the resolution of the Comintern Tenth Plenum (全体会议). After detailed discussion at the 25th Executive Committee conference (会议), the CC of the NPC fully agreed with it and its line.
- (2) Under the present international circumstances, besides opposing the Social Democratic Party, especially its left faction, we have to oppose the rightists, appeasers and opportunists. Because opportunistic elements in the Party of the colonies intend to replace the communist organizations by the nationalist party in these days.

- (3) Recently, Secretary of the Provisional Committee of the CYL, Cd. Fu Zai Long (符在隆), propounded to the masses of the Party how good Chen Du Xiu (陈独秀) Theory was. NPC not only did not dispose of him, it glossed over his serious mistake. Naturally Cd. Fu did not admit his mistake with Bolshevik spirit, let alone correct it.
- (4) In the past, the Nanyang Party made a serious mistake of blind actionism (盲动主义) on the one hand (a little of which remains), but after correcting itself, it deeply sank into non-actionism (不动主义) on the other. Not a little opportunistic tendency as well as such ideas as peaceful development, legal movement, narrow nationalism, Chinese revolution in Nanyang and waitism (等待主义) covertly remain in the Party. We must resolutely deal with the Third Party stratagem of the anti-reorganization faction.¹⁶

4. The Related Communist Movement in Thailand

In the late 1930s, the Siam (Thai) communist organization sent a letter in Russian to Kuusinen (Куусинену) of the Comintern. Below is a summary of the contents of the letter which referred to various developments within the early communist movement in Thailand:

After the coup d'état of KMT in 1927, Cd.Tang (Танг. [Tang Sen Sheng?]) came from Singapore. He had connections to the Provisional Committee of the Malay (Малаи) Communist Party. In the name of the Siam Special Committee of the Malay CP, he organized a Chinese communist group. In 1928, the PC of the Malay CP (PCMCP) appointed Cd. Tang as secretary of the Siam Party. But dissatisfied with him, Siamese members expelled him. Tang then set up another special committee which was not placed under the PCMCP but under the Guangdong Regional Committee.

After Siamese organizations had almost collapsed, the PCMCP dispatched inspectors in February 1930. At the enlarged Congress held in March 1930, the Siamese Committee of the Malay Communist Party was set up.

In May 1930, under the guidance of the Eastern Secretariat,¹⁷ the PC of Malay held the Third Congress at which the CC of the Malay CP was elected. The Siamese Committee had sent two representatives to this Congress, but one of them was arrested.¹⁸

5. Historians' Analyses

The information gleaned from the Comintern Files thus far can be compared with or corroborated by the research and analyses conducted by various historians up to this point.

With regard to the communist movement of that era, Cheah Boon Kheng has identified four of its Chinese leaders, that is, Soh Pek Ngi, Mah Yap Peng, Wong Juat Pho, and Ho Hong Seng. In November 1928, Soh was sentenced to three years' "rigorous imprisonment". The following year, in May/June, Wong and Mah, together with two Malay communist leaders, Ali and Hj. Mohamed, attended the annual conference of the Pan Pacific Trade Union Secretariat in Shanghai.¹⁹

Consulting both communist sources and colonial intelligence sources, C. F. Yong has analyzed the movement of this period in detail. Some important points from his analysis that are relevant to the leaders in this period may be summarized thus:

- (1) Five secret envoys were dispatched from China between October 1927 and January 1928. They were Phua Tin-kiap, Iang Pao-an, Yong Yok-su, Cheung Hong-seng, and Cheung Yok-kai.
- (2) In January 1928, a 15-member reorganization committee was formed. After founding the new party [NPC], it made way for a 5-member general committee. Coming under the authority of the general committee were local committees for Penang, Malacca, Johor, Kuala Lumpur, Seremban, Ipoh, Sungai Lembing [Pahang] and Rhio [Riau?].
- (3) There were two views as to who had dispatched the five envoys – the Comintern or the CCP? The fact that there was *no trace of an association between the five envoys and the Comintern* (emphasis added) suggested that it was the CCP which directed and controlled the new overseas offshoot.
- (4) The NPC comprised 13 members during 1928, including the five envoys and eight local Hainanese communists, the latter being Tan Pek-hai, Tan Heng-kok, Mah Yap-

peng, Soh Theng-bun, Tan Tiu-jeng, Ong Juat-pho, Tan Gam, and probably, Chiam Hang-cheong.

- (5) The five envoys formed the General Committee (GC) which was the party's standing committee until at least August 1928.
- (6) Iang probably returned to Macau and Hong Kong in the latter part of 1928 and then to Shanghai in 1929.
- (7) After three of the five envoys, Phua and both of the Cheungs, were arrested, the GC was reshuffled in March 1928. Yong was reappointed as a member. New members were Mah, Tan Tiu-jeng, Chiam and Wong Muk-han. By September 1928, however, Yong was no longer a Committee member.
- (8) Phua stayed in Malaya three times, that is, February to April 1926, October 1927 to July 1928. [During the second period, he was the head of the Nanyang General Labour Union (NGLU)]. But he was arrested on 31 January 1928 and deported after a six-month imprisonment.
- (9) Cheung Yok-kai was arrested in Singapore on 8 February 1928 and sentenced to penal servitude for life.
- (10) Cheung Hong-seng, alias Wong Teck-chai, played a significant role in reorganizing the Nanyang Local Committee. He was appointed by the Reorganization Committee to be the *party secretary*, the propaganda chief and a member of the military committee. Arrested on 8 March 1928, he was subsequently sentenced to penal servitude for life.
- (11) Tan Pek-hai was active in the labour movement during 1927. The records showed him to be still a member of the NPC in August 1928. After that, no trace of him has been available.
- (12) Tan Heng-kok was the acting head of the NGLU which launched the shoemakers' strike in Singapore between February and April 1928. He was arrested on 24 August 1928 and presumably banished from Malaya for life.
- (13) Soh Theng-bun, the acting deputy head of the NGLU, seemed to have remained at large during the era of the NPC.
- (14) Mah Yap-peng played an important role in building bridges with some of the Malay radicals in 1928 and 1929. He headed the six-member military committee of the party and maintained his position as a Committee member in 1928. His movements and whereabouts during 1930 were undocumented.

- (15) Tan Tiu-jeng, alias Tan Jui-seng, was assigned by the NGLU to reorganize affiliated branches in Seremban, *Kuala Lumpur* and Penang in 1928. He was on the military committee, but he was arrested on 5 August 1928 and presumed to have been subsequently banished.
- (16) One Juat-pho [with the 'One' to be read as 'Ong'], or Wee Juat-Pho, was involved in organizing Malay participation in the movement. He was a member of the military committee and remained at large until his arrest on 29 April 1930.
- (17) Chiam Hang-cheong was said to be a communist envoy from China in 1926. He was one of the key leaders of the NRC and NLC, as well as the founder of the NPC. He was appointed as a member of the new five-member General Committee in March 1928. Chiam was probably arrested and banished before July 1928.
- (18) Tan Gam was a "most wanted" communist in July 1928 but he retained his position as a committee member of the NPC in August 1928.
- (19) Wong Muk-han continued to be on the NPC until his arrest in September 1929 and deportation to China a month later.
- (20) On the list of the NPC members as at August 1928, besides the five persons mentioned above, there were Su Pek-ngi, Ho Hong-seng, Cheng Heng-sin, Bun Sin-oan, Fu Siang-hu, Tong Chek-an and Wang Lik-peng. Su had been one of the private secretaries to Borodin (Sun Yat-sen's adviser from Comintern) in Canton. Su was able to speak fluent English. He was arrested in November 1929. Ho was arrested on 2 August 1928 while Tong and Wang were arrested during July and August 1928.
- (21) The Standing Committee of the NPC between June 1929 and April 1930 comprised three persons, Wu Ching alias Hsu Tien-ping (Secretary), Fu Tai-keng and Lin Chin-chung. Wu and Fu arrived in Malaya in early 1929 and Lin before 1928.
- (22) Lei Kuang-juan was the acting head of the NGLU from May to August 1929. Chu Yang was a leader of the Nanyang Communist Youth League (NCYL) from June 1928 till the beginning of 1929. Huang Hai-ping was one of the three members of the Standing Committee of the NCYL during 1929.
- (23) Fu Tai-leong was one of the founders of the NRC in 1926. He succeeded to the leadership of the NCYL by the beginning of 1929.
- (24) In early 1928, the NPC adopted an extremist policy exemplified by the attempt to assassinate three visiting Kuomintang (KMT) officials in February and the

shoemakers' strike (which even featured bomb-throwing) from February to April. This phase of violence was followed by a Chinese nationalist anti-Japan phase. (Yong noted without elaboration that the NPC paid the full price for this experimentation: the NPC was reorganized after admitted that the policy was wrong.)²⁰

With regard to Fu Tai-keng of (21), Hanrahan noted that following the persuasion of Tan Malaka, Chief Comintern representative for all Southeast Asia of early 1926, the CCP sent a special representative, reportedly named Fu Ta-ching [Fu Tai-keng] to Malaya.²¹

In the footnote, Hanrahan wrote that this information was based on page 335 of Chijin [Chihiro] Tsutsui's *Nampo gunsei-ron*.²² In reality, p.335 of Tsutsui's book is the last page of his postscript cum his book itself. No reference was made to the MCP, the NCP or even Malaya. Instead, on page 146 and 147, Tsutui argued that communist movement in Malai²³ began when Fu Da-jing (符大经. Meaning Fu Ta-ching), who had fled from Guangdong in 1925, organized the NCP. In that year, as a result of a failed riot in Guangdong, many CCP members sneaked into Singapore with Fu as their supreme leader. On that occasion, the CCP decided to establish cells in this region and dispatched a French Communist Party member, Lefranc [alias Ducroux], to cooperate with Fu. In 1931, Fu and Lefranc were arrested by British authorities.²⁴

Tsutsui depended on the information provided by the Japanese Military Police (JMP. Kempei-tai). If the JMP had seized secret documents left behind by the British SB, it could have grasped the precise relations among Fu, Lefranc, the CCP and the Comintern. Tsutsui's inaccurate argument in this part shows the JMP obtained this information from other sources, probably from interrogation of arrested MCP members including Lai Teck.

Another point is, Chinese characters of Fu Da-jing (Fu Tai-keng) were also not accurate. According to Yong, his name is 傅大慶 (Fu Da-qing in Mandarin). In this regard, the informant seems either not to have provided an accurate information or not to have known the accurate characters.

6. Changes in the Comintern's Strategies

In order to gauge the influence of the Comintern over the NPC, the Comintern's relevant political strategies (especially concerning the CCP) and their changes will be briefly examined here.

In January 1923, the Executive Committee (EC) of the Comintern made a resolution that the KMT was a pivot of the national revolution of China and that the CCP should collaborate with the KMT. Abiding by this resolution, the Third National Congress of the CCP, which was held in June 1923, decided to form a United Front with the KMT. After the First National Congress of the KMT had accepted the principle of a united front in January 1924, the First United Front of the KMT and the CCP was realized.

At the 8th Enlarged Plenum of the EC held in May 1927, the “surrenderism” (meaning collaboration with the KMT now led by Chiang Kai Shek) of Chen Du Xiu, then secretary of the CCP, was strongly criticized. The CCP was instructed to reorganize the KMT from within and to oppose uprisings. Consequently, the CCP dismissed Chen from his post in August 1927 and expelled him from the party in November 1929.

In fact, it was the Comintern, or more precisely Stalin, who had directed the CCP to collaborate with the KMT earlier, whereas Trotsky had severely criticized that policy as the suppression of proletarian leadership. In July 1927, Chiang Kai Shek had terminated the KMT-CCP United Front by murderously turning on the CCP and its allies. As such, Chen sided with the Trotskyites from 1929.

At the 9th Enlarged Plenum of the EC held in February 1928, notions of ‘socialist revolution skipping over bourgeois democratic revolution’ and of ‘Putschism’ (riotism) were denounced as Trotskyism. In June 1928, Qu Qiu Bai (瞿秋白), who had replaced Chen Du Xiu and led the radical line of the CCP, was himself criticized as an adventurist and relegated at the CCP's 6th National Congress.

At the 6th World Congress of the Comintern held in August-September 1928, the CCP was criticized for “flattering the bourgeoisie” (KMT). Instead the importance of communist-led mass struggle was stressed. At the same time, however, an unceasing struggle against Social Democracy,

the main channel of imperialist pacifism within the working class, was prescribed as the first task. In turn, Trotsky attacked this new line as a switch to “extreme leftism”.

The 10th Enlarged Plenum of the EC held in July 1929 designated as the primary task a struggle against rightists and “harmonism” in which Social Democrats were to be regarded as traitors. Moreover, mass political strikes of workers (but not uprisings) were also emphasized. Towards the end of 1930, Li Li San (李立三), who had led the urban uprising policy, was criticized by the Comintern as being adventurist and Li lost his position in the CCP.²⁵

7. Shanghai Municipal Police Files

One file entitled Report on communist suspect in Nanking deals with Fu Ta-ching (傅大庆) in detail. Its cruxes relating to this period are as below:

- (1) His name is spelled Foo Thai Keng, Foo Da Ching as well. His pseudonyms are; Boon Tat Keng (文达庆), Voo Tat Ming (符达名), Vung Tat Qon (文达宽) and Veng Dah Ching (文达庆). (Information received from Singapore in April 1932).
- (2) A letter sent from Singapore SB to British Vice-Consul, Shanghai (dated 23 July 1931) states; Fu appears to be about 30 years though he gives his age as 25.
- (3) Chinese Authorities state that he is a native of Kiangsi (江西) and studied in Russia and France. He assisted Borodin when the latter was associated with the KMT in 1926.
- (4) From evidence in possession of Singapore Police, Fu first arrived in Singapore in November 1928. The Communist movement in Malaya was under his direction since then until his arrest on 1 June 1931.
- (5) Before his arrest, the Shanghai SB possessed no information about him.²⁶

8. Tentative Analyses

Comparing the Comintern files with some historians’ research findings, the present author has tried to clarify some salient points about the communist movement in Malaya before the establishment of the MCP. These points may be usefully recapitulated here:

- (1) Name of the Party: for several years, the party was variously named. While it was a branch committee of the CCP, it was also called the Malay Archipelago Communist Party, the Malay (Communist) Party, or Chinese (Communist) Party of Malay Archipelago. The name of Malay Party might have emerged because the relevant persons of the Comintern could not distinguish Malay from Malaya.²⁷
- (2) The General Committee (Standing Committee) should be the Presidium.
- (3) The Party's official assembly was also called by different names – Congress (which was its own usage in English whereas scholars have tended to use Conference), Plenum and Enlarged Plenum. Had the Party followed the Comintern system, Congress (Conference) would have been the national representatives' assembly while Plenum would have referred to the assembly of the Central Committee or the Presidium.
- (4) The First Congress of the Party was held in 1927 and the Second in 1930. Yet, the Third Congress was said to have been held before the Plenum of 2 July 1928 (1.- (13)). It would appear that this "Third Congress" was the Enlarged Plenum of May 1928. In this, the sequence of officials meeting might have been confusing even to the Party leaders themselves.
- (5) The Russian spelling of a Chinese name followed the Mandarin pronunciation. Likewise, the spelling of place names followed the Mandarin pronunciation of specific Chinese names, not the original Malay names. In all likelihood, the authors of the relevant reports were intellectuals familiar with Mandarin.
- (6) Some names of the leaders in the Comintern documents can be reconciled with those of leaders mentioned by past research. As Tables 2-1 and 2-2 show, one can reasonably identify some leaders whose names differed somewhat depending on the sources used by researchers.
- (7) The Comintern documents provide a detailed picture of the structure of the Party leadership at the Plenum of 2 July 1928, as shown below:

Presidium

Expelled: Huang Mu Heng (Wong Muk-han)

Resigned: Ma Ye Bing (Mah Yap-peng)

Newly appointed: Li Ji Xiang (Li Qi Xin or Li Sheng Xiang?), Zhan Xing Xiang (Chiam Hang-cheong)

PC: Su Bo Yi (Su Pek-ngi), Chen Bo Hai (Tan Pek Hai), Huang Mu Heng, Chen Xing Go (Tan Heng Kok), Chen Xiu Fang, Zhu Ping (Chu Yang?), Tang Sen Sheng, Ma Ye Bing (Mah Yap-peng), Zhan Xing Xiang (Chiam Hang-cheong), Wang Yue (Ong Juat-pho?)

Expelled: Wen Xin Ruo (Phua Tin-kiap?, Bun Sin-oan?), Feng Ning Guang.

Newly appointed: Huang He Qing (Huang Hai-ping?), Pan Ying Hou, Fang Cai Cheng, Yuan Zhuang Qi

PC Candidates:

Newly appointed: Li Ji xiang (Li Qi Xin or Li Sheng Xiang?), Lai Chuang Yao (Lei Kuang-juan?), Zhang Zhen, Huang Sheng Yu (Huang Sheng Qu)

Prominent leader of trade union: Tan Yao Tai

Secretary: Zeng returned to the CCP. He was replaced by Chen Bo Hai or Chen Xing Go (Guo).

(8) Comparing the Party leaders with those mentioned by the research of Cheah Boon Kheng and C. F. Yong

- Yong's research (5-(10)) suggested that Zeng might have been Cheung Hong-seng (Zhang Hong Cheng) because both had been Secretary of the Party. But as Cheung had been arrested on 8 March 1928, he could not have been appointed Secretary at this Plenum. Current information does not permit a precise identification.
- The trade union leader, Tan Yao Tai, who restored the trade union movement in Kuala Lumpur, might have been Tan Tiu-jeng. Again, that cannot be established with certainty.
- Yong wrote that the five envoys from the CCP – Phua Tin-kiap, Iang Pao-an, Yong Yok-su, Cheung Hong-seng and Cheung Yok-kai – formed the

Presidium (GC). From the Comintern list, if Secretary Zeng is Cheung Hong-sen, he could have been a Presidium member as well. It can be confirmed that Yong Yok-su was no longer a PC member in July, and that Cheung Yok-kai was not appointed at that time because he had been arrested in February 1928. Most of the other eight PC members mentioned by C. F. Yong correspond to those in the Comintern lists.

- Yong wrote that Li Chi-sin first arrived in Malaya in 1929.²⁸ The MCP's official record noted that Li was dispatched to Singapore by the CCP in 1930.²⁹ If Li Ji xiang was Li Chi-sin, he would have come to Malaya earlier and was soon after appointed as a Presidium member.
- The Comintern files mentioned the arrest and banishment of Huang Moh Hang alone. That might suggest that many of the leaders who attended the Plenum were arrested afterwards.
- The place names of the "town committees" in the Comintern files are almost the same as those of the "local committees" in Yong's account. It was not previously known that there was a local committee of East, West and Central Borneo.
- Although Ho Hong-seng appears in the respective books by Cheah and Yong, Ho was not mentioned in the Comintern files.
- As Su was once a secretary to Borodin, he might have been proficient in and able to write reports in Russian. Fu Tai-keng studied at the Oriental University in Moscow from 1921 to 1924 and, after returning to China, served as an interpreter for Borodin and the Soviet delegation.³⁰ It is more probable, then, that Fu wrote various Russian language reports to the Comintern.
- Both of the MCP's document³¹ and Yong³² stated that Fu Tai-keng (Fu Ta-ching) was born in 1900 in Jiangxi (Kiangsi). In this regard, Shanghai SB's information was accurate, which was provided by the KMT Government to the SMP. As for the year Fu was dispatched to Singapore, while the MCP's document and Singapore SB said it was 1928, Yong mentioned early 1929. Tsutsui's conjecture of 1925 was apparently wrong.

(9) Reorganization of the Party

Although he referred to the Party's reorganization, Yong did not touch on the punishment meted out to some of its top leaders. In reality, the reorganization went together with the stern punishment, including expulsion, of many of the highest ranking leaders. Besides, the NPC's report of 15 March suggested that the Party had different opposing factions including Chen Du Xiu School.

9. Tentative Conclusion

Finally, based on an examination of the various resolutions and instructions of the Comintern, one can also conjecture that:

- (1) In May 1927, Chen Du Xiu's stance of "surrenderism" was criticized. Yet, in February 1928, its opposite stance, "riotism", was denounced. Quite possibly, when the NPC decided to organize an uprising in early 1928, it was unaware that there had been a change of strategy. If so, the NPC adopted a radical, violent approach after its inauguration, knowing *only* that the Comintern had criticized surrenderism but *not* knowing that a reverse decision had been made in February 1928 (see 6 above).
- (2) One could speculate that the Comintern's crucial changes of strategy in the space of only a few years perplexed the NPC. To that extent, it would not have been unnatural for Chen Du Xiu to have had his sympathizers, such as Fu Zai Long, in Malaya.
- (3) Who took the initiative to organize the profound reshuffle? The Guangdong Regional Committee did not have a representative at the Plenum of 2 July 1928 (1.- (6)). The CCP's instructions of January and October 1929 mainly reflected the decisions of the Comintern's 9th Enlarged Plenum of 1928. At that point, the NPC did not have an undisputed leader, and the NPC members admitted that they abided by instructions sent from the Comintern. Comintern's review written in 1931 clearly criticized the radical strategy executed in Malaya in early 1928. Would it not seem, then, that the Comintern had played a decisive, if covert, role here? Yong held that there was no trace of any association between the five envoys (and the NPC) and the Comintern. The detailed reports in the Comintern Files, however, pointed to the existence of an important relationship between them.

Notes

1. *Nandao zhi Chun* (Spring of South Island. 南島之春), Singapore, Malaya Publisher, 1946, p.8.
2. C.F.Yong, *The Origins of the Malayan Communism*, Singapore, South Seas Society, 1997, pp.67-99.
3. Kurihara Hirohide, *Comintern System to Indochina Kyosantou* (Comintern System and the Indochinese Communist Party, コミンテルン・システムとインドシナ共産党), University of Tokyo Press, 2005, pp.55, 56, 103, 104.
4. This description is quite similar to “The History of the Malayan Communist Party” quoted by McLane. It was published in 1945. It runs: [The SSCP] held a Representatives’ Conference in 1927, which set up a temporary committee, but due to the “inadequate knowledge” of its members and “lack of leadership from the Comintern” little was accomplished. (see Charles B. McLane, *Soviet Strategies in Southeast Asia*, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1966, pp.132, 133, 535).
5. Ф. 495 о п.62 д.30.
6. C.F.Yong refers to the Pan-Pacific Trade Union Secretariat Conference held in Shanghai in September 1929. (Yong, op. cit., pp.97, 98, 104, 105, 120, 138). But he does not refer to this conference of 1928.
7. Ф. 495 о п.62 д.11.
8. The Far Eastern Bureau had been set up in 1926 in Shanghai to guide originally the communist parties of China, Korea and Japan. Its real activities started in 1929. In 1930, territories under its jurisdiction extended to Taiwan, Indochina, Indonesia, Malaya and the Philippines. See Kurihara, op., cit., pp.48, 57, 133, 134.
9. Ф. 495 о п.62 д.6.
10. Ф. 495 о п.62 д.1
11. In this section, question marks attached to names in () were original question marks. Those in [] are put by Hara.
12. Ф. 495 о п.62 д.1
13. Ф. 495 о п.62 д.3. On Russian contents, noted ‘IX 1930’ and on English contents, ‘May 1, 1930’. Inside the document itself, date of May 1, 1930 is noted down. Therefore the latter should be accurate.

14. Kurihara, op. cit., p.103.
15. Anna Belogurova, op., cit., pp.459, 460. Belogurova's argument here is based on Ф. 514 о п.1 д.532.
16. Ф. 495 о п.62 д.1
17. The Eastern Secretariat of the Comintern was set up in 1927 as a Headquarters' section in charge of Middle and Near East and Asian territories. Kurihara defines Headquarters of the Comintern as the centre and the FEB as an intermediate supervising organization. See Kurihara, op., cit., pp.48.
18. Ф. 495 о п.16 д.51
19. Cheah Boon Kheng, *From PKI to the Comintern, 1924-1941: The Apprenticeship of the Malayan Communist Party*, New York, Cornell University, 1992, pp.54-56.
20. C.F. Yong, op., cit., pp.67-122.
21. Hanrahan, G.Z., *The Communist Struggle in Malaya*, Kuala Lumpur, University of Malaya Press, 1971, pp.29, 30.
22. Tsutsui Chihiro, *Nampo Gunsei-ron* (Military Administration of Southern Regions), Tokyo, Japan Broadcasting Press Association, Feb. 1944. 筒井千尋<<南方軍政論>>. Based on this p.335, too, Cheah argued that "soon [after early1925], CCP members began arriving to join the Malayan KMT branch and to form the nucleus of a Communist group known as the Malayan Revolutionary Committee". However, Tsutsui mentioned neither about the communist group's approach to the Malayan KMT nor about the Malayan Revolutionary Committee at any part of this book, let alone on page 335. It seems these arose from mistreatment of the translated documents of the Japanese Military Administration.
23. From the end of 1942 through the end of the occupation, Japan called both Malay and Malaya as Malai. Prior to it, Japan called both Malay and Malaya as Malay (Malee). On 8 Dec.1942, Japanese cabinet decided this alteration (from Malay to Malai) because Malay was said to be an English corruption of the original native word.
24. Tsutsui, op., cit., pp.146, 147. As for Lefranc and a secret mission led by him, see Chapter 4.
25. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Japan, *Collection of Important Resolutions of the Comintern*, (コミンテルン重要決議集), Tokyo, 1951. / Takeuchi Minoru, *Mao Ze Dong and the Chinese Communist Party*, Tokyo, Chuo Koron, 1972. (竹内 実《毛沢東と中国共産党》).

26. US National Archives & Records Administration, *Shanghai Municipal Police Files (SMPF)*, D2866, “Communist Suspect in Nanking”, (23 July 1931– 21 Apr. 1932). Central Library of National University of Singapore (NUS), Microfilm R0012016.
27. According to Ms. Larisa Nikitina, Russian language for both “Malay’s” (adjective) and “Malayan” is “малайский”. “Malaya” is “Малайя”. Thus, it might be natural that “Malay Communist Party” and “Malayan Communist Party” are same in Russian language.
28. C.F. Yong, op., cit., p.139.
29. Fang Shan, et.al., eds., *Magong Wenji, Di 1 Ji, Zhanqian Dixia Douzheng Shiqi (1)* (MCP Anthologies, Underground Struggle Era before the War. 方山 等编 马共文集第 1 辑 战前地下斗争时期 (一)), Kuala Lumpur, Penerbitan Abad 21, 2010, (2010a henceforth), pp.46, 47.
30. Fang Shan, 2010a, pp.42, 43./ C. F. Yong, op., cit., pp.135, 136. / According to Yong, Fu was presumably executed by the Japanese in 1944.
31. Fang Shan, 2010a, pp.42, 43.
32. C.F. Yong, op., cit., p.135.

CHAPTER II

FORMATION OF THE MALAYAN COMMUNIST PARTY (MCP)

The date of the formation of the MCP has not been unanimously agreed even though the party has officially designated it as 30 April 1930. The MCP's official founding date relied on the memory of Ho Chi Minh (Nguyen Ai Quoc) who presided at the party's inaugural congress. But, this would have been the Second Representatives' Congress according to the brief history outlined earlier and to the MCP's book published after World War II.¹ Even this conference (congress) could have been the second or the third, noted Cheah Boon Kheng.² Then again, C. F. Yong suggested that the MCP was founded between early to mid-April 1930.³

Regarding those two issues, what have the Comintern Files revealed?

1. Was the NPC Congress the Second or the Third?

In the short history of the MCP written in February 1942, the CC of the MCP was elected at the Second Congress in 1930 (Chapter I-1.). However, a resolution adopted at that Congress stated that it was the Third Congress of the Malay Archipelago Communist Party (meaning NPC) (Chapter I-2.). Four other sets of documents noted that it was the Third Congress. The first set is shown in the list of Russian-language documents,⁴ the second in the list of English-language documents⁵ (see List of Documents of the RSASPH). There was also a third letter in Russian, dated 23 October 1930, which the Eastern Secretariat (ES) of the Comintern had sent to its Far Eastern Bureau (FEB).⁶ And, fourthly, there were also letters in Russian sent to Cd. Kuusinen.⁷ Since the contemporary (1930) documents were logically the most accurate sources of information, the NPC congress was most probably the Third Congress.

2. Date of the Inaugural Congress

None of the documents available to this author explicitly and indisputably mentioned the date of the MCP's inaugural congress.

