

People and Developments at NACPU: Beginning with An Email from Wu Huiqiu

Hunter Huang

I. An Article about Justice

On 2 February 2009, Mr. Wu sent me an email: "It's been a year since National Association for China's Peaceful Unification (NACPU) went through leadership transition. The gate of the Board is always open to you. Please keep your enthusiasm and wait. Now NACPU's structure is complete; our activities are ahead of others. Over the past decade or so, we jointly oppose Taiwan independence and advocate China's unification in the spirit of mutual assistance. During the struggling process, we are partners instead of enemies. Please do not complain everywhere you go because that will marginalize you. Ms. He and I can never feel sorry for what you have done and what you have said" (please visit mrunification.com to read Mr. Wu's original email).

A sage used to say: without reading history and current affairs, one cannot develop any deep knowledge; one may not see lies in front of him and be aware of malicious people at his or her back; if errors are not corrected, then true principles cannot become evident.

During the so-called leadership transition, Mr. Wu inserted his gang of four into NACPU's board illegally. On 22 December 2007, he used the method of the red guards and swept me, "a pioneer at the front-line of China's unification" (written on 28 March 2007), out of the organization. He achieved what Taipei's secret agents had failed to accomplish over three decades. A army may lose its leader, but no one should lose his or her will power. Mr. Wu's tricks could occupy the organization nominally, but he cannot grasp the NACPU's principles: transparency, justice, diligence and bravery. These principles have been growing inside me for over six decades since 1947.

NACPU is a small independent organization among 31.6 million others. To breach the containment and isolation of Taipei's secret agents, I frequently distributed recommendation letters and invited people to join the organization. On 14 September 1997, Mr. Li recommended Mr. Wu as NACPU's vice president, and I accepted the proposal with joy. In 1986, because my mother in law was sick, my wife applied to visit Taiwan. Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) required her not to take my articles to Taiwan; or else, she would not be allowed to see her mother for the last time. Hence I expected Mr. Wu to establish a website for NACPU so that my writings could be accessible to Taiwanese readers.

II. Eight Years of Website Building

On 12 September 1999 and 30 April 2000, Mr. T invited Mr. Wu to speak with me with regards to building a NACPU website. Wu asked for \$200 to buy a scanner. I provided all of NACPU's documents for Wu to place on the website and told him about the organization and its membership in detail.

On 12 December 2003, Mr. P invited Wu and He to a dinner and expressed the hope that we would form solidarity among ourselves. I strongly believed that if I write, He types, and Wu puts our efforts online, the three of us will become one, and the seed of China's peaceful unification will blossom eventually.

On 17 January 2004, I attended a dinner party held for George Washington University's scholars, called on them not to forget China's unification when doing their research, and established a GWU Association for China's Peaceful Unification. On 13 March 2004, I advocated the idea at University of Maryland. In October 2005, I did the same at Peking University and Tsinghua University. When the students visited our website, they all told me that the website lacked substantive content. I felt surprised and embarrassed.

Taiwan came under a pro-independence government in 2000, a critical time for us to oppose Taiwan independence and advocate China's unification. However, between 1998 and 2005, NACPU's website continued to lack any real content. After serious self-reflections and self-criticisms, I started to learn how to use computer on 2006/4/9 in my 80s, in addition to asking Wu to revise NACPU's website.

On 2 December 2005 and 5 December 2005, Wu and He told me on the phone that the website had been improved. Yet Wu changed his statement on 13 December 2005: "The website is currently inaccessible to the outside." On 10 February 2005, Wu said that "I have a lot of work myself; to advocate China's unification is Mr. Peng's job, and he should do more. We need to maintain our independence instead of listening to Peng's aimless command, not to mention that we don't have enough funds left." Wu had worked on the unification project for 11 years, but did everything he did have to be paid by public fund? I spent 40 years working for China's unification and paid everything on my own. Whose aimless command do I need to listen to?