Among the documents with Russian contents, there is one, "Resolutions at the Third Congress of the Communist Party of the Malay Archipelago", which was as a whole dated September 1930 to

January 1931 (Ф. 495 о п.62 д.3). The documents with English contents (also Ф. 495 о п.62 д.3) included two documents, “Resolutions adopted at the Third Congress of Malaya (sic) Party”, and “Notice! Issued by the CC of the Communist Party of the Malay States: Relating to the Conclusion of the III Delegate Congress of the Nanyang Communist Party” (hereafter Notice!); the latter was *dated 1 May 1930* (emphasis added).⁸ It means the “Notice!” was decided or drafted before 1 May.

Relating to the Inaugural Congress, there is one more file each among the Russian and English contents. Both are entitled “Central Circular” (Russian one is “No.1-9, April-May 1931”; English one is “No.1-5”, with no date.) and classified as Ф. 495 о п.62 д.13). Among this file, there is another English document entitled “CC [Central Committee or Central Circular?], the CP of Malay, *1 May, 1930*. Regarding to Party affairs” (emphasis added). It might imply that an important conference had been held before 1 May 1930.

Meanwhile, part of an English letter, dated 1 June 1930, sent from the CC of the MCP to the English Komparty (sic. Communist Party), London, read:

The Malay Komparty is being organised since May 24th, 1930. Formerly, we were a Malay section of the Chinese Komparty. On May 21st, *a Conf.* [Conference... emphasis added] was called. It was attended by 11 delegates, not including members of the CC [should be Central Committee as in other cases]. A representative of the Eastern Bureau (sic) of the Komintern was present. Following advice of the Bureau, our section was reorganised as an independent Komparty of Malay. Resolutions and programme have been discussed and adopted. Owing to difficulties of communications, we cannot yet send them to you. We will do it as soon as we receive your “private” address.

At present, we have 1,500 members in the Peninsula. Our Red LU [Labour Union] has 3 industrial unions (rubber, mine, seamen) with 1,333 members; and 11 unions of handicraftsmen with 3,244 members.

A Conf. (sic) [emphasis added] of the LU was called on (sic) April, immediately after the Party *conference* [emphasis added].

On April 29, a meeting was held to prepare the Mayday. All 11 comrades attending the meeting were arrested, including the secretary of the Party, the sec. of the LU, and a member of the Party CC.⁹

On the other hand, as recorded in the first Chapter, the Siam communist organization sent a letter to Kuusinen in the late 1930s stating that in *May* 1930, under the guidance of the Eastern Secretariat, the PC of Malay held the Third Congress at which the CC of the Malay CP was elected. (emphasis added).

The information obtained from these sources raises a new question: was the inaugural congress held shortly before 1 May or on 21 May? A few decades later, Ho Chi Minh, who had presided at the Congress, recalled that, “On a day prior to 1 May, the First Representatives Congress of the MCP was held in Kuala Pilah, Negeri Sembilan. But as this place drew attention of suspicious men, shifted to Johor and held the congress there.”¹⁰ In 1948, however, Li Chi-sin noted that

In May or June, the First Representatives Congress was held in Johor. Attended by A Song (阿宋. Nguyen Ai Quoc) who was dispatched by the FEB. Discussed in National Language [Mandarin]. CC including secretary, Li (黎 xx) [xx is original], head of propaganda, Fu Tai-keng and head of organization, Wu Ching (吴菁@ Hsu T'ien-ping. 徐天炳) was elected. In the same year, T'ien-ping was arrested.¹¹

Yong's list of the MCP's top leaders is similar to Li's. According to Yong, however, both Li (Lei Kuang-juan) and Wu were arrested on 29 April 1930 (in the so-called Nassim Road Incident). At that time, moreover, Wu and Mah Tso-jen (马作人) were respectively the secretary of the NPC and secretary of the NGLU. Yet secretary of the NGLU could mean its supreme leader which would have been its head, Ch'en Shao-chang (陈绍昌). Ch'en chaired the first representatives' conference of the Malayan General Labour Union (MGLU) which replaced the NGLU. This conference was held after the inaugural conference of the MCP in the latter part of April 1930. At the end of the meeting, Ts'ai Ting-wei (蔡廷位) was popularly elected the new head of the MGLU.

Soon after this conference [before 29 April], Ch'en was arrested.¹² Thus "secretary of LU" cannot be Ch'en Shao-chang who had earlier been arrested. Newly appointed MGLU secretary, Ts'ai Ting-wei, too, was not arrested on that day. The remaining sole possibility is Mah Tso-jen but his name was not included in C.F. Yong's list of the eight arrested persons, of whom six were identified. In Yong's book, Ma's name was referred only once as NGLU secretary.¹³ So Mah might be one of the two un-identified arrestees.

Yong also referred to other communists, besides Lei and Wu, who were arrested in the Nassim Road Incident, namely, Ong Juat-pho (alias Lee Kwan-jun), Lee Chay-heng, Pang Chin-chang (these three persons were CC of the MCP) and Chen T'ing-seng.¹⁴ (Of the 11 persons arrested, one [a woman] was discharged and two were soon banished without trial).¹⁵ Yong's sources for those names were various newspaper reports from 30 April to 16 July 1930. *The Straits Times*' report of 9 June 1930 said that Wong [Ong] Juat Pho "appeared to be the most important among the lot" and "one of the most important and foremost men of the Provisional Committee of the Communist Party".¹⁶

The Singapore Free Press of 9 June 1930 reported that:

The fifth accused [meaning Pang Chin Chang] was known to be a responsible officer of the CP which he joined in 1928. The sixth accused [meaning Wong (sic) Juat Pho] was also one of the chief men of the Party.... The eighth accused [meaning Lei Kwang (sic) Juan] was ... at present head of the Labour Union organisation.¹⁷

According to C. Y. Yong, Lei Kuang-juan acted for Ch'en Shao-chang as the head of the NGLU during 1929 when Ch'en attended the Pan-Pacific Trade Union Secretariat conference in Shanghai.¹⁸ Here, the Special Branch had apparently obtained old information about Lei's position and did not know his latest one. The SB appeared not to know who the CC members were. Anyway, this might mean the SB did not grasp the concrete Party post of each person at that time.

Another question emerges here. Though five CC members of the MCP (including secretary Lei and propaganda head Wu) were arrested, why did the letter of 1 June state that "*a member of the Party CC*" was arrested? If the author of this letter minded the office bearers of the NPC, can the result be

consistent? In April 1930, Wu Ching was secretary of the NPC.¹⁹ Among the Provisional Committee members of the NPC, there was Wang Yue (see Chapter I). He must probably be Ong Juat-pho [Wang Yue Bo]. None of the other PC members of the NPC related to the 6 communists was arrested on 29 April. Furthermore, among the 13 members of the NPC as at August 1928,²⁰ only Ong Juat-pho was arrested at the Nassim Road Incident (Wu Ching joined the NPC later in 1929).²¹ Thus, a sole “member of the Party [NPC] CC” should be Ong Juat-pho (Lee Kuan-jun) and “Secretary of the LU” should be secretary of the NGLU, Mah Tso-jen. This interpretation appears consistent enough. If so, the CC members of the MCP had not officially been decided yet by 29 April.

It should be noted that Chin Peng, Secretary General of the MCP from 1947, recalled in 1999 that he had read an article of the organ of the Comintern [Cominform (Communist Information Bureau) that was founded in 1947?] in 1950 or 1951. The article mentioned that the MCP had been established on 1 July 1930. Immediately then, Chin Peng said, the MCP decided to take that date to be their party’s “birthday”. In 1959 or 1960, two leading MCP members asked Ho Chi Minh in Hanoi about the date of the party’s establishment and was told that it was a day in April, perhaps the latter half of April. Hence, for convenience’s sake, the leaders said they took the last day of April to be their “birthday”.²² In his own memoir, Chin Peng stated that he had also asked Ho Chi Minh about the date in Hanoi in 1961. Ho recalled seeing red May Day (1 May) banners fluttering in the streets when he emerged from the inaugural meeting. Thereafter, “based our calculations [following] Ho’s recollections”, the Party claimed 30 April as its Founding Day.²³

On the other hand, Yong insisted that in the inaugural conference of early to mid-April, from among over 20 delegates who founded the MCP, a CC of 11 was elected, and this CC in turn chose a three-man standing committee (SC). In mid-April 1930, the SC consisted of Lei, secretary, Wu, organization head and Fu, propaganda head.²⁴

It should be necessary now to trace Ho Chi Minh’s exact foot print. According to Sophie, Ho’s comrade, Hoang Van Hoan, testified that Ho had arrived in Bangkok around the end of March 1930, proceeded to Udon [Northeast Thailand] and then returned to Bangkok on 20 April. He was issued a passport in the name of Sung Man Shao by the Consul General of the National Government of China in the Straits Settlements on 28 April 1930.²⁵ If so, Ho might still be in Thailand in early to mid-April and then might have arrived in Malaya in late April.

Yong wrote that the MCP was founded between early to mid-April (referred to earlier). But he also said that “After the inauguration conference of the MCP had ended, he [Ch’en Shao-chang] followed on to chair the first representative conference of the MGLU in the *latter part of April 1930*” (emphasis added).²⁶ This clearly suggests that the MGLU’s inauguration conference began immediately after the inauguration conference of the MCP ended on the same day. Thus, here Yong seemed to have claimed that the MCP had been founded in the latter part of April.

What may be deduced from the above discussion? The contemporary Party records clearly and decisively showed that 8 leaders were arrested on 29 April and the Inaugural Congress was held either prior to 1 May or on 21 May. Very likely, therefore, the Congress was scheduled to be held in late April but it was postponed to 21 May for reasons of security. As both conferences of the MCP and the MGLU were sequentially held on the same day, its date could be 22- 23 April for the MCP and 23 April for the MGLU (see Belogurova’s argument below). Such prominent leaders as Lei and Wu Ching, who were to be arrested on 29 April, might have been merely tentatively elected as CC members. Unusual description of the CC of the MCP’s letter dated 1 June; “*not including members of the CC*” might probably suggest that many of them were not present at this Inaugural Conference because they had been arrested earlier on 29 April (emphasis added).

Neither *The Straits Times* nor *The Singapore Free Press* referred to the party-posts of the arrested MCP leaders. It might possibly mean that the MCP had not elected such top leaders as secretary and head of organization yet at that time. Hence, the congress of April might be a provisional or preparatory one. Besides that, the “Notice!” was dated 1 May 1930. It might mean that the tentative CC of the MCP had already drafted the “Notice” before 1 May.

As shown above, Yong has suggested that the first representatives’ conference of the MGLU was held in the latter part of April 1930, after the inaugural conference of the MCP.²⁷ But the letter sent to the “English Komparty” distinguished between two conferences – a “Conf.” on 21 May, and a “Party conference” held before the MGLU conference. Hence, would not “Conf.” (with a capital C) mean the Inaugural Congress and “Party conference” (with the small c) a meeting of the Party CC? Otherwise, would the conference held in late April have been the Third Representatives’ Congress while the one held on 21 May was the First Representatives’ Congress of the MCP?

We can assume that at the conference (congress) held in late April, the CC members were tentatively appointed and at least the “Notice!” was drafted by them. At the Conference (Congress) held on 21 May, the CC members as well as the top posts including secretary were officially appointed and the Resolutions as well as the “Notice!” were officially adopted. That might be the reason why the CC’s letter of 1 July avoided referring to the CC of the MCP pertaining to the arrest of 29 April. Ho Chi Minh himself said he attended both congresses held in Negeri Sembilan and Johor. Since Ho Chi Minh came to Malaya from Bangkok between 20 and 28 April and traveled back to Bangkok from Malaya at the end of May,²⁸ he might have attended both congresses of late April and of 21 May.

To sum up, supported by various other documents and testimonies, the Comintern documents would induce a conclusion that the preliminary conference of the MCP was held in late April and its official Inauguration Conference (Congress) on 21 May, and thus indicate that the MCP officially commenced functioning on 24 May.

Anna Belogurova showed that, based on the Comintern File Ф514 оп.1 д.634, the third representative conference of Nanyang was convened on 22-23 April 1930.²⁹ But, however, she did not refer to Ф514 оп.1 д.634 which noted that the conference was called on 21 May 1930.

Thus, I conclude here now that the preliminary conference was held on 22 to 23 April and the official Conference on 21 May.

3. Resolutions Adopted at the Inaugural Congress

The English language document entitled “Resolutions adopted at the Third Congress of Malaya Party” consisted of the following four chapters.³⁰ I will summarize its contents here:

- (1) Malaya and the World Revolution
- (2) The Character and driving force of Malay (sic) Revolution
Malay revolution is a bourgeois democratic revolution as instructed by the CCP [Already quoted above. Here the Congress fully agreed with the instruction of the CC of the CCP which included, among others; only by way of armed insurrection,

imperialist can be driven out and the Malay Federation of Republics can be established].

(3) Mistakes and Lessons from the Work done / Misunderstanding of tasks of revolution

Cruxes are shown first: (1) The MCP still conducted movement entirely based on Chinese. (2) A unity party consisted of various peoples are wrong. Party should be a national party consisting of one Malayan people [Malayan nationals=马来亚民族?]. (3) Malay peasants and soldiers were neglected.

Details are below:

(a) To conduct Chinese rev. in Malaya

Its objective causes are: MP [MCP] was entirely built on Chinese members, responsible persons from China, the patriotism of Chinese toiling masses in Malaya. Subjective causes are: lack of investigation on the special economic conditions of Malaya, lack of special instructions from CC of the CCP. Therefore it departed from the practical life of Malaya and overlooked the fundamental tasks of Malay (sic) revolution. This mistaken line on work has not yet been corrected completely, notwithstanding *having received explanation from CC (sic) and the Provisional Com (sic)* (emphasis added). [In a later part of this document, the italicized part read: “through the instruction of CC of Chinese Party”]. Only when all peoples in Malaya have united, the victory of rev. movement can be secured.

(b) To organise a unity Party of Malay (sic) peoples.

In view of the mistake that the system of Malay P. belongs to Chinese Party, some members insist on organising an (sic) unity Party embracing all peoples in Malaya. This organisational line is also contradictory by the organisational principle of international party, for the unit of organization is people. Each native people should organise a national Party. Foreign people should participate in the native Party as members. To organise a unity P. consisting of various peoples is incorrect.

(c) Neglect of the work among peasants and soldiers.

(4) The Present Situation of Rev. Mov. and the General Line of Malay Party

Cruxes are shown first: (1) Formation of the Communist Party of Malay Peninsula is necessary. (2) Oppose imperialists and war. (3) Establish federated republic. (4) Protect people's right.

Details are below:

(a) The task to unite toiling masses of all peoples will be accentuated.

It is necessary to form CP of Malay Pen.. This is not contrary to the org. system. The org. of the Communist Committee of Malay Pen. will be annulled as soon as the CP of Malay Pen. has been formed.

(b) Ten big demands of Malay revolution.³¹

- (1) Driving out Imperialist.
- (2) Confiscation of imp. [imperialists'] enterprises and banks.
- (3) All economic rights to Malay (sic) peoples.
- (4) Against the war preparations of imperialists.
- (5) Self-determination by Malay peoples, establishment of federated republican state on the basis of equality among peoples.
- (6) Liberty of assembly, discussion, press, strike, trade, education, and etc.
- (7) Introduction of eight hour day, increase of wages, promulgation [sic. promulgation?] of trade union law, labour law, social insurance, improvement of living conditions of masses.
- (8) Expropriation and distribution of lands belonging to landlords, princes, officials and priests to peasants and soldiers.
- (9) Abolition of taxes levied by imperialists and landlords, introduction of unity, progressive tax.
- (10) Unite with proletariat of the world, the oppressed peoples and Soviet Union.

(c) The connection between the Malay Party and brotherhood Parties.

Besides under the direction of Comintern, Parties of China, GB, Holland and France are hoped to give their experience and instructions.

With regard to ((3)-(b)), “people” seemed to mean “nationals”, or “those who have same nationality”, such as Chinese nationals or Indian nationals living in Malaya. And “unity party” meant a party which unified those who retained various original nationalities. In this connection, the English-language “CC, the CP of Malay”, 1 May 1930 observed:

In the past, the communists of China, Java, & India, after their arrival at Malay (sic), had their separate organizations, the Chinese communists carrying on in Malay the Chinese Rev., They had made no rev. connections with the oppressed toiling masses of Malay At the present Conference, we have corrected this mistake and decided to establish the CP of Malay. Hereafter all the communists of China, India & Java in Malay should work under the guidance of the Party of Malay and join the Party life.³²

The NPC was evidently regarded and criticized as a “Unity Party” consisting of Chinese, Javanese, Indian, and Malayan nationalities. Past research on the MCP commonly referred to the criticism made by Ho Chi Minh at this Congress that the NPC had been China-centric and neglected the Malays. But the above assessment was more fundamental: it demanded that the party members consider themselves to be Malayan nationals, similar to the Malays.

Researchers had generally considered that the most important objective in reorganizing the NPC as the MCP was for the Comintern to guide the Malayan Party directly and not through the CCP. The documents of the Congress had no record of opposition to reorganization. But, before the summer of 1930, Kurihara has noted, the FEB located in Shanghai could have had no influence over the CC of the CCP; hence, the FEB tried to establish its own network in Nanyang from around 1931.³³ In this situation, some CCP members of the NPC (MCP) might not have fully agreed with the FEB’s directives which could have been one of the reasons the ES and the FEB repeatedly criticized the MCP. Nonetheless, it should be noted here that the CCP had sent an instruction in 1929 not to rely on the victory of Chinese revolution but to be independent under the leadership of the Comintern (see I-2.).

4. Membership of the Party

Various figures have been provided for the membership of the MCP in 1930. The 1 June 1930 letter sent to the “English Komparty” gave 1,500 members for the MCP and 4,577 for the LU. Special Branch information cited by Yong claimed that MCP drew its strength from the MGLU with its 10,000–15,000 members, a party membership of 500, and about 11,000 people whom the party controlled through its subsidiary organizations such as the MGLU and MGS[Seamen’s]U.³⁴

The Comintern Files included a Russian-language report, dated 6 August 1930, that made several observations. It lamented that the organizational situation had not changed quantitatively or qualitatively after the (Party) congress. It noted that a class for native people was organized in Kuala Lumpur and that more than 40 people were arrested in Singapore on 1 August. According to this report, the MCP’s monthly expenditure was 300 dollars (110 for publisher; 50 each for propaganda, organizing and secretariat; 30 for communication, and 10 for activities among the youth). Against expenditure, the monthly revenue was 200 dollars. As such, the party requested the Comintern to subsidize the deficit.³⁵

Another Russian-language report had a detailed table showing the distribution by state (in Malaya) of the membership of the Party and the Labour Union as at 3 October 1930. This table was contained in a Russian-language letter of 25 November 1930 which was forwarded to the Comintern on 18 December 1930 by Victor (Виктор).³⁶ The letter may be summarized as follows:

We decided to hold the Second CC conference (sic) on 12 October. The situation has improved since the Party congress. The number of [members in] the Party and the Red LU has increased to 1,220 and 6,000 respectively. The influence of the Party among the masses began to increase. The masses are waiting for our instruction. The Anti-Imperialist League (AIL) has a membership of more than 100. The Conference decided to enroll many Malays and Indians in the organizations, appoint a Malay comrade in the CC and elect 5 CC candidates (2 students, 3 workers).

One day before the memorial day of the October Revolution, many leading members were arrested. Nonetheless, more than 1,000 people, including 20 Malays

and Indians, participated in a demonstration. More than 40 were arrested. In Johor, more than 400, including Malays and Indians, participated.

Please urgently dispatch comrades who can aid our work. Please discuss this issue with the CC of the CCP.

A further examination of this table reveals a few interesting facts. Most of “Seamen” would be based in Singapore, and Party membership of Singapore far surpassed other places. When we compare this table with the Table 1 of the membership of trade unions, it could be discerned that many of them might be service workers, salesmen and factory workers. Negeri Sembilan, Johor and Perak followed Singapore in the number of members in this order, and many of them must be rubber tappers.

Nonetheless, the MCP’s strength had not expanded rapidly within half a year and the Special Branch did not have accurate figures on the party’s membership and influence.

Notes

1. Nan Dao Zhi Chun (Spring of South Island), pp.8, 9.
2. Cheah, op. cit., p.16.
3. C.F. Yong, op., cit., p.129.
4. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.3.
5. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.3.
6. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.14. On the English contents, it is entitled “Draft letter Re Tasks of the Com Party of Malaya”.
7. Ф. 495 оп.16 д.51. / O. V. Kuusinen (1881-1964). Secretary of the EC, Comintern, 1921-1939.
8. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.3.
9. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.6. / Sophie Quinn-Judge, *Ho Chi Minh: The Missing Years, 1911-1941*, Singapore, Horizon Books, 2003, also quotes this document. But she writes, ‘... the Malay Communist Party was organized on [not since] 24 May’. (pp.169-170)
10. Fang Shan, et.al., eds., 2010a, pp.19-23.

11. Ibid., pp.24-29. Li xx should be Lei Kuang-juan (黎光远). See C.F.Yong, op. cit., pp.129-138.
12. C. F. Yong., op. cit., pp.129, 130, 134-138.
13. C. F. Yong, op., cit., p.138.
14. C. F. Yong, op., cit., pp.137, 145, 146.
15. *The Straits Times*, 15 May 1930.
<http://eresources.nlb.gov.sg/newspapers/Digitised/Article/straitstimes19300515-1.2.87.aspx>.
accessed on 29 April 2014.(The date is accidentally same as the Incident).
16. *The Straits Times*, 9 June 1930.
(<http://eresources.nlb.gov.sg/newspapers/Digitised/Article/straitstimes19300609.2.93.aspx>.
accessed on 29 April 2014).
17. *The Singapore Free Press and Mercantile Advertiser*, 9 June 1930.
<http://eresources.nlb.gov.sg/newspapers/Digitised/Article/singfreepressb19300609-1.2.49.aspx> accessed on 30 April 2014.
18. C. F. Yong, op., cit., pp.134, 135.
19. C. F. Yong, op., cit., p.102.
20. C. F. Yong, op., cit., p.100. This list was based on the SB documents.
21. C. F. Yong, op., cit., p.135.
22. C.C. Chin, Karl Hack, eds., *Dialogues with Chin Peng: New Light on the Malayan Communist Party*, Singapore, Singapore University Press, 2004, pp.61, 62.
23. Chin Peng, *My Side of History*, Singapore, Media Masters, 2003, p.57.
24. C. F. Yong, op., cit., pp.129, 138.
25. Sophie, op. cit., p.169.
26. C. F. Yong, op., cit., p.138.
27. C. F. Yong, op., cit., p.138.
28. Sophie, op. cit., p.169.
29. Anna Belogurova, op., cit., pp.452, 456.
30. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.3. / Sophie estimates this report was authored by Ho Chi Minh. Sophie, op., cit., pp.169, 170.
31. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.3. These demands have two versions which are slightly different each other. Order of the demands are also different. The other one (Central Circular No.1) is in Ф. 495 оп.62д.13 (An English file. Circular of the CC of the MCP; April-May 1931). The latter is

entitled “The principal demands of the national rev. of Malay [sic] at the present stage”. Here “federated republican state” is not mentioned.

32. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.13.
33. Kurihara, op., cit., pp.133-136.
34. C. F. Yong, op., cit., p.140.
35. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.7. / According to Cheah Boon Kheng, “Review of Communism in Malaya during 1934” recorded that “Arrangement for payment by Shanghai of a subsidy of \$300 per month to the MCP were made towards the end of 1933.” Cheah, op., cit., p.71.
36. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.6, 7. / In his PS, Victor writes (a) This is the 5th letter. Did you receive all? (b) Though R (Russian script P) promised to send me files, I have not received anything from him. (c) Please send a memo to the university to indicate how to reply to the Malaysians.

CHAPTER III

THE MCP AND THE COMINTERN IN 1930

1. The Eastern Secretariat

Resolutions of the MCP were sent to the Comintern. With regard to this, the ES of the Comintern sent a Russian-language comment, dated 23 October 1930, to the FEB (see Chapter II note 4); the comment is summarized below:

Cruxes are shown first: (1) Though the MCP was expected to lead all Malaysians, it was still the local organization of the CCP. Yet, the FEB should select CCP cadres who would work in this area. (2) The MCP can play a great role in the neighboring countries. (3) Not only Chinese, but also Malays and Indians should be trained as cadres of the MCP.

Details are below:

It became fully clear for us that the Malay (Малайский) CP was none other than the Singapore organization of the CCP which had decided to be a separate Communist Party of Malay States. The Party is expected to lead the proletariat of all nationalities (национальностей). This is an important step forward.

The CCP should be its starter, initiator and organizer. The FEB has to carry out such tasks as are required to prepare and select reliable CCP cadres who will work in the Eastern countries. This is because many Chinese workers have emigrated to the Far East and Middle East.

The resolutions demonstrate that the CCP organization still stands outside the general revolutionary struggle of Malay, that it is not connected with the local working masses, including the Chinese, and that it is still an organization of the CCP which works among Chinese workers who came out of China recently.

The proletarian movement in Singapore can play a great role in propaganda and organization in its neighbouring countries. The FEB should contact them and assess how that task has been

implemented. It is indispensable to train Chinese, Malays as well as Indians to be cadres of the MCP.

Please report to us once every six weeks about how this task is implemented.¹

In its English version, the draft letter runs as below:

The beginning of a new revolutionary wave and the existence of an independent Communist movement in Malaya is of vital importance in the development of the anti-imperialist and agrarian revolutions in the Far East. Owing to its strategic military and economic position, Malaya is a meeting place of three rev. struggles – the Indian, Chinese and Indo-Nesian (sic) national emancipation movements.²

2. Far Eastern Bureau

On 15 November 1930, the CC of the MCP analyzed the Malayan situation (Chinese language document) thus:

- (1) As the bourgeoisie is weak and consists of diverse nationalities, it cannot form a united front in a struggle for independence struggle.
- (2) The living conditions of the Malayan proletariat are the most difficult in the world. Despite the British imperialists' divide-and-rule policy, the proletariat will surely become aware that they have to struggle for the destruction of the imperialist system.³

The FEB might have had such an analysis in mind also when it sent an English letter to “Malayan Cds.” on 17 December 1930.⁴ The contents of the letter may be summarized as follows:

Cruxes are shown first: (1) Armed uprising, general strike or terror should not be the present method. (2) Economic struggle should be given priority. (3) Chinese, Malays and Hindus [Indians] must unitedly fight for emancipation of Malaya with different acute slogans. There exists conflict between the Malay workers and the Chinese or Hindu workers. The Hindus and the Chinese must help the Malays. (4) The MCP must lead the peasantry struggle. (5) Attention must be paid to the

industrial centres. (6) The All Malaya Party Conference, the All Malayan Federation of Labour and the All Malayan Anti-Imperialist League are necessary. (7) Malayan CP must be one that includes all nationalities, Malays, Hindus and Chinese.

Details are below:

We read the material we got from one of your comrades. Your opinion about the tasks and the work is generally correct. But your method is not correct. You must not begin your work with the armed uprising or with the general strike, but basing it on the concrete conditions of life of the toiling masses, peasants and the urban poor, explain to them how the imperialist rule (sic) their country.

Among the workers, you must develop economic struggles for higher wages, for shortening the working day and for one rest day weekly. Even if there is no R Tus [Red Trade Unions], it is possible to organise and lead economic struggles. Only through their economic struggle, the workers can be organised into R Tus. and our nucleus (sic). Slogans must be different depending on concrete situation.

According to the informations (sic) from your cd, there are three different nationalities between the workers in the Malaya (sic) States – 50% are Chinese, 30% are Hindu, and only 20% are native workers. For them, you must penetrate with different slogans. For instance, for the Chinese workers; “The imperialists, that (sic) are fighting against the rev. mov. of the peasantry in South China, oppress also the Malayan State. Chinese workers together with the M (sic) workers must fight for the emancipation of the MS.”

To the Hindu workers; “The same British imp., that (sic) shot tens of thousands of the workers in Bombay and Calcutta, oppress also the MS. Fight against the B imp. in M is at the same time fight for emancipation of India.”

To the native workers; “The emancipation of workers can be realised only through the united front of all toiling masses of the MS regardless of nationality.”

Although we have no information about conflict or trouble between the native workers and the H. or the Ch. workers. Nevertheless, H and also a part of Ch. workers might live under much better

conditions than the native workers. This is the work of the imp.ts and cap-ts in order to weaken the united front. The native workers must fight for conditions equal to these demanded by the H and Ch., and not for the worthening [worsening?] of the latter. The Hs and that part of the Chinese must help the native w-s in their fight for the better conditions.

It is impossible to use the slogan of armed uprising, or even general strike when the org-s of the workers and peasants are very weak. However, when there is an armed uprising of spontaneous character, resulted by the very hard living conditions, then the party must make all efforts to participate in and to lead the uprising. Also, in case of impt's intervention against USSR, must the party organise the uprising to fight against the impts and to defend the first proletarian country.

Such slogans as "To carry out red terror to kill the labour traitors and running dogs" mentioned in the inf. of your cd., or "Individual terror against our class enemies, against imp-ts" are slogans of P-B [petty bourgeois] anarchist and have nothing in common with Communists. We Comts org. and prepare the masses for the rev. war and during the war we are destroying our class enemies.

Work among the peasants must start from the fight against high taxes, rent payments and other burdens laid by imp-ts and feudal landowners. Peasantry in your country participated very often in armed uprising against their oppressors. You must make every possible effort to get the leadership in these spontaneous actions in order to lead them into the correct rev. channel. Seeing readiness in certain villages, you should not think that all the peasantry in the whole is ready for the armed uprising.

Slogan to use among the handicraft workers and artisans and the small merchants, you can demand the reduction of [or?] even the total abolition of government charges. From the fight for these immediate demands, you can go on to the use of political slogans, such as the overthrow of the imp-st. We must always explain to the masses that their demands can be realised only under the leadership of the working class and its vanguard, the CP.

The main attention must be upon the industrial centres, especially the port and the military base of Singapore.

You must choose a trustworthy group of any nationality and create the city and village organizations. Give them concrete tasks. They must keep you informed about the progress of their work. You must call on meeting or conference for each and elect its Party committee. Afterwards you must immediately call on the All-Malaya Party Conference to discuss the tasks and elect the CC.

It is necessary to publish a party organ in three languages, Malayan (sic), Hindu and Chinese. The money needed for this organ must be gathered from among our own cds, sympathisers and the broad toiling masses.

As our trade union movement is too much split up, a centralised organisation, the All-Malayan Federation of Labour, is necessary.

We must also organise Anti-Imperialist Leagues first in factories, towns and villages and afterward in the whole country, that is, the All-Malayan Anti-Imperialist League.

(Hereafter, filed in a different place)

You have already an organisational basis in the Chinese Communist group. Now it is necessary to make every effort that these Chinese communist no longer exist like a group of Chinese emigrants living with their minds and hearts solely upon events in China. (It is possible that among the Chinese comrades are such comrades, who are under the influence of liquidator Chen-dusiu [sic], as under the influence of Li-Li-Sian's [sic. should be Li Li San] "left" phraseologic [sic]. You must fight against this very energitacilly [sic]). The slogan should be—the Malayan (sic), Hindu, and Chinese workers into the party organization of Malaya! In Malayan State there must exist but one CP including all nationalities. The idea of creating several CPs based on the nationalities must be energetically combated. The Party must pay attention to the difference of nationality, languages, customs, etc.

This is a concrete and detailed comment cum instruction. Although the author seemed not to know that most Indians in Malaya were Tamils who spoke not Hindi but Tamil, we can discern that this FEB staff member was well acquainted with Malayan affairs. Unlike many other Comintern documents, moreover, this letter generally distinguished Malaya from Malay.

The MCP's resolutions quoted above did not state that they would resort to terror, or even armed uprising. They only "fully agreed" with the instruction of the CCP which proclaimed that only by way of armed insurrection could their task be realized (A file, "Draft letter Re. Tasks of the MCP",⁵ appeared to refer to armed insurrection. To my regret, I do not possess a copy of this part).

When it received the lengthy comment from the FEB, the MCP might not have been fully convinced by it. As was mentioned in Chapter I- 6 above, its issuance of seemingly inconsistent instructions could have reflected the Comintern's wavering strategies. In such circumstances, although both Chen Du Xiu and Li Li San were criticized by the Comintern as well as the CCP at different points, it would have been natural that these two leaders might have retained to some extent their respective influence that could lead the MCP in other directions.

With respect to the point about having one Malayan party that was made up of various nationalities, the MCP's resolution, quoted earlier, had already called upon Chinese members, by setting aside Chinese affairs, to concentrate on the Malayan revolution by being the same as Malayan nationals or members of Malayan nationalities. But the FEB might have misunderstood the paragraph; "Each native people should organize a national party".

With regard to this MCP's resolution (see II-3-(3)-b), Anna Belogurova argued that:

This statement was incompatible with the Comintern's policy of one having one communist party per country. Over this paragraph, a Comintern cadre wrote:...'Absolutely wrong'.⁶

Out of the original resolution, she omitted one sentence between 1) "Each native people should organize a national party", and 2) "To organize a unity party consisting of various peoples is incorrect". The omitted part is: 3) "Foreign people should participate in the native Party as membership".

As to 1) above, Belogurova might construe that each native people should organize their own party. If so, there would emerge various parties consisting of different native people, such as Malay Party, Chinese Party and Indian Party, in Malaya. This concept differs from other sections of the MCP's resolutions. Not only 3) but also 2) clearly shows that the MCP considered that various peoples

(nationals) should form one single national party. A letter of the CC of the MCP dated 1 May 1930 also stressed; “Hereafter all the communists of China, India and Java should work under the guidance of the Party of Malay and join the Party life” (see II-3-(3)-c). Did Belogurova make the same misunderstanding as the FEB?

Notwithstanding this comprehension and resolution, the MCP could not implement “indigenization” or “localization” sufficiently until the Pacific War.

3. Letter from Shieng Kien Chu to the FEB

In an English letter, dated 26 December 1930, which was sent to the FEB, a certain Shieng Kien Chu (胜[单?,香?]建柱?) noted, as summarized below:

I was introduced by the CC of the Malaya Party to the CCP to receive any training. Not long after I had made connections with the CCP, the latter called a meeting of the comrades working in Malaya to discuss the problems of Nanyang (Comrades Wang Yun Hai and Huang Moh Hang & I participated). During the meeting, it was decided to ask me to return to Nanyang. The comrades of the CCP stated that the travelling expenses would be given by you through the CCP.

Three months has passed by since the Meeting. The CCP has not only not given me the travelling expenses but it has not organized me with the nucleus. I am living in a condition of extreme poverty, everything having been put into the pawn shop.

I have decided to return to Nanyang immediately and hope you will give me instructions & the travelling expenses.⁷

It is difficult to identify who Shieng was. His name has not appeared in any historian’s research to date.

4. Letter from Wang Yung Hai to the FEB

Part of another English letter, dated 28 December 1930, which was sent to the FEB by Wang Yung Hai is summarized below (a small portion of this having already been earlier cited):

Cruxes are shown first: (1) In Shanghai, Wang sought connection with the FEB through the CC of the CCP for more than three months. (2) Met a FEB comrade several weeks ago. (3) Wang, Huang Moh Hang (Wong Muk Han) and two others wrote a simple report on the work in Malaya. Huang made a detailed report on the history of the Party. Except Wang, the three know very little about present conditions in Malaya. (4) These reports did not reach the FEB. Wang could not receive even a single answer from the FEB. (5) Strong and regular connection with the FEB was required. To realize it, the Malaya Executive Committee was proposed. (6) Financial subsidy was requested.

Details are below:

I have come to Shanghai for more than 3 months. When I came here, I got letters of introduction to the FEB, the CC of the CCP and the All-China Federation of Seamen. As for the arrangements with FEB, the first thing is to make reports on the situations in Nanyang and to ask for instructions as well as economic allowance. The second matter is to receive training from you. I have repeatedly urged the CC of the CCP to convey these opinions to you but there is no news one month after another. Several weeks ago, I was very glad the comrade came to meet me.

The report on the work in Malaya (having been sent to you) was prepared by 4 comrades, namely Huang Moh Hang [see above], Fu Hung Chu who was returning from Moscow to attend the World Conference of the RILU [Red International Labour Union], Shieng Kien Chu and myself. This report is very uncomplete (sic) and simple, for Cd. Huang knows very little about the present conditions (Formerly he was the standing committee of the PC). So do Cd. Fu & Shieng. Before this report, Shieng made a report on the present works & struggles and Huang made a detailed report on the history of the Party. Huang has drawn up a map of NY [Nanyang], indicating the conditions of work there. All these have been sent to you through the CC of the CCP. But, according to the cd. who came to see me, all have not reached you! This was caused by the carelessness of the CC of the CCP. You are requested to make an inquiry from the CCCCCP about the materials which I sent to you through the Southern Bureau of the CCP in Hong Kong. It is my

hope that our reports will be translated into different foreign languages and sent to Moscow in order to attract the special attentions of the Comintern to the work in NY. I did not receive an answer to my questions for a month. I hope you will pay attention to the attached replies to your questions. I intend to receive a proper training before returning to Malaya.

Though you have given instructions on paper, these can hardly have powerful effects on action. The most urgent problem at present is to set up a strong & regular connection with FEB which should understand the conditions in Malaya. If there is (sic) no whole, concrete & practical instructions as well as material assistance, the MCP can never get away from the present connection (sic) of half-living & half dying.

I suggest to organize immediately an organ, the Malaya Executive Committee, to make regular connections with Malaya, the FEB and the Pacific Labour Conference. There must be cds. of the Party of Malaya. If the work is carried on by a comrade who does not understand the real conditions in Malaya, it is impossible to move forward the work. Before the Party of Malaya appoints cd. to make connections with you, cd. Huang Moh Hang may serve as such a functioning (He is now in the All China Federation of Seamen). Huang already told the cd. who came to see him all the plans. He promised to bring the plans to you.

Cd. Shieng has been decided by the CCCCCP to return to NY and the CC has promised to get the travelling expenses from the FEB, but no news for long.

During the past 2 months I have borrowed from others \$45 (5 for cotton bedclothes, 15 for clothes, 15 for daily expenses). I hope you will give the money sufficient for my living expenses.

Before returning to the South, I must make regular connections with you, at least twice one week. Please tell me a place where I can find you or you can find me in cd. Huang's place.⁸

5. Activities of the FEB in Shanghai

Historical research has never before referred to Wang Yung Hai either. Huang Moh Hang (Wong Muk Han), however, had been mentioned, among others, for being expelled from the Presidium (General Committee) of the NPC. According to C. F. Yong, Wong was deported from Malaya in

October 1929. In April 1931, the Comintern's Shanghai networks dispatched a three-man mission to Singapore. Headed by J. Ducroux (who will appear again later), the mission also consisted of Teo Yuen-foo (张然和) and Wong.⁹ Ho Chi Minh also returned to Shanghai in late June 1930.¹⁰ Thereafter, until his arrest on 6 June 1931 (after being implicated in Ducroux group), Ho stayed in Shanghai and Hong Kong where he played a pivotal role as a transmission post for the Malayan, Siamese and Vietnamese parties.¹¹

Onimaru Takeshi, who has made a detailed study of the FEB's activities in Shanghai during this period, observed:

In Shanghai, the Comintern had two organizations, the FEB and the secretariat of the Pan-Pacific Trade Union. The head of the International Communication Division (OMS) of the Comintern in Shanghai bore responsibility for various tasks. He was to liaise with various Communist Parties, distribute funds to support the activities of the relevant Parties, arrange meetings and the residences of the agents, and manage the [Post Office] boxes. From April 1928 to July 1929, and from March 1930 to 15 July 1931, the day of his arrest by British police, Jakov Rundnik (using the pseudonym of Hilaire Noulens) was the OMS's head.

Each Party sent a mission to Shanghai to secretly receive directions and funds. After they could establish reliable and safe connections with the FEB, funds were handed to them by the FEB or later borne by a courier who visited one of the countries. Connections to Shanghai were made through the postal service (and many P. O. Boxes were used in this way), telecommunications or direct personal contact. Since P. O. Boxes were constantly under the surveillance of the British police, members of the parties using this method to maintain contacts had to do so with extreme caution. The FEB's correspondences with the Comintern were sent in cipher through Berlin. Among the staff working in FEB were Ho Chi Minh, Tan Malaka, Joseph Ducroux (alias Serge Lefranc),¹² Fu Tai-keng (who was dispatched by the CCP Guangdong Regional Committee to Singapore at the end of 1928 or in early 1929),¹³ Bassa (alias Teo Yuen-foo)¹⁴ and Wong Muk-han (Huang Moh Hang).¹⁵ Towards the end of 1930, when the letters of Shieng Kien Chu and Wang Yung Hai were written, Ho was either in Hong Kong or Shanghai, and Bassa and Wong Muk-han were in

Shanghai. In general, communications between the FEB and the leading circles of the CCP in Shanghai were comparatively smooth but those between the FEB and CCP's various organizations in other places did not pass easily then.

When he stayed in Hong Kong, Ho Chi Minh sent mail to the FEB in Shanghai. Ho used such pseudonyms as L.M. Vuong and Wang Shan-yi.¹⁶

With regard to Ho Chi Minh's letters, Kurihara has also written that between 1930 and 1931, mainly based in Hong Kong, Nguyen (Ho) wrote letters to the ES using different pseudonyms. Once Ho intended to use the name of L. M. Wang.¹⁷

From C. F. Yong's account, Fu Hung-chi (Fu Hung Chu), a Hainanese leader who was then Chairman of the Malayan General Seamen's Union, was promoted to chief of the MCP in June 1931. Fu was reported to have received some political training in Moscow before obtaining those appointments. He was dispatched to Shanghai in the latter part of 1931 on a mission to resume party contacts with the CCP. He returned to Malaya in September 1932 but was expelled from the MCP for making political blunders.¹⁸

Against the background of the Shanghai networks of communications discussed above, it would appear from the letters of Shieng and Wang that:

- (1) The MCP did not have direct connections with the FEB. The MCP had to rely on the CCP to communicate with the latter. Funds and instructions were likewise to be handed through the CCP. But the connections between the FEB and the CCP were not smooth either. Thus, MCP representatives, unable to receive funds, lived in extreme poverty.
- (2) Even one of the established members of the FEB, Huang Moh Hang (Wong), could not smoothly communicate with the FEB.
- (3) As Ho Chi Minh occasionally lived in Shanghai and sent letters under various pseudonyms to the FEB, there was a slim possibility that Ho was "Wang Yung Hai". But as he needed an introduction to the FEB and said he was returning to Malaya, Wang might not have been Ho after all.

- (4) Wang Yung Hai wrote in December 1930 that Fu Hung Chu was already in Shanghai on his way back from Moscow. This differed slightly from C. F. Yong's version of events.
- (5) The MCP's history has not mentioned Shieng or Wang.

Notes

1. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.14.
2. Ibid.
3. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.3.
4. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.12.
5. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.14.
6. Anna Belogurova, op., cit., p.464
7. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.4.
8. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.6.
9. C. F. Yong, op., cit., pp.99, 163.
10. Sophie, op., cit., pp.169-172.
11. Ibid. p.177.
12. J. Ducroux was born in France in 1904, joined the French Communist Party in 1923. Under a pseudonym name, he was dispatched to Shanghai in February 1931 by the Comintern to be attached to the FEB.
13. MCP document states Fu was dispatched from Hong Kong in 1928. Fang Shan, et.al., 2010a, p.43.
14. Bassa was a Hokkien Chinese born in Indonesia and could speak Java, Dutch and Malay. After participating in the Indonesian Communist Party's uprising of 1926, he ran to Shanghai in 1927. He was also dispatched to Singapore in April 1931 by the FEB. Onimaru Takeshi, Shanghai: "Noulens Jiken" no Yami (Shanghai: Darkness of the "Noulens Affair", 上海「ヌーラン事件」の闇), Tokyo, Shoseki Koubou Hayayama, 2014, p.108.
15. Once deported from Malaya to China by British in 1929, Wong (Huang) was also dispatched to Singapore again in April 1931 by the FEB. C.F. Yong, op., cit., p.163.
16. Onimaru, op., cit., Mainly pp. 58-65, 70, 86, 108, 109, 148-163
17. Kurihara, op., cit., pp. 75-77, 107, 108.
18. C.F. Yong, op., cit., pp.136, 137.

CHAPTER IV

THE MCP AND THE COMINTERN IN 1931

1. Correspondence of the Anglo-American Secretariat (AAS) of the Comintern in early 1931

- (1) Report in English from the MCP to the AAS, dated 2 January 1931

During this period, the British Communist Party was also placed in charge of the Communist Parties of its colonial territories. That was why the MCP sent reports to the Anglo-American Secretariat as well. Below is a summary of the contents of the report:

Cruxes are shown first: (1) The MCP is still weak. Lack of contact with the Malays and Indians. (2) Such radical strategy as general strike, armed insurrection and worker-peasant dictatorship is necessary. (3) Printing facilities should be improved. (4) Cadres of labour movement should be nurtured.

Details are below:

Malay (sic) is the key, economically and strategically, for Britain. It has no freedom, no political right.

- (1) The MCP: The 2nd CC Conference found out many weak points. Even among the elder members of local committee, none has organisational capacity. Although seamen in Johore had a big spontaneous struggle, the party was at the tail end. The strike was defeated. The Committee has no plan to come in contact with the natives, other than regular conversation and politeness.
- (2) Miserable conditions of masses make them sympathetic to revolution in China and India. The MCP cannot satisfy them.
- (3) General strike, toiling class armed insurrection, and worker and peasant dictatorship (sic). The petty bourgeois theorist (we have such elements in the party) says; General strike is just, but the other two are not. Our answer is; Although Malay (sic) is in its first step of democratic revolution, it meets with Soviet revolution in China

and workers and peasants' uprising in India. Malayan people cannot be separated from these two countries. 3 years ago, was there not an armed revolt peasants in Trengganu? We need only to explain to them the scientific sense of insurrection.

- (4) Each local committee needs [to] spend about \$ 20 a month and one or two comrades to make the printing material. Each local committee needs to organise the Rayon press. The CC has bought a tin press for propaganda. The Malay and Hindus comrades' education is still too infantine in the press.
- (5) Seamen, rubber and tin-mine are the main industries. We have no experienced comrades for the labour movement. The thing they can do is "to sing some rev. song" [" " is original]. We plan to choose some worker comrades to discuss and decide a working programme.
- (6) In Siam, during last year, all responsible cds. were arrested. They write either the MCP or the CCP send to help them. We cannot answer them directly, because the totality of cds. being arrested must be examined. The Burma party also asks us to send some able cds.¹

Comparing this with the FEB's letter dated 17 December 1930 (see Chapter III), it is apparent that the MCP was not aware that the FEB had instructed them not to resort to armed uprising and general strike. This letter might not have reached the MCP before 2 January 1931. Was it seized and retained by the SB for a certain period or just forfeited for good?

- (2) Russian-language letter dated 1 February 1931

The Provisional CC of the CCP[?] (БЦК. ККП). [This might be the recipient]. The Politcommisar (политкомиссия) investigated the problems of the communist organisation of Malay States. Decided to propose to approve this organisation as its one sector at the nearest Congress of the Comintern. Until then, the CC of the CCP should supervise it. At that time, the FEB should directly contact the communist organisation of Malay States. The ES will prepare detailed letters to it.²

- (3) Proposal of the Eastern Secretariat on the Malayan problem (written in German, dated 1 February 1931)

With respect to the recent report from Malaya, we propose as follows:

- Report to the FEB to invite a representative of the MCP to its transmission department. Without waiting for the final report from M [Malaya?], send a letter to the MCP.
- Request the CC of the CCP again to send a comrade to M.
- Choose a Chinese comrade of the Lenin School and prepare to send him to M.³

(4) MCP's English letter, dated 7 February 1931, sent from Malaya. The following is a summary:

Cruxes are shown first: (1) Received the AAS's letter on 30 January 1931. (2) This letter will be discussed among the comrades. After that, the Party conference, attended by "Malayan", Chinese Indian and Javanese, will be called. (3) We had not practiced such wrong things as uprising and general strike as you criticized. (4) You might have been misinformed by comrade Soong [Ho Chi Minh].

Details are below:

Dear Comrades,

We have received your letter in English and in Chinese in (sic) 30 Jan. 1931. On the 4th Feb., we translated it into Malayan and Indian. We shall call a meeting to discuss the letter among the various national comrades. There will be one Chinese, one Malayan, one Javanese and one Indian (sic) comrade to attend.

As (sic) regarding to the methods of work which [were] noticed in your letter, we thoroughly agree to. But we do not even in practice perform those wrong things which you find out in our work. The uprising of toiling masses and general strike etc. were not used as the methods. We have sometimes write and explain (sic) such ideas on our papers. But it is only with purpose of propaganda. The slogans for terrorism were never used by party, even talked never. There were something like that character done by the mass, but it is only non-organised mass motion. Maybe you were misinformed by comrades Soong or (?) [? is original mark] about the assault once played on a manager by the workers of Tan Kah Kee.

We are expecting, after the above meeting, to call the conference of party, with Malayan, Chinese, indian (sic) and Javanese attend, before the first of April. When the day and work of this conference is finally considered and discussed at the said meeting, we shall inform you with details and for instruction.⁴

This letter, which refuted criticism that the MCP implemented terror, might have been a reply to the AAS's letter which had reached the MCP on 30 January 1931. Unfortunately, the latter was not contained in available files. Nonetheless, we can conjecture that in that letter the AAS criticized the MCP's radical political line expressed in its report, dated 2 January 1931, to the AAS (shown above). From a technical point of view, we can understand it took about a month for the MCP to receive a comment from the AAS. Another possibility is that the letter received on 30 January was the FEB's letter to "Malayan Comrades", dated 17 December 1930 mentioned above.

When analyzing the contents, we can discern that while in January the MCP took a radical stand, in February, barely a month afterwards, it changed its stand to a moderate one. During this one month, the MCP might have known the change of strategies of the Comintern (see Chapter I). It is not recorded as to whether there arose internal disputes in the MCP or not. Nonetheless, it sounds rather strange that the author of this letter did not know what the MCP had reported in January.

Meanwhile, it is interesting that the Party conference was not exclusively dominated by Chinese, but was represented by each ethnic group. Apart from a Malay representative, there was a Javanese representative. Their presence presumably reflected the MCP's endeavor to extend its influence among the Malays. According to C. F. Yong, however, it was not until March 1935 that the MCP decided to establish a unification committee in Singapore with five members – two Chinese, one Tamil, one Javanese and one Annamite.⁵

On the matter of an assault on Tan Kah Kee's manager by his employees, C.F. Yong wrote that the fire which destroyed one of Tan's rubber factories on 7 August 1928 was rumored to have been the work of his employees. In the early 1930s, the anti-Japanese movement was considered very important by the communists. As Tan, a very prominent member of the national bourgeoisie, was the preeminent leader of the anti-Japanese movement, an assault on his company's manager might not have been considered a correct revolutionary act.

As for the “Comrade Soong” noted in the letter, his identity was not much of a mystery. Recall Li Chi-sin’s recollection that A Song (阿宋. Nguyen Ai Quoc) had attended the First Representatives’ Congress of the MCP. Moreover, Sophie has shown that in June 1931 Ho Chi Minh held a passport of the Republic of China under the name of Sung Man Sho.⁶ Hence, Soong was none other than Ho Chi Minh.

(5) English letter dated 20 May 1931 (summarized by Hara)

Cruxes are shown first: (1) Connections with the MCP were scarce, merely conducted through several Chinese, who could not satisfactorily represent Malayan organisation, and Quak [Ho Chi Minh]. (2) These Chinese did not know about movement of non-Chinese. (3) All national groups (Chinese, Malayan and Hindu) must abolish their organisational independence and elect the unified CC. (4) It is not known whether present organisations and central leadership were unified. (5) In addition to our friend [Fu Tai-keng], Sam [Decroux] had been sent to Singapore. (6) Send a trusty Hindu and/or Chinese to India. (7) Find a connection-man as good as Quark [Ho Chi Minh]. (8) Certain amount of money might be provided.

Details are below:

Dear Friend,

As you have the possibility to make yourself better acquainted with the work of our Malayan friends and to have an influence upon their work, we would like to tell you our opinions.

The connections between us and the Malayan friends were until now carried out only through the Chinese friends. Through these friends and *Quak* (sic), various people could meet us. For instance, in January – May 1931, three different friends arrived here and everyone claimed to be the representative of the Malayan Directors’ Council (MDC). These friends, in the best of cases, were representatives of Chinese groups from various places. Through them we have the possibility to make connections with the M.S. [Malay States]. But we did not know who are (sic) speaking to. We tried in vain to clear up the matter through our Co. (sic) here. They could only tell us that the arrived man is a member of the Chinese firm, that 2 or 3 years ago he immigrated to MS and that they don’t know what is doing (sic) now. We could not recognise them as representatives of the MS or the MDC. Nevertheless, we gave them instructions, took information. It only showed that

they had no connections with the Company there, they could not give detailed information about the work there and achievements of our Firm. After two or three conversations, we decided to write a letter to our Malayan friends, which was sent in December-January. A message was received that it has been read by our Malayan friends and they consider (sic) it generally characterising the situation correctly — except some few points. This letter will be used by them as a basis for future work. For the immediate future, we placed upon them the tasks of unifying all the groups agreeing with the programme and decisions of the C.I. [Comintern] and of abolishing the organisational independence of all national groups (Chinese, Malayan and even Hindu). Another task is to call a joint meeting or conference and elect the CC for whole Malayan States.

We did not receive any answer to all these tasks. We did not know the party work, how the centralisation is going on and how strong is it, etc. We decided to speak with the Malayan firm and to give them instructions. We think it necessary to get information from responsible sources only about:

- Where and what kind of organization exist (sic)?
- Are people of various nationalities members of these organisations, or does every national group exist for itself—independently?
- Does there exist a Center for leadership of all groups, or has every group its own leadership?
- What is inner life in the adult, youth and trade union organizations?
- Mass work.
- Press.

On the basis of this information, further tasks must be placed before our friends. We think that our December letter is still in accord with the situation. If you [think] that the above tasks are insufficient and it is necessary to put new, please let us know.

We would like to inform you that, in addition to our friend who left for Singapore to help you, there is also our clarc (sic) –Sam for the PPTUS [Pan Pacific Trade Union Secretariat] work. We have information that he is already there. You shall find out what he does and try to help him if possible.

They demanded several times to send somebody for work in India. The only place we can get somebody is Singapore. We ask you to find a trusty Hindu. A Chinese, who could work among the Chinese there, will not be bad. Besides it, we ask you to find a good, steady friend, who could be our connection-man for MS, like *Quark* (sic).

About the budget of the party, youth and trade unions, we have no instruction in spite of several requests. This is so with the majority of the firms in Far East. But, according to the directives of the Center, we have the right to use certain amount of money for traveling, extra-ordinary meetings (conference) etc.

We have received a letter from Indo-China, which shows that the relations between them and *Quark* are not very good. We thought Q has some authority among his people. What do you think about this?⁷ (emphasis added)

This letter was kept in the AAS File entitled “AAS’s Correspondence relating to Questions on Malaya”. Yet its sender might have been a member of the FEB staff (see Gordon’s letter, below). In the letter, business-sounding words such as Company and firm were probably used as a precaution against interception by the colonial Special Branch.

The recipient appeared to be living in Singapore. Again his identity is probably not difficult to establish: Fu Tai-keng, a trusted member of the FEB, had been dispatched to Singapore in the late 1920s. On the other hand, Quak or Quark would probably be corruptions of the name of Quoc, mistakenly assumed to be the “last name” of Nguyen Ai Quoc. If these identities were the correct ones, then Fu was evidently considered by the AAS to be as reliable as Ho Chi Minh.

Who, though, was “our friend who left for Singapore to help you”? Could he have been Wong Mok Han or Teo Yuen-foo? The question could not be answered by the information in the letter. “Sam”, however, should be Ducroux who was also placed in charge of the PPTUS.⁸

The “Malayan Directors’ Council” in the letter might have had a connection to the Malaya (sic) Executive Committee proposed by Wang Yung Hai in his letter of 28 December 1930.

It seemed rather strange that the unified party of all Malayans irrespective of nationals (民族. ethnicity) had been organized a year before and yet the AAS continued to refer to the abolishment of the organisational independence of all national groups and to the tasks of unifying them. This was obviously a response to the relevant portion of the MCP's letter dated 7 February. It stated that the Party would call a national party conference to be attended by Malays, Chinese, Indians and Javanese. The MCP itself might be conscious that it was in reality still dominated by Chinese and there was no concerted, united movement of Chinese, Malay and Indian members. Another possible reason was simply that the AAS had only very bare information on the situation in Malaya. And if the MCP's representatives were not sufficiently trusted in Shanghai, that situation seemed to correspond to the point raised by Wang Yung Hai. He had stated in his letter that the four comrades who composed the report to the FEB knew very little about contemporary conditions in Malaya. These situations might be construed by the AAS that the MCP was yet to be a national united party.

2. FEB's Secret Mission to Malaya

(1) Background of the mission

Having advisory personnel who would directly inspect and lead the MCP was considered necessary by various sections. The ES wrote on 23 October 1930 that the FEB should inspect the MCP. Wang Yung Hai's 28 December 1930 letter had requested that regular connections be established between the FEB and, before that, the appointment of Huang Moh Hang as a tentative representative for that purpose. On 2 January 1931, the MCP had requested the AAS to send a member of "Hindu" and "Java" Communist Parties to lead propaganda work among Indians and Malays. A month later, on 1 February 1931, the AAS replied that the FEB should directly contact the MCP. On the same day, ES asked the CCP to send a comrade to Malaya.

Before the MCP was formed, the Plenum of the NPC in 1928 had requested the Comintern to send personnel to undertake surveys and for labour and women's movements in Malaya. After its formation, the MCP requested in a Russian-language letter of 25 November 1930 for comrades to be urgently dispatched who could aid their work and for the Comintern to discuss this issue with the CC of the CCP (see II, note 36). These matters appeared evidently resulted in the dispatch of three FEB staff. As Kurihara has noted, from about 1931, apart from the CCP networks, the FEB

tried to establish its own networks in Nanyang using the MCP.⁹ That might not have been a unilateral decision of the FEB given the MCP's requests for advisors.

(2) Three members of the mission

To recapitulate, the FEB sent a three-man mission comprising J. Ducroux (alias Serge Lefranc, Gordon), Wong Mok Han and Teo Yuen-foo (Bassa) to Singapore in April 1931. Ducroux left Shanghai at the end of January or the beginning of March 1931, and via Hong Kong and Indochina, arrived in Singapore on 27 April 1931.¹⁰ His principal task, according to Onimaru, was to make Singapore the FEB's liaison base in Nanyang and to establish a liaison line with India.¹¹ For C. F. Yong, Ducroux's main objectives included the reorganisation of the MCP, especially the promotion of the Malay communist movement. The PPTUS in Shanghai set aside \$50,000 for his task. Wong's task was to assist in the development of the MGLU. Teo Yuen-foo's plan included the promotion of communism among the Malays.¹² And since the MCP repeatedly requested personnel who could lead the movement among the Malays, the role of Bassa, who could speak Javanese,¹³ Malay, English and Dutch,¹⁴ was quite clear.

Onimaru's study has shown that on 1 May 1931, from an intercepted letter sent by the CC of the MCP to the All India Communist Party, the Criminal Intelligence Department (CID) of Singapore had determined that a representative of the PPTUS of Shanghai had arrived in Singapore. On 15 May, the CID intercepted a letter from Wan (Ho Chi Minh's pseudonym) to the CC of the MCP; the letter contained Ducroux's address. From then on Ducroux's every activity and meeting was placed under surveillance. On 1 June 1931, Ducroux, Fu Tai-keng and Wong Mok Han were arrested at Ducroux's office. Based on information from the documents seized at their residences, Ho Chi Minh was arrested in Hong Kong on 6 June, and Noulens on 15 June in Shanghai.¹⁵ With this round-up by the police, the MCP's connection with the Comintern was severely cut off for a few years.

(3) Gordon's French-language letter dated 22 May 1931

This letter is kept in File Ф. 495 оп.62 д.11 which is entitled, "Reports and Information on the country sent from Malaya to the AAS". According to Onimaru, Ducroux's 22 May letter was sent to P. O. Box 206, Shanghai, but it was intercepted by the CID. (Part of the letter was written in

code; it was neither translated nor recorded in the CID files.). That P.O. Box belonged to Noulens,¹⁶ making the intercepted letter the one that Ducroux sent to the FEB. Gordon's (Ducroux's) letter is summarized below:

Cruxes are shown first: (1) Work is smooth, collaborators are reliable, yet a more experienced person is needed as his successor. (2) Studying to reinforce the work among Malayan (Malay) and Indian workers.

Details are below:

Work in this place has just started and is expected to develop smoothly. I am satisfied with my collaborators. They are honest and devoted. But it is more desirable if an experienced person, who can receive various directives after my departure, can be found. This work is very important and demands many capabilities and responsibilities. Please explore this question and overcome the difficulty of personal disposition. It is important to receive a reliable person here in a few months.

Travelers can be sent soon. But there are many difficulties such as freight, shipping documents and the inexperience of the personnel. I feel happy because, due to my social position, I could send a telegraph. Everything is maintained in an orderly manner now.

We are currently studying the following questions:

- (1) Reinforcement of the work among Malayan (sic) and Indian workers. Creation of a special commission for this purpose.
- (2) Feasibility of sending a comrade to Rangoon.
- (3) Two members of the Secretariat were sent there to receive travelers.¹⁷

This letter contains a table which shows the number of Chinese members in the communist organizations of Malay Peninsula as at May 1931 (Table 4). Here, the author noted that the CC of the MCP consisted of 10 Chinese and one Malay. The Secretariat had three members, all Chinese.

In "Malaya Command Intelligence Summary 1931", C. F. Yong provided these membership figures of the MCP and its organizations: 500 for MCP, 640 for Communist Youth, 8,000 for

MGLU and MSGU 8,000, and nil for AIL.¹⁸ The MCP figure was considerably lower than the one in Gordon's report but the difference in Trade Union members (8,000 against 8,581) was relatively small. The Special Branch which intercepted Ducroux' letter, C. F. Yong noted, recorded an MCP membership figure of 1,500.¹⁹

In 1931 an MCP representative was sent to Thailand to resolve an internal dispute of the Siamese Communist Party.²⁰

3. Draft ES letters written after the arrest of the FEB mission

The Comintern Files contained two draft letters from the ES to the MCP which were prepared after Ducroux and his two mission colleagues were arrested. As the connection between the Comintern and the MCP was almost entirely cut off then, these letters might not have reached the MCP. The letters were written in English. The first letter, dated 3 July 1931, contained instructions from the ES to the MCP. The second, dated 8 July 1931, had the title, "The Present Situation in Malaya and the Task of the CPM (sic)". Both letters are summarized below.

(1) Draft English letter of instructions from the ES to the MCP, dated 3 July 1931

Cruxes are shown first: (1) Imperialists' agrarian reforms cannot solve slavery conditions of Malayan population. (2) Present chief tasks are to overthrow Imperialist and to abolish such pre-capitalist remnants as landlords and Sultans. (3) The main driving force in the revolution is proletariat (especially those working in rubber plantations and tin mines) and the peasantry. (4) Though general strike is an essential step toward armed insurrection, it requires widespread dissatisfaction of working masses and strong leadership of the Party. Today, general strike should be used as a slogan only. (5) Uprising in 1927 and 1928 and semi-Trotskyite leadership of Li Li San offended a mistake of leftist opportunist. (6) Trade union movement should be strengthened. Nanyang Federation of Labour, which subsumes non-Chinese as well, should be built. (7) Fundamental slogans of the anti-imperialist revolution; Establishment of Soviet Republic of Malaya. Confiscation of British Imperialists' as well as landlords' assets. Improvement of working conditions. Against Imperialist war. Defend USSR and Chinese, Indian revolution.

Details are below:

(1) Socio-economic conditions of Malaya

Emmigration (sic) to Borneo and Sumatra of thousands of Malay peasants and the insignificant agrarian reforms such as “free” irrigation cannot solve the agrarian problem. The repatriation of thousands of Indian and Chinese plantation workers cannot solve the mass unemployment, semi feudal slavery and mass pauperisation. The vast majority of Malay (sic) population, Malays, Chinese and Indians are enslaved under the imperialist-feudal yoke. In the present stage, the chief tasks are a B-D [bourgeois- democratic] rev. (sic), the overthrow of Imp. (sic) and the rev. (sic) solution of the agrarian problem towards the abolition of all pre-capitalist remnants.

- The main driving forces in the rev. in Malaya are proletariat and the basic masses of the peasantry. The main object of the rev. is British Imp. Its followers are the native bourgeoisie, the native feudal landlords and usurers, “Independent” and dependent Sultans and the majority of the Malay chiefs.
- As Malay (sic) produces one half of the world rubber, 60-65% of which is produced by plantation, and 1/3 of the world tin, there is correspondingly developed proletariat who are the only constant rev. class force.
- Slogans of general strike and armed insurrection have not clearly been understood by the MCP.

A general strike is an essential means of raising local struggles into a nationwide struggle. It is an essential step towards organising the masses for the highest stage of the class struggle—mass armed insurrection. But the successful calling and CARRYING THROUGH [capital letters are original] of a general strike presupposes an advanced stage in the class struggle. It requires certain objective prerequisites, particularly widespread dissatisfaction and rev. activity of broad sections of the working masses. It necessitates strong rev. leadership, esp. the strengthening of the Party.

Today the Party should use the slogan of a general strike only as a slogan of agitation. At the same time, it must prepare for a general strike. The Party must develop and lead the everyday struggles of the masses, of crystalising the discontent of the masses, of creating a whole net-work of politically active factory, mine,

plantation, trade union and peasant committees. By extending the strike movement into a broad mass mov., the Party with the Red trade unions will be in a position to carry through a general political strike.

- Raising the slogan of armed insurrection must be considered from the same view point. The left opportunist mistakes [does not understand?] arising from the use of this slogan as a slogan of action under circumstances where there was neither a favorable objective situation, a mass base or [nor?] a strong rev. leadership, has only served to retard the development of the rev. mov. and isolate the Party from the masses. The putschist uprising in Malaya in 1927 and 1928, and the semi-Trotskyite leadership of Cd. Li Li Hsian [Li Li San] offended this mistake.

Today, the slogan of armed insurrection in Malaya does not correspond to the existing situation. However, in the event of spontaneous armed uprising of the masses, the Party must support and, if possible, lead these movements.

- Trade unions. There are spontaneous strikes without rev. leadership, and unions fail to crystalise organisationally the increased militant activity of masses. The RTUs [Red Trade Unions] is still far from satisfactory. The MCP must build the unions of the NY Federation of Labour (NFL) according to the directives and decisions of the PPTUS and the 5th Congress of the RILU (The Red International of Labour Unions, Profintern), giving the greatest attention to the following tasks.

- i) Transform the NFL from a Chinese federation to a federation of Chinese, Indian, Japanese [Javanese?], Malay, etc. workers.
- ii) Organise a mass center—independently lead the local economic struggles.
- iii) Joint struggle for immediate unemployment relief and for unemployment insurance payed (sic) by the state and the employers.
- iv) Organise the unorganized, particularly the plantation and agricultural workers, tin miners and transport workers to draw into the unions on the basis of complete equality of immigrant workers, women and youth.
- v) Intensify the struggle for the legal existence of the RTUs.
- vi) Further centralise the federation and develop one industrial union for each industry.

- vii) Create opposition groups in the reformist unions and win over the best elements in the Labour Contract System Unions, Sarekat, Malaya, Anjuran, Islam, etc. unions.
- viii) Establish TU democracy, continually train and develop new proletarian cadres and strengthen the TU press.
- ix) Develop and maintain the closest contact with the rev. TU mov. in the Far East, esp., Indonesia, India and China.
- x) Mobilise the proletariat to support the Indian and Chinese revolution and defend the Soviet Union.
- xi) Unions must have a much wider base than the Party. Even the most backward sections of the workers who are willing to fight for their economic interests can be raised their political consciousness.
- Fundamental slogans of the anti-imperialist agrarian revolution
 - i) Overthrow of British Imperialism and power of the Sultans. Complete National Independence of the Malay States.
 - ii) Establish a Federated Workers and Peasants Soviet Republic of Malaya. Full right of all national Minorities to self-determination, even to separation.
 - iii) Confiscation and nationalisation of all British Imperialists' assets.
 - iv) Confiscation of compensation of all landed assets of landlords (native as well as imperialist) and transfer them for the use of toiling peasants and agricultural labourers, immigrant as well as native. Abolition of all debts and taxes of the peasants and agricultural laborers. Abolition of indenture contract and forced labour.
 - v) Eight hour day. General increase in wages. Equal rights for all workers.
 - vi) Against Imperialist war. Defend the Soviet Union and Chinese and Indian revolution. International working class solidarity.²¹

The above instructions were quite similar to the Ten Big Demands adopted at the Third Congress of the NPC (Inaugural Congress of the MCP) in May 1930. While the right to freedom of assembly, etc., was not mentioned, the abolition of indenture contracts, and the defense of the Chinese and Indian revolutions were raised.

These also bore close similarity to the Twelve-point Revolutionary Programme adopted at the Third Representative Conference of the MCP in early 1932 except that in the latter “the abolition of the capitalist system and the development of the Malayan nationals’ (马来亚民族) economy through socialism” (clause 5) and “opposition against all reactionary religions” (clause 8) were added.²² Indeed, it would seem that the Twelve-point Revolutionary Programme might have been based on the lengthy, almost comprehensive, instructions from the ES that were drafted after the Ducroux mission had been detained. If so, it remains a mystery who delivered the instruction to the MCP and by what means. Yet it suggests that the fundamental policy lines of the MCP had not changed from its inauguration to 1932.

- (2) English draft letter from the ES to the MCP, dated 8 July 1931. “The Present Situation in Malaya and the Task of the CPM (sic)”.

Cruxes are shown first: (1) The MCP should support the movement of Siam, Burma and Indonesia. (2) The Comintern appreciates the courageous activity of the CPM (MCP). (3) But the Party still remains as a part of the CCP. (4) The Party should strengthen peasant, working class movement and anti-imperialist movement.

Details are below:

- (1) The CPM by virtue of its strategic position and the development of the Communist movement is called upon to actively support the movement in Siam and Burma as well as in the re-establishment of a Communist Party in Indonesia. It should train for short periods native workers from these countries, and guide these Communist groups which must not be considered as Section of the CPM.
- (2) The ECCI (Executive Committee of the Comintern) notes with satisfaction the courageous activity of the CPM which in spite of many shortcomings is beginning to be established as an independent political force. It has organised and participated in a number of strike struggles and carried on agitation in defense of the SU as well as Chinese and Indian revolutions. The ECCI particularly notes with approval the step forward made by the Party at the Third Congress.
- (3) But the Party has failed to organise and lead the peasantry and has not mobilised wide sections of workers. The Party has functioned mainly as a “Section” [original

quotation marks] of the CCP and remains as a Party composed mainly of Chinese workers.

- Imminent tasks;
 - i) Organising, initiating, leading and carrying on strike movement of the working class and the fight of the peasantry, plantation and agricultural labourers.
 - ii) Extending and strengthening the anti-imperialist movement, securing and maintaining the independent leadership of the working class.²³

This second letter of 8 July appeared to have had a comparatively favourable assessment of the MCP. Yet both letters were concerned that the MCP was still mainly a Chinese party despite the decision taken at its inaugural congress.

As for the issue of armed insurrection, an MCP letter of 2 January 1931 placed “general strike” together with “armed insurrection by toiling class” among its “present political tasks”. The MCP’s letter of 7 February 1931, however, specified that the uprising of toiling masses (or terrorism) and general strike “only [for the] purpose of propaganda”. Maybe because of this, the ES or the FEB considered it necessary to issue its instruction which was to deny any resort to armed insurrection even as a slogan. Still, the MCP might have been embarrassed and not merely confused by the Comintern’s changing and inconsistent standpoint on armed insurrection.

4. Shanghai Municipal Police Files

Files are summarized below:

- (1) Fu Ta-ching first arrived in Singapore in November 1928. The Communist movement in Malaya was under his direction since then until his arrest on 1 June 1931.
- (2) The following seized documents are purported to have emanated from Lefranc [Ducroux].
 - Letter dated ‘Singapore 27.3.31’, partly in French and partly in code, refer to the arrival of a certain person from Shanghai for information work. One ‘Mr. Jack’ is mentioned.²⁴

- Cablegram dated 17.V.Nr.9. “Connections well established”.
 - Document in English appealing for help as they (?) are without help and are communicating with *Quac*-an Annamite Communist. (emphasis added).
 - Letter in French dated ‘Singapore 4.5.31’, mentioning the addresses; Serglefran, Singapore and Post Box 307 Singapore. The signature of the sender is undecipherable.
- (3) Fu was deported to China after six months imprisonment and arrested on his arrival in Shanghai on 3 November 1931 by the Public Safety Bureau (Chinese Territory Police) and then handed over to the Chinese (Soong Wu) Military Authorities. Meantime, a letter from British Consul-General to the SMP dated 2 September 1931 stated that the Nanking Government had no definite charge against Fu, though the Chinese authorities had no objection to taking him over. Contrarily, SMPSB’s note dated 8 April 1932 stated: The Chinese Authority arrested him entirely on their own responsibility. ... We did nothing which would justify the Public Safety Bureau in thinking that we wished that a charge be preferred against Fu.²⁵

From here it is known that various documents were seized before Ducroux and Fu were arrested on 1 June 1931. But not all ciphered parts were deciphered. Second interesting fact is that the continuing intermediate role of Ho Chi Minh (“Quoc” here) between the MCP and the Comintern was monitored by the SB in this period as well. The third interesting fact is that the SMP had no charge against Fu, that is, no intention to arrest him. The KMT government arrested him without definite charge. According to an MCP document, through relief work by Mrs. Sun Yat Sen, Song Qing Ling (宋庆龄), Fu was released after the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese War.²⁶

Notes

1. Φ. 495 оп.62 д.11.
2. Φ. 495 оп.62 д.10.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
5. C.F. Yong, op., cit., p.164.

6. Sophie, op., cit., p.169. This passport was issued on 28 April 1930 by the Consul General of China in the Straits Settlement.
7. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.2.
8. Krihara also says Sam might be Ducroux. Krihara, op., cit., p.135.
9. Kurihara, op., cit., p.135.
10. Onimaru, op., cit., pp.148-151. / Cheah, op., cit., pp.17, 60.
11. Onimaru, op., cit., p.141.
12. C.F. Yong, op., cit., p.163.
13. Ibid.
14. Onimaru, op., cit., p.108.
15. Ibid., pp.148-155.
16. Ibid., pp.69, 153.
17. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.11.
18. C.F. Yong, op., cit., p.156.
19. Ibid., p.155.
20. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.51.
21. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.16.
22. Nan Dao Zhi Chun, p.9. / C.F. Yong, op., cit., pp.160, 161. Yong says it was the **Second** (emphasis added) Representative Conference held in March 1932. /This Nan Dao Zhi Chun's "Twelve Point Programme" is exactly same as the "Twelve Revolutionary Bylaws drafted by the Third Representative Council Meeting in 1932" cited in the "Report No.3780", Office of Intelligence Research, Department of State, US, March 16, 1947. See Cheah, op., cit., pp.94, 95.
According to the MCP's historical document published recently, this assembly was called the Third Representatives Congress (Conference). Before the Pacific War, the representatives congress was called enlarged plenum. Fang Shan, et.al., eds., *Magong Wenji, Di 2 Ji, Zhanqian Dixia Douzheng Shiqi (2)* (MCP Anthologies, Underground Struggle Era before the War. 方山 等编 马共文集第 2 辑 战前地下斗争时期 (二)), Kuala Lumpur, Penerbitan Abad 21, 2010, (2010b henceforth), p. iii.
23. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.16.
24. As Ducroux arrived in Singapore on 27 April 1931, this letter was not "emanated" from him.

25. US National Archives & Records Administration, *Shanghai Municipal Police Files (SMPF)*, D2866, “Communist Suspect in Nanking”, (23 July 1931 - 21 Apr. 1932). Central Library of National University of Singapore (NUS), Microfilm R0012016.
26. Fang Shang, 2010a, p.43.

CHAPTER V

THE MCP AND THE COMINTERN FROM 1932 TO 1934

I. 1932

Few documents on the activities of the MCP or its communications with the Comintern were kept in the Comintern Files. This was because of the destruction of the Comintern networks by the colonial police in Malaya, Hong Kong and Shanghai.

1. A letter in Russian from the CC of the Siamese Communist Party (SCP) stated that, in 1932, after the anniversary of Lenin's demise (21 January), the central intelligence organization of the SCP was destroyed and its relations with the CC of the MCP became estranged.¹
2. Among the files with Russian-language contents,² there was a file, "Resolutions, Circulars and other materials relating to the Organization, Labour Movements, MYuD (MЮД), and etc. of the CC of the MCP: 12 October 1932–25 December 1932".³ One of the materials was a Chinese-language circular of the MCP entitled "Resolutions of the CC of the Party relating to the Aliens Ordinance and our work". The Aliens Ordinance was enforced in January 1933. Therefore, this circular would have been issued in 1932. The Resolutions are summarized below:
 - The Aliens Ordinance was already read for the second time in the Straits Settlements Legislative Council. Its main objective is to strictly restrict entry of nationals not belonging to Britain and its protected territories. All toiling and unemployed masses will be regarded as non-beneficial elements and prohibited to enter Malaya. Such categories of masses already in Malaya as well as all revolutionary elements will be arrested and deported at any time.
 - This Ordinance has the illusion that if all toiling masses sojourning in Malaya, beginning with unemployed masses, are deported, the unemployment crisis can be alleviated.
 - It intends to provoke emotional conflict among nationals (ethnic groups) and to split, weaken their anti-Imperialist united front.
 - It intends to enforce economic exploitation of the masses and to oppress the ever developing revolutionary movement.

- It intends to strengthen the logistics for the war.
- All oppressed masses of Malaya, be united to oppose this Ordinance! Overthrow British Imperialist rule and establish a Worker-Peasant Democratic Government!⁴

In this connection, C. F. Yong has referred to student demonstrations against this Ordinance in 1932 and 1933.⁵

3. Shanghai SB Files

(1) Arrest of three Annamite Communists

On 5 January 1932, at the instance of French Police the local [Shanghai] Japanese Consular Police arrested three Annamite [Vietnamese] communists, on board the “Shanghai Maru” prior to its departure. According to French Interigence Report, they were Truong [more often spelled Troung] Van Lenh, Vuong Trach and Cao Duc Chinh. But Japanese report noted their names as Tsang Yui Ling (张云领), Lee Mong San (李梦山,24) and Van Ts Kwong (范智光) [both orders are original].⁶

According to Sophie, Lai Teck was possibly a pseudonym of Truong Phuoc Dat alias Ly Minh Son. Truong (Ly) was arrested in Shanghai in April 1933.⁷ Sophie also states that Truong Van Lenh was arrested in Shanghai in 1932.⁸ Ly Minh Son was referred to by Yoji Akashi, too, as one of Lai Teck’s pseudonyms. Akashi also says Lai Teck was apprehended by the French secret police after the Manchurian Incident (September 1931) when he travelled back and forth between Tientsin and Shanghai.⁹

If Lee Mong San was Ly Minh Son, it meant Lai Teck had earlier been arrested in January 1932 in Shanghai by the Japanese police.¹⁰

(2) Aliens Registration Bill

In SMPF, there is an extract, entitled “Malayan Communist Party”, from Straits Settlements Political Intelligence Journal for December 1932. It states; on 28 November, 4 and 11 December

1932, demonstrations against the Bill were arranged. Presence of police prevented trouble for the first two occasions. On the third occasion, demonstration materialised and 59 were arrested, large portion of whom were senior students of the Chinese High School, Bukit Timah Road. They commemorated the 5th anniversary of the Canton Uprising as well. On 12 December 1932, a serious riot occurred in Kulai, a small village in Johor. Some three hundred Chinese assembled. Two Police Constables were severely assaulted. Police killed two leaders and arrested a number of the Chinese.¹¹

II 1933

1. One file contained Chinese-language documents of the Draft Resolutions of the First Enlarged Plenum of the MCP.¹² This document was published on 5 April 1933 and a copy was submitted (交抄) on 25 August 1934. The file also contained the General Conclusion of the Second Enlarged Plenum of the MCP. It was written on 5 September 1933 and its copy was submitted on 26 August 1934.

The draft resolutions pertained to the following matters:

- Political Issues
- Party Affairs
- Trade Union Movements
- Peasants Movements
- Soldiers Movements
- Anti-Imperialist Movements
- Nationalist Movements
- Youth Movements
- Women Movements
- Welfare Society Movements
- Party's Economic Problems
- Others

The fact that these two MCP documents reached the Comintern only in late August 1934 suggested that it took a year for them to restore their communications.

The Russian-language brief history of the MCP, written in February 1942, noted after the portion quoted above that between 1933 and 1934 the MCP worked under the guidance of the FEB. But this guidance was lost after the representatives of the Comintern were arrested.¹³

2. MCP's Chinese language document dated 10 August 1933¹⁴

Below is a summary of its contents:

Cruxes are shown first: (1) Fundamental tasks are to overthrow the Imperialist rule, feudal forces and capitalist system and establish a worker-peasant government. (2) Organize all Malayan nationals, especially Malays and Indians, under the leadership of the Party.

Details are below:

Dear Comrades!

Our Party's fundamental tasks for the Malayan revolution are to overthrow the rule of British Imperialists, Sultans, landlords and capitalists, establish a worker-peasant government and extinguish the capitalist system. The completion of these tasks depends on how we realize the following fundamental work:

- (1) Organize oppressed Malayan nationals, especially Malayan (sic), Chinese and Indian masses into a strong anti-Imperialist United Front.
- (2) Organize the great majority of working class under the leadership of the Party and the Red Trade Union.
- (3) Mobilize and organize extensively peasants, soldiers and all toiling masses to carry out anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, and anti-capitalist struggles under the leadership of the proletariat.
- (4) Mobilize and lead daily economic struggles of workers, peasants and toiling masses and raise their fighting spirit and knowledge.
- (5) Make the Party a vanguard of the working class to lead them with correct proletariat consciousness.

We already have considerable organizational bases among the Chinese. But among the Malays and Indians, we are still in an embryonic state. For the liberation of every oppressed Malayan national and for the victory of toiling masses, we should resolutely implement this work!

According to Yong, the MCP dispatched two delegates, Bun Teck-chai (Li Chi-shin) (twice) and Li Su-kong to Shanghai to contact the FEB during 1933 and 1934. Bun succeeded in contacting the CCP agents and received advice from them. The advice was brought back to Singapore and yielded results in the Federated Malay States Railway strike. The other official, Li Su-kong, was sent in 1934. But no further news on him surfaced.¹⁵

III 1934

1. Decision of the CC of the MCP on affiliation to the Party, passed on 18 March 1934. Below is a summary of this Chinese-language document.

Worker, employed peasant, poor peasant, toiling mass and soldier must possess the following qualities; ① faithfulness ② fairly high class consciousness ③ spirit to sacrifice oneself for the people ④ absolute acceptance of the Party leadership, and ⑤ active devotion to revolutionary work. In addition to the above, a student, teacher, intellectual, middle-class peasant, small merchant or officer (军官) must endure toiling life as a proletarian.¹⁶

2. Letter from the MCP dated 20 March 1934

This Chinese-language document is summarized below.

Cruxes are shown first: (1) In order to restore the Indonesian Communist Party, the MCP found one of its members. (2) He can contact hundreds of Indonesian comrades. (3) The Comintern is requested to lead them.

Details are below:

Relations with the Party of Java: although we searched in various quarters, we could not contact them. Recently, through an Indonesian comrade we managed to find a clue. This comrade formerly

participated in the Java Revolution. He went to the USA in 1928, worked there and participated in the US Communist Party and its activities. He came back to Indonesia in February last year. He knows several comrades who were released after imprisonment for a while. Through these relations, he can contact more than 100 comrades (all were arrested and released shortly after) and 500 revolutionary masses of Batavia [Jakarta]. Though eager for revolution, they have neither organization nor plan of activity. Through this comrade, we decided to invite one comparatively resolute, capable and high-ranking comrade among them to come to Singapore. We will discuss with him the restoration of the organization and the work of the Party. If he agrees with us, we will introduce them to you. Then, you can directly lead them. This procedure has already begun.

According to information from seamen, a party (probably our Party) disseminated leaflets in Batavia. It was put on strict alert.¹⁷

The invited person could have been one of four Indonesian communist leaders who, C. F. Yong and Cheah Boon Kheng said, stayed in Malaya between 1933 and 1935. The four were Ma Ali (Sutan Jenain), Amir Hamzah Siregar, Ho, and Sajeti (Sutan Budiman). The first three of them were paid by the MCP.¹⁸

3. Report from the MCP dated 24 March 1934

The summary of this Chinese-language document is given below.

Cruxes are shown first: (1) Membership has not changed much for the last 6 months. Malay-Indian work was neglected. Discipline of the Party members were low. (2) Though the Party tried to train Malay comrades, only one was found. This indispensable Malay cannot be dispatched to Moscow. (3) Central Standing Committee (CSC) consisted of Chen Liang, Chun Guang and De Cai (Li Chin-sin). Of them, Cheng Liang was arrested in November 1933. Zheng Shun was appointed acting SC member, De Cai File Secretary and Chun Guang Acting Secretary. De Cai went back to China. (4) Please dispatch a Chinese, who is fluent in Chinese and English, and a Malay.

Details are below:

(1) General situation of the organization and its work

Membership has not changed since six months ago. We have had some new members in Johor Baru and Johor but our number in Singapore and Negri Sembilan has been reduced mainly due to arrests. Only in Negri Sembilan have several Malays joined. In other places, there was no increase in the number of Malays and Indians. We sent members to investigate the situation. They clarified that most comrades did not devote themselves to Malay-Indian work despite knowing its importance. They could not endure the difficult work. Some lacked confidence. Party leadership in this work was very weak. Our Party was alienated from the masses. Members' attitudes were "watch without making a move (看不动), defeatism (失败主义) and opportunism (机会主义)".

(2) Dispatch of Malay comrades (to the Comintern) for training

Abiding by your instruction, we sent comrades to various places to find Malay comrades to be trained. In Malacca and Negri Sembilan, five comrades met our new conditions. They said, however, that they could not leave their homes not only for one to several months, but even just a week.

In Singapore, only one comrade is qualified. He is a pivotal person who can lead Malay work in various places. If he leaves here, our work would badly be affected. Therefore, the problem of dispatching Malay students cannot be resolved now. We shall try our best to continue organizing Malay comrades' training courses.

(3) Arrest of Cd. Ch'en Liang and problem of the Central Standing Committee

We agree with your view on how to dispose of Comrade Ch'en Liang (陈良). But he was arrested on 7 November last year (1933) and sentenced by the imperialist government to four years' imprisonment and banishment after his sentence is served. Cd. Ch'en is one of the Central Standing Committee (CST) members. After his arrest, only two, Chun Guang (春光) and Cd. De Cai (德才) (Bun Teck-chai @ Li Chi-sin ...), are left. For the sake of maintaining sound work in the ST, we convened an enlarged ST (because it was very difficult to convene an Executive Committee [EC]) after Cd. De Cai went back [to China].

The meeting decided that an EC candidate, Cd. Zheng Shun (正顺), would tentatively work as an acting SC member. The appointments are: Cd. Chun Guang, acting secretary (代理书记. acting shuji); Cd. Zheng Shun, acting organizational head; Cd. De Cai remains propaganda head and concurrently file secretary (秘书. mishu).

Although we originally intended to convene an EC soon afterwards in order to duly solve the problems, we felt it to be very inconvenient. As to whether the present appointment of comrades should be changed, please give us your opinion.

(4) Our request to you

Please dispatch a Chinese comrade who is fluent in Chinese and English (beyond an intermediate level) and has comparatively ample experience and knowledge of the work. Our Party (the present leadership being still borne by Chinese comrades) has met serious problems in trying to lead Malay/Indian comrades (and M/I people as well). Here we are unable to nurture such a comrade quickly.

Again please consider sending a Malay comrade to help our work (no matter whether he stays for a long or short period). Objectively speaking, present conditions here are very favorable. But we lack suitable personnel.¹⁹

As to the top post of the Party, section (3) above showed that before his arrest of 7 November 1933, Ch'en Liang was the supreme leader of the three persons' SC, and at the enlarged SC after his arrest, Chun Guang was appointed acting secretary. It might mean Ch'en Liang had been secretary at that time.

C.F. Yong has mentioned three CC members elected at the Third Representatives' Conference of August 1933, namely, Au Teck-siu (欧德修), Bun Teck-chai (De Cai) and Li Su-kong (李书光).²⁰ He also said that in June 1934, party secretary, Bun Teck-chai, was arrested.²¹ It was also reported on internet web-sites that Bun Teck-chai was appointed secretary at this Conference and he kept this position until his arrest in June 1934.²² According to Cheah Boon Kheng, the Special Branch

recorded the arrest on 22 June 1934 of seven communists, including the Secretary of the MCP “Central”.²³ The “Secretary” might have been Bun. It appears that difference between Shuji and Mishu was not discerned by outsiders including the SB.

At the Fourth Representatives’ Conference of September 1935, Yong noted, Ch’en (Chen) Liang, Liu Teng-chan (刘登乘) and Boo Chih-fu (邬炽夫) were elected CC members.²⁴ If so, Ch’en was elected in absentia because he was supposed to have been in prison still.

In the memoir of Bun (Li Chi-sin), written in late 1947, he wrote:

After the destruction resulting from the arrest of Ducroux’s group, a new CC was formed. Fu [Fu Hung-chi] was appointed Secretary. He was a worker and somewhat lacking in capability (he came from China and joined the Party here). At that time, a post of File Secretary (文书. wenshu) was set up. It was in charge of drafting resolutions and declarations as well as of conducting inspections. Cd. X (Li Chi-sin) assumed this post. It was almost the same as the post of Secretary. In 1932, Cd. X was sent to Shanghai. Soon after his arrival in Shanghai, he managed to contact the FEB (Alimin)²⁵ and the CCP. Alimin expressed serious distrust of the MCP. Both gave him written directives. CCP’s was more concrete. In 1932 or 1933, he came back to Malaya. Soon afterwards, a Hokkien, namely Lin (a university student, the son of the taukeh of the Singapore Amusement Park) (Lin Chin-chung? or else? to be examined)²⁶ became Secretary (maybe due to Fu’s arrest). He died of tuberculosis. After his death, another comrade became Secretary.

Cd. X *came back* to Shanghai in 1934 and was arrested in August in that year. This time around, the CC was totally annihilated.²⁷

We can understand now how different the words “shuji (书记)” and “mishu (秘书)” were. “Mishu” should be the “wenshu” (File Secretary) in Li’s memoir. Li was not officially appointed secretary but he was virtually the secretary. Hence, the Special Branch might have regarded him to be the official secretary.

A renowned Chinese novelist, Ma Ning (马宁), who had stayed in Malaya in this period as an MCP and AIL cadre, recollected in an interview with the present author in Fuzhou in August 1991 that:

The leader of the AIL (反帝大同盟) was Wu Zhi Hao (邬志豪 @ Boo Chih-fu 邬炽夫), the propaganda head of the MCP. After Wu was buried alive as a dissident by the CC, Lim Choon Kwong (Lin Chun Guang, 林春光) succeeded as the propaganda head. Lim was a secondary school student at that time. As his father was a Chinese member of the Straits Settlements Legislative Council (SSLC), the British authorities dared not overtly put their hands on him, but instead killed him by conspiracy.²⁸

In 1934, there was a Dr. Lim Han Hoe (林汉河) among the SSLC unofficial members.²⁹ But it is not known whether he was Choon Kwong's father.

4. English letter from the Comintern to the CC of the MCP, dated 1 June 1934

Below is a summary of its contents:

Cruxes are shown first: (1) An enlarged plenum of the CC or Party conference as well as various branch conferences should immediately be convened to implement the recent decisions of the Comintern. (2) The MCP should guide and support Parties and trade unions of Indonesia, Thailand and Burma. Send reports about them. (3) Send a delegate from Malaya and Indonesia respectively to the 7th World Congress of the Comintern. (4) Send several comrades to Moscow for training. (5) Polit-bureau should be enlarged to five including at least one Malay and one Indian.

Details are below:

In addition to our political remarks and recommendations, we further wish to suggest a number of proposals and to call your attention a number of special conditions.

- (1) The CC should immediately convene an enlarged plenum of the CC or a Party conference, at which leading Party activists in the YCL, TUs and other mass

organisations should also participate, for actively mobilising the entire Party on the bases of the line and the decisions of the 13th plenum of the ECCI and our directives. This conference should be followed by enlarged provincial, district and local Party conferences at which the CC should work out concrete ways and means for carrying thru and controlling the decisions of the CC conf. Of particular importance is that Polburo (sic) prepare a three to six months working plan of action, on the basis of which every organization and member can be mobilized to execute definite day to day tasks.

- (2) One of the most important international tasks of the CPM (sic) is to give consistent political guidance and organisational support to the Communist groups in the Dutch East Indies (DEI), Siam and Burma. The CC should strengthen contact with the Party and red TUs in these countries and train a number of cadres there, as well as mobilize the workers and peasants in Malaya for active support of the rev. mass movement there. We urge the CP to send a number of students, particularly native workers and poor peasants from these countries. Send with your next representative a detailed report covering the political situation and the position of the respective Party organisations there.
- (3) Regarding sending of delegates to the 7th World Congress of the Comintern which has already been taken up with your representative, we urge you to immediately send your delegate without waiting for the conclusion of the Party conf. The CSC must prepare the report which this comrade shall make. We request to make every effort to send one of the leading comrades from the DEI.
- (4) Send three to five comrades for one or two years training, three of whom should be Malayan (sic) or Indian workers or poor peasants, two of whom may be Chinese providing they are industrial workers and born in Malaya.
- (5) Polburo be enlarged to five members to include the general secretary, org. secretary and secretary of the Malayan Federation of Labour, and two workers from the main industries; amongst which, if possible, at least one Malayan and one Indian comrade should be co-opted. Three of the PB should reside and function in Singapore, while the other comrades should be systematically sent out to the key concentration centers. The PB should work on the basis of stronger collective work, more concrete division of labour and individual responsibility for the operation and control of all decisions.³⁰

This letter was intercepted by the British Special Branch. The Comintern Documents did not clearly indicate whether the letter came from the ES or FEB. Nonetheless, using the Malayan Combined Intelligence Summary, C.F. Yong interpreted it as a FEB directive urging the MCP to “mobilize the broad masses against imperialist war”, and “prepare and lead strikes and sabotage activities in the Singapore Naval Base”.³¹ But, C. F. Yong did not refer to the portions of the letter shown above.

5. Anti-Imperialist League (AIL)

A Russian-language document, “Biographical information and evaluation of the leadership of the MCP – Prepared by reviewers of the EC”, quoted above, stated that the AIL was formed at the initiative of the MCP in 1934. This document was written in February 1942. Actually, the AIL was formed in 1932 but in 1946 it was severely accused of being traitors by the then mainstream faction of the Party.³² The error in the document suggests that the Comintern did not have detailed knowledge of the Malayan AIL and its evaluation by the mainstream faction.

6. Komsomol of Thailand

In October 1934, the Siam Communist Party dispatched a member of the Komsomol (CYL) to Singapore in order to inspect the CC of the MCP. But as he was prohibited from disembarking, he returned to Siam.³³

7. Shanghai Municipal Police Files

This file³⁴ contains three letters sent from the CC of the MCP. These were intercepted, deciphered and translated into English by the SB, one was that of Singapore, and other two that of SMP.

- (1) Letter from Kok Kong (国光) to the FEB, c/o Kok Bun (国文) dated 15 August 1934. This was stopped at Singapore and translated on 25 August 1934. Straits Settlements SB noted, “written in (original language) in Number Code”. British Consul-General considered this was most possibly addressed to Li Su Kong (李树光).

Cruxes are shown first: (1) One delegate came back from Moscow or Shanghai and another was sent. (2) Subsidy from the Comintern was not enough. Yet, \$1,000 was collected for the CCP. (3) Malay and Indian work is difficult. (4) Difficulty to guide CP of Indonesia, Siam and Burma. (5) Difficulty to find a reliable address prevented the mutual communications. (6) Based on the Comintern's instructions, a greater conference will be held. (7) It was difficult to find a capable person replacing Li Chi-sin.

Details are below:

- Our delegate, Koak Jin (曷羸), returned from your place [Moscow? Shanghai?] in June with the money (1,000 guilders and 800 American gold dollars).
- It is difficult to assist the CP in Java. Liaison with Siam has just been established. Works in Burma is impossible.
- One of our comrades has already left for your place [Moscow] to attend the 7th World Conference.³⁵ Impossible to send a delegate from Indonesia.
- Two students have already been sent to your place. They have resided in Malaya for long. The procedure for an Indian student to go abroad is too laborious. Though we have found two poor Malay peasants, they run (sic) away secretly. Please ask a Malay and an Indian comrade in Shanghai to find employment for our Malay and Indian comrades. Then we can make use of the employment as a camouflage.
- Based on your instructions, a greater conference will be held in the near future and your suggestion to organize Political Bureau will be discussed then.
- Subsidy from you is not sufficient.
- We propose to prolong the period of our liaison till the end of year because there must be plenty of work to prepare a greater conference. Did our delegate, Iun Chin Sun (杨进孙) make known to you our most pressing needs?:
 - i) Immediately send a comrade who is capable of taking up the secretary work because after the arrest of Bun Tek Chai [Li Chi-sin] we are facing great difficulty.
 - ii) The MGLU will hold a representatives conference in the near future. Please inform the International Red Labour Union and the Pan Pacific Secretariat to send their representatives.

- Two accommodation addresses are to be discarded and the following addresses [Two Singapore addresses are shown] are to be used. The reason why we have delayed in writing you this letter is because we have not been able to find the reliable addresses.
 - We have collected funds of \$1,000 for the support of the Chinese Soviet Revolution. Our delegate was instructed to request you to deduct \$400 from the subsidy you promised and the remaining \$600 will be sent to you when we have received a more reliable address from you. Our delegate was also instructed to request you to publish in the Soviet papers the amount we collected or give us official receipt, but you haven't given us any reply.
- (2) A letter sent to Kok Bun (Shanghai) from Kok Kong (Singapore) dated 27 August 1934. Our delegate and that student have already reached Shanghai. Please ... seek for Tan Sin Hoa (陈新华) or ... Li Kok Cheng (李国桢). We request you to give us explanation for your not going to get in touch with them.
- (3) A letter sent to Lieu Ts Oen (刘子安, Shanghai) from Kwong (光, Singapore) dated 27 August 1934.

Tuh Sung (德生) said you had returned to Swatow but Chiu Sung (秋生) said you were still in Shanghai and he had seen you. Why haven't you sent me a letter for so long?

First of all, it is evident that the first letter (1) was a reply to the Comintern's letter dated 1 June (shown above).

With regard to these letters, a letter from British Consul-General, Shanghai, to SMP dated 25 September 1934 states: ① Careful enquiries made into the two addresses contained in the first letter elicited two addresses of Mr. Lau Chu An [should be same as Lieu Ts Oen] and Mr. Oh Kok Cheng [胡国桢? should be the same person as Li Kok Cheng]. ② For them watch was kept. ③ But the respective recipient failed to claim delivery.³⁶

As to MCP's delegates in Shanghai, according to Yong, in 1934, the MCP sent an important official (CC member), Li Su-kong (李书光), to cement further ties with Comintern's Shanghai networks.³⁷ Li Shu Kong should be this Li Su-kong. And Kok Bun also might probably be Li Su-kong. Meanwhile, as quoted above (3.(3) and (4)), Bun Teck-chai (Li Chi-sin) went back to Shanghai in 1934. Kok *Bun* might be *Bun* Teck-chai as well. We can discern here that as many as nine persons successively stayed in Shanghai at that time, that is, Li Chi-sin, Koak Jin, Tuh Sung, Chiu Sung (these three had already returned), Li Su-kong (= Kok Bun?), Iun Chin Sun, Lau Chu An, Tan Sin Hoa and Oh (Li) Kok Cheng. In Yong's research, secretary of the MCP in 1934 was not identified. According to one of the former MCP leaders, Zhang Ming Jin (张明今), secretary of this period was Liu Teng-chan (刘登乘).³⁸ If this is correct, Kok Kong might be Liu's pseudonym. But the above quoted record of the MCP (3.(3)) mentioned that since early 1934 acting secretary was Chun Guang (Lim Choon Kwong). Possibility of Kok Kong (Guo Guang) being pseudonym of Chun Guang might be higher.

Two questions arise here.

- (1) British Consul-General's another letter to the SMP dated 25 September³⁹ said; "[MCP's] original [letter] was in code numbers which have been decyphered, as well as in secret ink, which has been developed". Why were letters written in number code deciphered?

According to eminent historian, Dr. Leon Comber, who was once affiliated with the SB, "Chinese Commercial Code" was widely used among Chinese businessmen in this period, especially for sending telegrams. Each Chinese character was given specific number. Code number books, which showed common code number, were easily obtainable. The MCP might have used this commercial code.⁴⁰ If so, in hindsight, they were not cautious enough.

- (2) Why were these letters not kept in the Comintern Files?

SMP officials said though these were delivered to the addressed places, no one appeared to claim them. It meant the relevant persons of the Comintern as well as the MCP in Shanghai sensed the

danger and stayed away from it. Thus, these letters could not reach Moscow. It depicts again how difficult was the communication between the MCP and the Comintern.

8. Cheah's View on the MCP in 1934

Cheah Boon Keng wrote about the MCP in 1934 as below:

Since the date of the 1933 [MCP annual] Conference, ... the reorganisation of the Comintern Apparatus in Shanghai has taken place and a regular subsidy has been received which ... has considerably altered the rather gloomy picture of the fortunes of the MCP presented by the earlier Conference reports.⁴¹

Notes

1. Φ. 495 оп.62 д.51. Date of this letter is not written.
2. Φ. 495 оп.62
3. Φ. 495 оп.62 д.20.
4. Ibid.
5. C. F. Yong, op., cit., p.174.
6. SMPF, D3055. "Arrest of three Annamate Communists", (5-7 January, 1932), NUS Microfilm, R0012017.
7. Sophie, op., cit., pp.196, 343.
8. Ibid., pp.191, 194, 343.
9. Yoji Akashi, "Lai Teck, Secretary General of the Malayan Communist Party, 1939–1947", *Journal of the South Seas Society*, Vol.49, 1994, pp.61, 63.
10. Professor Christopher Goscha wrote in 2000 that Lai Teck's real Vietnamese name was possibly Huynh Kim Ggok (Christopher E. Goscha, "Vietnamese Revolutionaries and the Early Spread of Communism to Peninsular Southeast Asia", *Copenhagen Journal of Asian Studies*, 14, 2000, p.39). [If Huynh Kim Ggok is 黄金玉, it must be one of Lai's pseudonyms in Malaya].

Based on Brian Moynahan, Dr. Leon Comber wrote in 2010 that Lai's Vietnamese name was Nguyen Van Long [阮文龙?] (Leon Comber, "'Traitor of all Traitors' — Secret Agent

Extraordinaire: Lai Teck, Secretary General, Communist Party of Malaya (1939-1947)”, *Journal of Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol.83, Part 2, 2010, p.3).

Based on information provided by Goscha, Comber also showed Lai’s other names in Vietnam: Lai rac [莱??] and Pham Van Dac [范文铎?特?]. (Comber, *ibid.*, pp.3,4). (To identify due Chinese characters of Vietnamese names here, I owe to help of Dr. Miyazawa Chihiro of Nanzan University, Japan).

These names did not appear in the Shanghai Municipal Police Files.

11. SMPF, D4443. “Malayan Communist Party: Aliens Registration Bill”, (31 January, 1933), NUS Microfilm, R0012023.
12. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.21.
13. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.30.
14. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.20. See note 3 of Chap.4. This might be a circular of the MCP.
15. C. F. Yong, *op.*, *cit.*, p.172.
16. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.23.
17. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.22.
18. C. F. Yong, *op.*, *cit.*, p.164. / Cheah, *op.*, *cit.*, pp.19, 20, 139, 140.
19. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.22.
20. C. F. Yong, *op.*, *cit.*, pp.166-173.
21. *Ibid.*, p.170./ Yong further said here that Bun (Li) was imprisoned for four years before being banished to China in 1938. This part does not accord with other sources. It cannot be denied that Li was in Shanghai in 1934..
22. As to Li Chi-shin’s assumption of Secretary of the MCP, see Hara Fujio, “Chinese overseas and communist movements in Southeast Asia” pp.337-340, in Tan Chee-Beng, ed., *Routledge Handbook of the Chinese Diaspora*, London & New Youk, Routledge, 2013.
23. Cheah, *op.*, *cit.*, pp.70-72.
24. C. F. Yong, *op.*, *cit.*, p.166.
25. Alimin was a leader of the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI) and a commissary of the Comintern.
26. Now it is evident that this Lin is Lim Choon Kwong.
27. Fang Shan, et.al., eds.,2010a, pp.25-29. / As to Li’s return to Shanghai, his brief biography carried in the same book states that Li was deported to China in 1934 and then imprisoned in Hainan. *Ibid.*, p.46.

28. Hara, "Interview with Former Leaders of the MCP", pp.350-352, in Hara, (Translated by Liu Xiao Min), *Malaiya Huaqiao yu Zhongguo*, (Malayan Chinese and China). 原不二夫 著、刘晓民 译 马来亚华侨与中国, Bangkok, Datong Publisher, 2006.
29. *The Straits Times*, 30 July 1934.
30. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.22.
31. C. F. Yong, op., cit., p.172. / McLane also refers to this directive. According to him, it instructed the MCP to create a mass party of all races, to organize strikes in the urban areas, and to devise slogans capable of exercising a wider appeal (McLane, op., cit., p.201).
32. *Nan Dao Zhi Chun*, p.9.
33. Ф. 16 оп.51.
34. SMPF, D6152. NUS Microfilm R0012031.
35. Based on McLane (op., cit., pp.237, 240), Cheah argued that the MCP apparently failed to receive an invitation to attend the [7th World] conference (Cheah., op., cit., p.21). As this letter was monitored and recorded by the SB, the SB should have been aware that the MCP had received the invitation. McLane seemed not to be informed of it.
36. SMPF, D6152. "Letter dated September 25, 1934, from H.B.M. Consulate-General, re. letter intercepted in Singapore and two addresses in Shanghai". NUS Microfilm R0012031.
37. C. F. Yong, op., cit., pp.166, 172.
38. Hara, 2006, pp.51, 52.
39. SMPF, D6152.
40. Informed from Dr. Leon Comber in March 2015 at ISEAS.
41. Cheah, op., cit., p.71.

CHAPTER VI

THE MCP AND THE COMINTERN FROM 1935 TO 1939

I 1935

1. A Russian-language document, dated 27 July 1935, is summarized below:

Politcomissar held from 20 January 1931 proposed to approve the MCP as its branch at the 7th Congress of the Comintern.¹

For the past one and a half years, this organization lost contact with the Comintern and the CCP which was led by the Comintern. We have not been informed of its activities and organizations. Therefore, the ES refrains from approving its application for affiliating with the Comintern as a section.²

Another loss of contact was affirmed by the Special Branch in 1935. According to Cheah, the SB reported that throughout 1935, the MCP lost contact with the Comintern apparatus in Shanghai and consequently failed to receive any subsidy and instructions.³

In fact, as shown in Table 6, though the Comintern received three reports dated March 1934 from the MCP, three other letters dated August 1934 did not reach it. In 1935 none.

The above Russian-language document clearly shows that the MCP had not obtained official affiliation with the Comintern. Kurihara also states that the MCP's membership was not approved right to the end of the Comintern.⁴ This crucial piece of information stands at odds with previous views on this matter. Hanrahan had cited the Constitution issued by the Sixth Plenary Session of the CC of the MCP on 6 March 1934. In that Constitution, Article 1 declared that, "The MCP *is an affiliate of the Comintern*" (emphasis added).⁵ In fact, as will be clarified later, the 6th Enlarged Plenum of the CC of the MCP was held in April 1939. According to the MCP's official document, the first clause of the 1939 Constitution declared that, "The MCP is a *preparatory branch* (预备支部) of the Comintern" (emphasis added).⁶ However, another MCP document issued in 1946, *Nan Dao Zhi Chun*, stated that, "The MCP is a branch of the Comintern."⁷

From all this, it might be suggested that (1) the MCP had applied for affiliation to the Comintern; (2) the Comintern did not officially approve it; (3) the MCP considered their status as a preparatory branch before the Pacific War; and, (4) after the end of the War, the MCP intended to present itself as a member of the Comintern.

2. In the Russian-language brief history of the MCP, the MCP's activities over several years from 1935 on were reviewed by Comintern reviewers. One part of the review is summarized below:

Until 1935, the MCP struggled to establish a Worker-Peasant Soviet Republic of Malaya. Following the CCP, the MCP changed its policy in 1935 to establish an Anti-Imperialist National United Front and other mass organizations. At that time, there emerged a dissident group who opposed the new policy and tried to split the Party to form its own CC. The MCP experienced a serious crisis. It was attacked by British Imperialists from outside and by the dissident group from inside. The MCP crushed the dissidents and extricated itself from the crisis.

Between 1935 and 1937, the Party struggled for ending the civil war, for national solidarity to oppose the Japanese Imperialists in China, for building up and strengthening patriotic movements of overseas Chinese, and for improving the positions of the working masses in Malaya. In order to support the Anti-Japanese movement of Chinese people, the Malayan Chinese Anti-Japanese Backing-Up Society (MCAJBS) was set up.⁸ The prestige of the Party was raised.⁹

(The concluding part of the above document contained the reviewers' general assessment of the MCP from 1930 to 1940. The assessment will be quoted in the section on 1942.)

The dissident group of 1935 was led by Boo Chee-fu (Wu Zhi Hao). According to the above document, the dissident group seemed to have insisted that the struggle should not be confined to being Anti-Japan. C. F. Yong referred to two party instances of dissidence. First, in August 1932, the moderate Hakka faction broke away and founded its own counter-organization, the Malayan Communist League (MCL. 共产党大同盟). Second, in 1935–1936, the power struggle between the Hainanese and Hakka factions degenerated into bloodshed, which resulted in the arrest of some of the CC members, the departure of Liu Teng-chan to China, and the murder of Boo Chee-fu.¹⁰ Were the Malayan AIL and the MCL in fact different organizations? Yong wrote that the Nanyang AIL

was founded in early 1928,¹¹ the Malayan AIL in 1928,¹² and in 1932,¹³ and the MCL in 1932.¹⁴ In other words, these must have been the same organization, under different names, that was led by Boo. But, according to C. C. Chin, who is well versed in the MCP history, he informed me that these were different organisations commonly led by Boo. And the Chinese name of the MCL was actually 马来亚共产主义者同盟.¹⁵ No matter whether the AIL and the MCL were same or different, the main faction's criticism was directed at Boo's theory.

By the account of Zhang Ming Jin (张明今), one of the MCP leaders in the late 1930s and the first half of the 1940s, Boo had insisted that as the consciousness of the worker-peasant masses of Malaya was still low, the Party should work on intellectuals and the petit bourgeoisie first, and only after deploying a mass movement like the May 4th Movement of China, work on the working class. Lai Teck, who had just been infiltrated into the MCP by the Special Branch and was rapidly rising in the Party, instigated the CC to eliminate Boo and his group.¹⁶

But to Ma Ning, propaganda head of the AIL, the AIL's objective was to unite not only Chinese but also Malays and Indians in order to liberate all Malayan nationals. As Boo insisted that a revolution by workers and intellectuals was necessary, and a worker-peasant struggle was not, he was executed as an anti-party element.¹⁷

Why were the interpretations of the main objective of the dissident group different? The Comintern document noted that the dissidents opposed the new policy of an anti-imperialist united front. The AIL, led by Boo, would have adopted this new policy. The mainstream faction of the MCP, led by Lai Teck, might have informed the Comintern in 1942 that the anti-imperialist policy was its own policy because it was known later that the Comintern in 1935 regarded the anti-imperialist policy as being correct. It is now known that Lai Teck eliminated all capable opponents in the Party by secretly supplying information on them to the Special Branch which resulted in their arrests, and by assassinations.¹⁸

3. Reformation of the Comintern

This portion is a summary of Kurihara's argument.

In October 1935, Comintern restructured its system. All of the Regional Secretariats including the Eastern Secretariat were abolished and, replacing them, nine Personal Secretariats were set up. British and USA colonies came under the jurisdiction of the Marty¹⁹ Secretariat. One of the main reasons was that the former Regional Secretariats were ruled by party officials who were not familiar enough with the conditions of respective foreign countries. In practice, the Communist Parties of the colonies that had been under the jurisdiction of the ES were to be guided by the respective suzerain countries' Communist Parties. Nonetheless, after 1935 there was no evidence that the Comintern guided the MCP or tried to establish connections with it. With this reformation, Comintern's principle relating to the party and the ethnicity also changed. Formerly any ethnic groups in a country were to be equally affiliated to that country's party. Under the new system, each ethnic group was allowed to have specific connections with its original country's party.²⁰

Notwithstanding with it, the MCP continued sending reports cum requests to the Comintern and the Comintern kept on watching the movement of the MCP.

II 1936

- (1) There was no document for this year. There was also no reference either to the 5th Enlarged Plenum of the CC of the MCP which was held in September 1936.

A Party document written in the 1950s said that by 1934 all CC members had been arrested one after another. As a result of the enemy's offensive, the party organizations were in chaos and connections with the Comintern were cut off. In this confused situation, Lai Teck infiltrated the Party at the end of 1934 or 1935²¹ and joined the MCP pretending to be a Comintern representative. C. F. Yong maintained that the leadership vacuum afforded the opportunity for Lai Teck's election into the CC and as the Deputy Secretary at the 5th Representatives' Conference in September 1936.²²

It was possible that Lai Teck deliberately severed contact with the Comintern in 1936 to prevent the exposure of his true character before he had consolidated his position as Secretary of the Party in 1939.

(2) Shanghai Municipal Police Files

Letter sent from the MCP Central (Singapore) to the CCP Central (Shanghai) dated 26 March 1936.²³

This letter was addressed to Tiao Tiong Beng or Zao Tsoong Ming (赵忠明), c/o Soh (苏). It was stopped on the same day in Singapore, then translated and forwarded to the British Consul-General in Shanghai. SMP recorded it in a report dated 25 April 1936.

Summary of the letter is below:

- We [the MCP] sent a seaman courier to Amoy to reestablish contact with you.
- On 5 June 1935, we sent another comrade to Shanghai. No news about him. In August 1935, several organizations in Shanghai were discovered and comrades arrested. One was reported to be in possession of documents from Malaya and a map of Singapore Naval Base. He was probably our comrade.
- Please instantly establish a close liaison with us.
- The address to which this letter is sent is given by a revolutionary refugee who left China long before. He cannot ensure this letter can reach you. Please send reply to the following two addresses of Singapore [omitted here].

SB note written on the document runs: This letter is written in the handwriting of Choa Bun Seng (蔡文盛), the present secretary of MCP Central. According to Yong, Secretary of the Party in this period was Ts'ai Pai-yun (蔡白云) who was to be arrested in January 1937.²⁴ Choa Bun Seng must be his pseudonym.

SMP's report of 25 April 1936 runs: Arrested "comrade" mentioned in the letter refers to a raid carried out by the SMP on 22 July 1935. The man arrested in connection with the seizure of the sketch of the naval base was one Iong Chin Sng (杨进胜). The characters for such a name are not to be found in SMP records.²⁵ Iong Chin Sng must be Iun Chin Sun who was mentioned in the

SMPF of 1934 shown above. Could the SMP not remember it? It appears this letter did not reach the Comintern because it was not recorded in its files.

III 1937

The reviewers' brief history of the MCP noted that the Chinese National Liberation Vanguard Corps (CNLVC, 中华民族解放先锋队) was set up in 1937. Its leaders were Cheong Choo Kun (Zhang Chu-kun, Чжан Цу-кун, 张楚琨), Liu Tao-nan (Лю Тао-нан. 刘涛南?) and Si Hong-peng (Shi Fang-pin, Ши Фан-пин, 施方平). Cheong was an editor of the *Nanyang Siang Pau*, Liu was a teacher in a girls' secondary school, and Si was a KMT member.²⁶

This document was not written in 1937 but in February 1942. Apparently the communications between the MCP and the Comintern had not been sufficiently restored yet.

IV 1938

No document was available.

V 1939

The Sixth Enlarged Plenum of the Party was held in April 1939. The Comintern Files contained various documents relating to this plenum. In the documents entitled "Resolutions, circulars, appeals to the people by the CC of the MCP and analyses of the Singapore City Committee of the MCP on local situations as well as on the impending tasks of the Party: 13 November 1939 – 13 June 1940" (Russian-language title), the decisions adopted at the 6th enlarged plenum were recorded and reviewed.

1. Ten-point Programme of the MCP in the Comintern file.

The most important decision taken at this Plenum was the adoption of the Ten-point Programme. The Russian-language version was recorded (and reviewed) in the report of the reviewers.²⁷ This corresponds to the Ten-point Programme in the MCP publication of 1946, *Nan Dao Zhi Chun*. This Programme (denoted as TPP-a here) is given below.

- (1) Establishment of an All Nationals United Front (各民族统一战线) irrespective of class, party, creed (and religion) to fight for democracy and to defend peace and security in Malaya.
- (2) Establishment of an All Malayan Congress and State Councils, both of which are elected by all nationals (各民族人民) and empowered to solve economic, political, defense and other problems.
- (3) Safeguarding of the rights to freedom of speech, press, assembly, organisation, belief and emigration.
- (4) Opposing reactionary policies and inflicting punishment on Fascist elements and national traitors.
- (5) Increasing wages, providing aid to victims of disasters and unemployment and enforcing labour laws and an eight-hour working day.
- (6) Reduction of all taxes and interests. Development of industry and commerce. Self-determination of the rate of customs revenue.
- (7) Totally equal treatment for men and women. Thorough abolition of the 'Mooi chai'²⁸ system and the Poh Leung Kuk (保良局).
- (8) A system of universal education, using our national language for each nationals (用本民族语文实行普通教育). Free education for poor students.
- (9) Pressing the British government to take part in collective security, imposition of direct sanctions against fascist aggressors, and assistance to the Chinese people in their war of self-defense.
- (10) Solidarity with all peace-loving countries and peoples to fight against the Imperialist war, and support of the international united movement for peace.²⁹

2. Russian-language review of the MCP's policies and activities in and around 1939 by the three reviewers of the Comintern (7 February 1942)³⁰

As previously noted, this document favourably assessed the MCP's Chinese patriotic policy against Japan which had raised the party's prestige. Then, the review turned rather negative. The TPP-a itself was positively reviewed but the MCP's activities in this period were severely criticized as being too nationalistic and without class consciousness.

This review is summarized below.

Cruxes are shown first: (1) In order to implement the Anti-Japanese national united front, the MCP tended to ignore class line. (2) The 6th Enlarged Plenum of the CC (April 1939) corrected this mistake by adopting the TTP-a. (3) Between April and September 1939, could not recognize the conciliatory character of bourgeoisie represented by Chiang Kai Shek and neglected the Party's sovereignty. (4) Following the expansion of the Imperialist War in Europe, the MCP should strengthen its leadership and politico-economic struggle. (5) Should not support British Imperialist.

Details are below:

(1) The Sixth Enlarged Plenum and before

In order to implement the national united front, there emerged a tendency to waver over class conflict, to ignore the masses and allies and to ignore the political and organizational sovereignty of the Party.

Following the expansion of legal activities, some organizations began to terminate the illegal activities of the Party. As a result of this political misconstruction, all the Party cadres were exposed and attacked by the British Imperialists and Malayan reactionaries.

The Sixth Enlarged Plenum of the CC of the MCP corrected this opportunistic mistake by adopting the TPP [TPP-a].

Various resolutions of this Plenum show that the Party should secure its political and organizational autonomy when operating the Anti-Imperialist United Front. It should also secure opportunities to struggle for the improvement of the status of the proletariat and working masses, and to struggle against the bourgeoisie's conciliatory and defeatist tendency. Between April and September 1939,

workers were mobilized, the Chinese patriotic movement developed and our camp was strengthened. But a serious mistake was made in the Party activities in this period. Some comrades considered activities in the MCAJBS as the principal ones, could not see through the conciliatory character of the bourgeoisie's politics, and neglected to consolidate the defense of the Party. They considered it necessary to stay neutral in the imperialist war and to focus all attention on backing Chiang Kai Shek. In September 1939, BI was drawn into the European War and the MCP was confronted with two wars, an anti-imperialist war and a war against BI's aggression toward Malayan people.

(2) 12 September 1939. Central Politburo:³¹

The expansion of the Imperialist War would surely bring about an increase in economic exploitation and burden on the people. It will raise the anti-imperialist and the anti-war sentiments of masses and lead to the revolution.

Our slogans are:

(internally)

- Strengthening and expansion of party organization and solidarity. Decisive struggle against rightist opportunistic leaning and remnants of factionalism.
- Strengthening and expansion of the mass bases. Positive leadership in economic struggle to improve workers' positions. Establishment of the leadership of the Party in the mass movement.
- Utilization of politico-economic struggle for national interests.
- (externally)
- Opposition to forced military mobilization, increase in taxes for workers and robbing people of freedom.
- Strengthening united activities and solidarity among nationals. Pursuing the democratic system.
- Thorough rejection of support for BI to carry out war. Struggle to oppose the "Munich of the Orient" with its sacrifice of the Chinese people.³²

Between September 1939 and January 1940, the labour movement developed. 100,000 workers participated in strikes.

(3) Chinese patriotic organizations

The Chinese National Liberation Vanguard Corps (CNLVC): Facing a crisis of collapse, it held a congress in August 1939 and elected a new leadership. It agreed with the united front. It had a membership of 3,000.

The Backing-up the Eighth Route Army Committee (援八委) has been formed.³³

3. Assessment of the strategies decided at the 6th Enlarged Plenum [probably by the Standing Committee of the CC].

This Chinese-language document is summarized below.

Cruxes are shown first: (1) We cannot cooperate with British Imperialist now. Only when Japan invades Malaya in the future, we will acknowledge the possibility of cooperation with them. (2) The Party should not unconditionally cooperate with the bourgeoisie (meaning Chinese capitalists and KMT members in Malaya). (3) The TPP-a is too hollow. It does not represent the interests of all nationals (especially Malay peasants). (4) Party branches are requested to discuss the problems and prepare resolutions. (5) Both leftist exclusionism and rightist opportunism should be criticized.

Details are below:

- (1) If we propose a slogan of cooperation with Britain, comrades would easily have an illusion of legalism. Because our impending main enemy is British Imperialism. Our Party is to thoroughly liberate all nationals and protect our interests. Therefore, we cannot lessen the struggle against the main enemy! When Japan (日寇) militarily invades Malaya, we acknowledge the possibility of “mutual concession” and “mutual cooperation” with BI in order to jointly defend the peace and security of Malaya. But that is merely a future possibility. Presently BI ever more furiously intensifies its reactionary policy and oppression. We can never appeal to the masses

to “cooperate with Britain”. That would soften the anti-BI sentiment of masses, encourage a tendency toward legalism and opportunism in the party and eventually destroy the Party.

(2) The slogan and assertion of “employer-employee cooperation” mean the abandonment of class interests and are incorrect. In maintaining the national united front, our Party never insists on unconditional cooperation with the bourgeoisie. The slogan of cooperation is merely a part of our strategy. It should be properly applied based on class relations in each place and section. Its objective is to make the bourgeoisie understand that the development of the masses’ strength would not collide with their interests.

(3) Assessment of the Ten-point Programme (TPP-a)

- Establishing a national united front to gain a democratic system is too hollow. It is merely a present slogan of activities. It cannot be a programme to represent the masses’ interests.
- Congress and Councils are too general. They do not clearly indicate the kind of democratic system.
- “Reactionary policy” is too general. It does not clearly and concretely indicate what policy is most harmful to the people of each national (民族).
- Labour laws are not clear, because imperialists also enact labour laws. What kind of labour laws do we need?
- “Equality of men and women” is hollow. Before socialism is finally realized, we cannot discuss the necessity of this equality in the process of national liberation.

Other defects and insufficiencies are as follows:

- i) Applies to overseas Chinese only. Cannot represent the pressing interests of all nationals (全民族).
- ii) Lack of peasants’ demands. Peasants’ problem is not placed as a principal issue of revolution. “Reduction of taxes” is not urgent at all.

The Central Standing Committee considers that these problems relate to the future of the Party’s national liberation struggle. Various Party branches are requested to mobilize all members to discuss these problems and prepare to present revisions to the Second Executive Committee

meeting. Discussions should concretely be focused on each nationals' (各民族) national liberation struggle, on BI's reactionary policies and on how to lead the peasants after taking the relations between the rural middle class and peasant masses into consideration. All comrades are requested to go deeply among the masses to investigate the situation. Every discussion should refer to the struggle against leftist exclusionism and rightist opportunism. The circumstances of the discussion and the conclusion should be reported to the Center. Until the 2nd EC is held, the Programme of the 6th Enlarged Plenum remains valid.³⁴

4. Draft of the resolutions to be adopted at the 3rd Standing Committee Conference of the 2nd Executive Committee dated 13 June 1939

This is a summary of the Chinese-language document.

Cruxes are shown first: (1) Narrow class-line merely to see the interests of worker-peasant and to ignore those of petit bourgeoisie should be avoided. (2) Some comrades, such as North Malayan comrades, ignored backwardness of the masses and implemented radical clandestine work. As a result of it, mass organizations starkly decreased. Comrades should be concerned with the backwardness of masses. (3) The Party has no base in such important industries as rubber, tin and transportation. (4) Most of the Chinese are worker class. They do not have proletarian consciousness yet, instead, retain strong nationalistic consciousness. The Party has to unify them in anti-enemy struggle. (5) Chinese petit bourgeoisie in Malaya were almost collapsed. Though become nationalistic and agree with anti-enemy war, they lack confidence in the struggle. (6) Compromise faction of bourgeoisie grasped the sentiment of masses. Narrow class-line expedited it. (7) The Anti-Japanese war and the national salvation movement are the most impending demands of the Malayan Chinese. The Party should not use Anti-British slogan. (8) National salvation organizations have anti-imperialist character. (9) Backing-up the 8th Route Army movement is an important work to revolutionize masses. (10) The Party should be Bolshevized through national liberation movement. (11) Anti-war and anti-imperialist movements should be expanded.

Details are below:

- (1) Discipline of thoughts

We should eliminate the danger of right-leaning³⁵ exclusionism in the Party's policy toward mass organizations. This danger has three types.

1. Narrow class-line to be evaded

Such a wrong stand presently prevails as carrying out worker-peasant work only and labeling the petit bourgeoisie as "surrendered" and lagging behind the masses. Some worker-work comrades arbitrarily proposed the slogan, "Workers have no home country". These comrades forgot that the Party's present principal task was still an anti-imperialist united front. They merely saw the interests of the worker-peasant movement and ignored that petit bourgeois citizens generally had intensified their anti-imperialist sentiment day by day. They did not take the stand that the interests of class coincided with those of nationals (民族).

As a result, using such slogans as "cooperation between employee and employer", "goodwill between China and Britain" and "whole nation's diplomacy" (国民外交), reactionary elements of the bourgeoisie attacked our Party as a narrow class representative and concealed their own compromise and surrender. This narrow policy line, which merely relies on worker-peasant's unity, cannot defeat the enemy's aggression. If this view-point continues and develops, it will help the enemy to break the unity of the nationals (民族团结).

2. Lack of historical view-point

Ignoring the concrete historical development of the masses of their districts, these comrades implemented the Party's mass organization work. In particular, North Malayan comrades merely saw an ever rising anti-imperialist sentiment. Never historically observing the backwardness of the local masses (greatly different from Singapore), they adamantly implemented the mass organization line decided at the 6th Enlarged Plenum. On the other hand, a large number of comrades recognized that only through struggle could we extend our organizations. Some comrades (such as Perak) publicly declared their resolve to stop open societies' organizational work. Old societies were quietly dissolved one after another. Some comrades virtually turned the trade union movement into a secret cell movement.

Thus, in North Malaya the number of members of the mass organizations starkly decreased in these several months.

Another serious problem is that our Party has no organizational base in the material production sections of the imperialist.

The Center calls upon all comrades, especially comrades of the three North Malayan States, to discuss these shortcomings at various Party conferences.

(2) How to lead the Chinese

1. The first force. Among worker-peasant masses of our forces, the Chinese are about 10,000 only. Economically they are entirely Malayanised. This is because the majority of them emigrated from China and were bankrupted middle-class farmers, poor farmers and agricultural employees of villages, the bankrupted petit bourgeoisie of the towns and lower-class workers in China. After the World Depression of 1929, many among the local petit bourgeoisie were bankrupted and reduced to the proletariat one after another. The great majority of the worker class, the main revolutionary force of the Malayan Chinese masses, cannot yet possess pure proletarian consciousness. Although there are presently tens of thousands of workers and they have been trained in economic struggles under the Party's revolutionary influence, the majority of the masses retain strong nationalistic consciousness. Leading a dog's life under the cruel rule of BI, their enthusiasm and resolution to thoroughly liberate their home country grows ever more solid. This force stands on the side of firm anti-enemy war, unity and progress. But our Party's capacity to unify the struggle of this force is not yet universal. Backwardness generally remains.
2. The second force. Urban petit bourgeoisie, students and intellectuals. They make up a considerable proportion of the Chinese. Under BI's aggression for years, almost all national capital (民族资本) collapsed. As the imperialist war expands presently, they are further disappointed in Malaya. They are very eager to invest in the home country and hope they might gain opportunities in the anti-enemy-war nation-building (抗战建国). They agree with the anti-enemy war and support unity and progress. But they are pessimistic over the present situation or want to wait for it to

turn favorable. Even though they have a grudge against BI, they lack confidence in the struggle and are frightened.

Compromise/surrender faction of bourgeoisie presently grasp national sentiment of extensive backward masses and they carry out opportunistic activities. As the narrow class consciousness of comrades grows, and some organizations obstinately implement that line, the conspiracy of the compromise faction is expedited.

- Chinese and other nationals

Chinese and other nationals (华侨与各民族) are different. Our Party has occasionally pointed out that only through each nationals' liberation movement, genuine liberation can be obtained. In the present situation, to back up the Anti-Japanese war in our home country, to unite solidly and to support progress are still the common impending demands of overseas Chinese. Our Party should not use such slogans as "Down with BI" and "Oppose imperialist war" to call upon the masses whose thoughts are not uniform. We must call upon and organize them based on the level of the masses' own consciousness and concrete conditions. Only our party can teach the masses based on their experience. Our Party does not need to organize the masses in the overt name of revolution. We have to retain the policy line of the Party's mass organization under various adequate names. Our Party should not, and cannot make the final political objectives the practical line to be executed. Work on extensive Chinese should be based on different conditions of their various strata.

(3) Center's appeal to all Party members

1. Every member should deeply understand the Party's view on the Anti-Japanese War and national salvation movement of the Malayan Chinese (马华)³⁶ and extend the Party's stance to the masses.
2. Each local as well as city committee member should present the problems of the salvation movement at the nearest conference and examine the actual situation there in detail. Check the shortcomings of the Party and decide how to overcome them. All comrades who are directly involved in leading the salvation movement should, with other Party comrades, discuss and explore our stance as well as work on the

Chinese.

3. Anti-Japanese national salvation organizations (抗援组织)

Our Party recognizes that the Anti-Japanese national salvation organizations have an anti-imperialist character and their own independent stands. Some districts made a mistake of abandoning the work of these organizations. Districts which had no such organizations should make an effort to restore them soon. The Center calls upon various branches and all comrades to strengthen and extend these organizations.

4. Each branch should recognize that backing up the 8th Route Army movement (援八运动) is one of the important types of work to revolutionize masses. Take responsibility of it by ourselves and extend its fund-raising work and propaganda.

(4) Three main tasks

1. To secure our Party's Bolshevikization within the process of the national liberation movement.
2. To strengthen and extend mass organizations especially in the material-producing sections. Strengthen united organizations of the lower strata. To secure the Party's leadership.
3. To extend the anti-war and anti-imperialist movements, protect USSR, and protect the Chinese revolution. To continue leading the economic struggle of worker-peasant masses and urban petit bourgeois. To raise the spirit of national liberation struggle among the people of each nationalities' (各民族人民的).

(5) Serious shortcomings

1. The policy line is not concrete. Examining work reports, it is discerned that comrades never left alone (没有放掉) various types of organizational work (open, semi-open and illegal). Many comrades, however, were not concerned with the backwardness of the masses and their concrete way of development and did not go among the masses to understand them. Some comrades even assessed the masses from the viewpoint of revolution. They hastily feared that the masses might follow a reactionary path. (For example, Perak retracted legal societies' work. And comrades

of North Malaya insisted that only through struggle could we organize the masses). The present problem is not to revolutionize all masses. Under savage oppression by our enemy, we need not fear the backwardness or reactionary tendency of masses. The problem is the correct application of the political line.

2. Many comrades consider that the center of national liberation is formed of workers and peasants and not the people as a whole. This is another shortcoming. There is a secret, narrow class viewpoint in the Party. Comrades cherish workers and peasants, but neglect the petit bourgeois. They are not advocates of a national united front but of narrow exclusionism.
3. Many rubber estates, big mines, oil palm estates and transport sections do not have Party organizations yet. Many comrades do not concentrate their efforts on petit bourgeois work.³⁷

5. Main issues of dispute: Change of viewpoints

The viewpoints of the analyses changed via the conferences and the commentators. The main issues of dispute may be categorized here.

1. Reviewers of the Comintern (as per the document of 7 February 1942).
For the reviewers, the main issues of dispute were the class line, illegal activities, leadership of the Party and the proletariat, and upholding the anti-imperialist war. Hence, efforts should not be fully concentrated on supporting Chiang Kai Shek.
2. TPP-a (April 1939).
The principal issue was the shared security of Malaya and Britain. It was necessary to oppose imperialist war.
3. Central Politburo of the MCP (12 September 1939, as recorded in the reviewers' report).
Rightist opportunism should be opposed. The leadership of the Party should be established. Support for BI should be thoroughly rejected. Conduct politico-economic struggles and anti-war work.
4. Standing Committee (?) of the MCP (between April and June 1939?)
Remain anti-BI. Cooperation with BI is merely a future possibility. Oppose legalism, rightist opportunism, "employer-employee cooperation" and leftist

exclusionism. “Struggle for democratic system” is hollow. The interests of non-Chinese and peasants should be taken into consideration.

5. The Third Standing Committee Conference of the MCP (13 June 1939)
Rightist (Leftist?) exclusionism and narrow class-line should be opposed. Cooperation should be pursued with the petit bourgeoisie and the masses in the anti-imperialist united front. Open organizations / activities should be retained. The Party should unite with the Chinese masses and Chinese national bourgeoisie in the anti-Japanese united front. The Party should not use the slogans, “Down with BI” and “Oppose imperialist war”. Anti-Japanese national salvation organizations should be given priority.

This decision (5) would appear to reflect the influence of Lai Teck who assumed the position of Secretary-General at the Sixth Enlarged Plenum in April 1939. It is apparent that the MCP’s stand wavered and yet to be conformed in this period.

Notes

1. See Russian language letter dated 1 February 1931 quoted above. 7th World Congress of the Comintern was held between 25 July and 21 August 1935.
2. Φ . 14 on.385.
3. Cheah, op., cit., pp.19, 79.
4. Kurihara, op., cit., pp.21,101. The Thai Communist Party was not approved as a branch, either.
5. Hanrahan, G. Z., *The Communist Struggle in Malaya*, Kuala Lumpur, University of Malaya Press, 1971, p.151. / McLane also follows Hanrahan’s mistake. (McLane, op., cit., pp.202, 237).
6. Fang Shan, et.al., eds., *Magong Wenji, Di 2 Ji, Zhanqian Dixia Douzheng Shiqi (2)* (MCP Anthologies, Underground Struggle Era before the War. 方山 等编 马共文集第2辑 战前地下斗争时期 (二)), Kuala Lumpur, Penerbitan Abad 21, 2010, p.23./ This Constitution was adopted on 6 April 1939.
7. *Nan Dao Zhi Chun*, p.8.
8. The MPAJBS (马来亚华侨抗敌后援会) was set up in August 1937.

9. Φ. 495 оп.62 д.30. / In its later part, this document notes that the AIL was set up under the initiative of the MCP in 1934, and that in 1935 the Association of Saving Home Country (马来亚救国会) was set up which evolved into the MPAJBS later. Home country meant China here.
10. C.F. Yong, op., cit., p.168-169.
11. Ibid., p.108.
12. Ibid., p.140.
13. Ibid., p.158.
14. Ibid., p.168.
15. E-mail from Dr. C. C. Chin, dated 16 April 2015.
16. Hara, op., cit., pp.22-25.
17. Ibid., p.19.
18. Hara, op., cit., pp.359, 360. / Fang Shan, et.al., eds., *Magong Wenji, Di 8 Ji, Zhanhou Heping Shiqi (3)* (MCP Anthologies, Peaceful Era after the War. 方山 等编 马共文集第 8 辑 战后和平时期 (三)), Kuala Lumpur, Penerbitan Abad 21, 2014, pp.166, 182-185.
19. André Marty, 1886-1956. A leader of the French Communist Party.
20. Kurihara, op., cit., pp.177-198.
21. Fang Shan, et. al., eds., 2014, p.182.
22. C. F. Yong, op., cit., pp.169, 179, 180. On p.169, Yong calls this meeting as the 5th representatives conference. On p.179, however, calls as the 5th enlarged plenum. As for the 6th meeting in April 1939 and the 7th meeting in July 1941, he uses “enlarged plenum” only (pp.183-186, 198). From the 1st up to the 4th, all were written as the representatives conference (p.166). / MCP’s own documents write the 5th, 6th, and 7th meeting as “enlarged plenum (扩大中委全体会议)”. Fang Shan, et., al., op., cit., 2014, p.182. / *Nan Dao Zhi Chun*, pp.10, 13. / As mentioned earlier, *Nan Dao Zhi Chun* calls the meeting of the MCP in 1932 as the 3rd representatives conference.
23. SMPF, D7380, “Letter from Communist in Singapore to associate in Shanghai”, (25 April 1936), NUS Microfilm, R0012038.
24. C. F. Yong, op., cit., pp.181, 182.
25. SMPF, D7380.
26. Φ. 495 оп.62 д.30.
27. Ibid.

28. 'Mooi chai' (妹仔) is Cantonese dialect. In the Chinese version it is written as '奴婢' (woman slave).
29. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.30./ Nan Dao Zhi Chun, pp.13, 14. / While occasionally based on English translation by Tan Kim Hong in Cheah Boon Kheng's book mentioned earlier (p.109), the original expressions of the revised English version quoted later are preferred and revived here.
30. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.30.
31. According to C.F. Yong (p.184), at the 6th enlarged plenum, CC of 13 members including standing committee of 7, political bureau of 3 and organization department of 4 were elected. The Central Politburo should mean this bureau. Lai Teck was on both the committee and the bureau.
32. From "12 Sep.1939" above up to here, it seems, decisions at the CC Politburo are shown./ According to Mr. Hara Happa, who translated Russian language documents, there are many misspelling in this section b).
33. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.30.
34. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.28.
35. In normal conception, this view-point might be extreme leftist. But I (Hara) copied as it is.
36. This must be one of the earliest usages of the word "Ma Hua".
37. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.28.

CHAPTER VII

THE MCP AND THE COMINTERN FROM 1940 TO 1942

I 1940

1. The Second Plenum of the Central Committee held in January 1940¹

(1) Russian-language part (Reviewers' report)

A summary is given below.

The Party membership was more than 1,000. Branches were established especially in big factories in Singapore. Party activities had become positive.

Resolutions were passed regarding Party tactics in the Anti-Imperialist United Front of Malayan nationals (pertaining to the national problems [民族问题], class struggle, main forces of the revolution and allies); the Party's policy line relating to mass organizations (trade unions, peasant organizations and youth/women organizations); and the "three month-movement" in pursuing the political unity of the Party.²

(2) Chinese-language part

A summary is provided below.

Development of the Party

- Membership nearly doubled. The number of members of mass organizations more than doubled. In many places, the status of the Party and Party members rose among the masses.
- The Party's struggle against left-leaning exclusionism and right-leaning opportunism had borne considerable fruit. In the second term, especially in Singapore, the tendency towards opportunism had been substantially overcome.
- The Party's anti-war propaganda had received fairly enthusiastic responses among the masses. The scope of the Party's influence has expanded considerably.

- Membership of the mass organizations: From the 6th Enlarged Plenum till now, membership in Pahang increased seven-fold, Selangor four-fold, Penang three-fold, and generally doubled in other places. Only Malacca saw merely a one-third increase. North Johor decreased by a few dozens. Party membership tripled in Pahang.
- During this period, the Party led 200–300 workers' struggles that drew about 80,000 participating workers. In the second term, Singapore had the best record of more than 120 cases.³

2. New Ten-point Programme of the MCP in the Comintern file

The same file contained both the English and Chinese versions of the New Ten-point Programme. This must be the revised version prepared following the various level discussions. As two kinds of the Reviewers' Comment of the Comintern quoted above were written in January and February 1942, these might not have been reflected in the revision. The English version (TPP-b), published on 20 February 1940, is summarized below.

According to the MCP's document published recently, this programme was part of the resolution decided at the 2nd CEC conference of the MCP held on 24 January 1940. This programme was called "Impending Ten-point Programme for the Party to struggle for independent, free Democratic Republic".⁴

Compatriots! We cannot wait for our ruinous fate, we must fight for our living. Our Party has raised before you the following Ten Point Programme as the goal for the common struggle for our Party and yourself.

- (1) Expulsion of the British Imperialist out of Malaya. Acquiring of national independence. Establishment of a Free, Independent and Democratic Republic.
- (2) Establishment of an All Malayan Congress and the State Councils, candidates to which are to be elected through a universal franchise in which all the anti-imperialist parties and organisations and the peoples of Malaya will have the right to participate.
- (3) Realization of democracy. Safeguarding of the right to freedom of speech, press,

- assembly, organisation, belief and strike. Censure of corrupt officials.
- (4) General increment of salaries for employees and soldiers. Relief measures for the distressed and the unemployed. Development of industry, commerce, agriculture and national economy. Self-determination of rate of customs revenue.
 - (5) Eight-hour working day. Increment of wages. Abolition of the systems of contract-labour and apprentice. A non-contributory social insurance system.
 - (6) Abolition of all heavy and miscellaneous levies and taxes and high interest money-lending system. Decrement of rents and duties. Improvement of farm irrigation work. Repeal of agricultural control. Right of freedom of tilling.
 - (7) Equal pay for sexes and nationalities. A system of two months' leave with full pay for female workers during the period before and after their giving birth to a child. Safeguarding of the equality between the sexes in economical, political and social standing. Abolition of the 'Mooi chai' system and the women foformatory [sic. reformatory?].⁵
 - (8) A democratic system in the army and other forces. Equal treatment between officers and common soldiers. Abolition of such regulations for suppressing the ranks and files. Preferential treatment for their family.
 - (9) A system of universal education, using our national language for each nation. Free education for poor students. Development of national culture.
 - (10) Solidarity with all oppressed nations and peace-loving countries and peoples to fight against the Imperialist war, to uphold the peace policy of the SU, and to back-up the War of Resistance of the Chinese nation and the National Liberation Movement of India.⁶

The Chinese version referred to "using our national language for each nation" (clause(9)) is "用本民族语文实行普通教育". This meant that Malay students should be taught in Malay, Chinese in Chinese (Mandarin), and Indians in Tamil.

3. Manifesto of the Central Executive Committee, MCP

An English document, "Forward to a National Anti-Imperialist United Front for Free Independent and Democratic Republic of Malaya", dated 9 February 1940, is summarized below:

Compatriots of all nations! In April last [year], when the fascist war of aggression had still not extended to the entire surface of the world, our Party had issued 'Declaration to Compatriots of all Nations in Safeguarding the Peace of Malaya', in which we raised the 'Ten-point Programme for Safeguarding Peace' as a common programme for our compatriots and ourselves. In the Declaration, our Party strongly criticised the Appeasement Policy of the Chanborlain [Chamberlain] Government as a mean policy of encouraging war, and therefore called upon our compatriots of all nations to consolidate and safeguard peace.

Today, after the revelation of the fact that there is practically no difference between the BI and the Fascist gangsters both indulging in the same crime of robbery; today, when the BI has intensified its general offensive against the peoples of Malaya, there are only two possible ways before us; either to unite, establish the National Anti-Imp United Front, expel the BI and fight for the Democratic Republic of Malaya, or to compromise and capitulate and wait for the hour of destruction. The former is the only right path.⁷

4. Decisions of the Central Standing Committee of the MCP dated 6 April 1940

This Chinese document is summarized as follows:

(1) Problems yet to be resolved

- Anti-Imperialist National United Front: Some comrades believe that the Party's strategy has already reached Soviet-revolution stage. They do not understand the fundamental meaning of the present slogan, "Anti-Imperialist First". Therefore, we have not yet reached a consensus on the slogan to oppose the national bourgeoisie's compromise/surrender. Various kinds of work cannot yet reflect the interests and demands of all nationals.
- Conditions for admitting new Party members are not unanimously understood. A member's readiness to sacrifice himself is still neglected. No consensus has been reached towards work on the National United Front's lower-strata base. No work has reached the point of unanimous agreement based on the resolutions.

(2) Characteristics of present struggle

The economic struggle has become the basis of revolutionary influence. No matter whether the struggle succeeds or fails, it directly damages and weakens BI's politico-economic foundation. Thus, the working masses' revolutionary path is advanced. The CC demands that all Party members objectively respond to this new situation and boldly and persistently lead the economic struggle.⁸

On the point of Party membership C. F. Yong has provided the following figures based on police files: March 1937 – 379 members; April 1939 – 1,000; May 1940 – 1,700; and 1941 – 5,000.⁹

5. TPP-38 (April 1938), TPP-a (April 1939) and TPP-b (January 1940)

It is necessary to compare the two Ten-point Programmes, namely, TPP-a of 1939 and TPP-b of 1940. In fact, in April 1938, the CSC of the MCP had adopted another Ten-point Programme (denoted here by TPP-38).¹⁰ C. F. Yong's analysis of these TPPs may be summarized as follows:

(TPP-38) dropped the class line and anti-British policy. Instead, it was the mass line to unite with their adversary, the British authorities, in an all-out war against Japanese expansionism. Probably the work of Lai Teck, this TPP-38 represented the shift towards the extreme right.

(TPP-a) emphasized the demand for democratic rights and the preservation of peace and security for Malaya. It was again moderate and the "anti-British" wording was dropped on purpose

The radicalization of the MCP took place soon after the outbreak of the European war in September 1939, culminating in the resolution at the second plenary meeting of the CC (sic) in January 1940. The innocuous demand for democratic rights in TPP-a was replaced with a fighting platform of the TPP-b – "the eviction of BI from Malaya, the attainment of national independence".¹¹

6. Main issues of dispute – Change of viewpoints

- (1) The Second Plenum of the CC (24 January 1940).
Left-leaning exclusionism and right-leaning opportunism should be opposed. Anti-war struggle should be carried out.
- (2) TPP-b (24 January 1940).
Expulsion of the BI. Establishment of Free, Independent, Democratic Republic.
- (3) Manifesto of the CEC (9 February 1940).
Expel the BI and fight for the Democratic Republic of Malaya. No difference between the BI and the Fascists. Establish the National Anti-Imp United Front.
- (4) Decisions of the CSC (6 April 1940).
“Soviet revolution” stage has not been reached yet. Economic struggle should be given priority.

Part II 1941

No document. The Seventh Enlarged Plenum of the CC was held in July this year.

Part III 1942

1. Leading and middle class cadres of the Party organizations of Singapore: Compiled by Dashevskii, dated 15 January 1942

This Russian-language document is summarized below.

- (1) Leading cadres: Deng Ming-xing? (Ден Мин-син. 邓明兴?). Cantonese, 20 years old.
Student League in 1935. Joined the Party in 1937. Worked in the Huin in 1938.

At the directive of the Party, came to Singapore at the end of 1938. Worked among seamen. Participated in the China Relief Fund Association (中国筹赈会?). Worked among machinery workers in 1939. Trade union, March 1940. And four other cadres with no information of their careers.

(2) Middle-level cadres:

Chi Cheng? (Ци Чен. 池成?). Fujian, 24 years old. In the early Sino-Japanese War period, he established the CNLVC. Boycott Japanese goods movement. Joined the Party in 1937. A member of the cell-secretariat relating to organizational problem.

Jiang Xing? (Цзян Син. 江星?). Woman. 30 years old. Secretary of Party's women's cell. Former construction worker. Well known woman activist in Singapore. Joined the Party in 1937. Led strike at the Sun Siang (Сунсян) Factory in 1939. Secretary in 1940.

Bing Kun? (Бин Кун. 宾坤?) . Fujian, 29 years old. Worked in a youth organization. Joined the Party in 1937. Standing Committee member of the Anti-Japanese Relief China Youth Association. Singapore Anti-Enemy Association, 1939.

Huang Ying-xiang? (Хуан Ин сян. 黄英祥?). Chaozhou, 18 years old. The most revolutionary student in Singapore. Representative of the Singapore Student Anti-Enemy Society (SSAES). Left school in 1937. Worked in the SSAES. Joined the Party in 1939.

And 17 others.¹²

2. Conclusion of the 7 February 1942 review of the MCP's policies and activities by the three Comintern reviewers

This Russian-language document is summarized below.

Cruxes are shown first: (1) Slogans of the CCP were mechanically transferred to the MCP. (2) Slogans which were too compromising to bourgeoisie and British Imperialist were adopted. (3) Work on Malays and Indians were neglected. The Party resolutions did not reflect demands of peasants. (4) Even among Chinese as well as factory workers, Party's influence was limited. (5) Ideological education was insufficient.

Details are below:

(1) Tactics of the MCP

The tactics of the MCP at various stages of the struggle were decided without sufficiently considering the concrete international and local situations. Almost all the important political slogans of the CCP were mechanically transferred to the MCP. For instance, like the CCP, the MCP struggled for the establishment of the Worker-Peasant Soviet Republic until 1935. Since the beginning of the Sino-Japanese War, similar to the CCP, the MCP entirely devoted itself to the war against the Japanese Imperialists. When Britain was opposed to China, MCP's slogan, "No support for Britain", prevailed. And finally in January 1940, "Expulsion of the BI from Malaya" was made the task in the resolution of the Second Plenum of the CC. As long as slogans were given without taking Malayan characteristics into consideration, the Party's objectives occasionally could not be attained in practice.

Deploying strenuous activities to support the people of China, many Party members replaced the slogans proposed by the Party with their own. "For Party's legal activities" was replaced with "For abolition of all illegal activities" and "United front with participation of national bourgeoisie" was replaced with "Collaborative work with bourgeoisie", "Secure peace and security of Malaya" was replaced with "Collaboration with Britain", and so on.

(2) Work with Malays and Indians

The MCP virtually relies only on the interests of overseas Chinese; yet it formally claims it takes the interests of all the repressed people of Malaya into consideration. In practice, therefore, the MCP cannot demonstrate the true essence of the colonial policy of the BI. It could barely point out to the Malays and Indians the consistent intentions of the Japanese invaders toward Malaya. The Party has greatly contributed to raising its influence among overseas Chinese. It led such organizations as the MCAEBS and the China Relief Fund. But it has barely worked among the Malays, Indians and other Malayan nationals.

(3) Serious shortcomings of the MCP

- The resolutions of the MCP do not reflect the demands of peasants. The tactics for handling the national problem (民族问题) were not sufficiently probed.

- Even among the overseas Chinese, the Party's influence was not extensive. In many factory areas (Terengganu, Selangor and Johor), Party organizations were extremely weak.
- The member recruitment activities among the Malays and Indians were very inadequate.
- Among the cadres of various organizational levels, those from the worker class were extremely few. Cadres were principally Chinese. The Party virtually did not tackle the problem of appointing, nurturing and deploying non-Chinese cadre-candidates.
- The Party did not make an effort to raise the ideological and political standard of the members.
- Propaganda and agitation work based on the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism among the Chinese was weak. Among the Malays, Indians and other nationals, it was entirely insufficient.¹³

3. What policies were criticized by the reviewers here?

- (1) Since the Sino-Japanese War of 1937, the MCP had merely concentrated on the Anti-Japanese struggle. To that extent, the decisions of the Third SC Conference of 13 June 1939 might have been targeted.
- (2) Important slogans were erroneously replaced with others such as “Abolition of all illegal activities”, “Collaborative work with bourgeoisie”, and “Collaboration with Britain”. In this context, the SC Conference of 13 June 1939 might again have been targeted.

4. Probing the change of viewpoints since 1938

The viewpoints of the Comintern and the MCP can fundamentally be classified into three: ① revolutionary class line and Anti-BI (leftist line); ② moderate conciliatory line (rightist line); and ③ Chinese nationalistic, anti-Japanese line. The Chinese nationalistic viewpoint might be comparable to the non-class line and, therefore, be classified as the rightist line. But this line was in fact regarded as the most effective revolutionary line immediately before the Pacific War. The above viewpoints may also be distinguished by reference to their source or origin, as follows:

- (1) Reviewers (February 1942), Central Politburo (12 September 1939), CSC (April-June 1939?), the Second Plenum of the CC and TPP-b (24 January 1940), and Manifesto of the CEC (9 February 1940).
- (2) TPP-38, TPP-a (April 1939), the Third SC (13 June 1939), and Decisions of the CSC (6 April 1940). These might have reflected Lai Teck's viewpoint.
- (3) The Third SC (13 June 1939) and Decisions of the CSC (6 April 1940).

It can be presumed that: (1) In early 1942, the Comintern took leftist's view-point and was very critical to the MCP's activities from 1939, (2) The Comintern had received the latest reports from the MCP, (3) As the Pacific War began in December 1941, these Comintern's Review had no means to reach the MCP, (4) Therefore, Comintern's criticism might not have affected the policies of the MCP in this period, (5) The MCP wavered between the leftist and rightist lines. While the leftist line might reflect views of radical factions represented by north Malayan leaders, the rightist line might reflect those of Lai Teck, (6) Since mid-1940, the third, anti-Japanese line prevailed. Impending Japanese aggression to Malaya seems to have prevented leftist anti-British line. (7) Rightist faction, too, had no reason to oppose the anti-Japanese line. Thus the Party could be united through this line.

Notes

1. According to *Nan Dao Zhi Chun*, the second plenum of the CC of the MCP was held in February 1940 (p.18). According to C.F. Yong, it was in 24 January 1940 (Yong, op., cit., p.199)
2. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.30.
3. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.28.
4. Fang Shan, et.al., eds., *Magong Wenji, Di 2 Ji, Zhanqian Dixia Douzheng Shiqi (2)* (MCP Anthologies, Underground Struggle Era before the War. 方山 等编 马共文集第2辑 战前地下斗争时期 (二)), Kuala Lumpur, Penerbitan Abad 21, 2010b, pp.58, 59.
5. Chinese version here is '保良局 (Po Leung Kuk)'.
6. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.28.
7. Ф. 495 оп.62 д.28.

8. Φ. 495 оп.62 д.28.
9. C.F. Yong, op., cit., p.202.
10. *Nan Dao Zhi Chun*, pp.10-13.
11. C.F. Yong, op., cit., pp.195-201.
12. Φ. 495 оп.62 д.30.
13. Φ. 495 оп.62 д.30.

CONCLUSION

The MCP history as recorded in the Comintern Files may roughly be outlined as follows:

1. Behaviour and correspondence of the suspected persons were closely watched not only in Malaya but also in Shanghai and Hong Kong. Once a relevant person was arrested, all documents kept in his office as well as residence were seized. Once a letter was intercepted, persons as well as places addressed in a letter were kept watched. When the communists sensed the trap, they dared not approach the addressed places. Therefore, even if re-posted after interception, these letters seldom reached the recipients, that is, the Comintern or the MCP. Documents sent by the MCP and fortunately kept in Moscow are the ones which survived these strict surveillance.

2. In 1927, the First Congress of the South Seas (Nanyang) Communist Party was convened and the Provisional Committee was set up. Another contemporary document also said that it was inaugurated in early 1928. It was called the Nanyang Provisional Committee (NPC), the (Chinese) Communist Party of Malay Archipelago, or Malay Communist Party. On 2 May it convened a large-scale Enlarged Plenum that lasted for two weeks; subsequently, on 2 July, it held a Plenum. One of these two plena would be the Second Representatives' Congress of the NPC. The core of the PC's leadership was called the Presidium (or General Committee in C. F. Yong's account). In early 1928, the NPC implemented so radical a strategy that it encountered serious repression. As a consequence of this 'mistake', the NPC was reorganized at the Plenum of 2 July 1928. While some members were expelled from the leadership, the others, though reprimanded and demoted, remained in the PC. Table 5 shows the top leaders of the NPC who were mentioned in the Comintern documents and in C. F. Yong's book, the two sources being closely similar. From Yong's information, it is known that most of the top leaders were arrested and deported soon after. Mainly due to the arrests of many NPC leaders, only a few of them were able to continue to lead the MCP.

3. Most contemporary Comintern documents stated that the MCP was formed at the Third Representatives' Congress (Conference) of the NPC. As for the inauguration date of the MCP, the Party officially claims it to be 30 April 1930. C. F. Yong argues either early-mid April or late April 1930 because most of the MCP leaders were arrested on 29 April after they had been appointed. On the other hand, a Comintern document dated 1 May 1930 showed the Notice relating to the

Conclusion of the Third Congress of the Nanyang CP (meaning the inaugural Congress of the MCP). A document kept in a different file, which was referred to by Anna Belogurova, noted that the third representative conference of the NCP was held on 22-23 April. Another Comintern document dated 1 June 1930 noted that the inaugural Conference was convened on 21 May 1930 and suggested that the leaders who had been arrested on 29 April did not officially assume the MCP's posts on their arrests yet. Ho Chi Minh who presided at the conference recalled the meeting had been held twice. It might be presumed from here that its preliminary congress seemed to have been convened on 22-23 April (tentative decisions were made) and the official Congress on 21 May 1930.

4. It has been considered that the Comintern and Ho Chi Minh directed the newly formed MCP to be a more multi-national (multi-ethnic) organization that would attach greater importance to organizing Malays and Indians. The Comintern documents showed that it had instructed the MCP to form a unified national party consisting of the various Malayan nationals (ethnic groups), including Malays, Chinese, Indians and so on. The idea of establishing a "Unity Party" comprising people who each retained their original nationality (国籍) was rejected. Subsequently, the Comintern instructed that the MCP should subsume all nationals under its organization, and non-Malays should leave the movements of their original countries. Evidently the MCP did not understand this conception which was why the Comintern continued to criticize the MCP for not sufficiently taking the concrete, practical Malayan situation into consideration.

5. After the MCP was established in 1930, the party dispatched several representatives to Shanghai to report about the situation of Malaya and, in return, receive instructions and funds from the Comintern's FEB through the CCP. Here, Ho Chi Minh appeared to have played the role of a mediator while he lived in Shanghai and Hong Kong. But, due to the strict vigilance of the colonial authorities, it was difficult for the MCP representatives to contact the CCP, let alone the FEB. Because of this, the MCP time and again requested the Comintern to directly dispatch its representatives to Malaya to guide the movement. Thus Ducroux and his group of the FEB were sent to Singapore in 1931. So far, it was only argued that because the Comintern wanted to lead the MCP without intervention by the CCP. But actually it was realized not due to unilateral interests of the Comintern but due to bilateral ones with the MCP.

With the arrest of the Ducroux group in Singapore in June 1931, the FEB personnel were likewise arrested and the FEB's network was completely eliminated. That restricted MCP's

subsequent communication with the Comintern to mail alone. In around 1934, their connections were to some extent restored and nine representatives were successively dispatched to Shanghai. In 1935 and 1936 also, a few were sent again. Yet, it was difficult for them to contact either the Comintern or the CCP. As for representatives sent to the Comintern's Headquarters, Moscow, only two persons could be confirmed. One was Fu Hung-chi who came back to Shanghai from Moscow towards the end of 1930 and an unknown person who was dispatched to Moscow to attend the 7th World Congress in 1934. Therefore, there might be no direct connection between the Comintern and the MCP.

6. Documents analyzed here ranged from 1928 until early 1942. Dividing these into two, documents written by the Comintern and those by the MCP, the important ones are shown by chronological order in Table 6. Those written by the Comintern, most of them seemed to have been sent from Shanghai, could not necessarily reach the MCP in Malaya (mostly Singapore). Those written by the MCP certainly reached the Comintern simply because these were kept in their archives. But some were intercepted either in Malaya or in Shanghai and could not reach the Comintern. These were not listed in the Comintern Files.

From immediately before the foundation of the MCP in early 1930 until the arrests of the Ducroux group in mid-1931, many letters were exchanged. There existed "dialogue", that is, something like; report ~ instruction ~ reply ~ comment~ criticism. This dialogue was stopped by the Ducroux incident. As for 1932, only one MCP's letter written towards the end of that year reached Moscow. Two MCP letters written in 1933 took a year to reach the Comintern. In 1934, communication was revived. Yet, a majority of the MCP letters appeared not to reach the Comintern due to interception of the SB. As far as the documents listed on the Comintern Files, an instruction sent from the AAS dated 25 January 1935 was the last one sent to the MCP. After that, no such directive was recorded among the Comintern Files.

According to Yong, the MCP's adoption of the mass line [Anti-Japanese United Front] in 1936 was in response first to Comintern directive arising from its Seventh World Congress in Moscow in July 1935 and then to the CCP advice after the Sian [Xian] Incident in December 1936.¹ It is well recorded in his book that in this period the CCP increased its influence over the MCP, especially by sending many trained cadres to Malaya to lead the anti-Japanese movement.² No instruction after that was mentioned in his book. Cheah, too, said: "The MCP remained throughout of the year [1936] isolated from contact with the Comintern".³ No directive after 1936 was referred in his book. McLane also wrote: "Ties alleged to have existed since 1933 between the

MCP and the so-called “Comintern apparatus” in Shanghai were allegedly severed with the dissolution of this apparatus in mid-1935, no further ties between Moscow and the Malayans are reported (even by Malayan police officials, who are normally eager to claim them)”.⁴

It apparently does not mean that the SB could not detect letters, but in the first place the Comintern did not send letters after 1936. Kurihara’s observation (see Chapter VI) endorses this situation.

On the contrary, the MCP continued sending letters until April 1940. These letters sent between 1939 and 1940 were not intercepted by the SB.

7. After the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese War in 1937, the MCP laid emphasis on the anti-Japanese national (“national” meaning China) salvation movement and succeeded in expanding the Party’s influence among the Chinese in Malaya. Since the Comintern had, until the German- USSR War, all along directed the CPs of the colonized countries to intensify its anti-Imperialist struggle, the “Reviewers” of the Comintern criticized the MCP for ignoring the concrete, practical Malayan situation while being entirely devoted to China’s war against Japanese imperialism. The German-Soviet Non-aggression Pact of August 1939 seemed to have strengthen anti-British stance of the Comintern. With the invasion of the USSR by Germany on 22 June 1941, however, the Comintern changed its policy and directed various Communist Parties to fully launch anti-Fascist movements and conditionally collaborate with the Allied countries, including Britain. Though in 1935 the Comintern was said to have allowed various ethnic groups (nationals) of the Communist Parties to have specific connections with their originated countries, the “Reviewers” retained very critical stand against this situation. It is not known which stand of the Comintern had been conveyed to the MCP since 1936. Nonetheless the Comintern’s (actually USSR’s) foreign policies were widely known to the world. Without official instructions, the MCP might feel bound to the change of the policies. These policy twists and turns could have perplexed the MCP. Firm anti-British stand of the MCP’s Central Politburo of September 1939 and the Anti-Fascist United Front policy adopted at the 7th Enlarged Plenum of the MCP held on 28 July 1941 (which supported UK-USSR’s anti-German Alliance)⁵ might have reflected the changes of the Comintern (Stalin). But, as noted above, it is not known that the MCP directly received such directives from the Comintern.

8. The political line and instructions of the Comintern (or Stalin’s actually) were not consistent. Sometimes the stance taken was too radical and sometimes too moderate. For instance, the three reviewers of the Comintern criticized the MCP in February 1942 for mechanically and

unconditionally following the CCP line in the former's struggle for the establishment of a Soviet Republic of Malaya. In actuality, the ES of the Comintern had instructed the MCP as far back as in July 1931 to have a fundamental slogan to establish a Soviet Republic of Malaya. Conversely, the same reviewers criticized the MCP because it had changed the slogans in 1935 from "establishing Worker-Peasant Soviet Republic of Malaya" to "establishing an Anti-Imperialist National United Front".

9. There were consistent parts as well in the instructions. From the very beginning to the end, the Comintern instructed the MCP to guide the Communist Parties of Indonesia, Siam (Thailand) and Burma (Myanmar). Acknowledging its necessity, the MCP all the while appealed its difficulty. Another consistent instruction is related to the Malay (*inter alia* Malay peasant), Indian work. The Comintern repeatedly directed the MCP to strengthen these works. Without exception, the MCP replied that despite their sustained endeavor to nurture Malay as well as Indian members, it did not bear satisfactory fruit.

10. As for the system of the nation to be established by revolution, besides the instruction of 1931 quoted above (Soviet Republic), the Comintern had no other instruction. Only the CCP's instruction of 1929 (sent to the NPC) cited "Federated Republics". On the MCP side, at its inaugural resolution of 1930, the MCP accepted the Federated Republic instructed by the CCP. Worker-Peasant Dictatorship and Worker-Peasant Government were cited in the Party resolutions in 1931 and 1933 respectively. In the resolution of 1940, Democratic Republic was cited. This must reflect the moderate line of the united front policy. Comintern Reviewers criticized the MCP in February 1942 that though the MCP had first struggled to establish Soviet Republic of Malaya, it changed its policy to a compromising Anti-Imperialist National United Front in 1935 (see Chapter VI). But as far as the MCP documents consulted above are concerned, the MCP had never officially adopted a slogan of Soviet Republic. This can be compared with the CCP which named its provisional government "Chinese Soviet Republic" in 1931. Why did the MCP avoid the word "Soviet"? The Party might consider that as Malayan revolution was a bourgeois-democratic revolution, "Soviet" (meaning socialist revolution) was presently not appropriate.

It might be worthwhile to compare these with the state system pursued by the MCP after the Pacific War.

In February 1943, while the Party was carrying out Anti-Japanese War, it decided on the Nine Point Programme. It declared establishing a *Malayan Democratic Republic* after driving out

the Japanese Army. Immediately after the end of the War, the MCP changed this policy to realization of a *Self-Government*. In December 1948, half a year after commencing armed struggle, the MCP declared establishing a *People's Democratic Republic*. In December 1955, a week before the Baling Peace Talks,⁶ in order to show its sincerity of peaceful line, the MCP declared its forming the *Independence, Democracy and Peace of Malaya*. In April 1970, when its armed struggle was at the peak, the MCP proclaimed establishing a *People's Republic of Malaya*. But since the late 1970s, the MCP has tried to explore ways to negotiate with the government. In April 1980, MCP's programme described its objective was to establish a *Democratic United Government*. In February 1985, unofficial contact with the government officials began. In April that year, the MCP accepted the *Constitutional Monarchy* system. This softened line led to the Hadyai Peace Treaty of 1989.⁷

To sum up, while the MCP pursued a *Democratic Republic* until the end of the Pacific War, it was changed to a *People's Republic* when it carried out an armed struggle. While *Democratic Republic* symbolized a bourgeois democratic revolution, *People's Republic* a socialist revolution. In this sense, pre-War MCP was consistent with carrying out revolution in a colonized feudal country.

11. As for the strategies of the struggle, the Comintern had never officially instructed armed struggle line after 1930. The Comintern as early as 1928 criticized the NPC for launching an uprising that year. In an instruction dated 17 December 1930, the Comintern criticized again the armed uprising or even the general strike supposed to be implemented by the MCP. In an instruction dated 3 July 1931, the Comintern denounced the armed insurrection again and clarified general strike as merely a slogan. After that, the denial of armed struggle have apparently been taken for granted.

On the other hand, the MCP at its inaugural conference of 1930 accepted the armed insurrection policy instructed by the CCP in 1928. And in its letter dated 2 January 1931, the MCP reiterated the importance of armed insurrection as well as general strike. This was severely criticized by the Comintern again in its instruction dated 1 February 1931. After that the MCP never positively referred to armed insurrection or armed uprising until the impending Japanese invasion of Malaya in 1941.

In this connection, it also might be worthwhile to compare these with the strategies adopted during and after the Pacific War.

Two days after the Japanese invasion of Malaya on 10 December 1941, the MCP declared arming themselves to protect Malaya against Japan and soon afterwards organized the Malayan People's Anti-Japanese Army.⁸ When the War ended, the MCP decided not to wage an armed struggle against the returning British Imperialist. In early 1948, owing to severe suppression by the colonial authorities, the MCP decided to commence armed struggle. In the mid-1950s, the MCP adopted peaceful negotiation line which culminated in the Baling Peace Talks. But in September 1961, the MCP decided to re-start armed struggle. This decision was implemented in June 1968 and the armed struggle lasted until the Hadyai Peace Treaty of December 1989.⁹

It can be discerned that the political lines of the MCP were comparatively moderate before the Pacific War. It had no tradition of, no inclination to, an armed struggle during this period. It was not until 1948, when the MCP felt the colonial authorities were too stubborn, too oppressive to negotiate, that the Party resorted to an armed struggle.

12. The fact that the Comintern did not send instructions to the MCP after 1936 might lead us to an assumption that the decisions and their changes were the result of internal analyses, review, probation and effort.

Though the MCP, abiding by Comintern's ceaseless instructions, made with all its might an effort to organize "red" trade unions especially in such important industries as rubber plantations, mines and transportation, it was difficult to bear satisfactory fruits for long. Expansion of Party membership as well as influence were also not so smooth while the MCP was receiving instructions from the Comintern. But its movement gained momentum during 1935 and 1936. In 1937, the MCP succeeded in mobilizing several thousand mining workers of Batu Arang Colliery, Selangor, to strike. At the 2nd Plenum of the MCP in 1940, it was reported that membership of the Party as well as the affiliated organizations were more than doubled and that 80,000 workers participated in the Party-led struggles. These might be attributed to the MCP's own effort, not to the Comintern instruction.

13. During the short period immediately following the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese war, the MCP's political line or viewpoint oscillated between radicalism and moderation. Yet even the policy change then could not be attributed to changes in the international or local political situations only. It was quite possible, too, that the MCP adopted a moderate line when Lai Teck managed to influence or persuade its CSC or CEC. The Party adopted the radical line, however,

when Lai Teck could not convince the radical CSC or CEC members (perhaps notably represented by leaders from Perak).

Originally, the united front line to cooperate with national bourgeoisie as well as British Imperialist was opposed by the leftists. But the Sino-Japanese war of 1937 and the Anti-Japanese National Salvation Movement, which subsequently got huge momentum, appeared to have buried the rift between the two factions. In the first two years after assuming the Secretary General in 1939, Lai Teck might not be able to persuade the leftists to accept his moderate united front policy. But impending Japanese invasion compelled the leftists to, setting aside the class line, accept Anti-Japanese United Front policy. Unified, the party might have strengthen Lai Teck's position. In the Notice of the Central Polit-bureau of the MCP dated 26 August 1940,¹⁰ Lai Teck was praised at its very beginning as "our Party's brilliant leader (英明的领袖), Comrade Lai Teck". It might mean that by this time Lai Teck's position in the Party was solidified. Soon after Japan occupied Malaya, Lai Teck became a spy of the Japanese Kempeitai and subsequently sold out to the Japanese almost all the prominent leaders of the Party. Thus his dictatorship inside the Party was consolidated.

14. It must have been a fatal contradiction or a tragedy that while the Comintern stressed time and again that the MCP's strategy should be based on concrete, practical, local, political, social and economic conditions, the Comintern's instructions were more often than not formulated by people who were not sufficiently versed with Malayan affairs. These instructions were not necessarily concrete and precise. Further, these instructions were communicated via uncertain and unreliable methods which were subjected to the scrutiny of the British authorities. In this sense, it might be natural, and at the same time ironical that after their connection was severed the MCP developed and strengthened its influence among Malayan people, though generally restricted to Chinese, more steadily and solidly than before.

15. Lastly, Table of the List of Secretary of the MCP is attached as an appendix.

Notes

1. C. F. Yong, op., cit., pp.195, 242.
2. See also, Hara, op., cit., pp.73-100.
3. Cheah, op., cit., p.84.

4. McLane, op.,cit., p.237.
5. Fang Shan, 2010b, pp.91-121. At this Plenum, the Democratic Republic of Malaya was dropped from the slogan.
6. Failed negotiation between the Malayan government headed by Tunku Abdul Rahman and the MCP headed by Chin Peng was held in a small town of Baling, Kedah, on 28 and 29 December 1955.
7. See, Hara, *Unaccomplished International Co-operation: The Malayan Communist Party and Its Fraternal Parties*, Tokyo, Fu Kyo Sha, 2009. (未完に終わった国際協力：マラヤ共産党と兄弟党).
8. Fang Shan, 2010b, pp.262, 263.
9. See, Hara, 2009.
10. Fang Shan, 2010b, p.135.

Appendix

List of Documents of the RSASPH

In this work, the classification of the RSASPH documents follows that used by Prof. Kurihara, such as Ф. 495 оп.62 д.30. (Ф: Фонд [Fond], оп: опись [opisi, inventory], д:d).

I. List of Russian-language documents

The Russian-language list of documents related to the MCP is classified as Ф. 495 оп. 62 д from 1 to 30. The titles and dates of the third number (д) in the list are shown below.

1. Report of the Provisional Committee of the Malay Archipelago Communist Party on the (regional) plenum on 2 July and on the date it was convened (3 August). Report of the Trade Union Council on the labour movement in Malaya. August 1928, March 1930.
2. Mail correspondences of the Anglo-American Bureau with regard to inquiries of Malaya. Oct.1930, Jan.1931.
3. Resolutions and decisions of the Third Congress of the Malay Archipelago Communist Party. Comments of the Central Committee of the Communist Party on the resolutions. Sep. 1930, Jan. 1931.
4. Personal proposals from the MCP to the Far Eastern Bureau (FEB) (Received letters relating to the cadres). Dec.1930, May 1931.
5. Slogans and appeals of the CC of the MCP as well as of the Singapore Committee. And the manifestos relating to the 13th Anniversary Day of the October Revolution and other issues. Nov.1930, May 1931.
6. An open letter from the CC of the MCP and a report from the region (страна). Letters from the CC of the MCP to the CC of the British Communist Party. Jan.–Jun. 1930, Apr. 1931.
7. Information on the staff of Malaya and the Reports from the Anglo-American Secretariat (AAS). 1931
8. Economic expectations of the situation of Malaya. Feb.1931.
9. Data of information on the trade union movements in Malaya. 21–23 Apr. 1931.
10. Mail correspondence of the AAS on Malaya. 1 Feb.1931.
11. Reports from Malaya to the AAS and information on the situation in region. 16 Feb.–22 May 1931.
12. Letters from the FEB to the MCP. Feb.–April 1931.
13. Circulars of the CC of the MCP (No.1–9). Apr.–May 1931.
14. Draft letters of the Eastern Secretariat (ES) on tasks of the MCP, No.1. 11–13 Jun. 1931.
15. Do, No.2, Incomplete.
16. Draft instruction–letters of the ES of the Executive Committee, Comintern on Malayan situation and task of the MCP. No.1. 5 May–3 Jul. 1931.
17. Do, No.2.
18. Draft instruction–letters of the ES towards Malaya, No.1. 20 Feb.–4 May 1931.
19. Do, No.2, Incomplete.
20. Resolutions, circulars and other information of the CC of the MCP on the organization, labour movement, МЮД [MYuD] and etc. 12 Oct. 1932–25 Dec.1933.
21. Report on the resolutions of the First Enlarged Plenum of the CC of the MCP and on the result of the Second Enlarged Plenum. 5 Apr. –5 Sep.1933.

22. Letters — Report of the MCP and the magazine, *Malayan Avant-garde* (Малайский авангард), No.1. Mar. — Dec.1934.
23. Resolutions of the CC of the MCP on labour movement, trade unions, women and etc. 30 Jan. — Nov. 1934.
24. Reports from Malaya on the Komsomol (Communist Youth League), trade union movement, seamen movement and etc.
Appeal of the CC of the MCP to the unemployed. The thesis of the CC on the tasks of the Party, and other material. 5 Jan. — Nov. 1934.
25. Report of trade unions of Malaya and informative material. 25 Mar. — Apr. 1934.
26. Material of the Anglo-American Secretariat: "Open letters to the comrades of Malaya and India". 25 Jan. 1935.
27. Informative material on Malaya and other material. No date.
28. Resolutions, circulars, appeals to the people, and other material of the CC of the MCP. Material of the Singapore City Committee on the domestic situation, present tasks of the Party, united national front and other problems. 13 Nov. 1939 — 13 Jun. 1940. Some have no date.
29. Pamphlet, "Malaya Today" (Малайя сегодня) edited in October 1940 and its abridged translation. Dec. 1939.
30. "Biographical information (биографические сведения) and evaluation of the leadership of the MCP — made by reviewers of the Executive Committee (EC) of the Comintern.
"Research report on the activities among overseas Chinese in Malaya — made by reviewers of the EC of the Comintern based on the data of 1939-1940". Jan. — Feb. 1942.

II. List of English-language and some Chinese-language documents

The list of English-language documents (in my possession) is incomplete. It includes, however, some Chinese-language documents (denoted as "Chinese" at the end of their titles). The classification of the documents in this list follows the classification of the Russian-language list.

3. Resolutions adopted at the Third Congress of Malaya (sic) Party.
Notice! Issued by the CC of the Communist Party of Malay States. Relating to the Conclusion of the III Delegate Congress of the Nanyang Communist Party. May 1, 1930.
What the labourers should do? (Chinese)
6. To the English Komparty [Communist Party], London. 1 Jun. 1930.
An open letter from the CC of C.P. of Malay [sic] to the working class of Malay [sic]. 7 Nov. 1930.
Letters (in Russian—language) (Malaya). 25 Nov. 1930.
To the FEB (Wang Yung Hai from Shanghai). 28 Dec. 1930.
12. From the FEB to the Malayan Comrades. 17 Dec. 1930.
13. Central Circular, No.1—No.5
14. Draft letter Re: Tasks of the Com. Party of Malaya.
Re: Draft letter to Malaya. Tasks of the communists in the agrarian movement.
16. The present situation in Malaya and the task of the CPM [sic]. (Draft letter).
3 Jul. 1931.
18. Dear Comrades! (EC of the Comintern) [Russian— language].
21. Draft resolutions of the First Enlarged Plenum of the Malay [马来] Communist Party.
(Published on 5 Apr. 1933, submitted on 25 Aug. 1934).
General conclusion of the Second Enlarged Plenum of the M [Malayan] CP.; Written on 5 Sep. 1933, submitted on 26 Aug. 1934 [Chinese—language]

Table 1. Membership of Trade Unions in Malaya (sic) Peninsula (Early 1930 ?)							
Section	Occupation	Chinese	Malaya(sic)	Indian	Java	Total (a)	Total (b)
Transport	Seamen	500	30	250	12	800	792
	Wharf coolies (included among the seamen)						
Industry	Rubber	1980	20			2000	2000
	Tin mine	150				150	150
	Iron mine	20				20	20
	Bolo Hill	50				50	50
Metal	Mashines	50				50	50
	Tin factory	30				30	30
Municipal	Electric	20				20	20
	Salesman	400				400	400
	Peddlers	330	20			350	350
Workers	Foreign						
	Service	800				800	800
	Printing	10				10	10
	Motor service	50				50	50
Manufacturing	Cheris factory	300				300	300
	Changs f.	30				30	30
	Bolo-f.	210(200?)				200	210
	Rubber f.	295	5			300	300
	Timber f.	120				120	120
	Total (b)	5345	75	250	12		5682
	Total membership : 5,860						

Notes

(a) Original figures. (b) Calculated from the relevant columns. f. factory

Source: Ф. 495 оп.62 д.11. (English document)

Table 2-1 Persons Mentioned in the Comintern Files

Chinese Name	Original Russian Name	Chinese Character	Possible Alias or Original Name		
			Local Spelling	Pinyin	Chinese Character
		(conjectured by Hara)			
Chen Bo Hai	Чень бо хай	陈博海	Tan Pek Hai	Chen Bi Hai	陈碧海
Chen Dan	Чень Дан	陈丹	Tan Gam	Chen Yan	陈严
Chen Liang	(no Russian)	陈良	Ch'en Liang	Chen Liang	陈良
Chen Xing Go	Чен син го	陈兴国	Tan Heng Kok	Chen Xing Guo	陈兴国
Chen Xiu Fang	Чень сю фан ?	陈旭芳	Tan Tiu-jeng ?	Chen Shao Ren	陈绍仁
Chun Guang	(no Russian)	春光	Lim Choon Kwong	Lin Chun Guang	林春光
Fang Cai Cheng	Фан Цай чен	方才盛			
Feng Ning Guang	Фын нин гуан	丰宁光			
Fu Hung Chu	(no Russian)	符鸿记	Fu Hung-chi	Fu Hong Ji	符鸿记
Fu Zai Long	(no Russian)	符在隆 1)	Fu Tai-leong	Fu Dai Long	符戴隆
Huang He Qing	Хуан хе цин	黄和清	Huang Hai-ping	Huang Hai Ping	黄海平
Huang Mu Heng	Хуан му хэн		Wong Muk-han	Huang Mu Han Huang Mo Han	黄木涵 黄默涵
Huang Sheng Yu	Хуан шень юй	黄声誉	Huang Sheng-chi	Huang Sheng-qu	黄声渠
Lai Chuang? Yao	Лай чуан ? яо	赖创耀	Lei Kuang-juan	Li Guang Yuan	黎光远
Li Ji xiang	Ли цзи сян	李吉祥 or	Li Chi-sin	Li Qi Xin	李启新
			Li Seng-hsiang	Li Sheng Xiang	李生香
Ma Ye Bing	Ма е бинь	马业炳	Mah Yap-peng		马业炳
Pan Ying Hou	Пань ин хоу	潘迎候		Pan Yun Bo (?)	潘云波(潘先甲) 2)
Shi Fang Ping	Ши Фан-пин	施方平	Si Hong-peng		
Shieng Kien Chu	(no Russian)	胜 (单) 建柱 ?		Sheng (Shan) Jian Zhu ?	
Su Bo Yi	Су бо и	苏博义	Su Pek-ngi	Su Bi Yi	苏碧义
Tan Yao Tai	Тань яо тай	谭耀泰	Tan Tiu-jeng ?	Chen Shao Ren	陈绍仁
Tang Sen Sheng	Тан сен шен	唐森盛		Tang Sen Sheng	唐森盛
Wang Yue	Ван юэ	王月	Ong Juat-pho	Wang Yue Bo	王月波

Wang Yung Hai	(no Russian)	王永海 ?			
Wen Xing Ruo	Вень син жо	文新若	Phua Tin-kiap	Pan Xian-jia	潘先甲
		or	Bun Sin-oan	Wen Xin An ?	文新安 ? 3)
Yuan Zhuang Qi	Юань Чжуан ци	袁庄琪			
Zeng	Цзен	曾	Cheung Hong-seng ?	Zhang Hong Cheng	张洪成
Zhan Xing Xiang	Чжан син сян	詹行祥	Chiam Hang-cheong		詹行祥
Zhang Chu Kun	Чжан Цу-кун.	张楚琨	Cheong Choo-kun		张楚琨
Zhang Zhen	Чжан чжень ?	张真			
Zheng Shun	(no Russian)	正顺			
Zheng Ting Xing	Чжен Тин Син		Cheng Ting-hsien	Zheng Ting Xing	郑庭杏
Zhu Ping	Чжу пин	祝炳	Chu Yang	Zhu Yang	祝仰

Notes

1) Original Chinese name in a Chinese document.

2) This alias name depends on Fang Shan, et.al., eds., *Magong Wenji, Di 1 Ji, Zhanzheng Dixia Douzheng Shiqi (1)* (MCP Anthologies, Underground Struggle before the War. 方山 等编 马共文集第 1 辑 战争地下斗争时期 (一)), Kuala Lumpur, Penerbitan Abad 21, p.155.

3) C.F. Yong, p.100.

Table 2-2 Communist Leaders Referred by Yong and Cheah		
Local spelling	Pinyin	Chinese character
Cheng Heng-sin	Zhong Ting Xin ?	钟廷新 ?
Cheung Hong-seng (@ Wong Teck-chai)	Zhang Hong Cheng Huang De Cai	张洪成 黄德才
Cheung Yok-kai	Zhang Yu Kai	张玉楷
Foo Yung-ting	Fu Rong Ding	符荣鼎
Fu Siang-hu	Fu Xiang Fu ?	符祥福 ?
Fu Tai-keng	Fu Da Qing	傅大庆
Ho Hong-seng	He Hong Sheng ?	何鸿盛 ?
Ho Wen-han	He Wen Han	何文汉
Iang Pao-an	Yang Pao An	杨匏安
Li Su-kong	Li Shu Guang	李书光
Lin Chin-chung	Lin Qing Chong	林庆充
Soh Theng-bun	Su Ding Wen	苏定文
Tong Chek-an	Tang Ze An ?	唐泽安 ?
Wang Lik-peng	Wang Lu Ping ?	王陆平 ?
Wu Ching (@ Hsu Tien-ping)	Wu Qing Xu Tian Bing	吴清 徐天炳
Yong Yok-su	Yang Yu Shu	杨玉树
Teo Yuan-foo (Bassa)	Zhang Ran He	张然和

Note: ? Chinese characters are conjectured by Hara.
(Alphabetical order)

Table 3 Membership of the Communist Organizations of Malay States. 3 Oct. 1930						
State	No.of Cells	Party	CYL (a)	LU	Newspaper	Note
Johor	18	120	79	550	1 (W)	①
Malacca	8	80	56	400	0	②
N. Sembilan	6	138	37	460	0	
Selangor	6	78	20	280	4 (W)	③
Perak	11	86	-	180	1	
Penang	6	55	46	280	-	④
Terengganu	-	14	-	50	-	
Kelantan	-	9	-	80	-	
Kedah (b)	9	85	-	250	-	
Singapore	25	355	203	1150	1 (W)	
Seamen	-	110	-	500	-	
Total	89	1130	441	4250 (c)	7	

CYL: Communist Youth League. LU: Labour Union. W: weekly.

Original notes.

① In LU, native persons are 12 only.

② All Party members are working in rubber plantations.

③ Newspapers are: Party 1, CYL 1, LU 1, Anti-Fascist League 1.

④ As a whole, native comrades are 2, Indian seamen are 250.

Quoter's notes.

(a) Original Russian inscription is КС М.

(b) Original Russian inscription is Колибан (Голу) [Koliban (Golu)].

It cannot be other than Kedah.

(c) Total number calculated above is actually 4180.

Source: Ф. 495 оп.62 д.7.

Table 4 Chinese Members in Organisations of Malay Peninsula as at May 1931						
District	CP	Youth	TU	Women	AIL	M & I (e)
Singapore	320	200	2000	50	200	130
Johore	180	100	900			100
Malacca	70		900			14
Seremban	180		1500			300
Kuala Lumpur	100		500			15
Penang	100		450			50
Ipoh	90	30	300			100
Trengganu	30		50			2
Sinsan (a)	60	110	800			
Kugan (b)	15		40			
Kiliwin (c)	40		200			
Quantan (d)	40		230			
Total	1225	440	7870	50	200	711

Abbreviation: CP Communist Party, TU Trade Unions, AIL Anti-Imperialist League.

Quoter's notes

(a) Might be Xinshan (Johor Baru)

(b) Might be Kedah

(c) Might be Kelantan

(d) Kuantan

(e) This column is not shown on the original table.

Figures here are shown under the table as numbers of Trade Unions in "Malaya States & Indian Countries". It should be Malay & Indian members.

Original comment says about a half is Malay St., another half Indian.

Table 5 Leaders of the NPC & the early MCP: Comparison between the CI Documents and Yong's Book		
Name	Comintern Documents	C.F. Yong
Bun Sin-oan	exp. from PC (28) (?)	PC (28)
Ch'en Liang	Sec.MCP(32)	
Cheng Ting-hsien	Obs.(28)	from China (26)
Cheung Hong-seng (@Wong Teck-chai)		GC, Sec., arre.(Mar.28)
Chiam Hang-cheong	criticized, Pres. (28)	from China (26), GC (28), arre.(Jul.28)
Chu Yang	PC ?, repremanded (28) ?	NCYL (28)
Fan Cai Cheng	PC (28)	
Feng Ning Guang	exp. from PC (28)	
Fu Hung-chi	In Shanghai (30)	MGSU, Sec.MCP (June 31-32)
Fu Tai-keng		SC (29-30), CC(propa.)MCP (30)
Fu Zai Long	Sec.CYL, Pro Chen Du Xiu (30)	NRC (26), NCYL (29)
Huang Hai-ping	PC (28)	NCYL (29)
Huang Sheng-chi	PC Cand. (28)	
Lei Kuang-juan	PC Cand. (28) ?	NYGL (29), Sec.MCP, arre.(Apr.30)
Li Chi-sin	PC Cand.? Pres. (28) ?	
Li Seng-hsiang	PC Cand.? Pres. (28) ?	
Lim Choon Kwong	Act.Sec.MCP(34)	
Lin Chin-chung		SC (29-30), Sec.MCP (30-31),
Mah Yap-peng	PC. criticized, res.from Pres. (28)	PC, Malay work
Ong Juat-pho	PC. criticized (28)	PC, Malay work, arre.(Apr.30), CC.MCP(30)
Pan Yun Bo (?) (@Phua Tin-kiap)	PC (28)	from China, arre.(28). In Malaya 3 times (26-30)
Shieng Kien Chu		
Su Pek-ngi	PC. criticized (28)	PC. arre.(Nov.28)
Tan Gam	Obs.(28)	PC
Tan Heng Kok	PC. repremanded, Sec.(?) (28)	PC, NGLU, arre.(Aug.28)
Tan Pek Hai	PC. repremanded, Sec.(?) (28)	PC (-Aug.28)
Tan Tiu-jeng ?	repremanded (28) ?, PC ? Mem. Restored (28) ?	PC, NGLU, arre.(Aug.28)
Tang Sen Sheng	PC. warned (28) ?	
Wang Yung Hai	Shanghai (Sep.30-)	
Wong Muk-han	PC. exp. from Pres. (28)	PC (28), arre. (Sep.29)
Wu Ching (@ Hsu Tien-ping)		Sec. (29-30), CC(org.).MCP, arre.(Apr.30)
Yuan Zhuang Qi	PC (28)	
Zeng	Sec.(28) , To China	
Zhang Zhen	PC Cand. (28)	
Zheng Shun	Act.SC.MCP(34)	

Notes

exp. : expelled. res.: resigned. are.: arrested. Obs.: observer.
Cand.: Candidate. Mem.: membership. Pres. Presidium. Sec.: secretary. SC: Standing Committee
NRC: Nanyang Regional Committee.

Table 6 Exchanged Documents							
	1-1 From the Comintern						
	Date	Author(s)	Title/Subject	Reached?	Relation	Inclination	State
							note
1	Jan., Oct. 1929	CC., CCP	Instruction	O		bour-democ, armed insu.	Fed. of Republics
2	23 Oct. 1930	ES	to FEB	O	comment on 5)	Malay, Indian work	
3	17 Dec. 1930	FEB	Instruction	x ?	comment on 7)?	Armed insu. denied	
4	1 Feb. 1931	AAS	to CCP	O ?		to be guided by the CCP	
5	1 Feb. 1931	ES	to AAS	O			
6	14 Apr. 1931	ES	to MCP	?			a)
7	20 May. 1931	FEB?	to AAS	O	reply to 10)	unified CC urged	
8	22 May. 1931	Gordon	to AAS	# O		Malay, Indian work	
9	3 Jul. 1931	ES	Instruction	O ?		gen.strike dinied	
10	8 Jul. 1931	ES	Instruction	x ?	→12p.program?	should depart from CCP	Soviet Rep. of M.
11	23 May. 1933	Comintern	Resolutions	# x?		anti-social democratism	b)
12	1 Jun. 1934	Comintern	Instruction	# O		guide neighbouring parties	
13	25 Jan. 1935	AAS	to MCP	?			na
14	1936	Comintern	Directive	#	united front line	mass united front	c)
	1-2 Reports which were not known whether sent to the MCP						
	27 Jul. 1935	Comintern	on affiliation				
	15 Jan.1942	Dashevskii		?			
	7 Feb.1942	Reviewers		?			
	Notes						
	O Reached, x Not reached # Intercepted						
	a) Anna, op., cit., p.460.						
	b) Cheah Boon Kheng, op., cit., pp.27, 71.						
	This was not recorded in the Comintern Files.						
	This SB document quoted by Cheah noted the XIIIth Plenum of EC of the Comintern was						
	held in Dec.1932. But it was held in Dec.1933. The said Plenum should be the XIth						
	Plenum held in Aug.-Sep.1932.						
	c) C. F. Yong, op., cit., pp.195, 242.						

Table 6 Exchanged Documents (cont.)								
	2-1 From the NPC/MCP (Malaya)							
	Date	Author(s)	Title/Subject		Relation	Inclination	State	Note
1)	Aug. 1928	CC, NPC	Report on the Congress	O		moderate		From Shanghai?
2)	15 Mar. 1930	CC, NPC	Agree to the Comintern	O				
3)	1 May. 1930	CC?, MCP	Resolutions, Notice	O			Fed. of Republics	
4)	1 Jun. 1930	CC, MCP	Foundation of the MCP	O				
5)	Mid-1930	Ho Chi Minh?	Resolutions	O		armed insurrection		
6)	6 Aug. 1930	CC?, MCP	Report on the Party	O				
7)	15 Nov. 1930	CC, MCP	Analyses on Malaya	O				
8)	25 Nov. 1930	CC?, MCP	Report on the Party, TU	O				
9)	2 Jan. 1931	CC?, MCP	Report on the Party	O		armed insurrection	w-p dict.	
10)	7 Feb. 1931	CC?, MCP	Strategy	O	Reply to 3?	uprising denied		
11)	Oct.- Dec. 1932	CC, MCP	Resolutions, Circulars	O		anti-imperialist		
12)	5 Apr. 1933	CC?, MCP	Resolution	O				
13)	10 Aug. 1933	CC?, MCP	Tasks	O		anti-imperialist	w-p. govt.	
14)	5 Sep. 1933	CC?, MCP	Resolution	O				
15)	18 Mar. 1934	CC, MCP	Party regulation	O				
16)	20 Mar. 1934	CC?, MCP	on the PKI	O				
17)	24 Mar. 1934	CC?, MCP	on the Party	O		Malay, Indian work		
18)	15 Aug. 1934	Kok Kong	Kok Bun (Shanghai)	# x	Reply to 12			
19)	27 Aug. 1934	Kok Kong	Kok Bun (Shanghai)	# x			(until 1935	
20)	27 Aug. 1934	Kwong	Lieu Ts Oen (Shanghai)	# x			Sov. Rep. of M)	a)
21)	26 Mar. 1936	CC, MCP	CC, CCP	# x		anti-fascist united front		
22)	Mid 1939	CC?, MCP	VI Enlarged Plenum	O		collective security with BI	All M. Congress	
23)	Late 1939	SC, MCP	Assessment of the policy	O		anti-British		

24)	13 Jun. 1939	SC, MCP	Resolutions	O		moderate		
25)	24 Jan. 1940	SC, MCP	Resolutions	O		anti-Imp. anti-exclusionism	Democ. Rep.	
26)	9 Feb. 1940	CEC, MCP	Manifesto	O		anti-Imp. united front	Democ. Rep.	
28)	6 Apr. 1940	CSC, MCP	Decisions	O		economic struggle		
	2-2 From the NPC/MCP (Shanghai)							
	Date	Author(s)	Title					
29)	26 Dec.1930	Shien Kien Chu	To the FEB	O				
30)	28 Dec.1930	Wang Yung Hai	To the FEB	O				
31)	1931	?	Trade Union Movement	O				From Malaya?

Notes

Fed.: Federated. Sov.: Soviet. Rep.: Republic. w-p dict.: worker-peasant dictatorship.

a) "Reviewers" said: "until 1935 'Soviet Republic of Malaya'. Since then, 'Anti-Imperialist National United Front'".

Table 7 Secretary of the NPC & MCP			
assumption	name		notes
NPC			
Jan. 1928	Cheung Hong - seng		
mid-1928 ?	Zeng		a)
July. 1928	Chen (Bo Hai?)		a)
1929	Wu Ching (Hsu Tien-ping)		
MCP			
Apr. 1930	Lei Kwang-juan		
May. 1930	Lim Chin-chung		
Jun. 1931	Fu Hung-chi		
Mar. 1932	Ho Wen-han		
Jul. 1932	Ch'en Liang		b)
Early 1934	Lim Choon Kwong	acting	b), c)
1935	Au Teck-siu		
Sep. 1936	Ts'ai Pai-yun		
Jan. 1937	?		
Apr. 1939	Lai Teck	Sec. Gen.	

Notes

a) See Chapter I.

b) See Chapter VII.

c) Hara, op., cit., p.48.

Others; C. F. Yong, op., cit. pp.166, 181, 182.