In April 2006, I saw two of my articles and two of Wu's articles on our organization's website; each of the other leaders also had one online. On 20 August 2006, I invited Wu to set up columns for Shen Min (known as the "flying general") and five other contributors. On 13 October 2007, I asked to link NACPU's website with Wang Shengwei's and Li Zhizhong's. In August 2007, Wu wrote in NACPU's 2007 Activity Summary (Item 18, Point 1) that "NACPU's website, since its establishment by Wu in 2001, has been updated on a timely manner, rich in content and well-decorated with a mixture of words and graphics." Wu asked for my opinion when the Activity Summary was submitted. I thought Wu was lying both to people above and those below.

Since Wu established the website, it was inaccessible to the outside during the eight years between 1998 and 2005. When Wu used the measure of red guards illegally to discharge me from NACPU on 22 December 2007, I asked other people to help me establish a website. It took less than two days, and the whole world was able to see it on 2 January 2008. Why was there such a huge difference? Can Wu reflect on that? He is not interested in China's unification, but passionate about promotion and titles.

Wu always lacked interest in website construction, promotion of the organization's affairs, seminar coordination, struggle with Taiwan independence movement, and advocacy of China's unification. When NACPU co-hosted the "Global Conference for Oversea Chinese to Oppose Taiwan Independence and Facilitate China's Unification" (20 November 2000), Mr. Cheng told me that Wu never cared to ask a single question about the organization's affairs. Out of 11 preparatory meetings, Wu only attended two. Wu did not attend NACPU's seminar discussion with a delegation of the Revolutionary Committee on 20 June 1999 (I even asked Jia Yibin, Vice President of the Revolutionary Committee, to invite Wu to Beijing), nor did he attend NACPU's seminar discussion on "two-country discourse" on 28 August 1999. In 2001, Wu refused to participate in the May 20 Protest against Taiwan Independence. On 25 March 2002, Wu did not participate in the seminar entitled "Anti-Terrorism, Anti-Taiwan Independence." On 12 February 2004, NACPU held a referendum on opposition to Taiwan independence on Capitol Hill. Wu refused to prepare for the event with the excuse that he was flying back to China on 1 January 2004 to serve as a department chair at his Alma Mater. Wu refused to take part in the 9/18 Parade in Memory of China's Resistance against Japan as well as the protest in front of TECRO every Saturday. In almost 10 years, various overseas Associations for China's Peaceful Unification held more than 10 conferences opposing Taiwan independence, but Wu did not participate in any single one of them.

III. Five Promotions over Five Years

Wu's lack of interest in China's unification has numerous examples. To oppose Taiwan independence and facilitate China's universities is a grand project, not a lucrative title to hold. Yet when Jia Qinglin began to serve as the leader of Beijing's Association for China's Unification, Wu said "very good." A few days later, on 19 October 2004, Wu asked me to promote him to be Executive Vice President. I agreed. On 18 November 2005, Wu asked me to raise him to Co-President. In order to let Wu improve NACPU's website as soon as possible, I agreed reluctantly. On 4 November 2006, Wu became the chairman of U.S. Association for China's Peaceful Unification. He achieved the position intentionally through illegal means. In January 2007, Wu became the chairman for the Global Summit Forum for China's Peaceful Unification. Was it a self-assigned position? In January 2008, he illegally became both the Executive President of the All-America Alliance for China's Peaceful Unification as well as the only President of NACPU. Within five years, Wu went through five promotions.

In fact, before I discovered Wu's manipulation of the website, I told Wu and He over ten times that they should inherit my work as early as possible to let me focus on my writing. Since I unilaterally explained the details of NACPU's history and membership to Wu and He, they knew everything about the organization and, because of the difficulties lying ahead of the project, refused to take over the leadership.

When he rose to become the Co-President, Wu excluded his dissidents, such as Chen, Liu, Xiao, Shen, Zhang, and Wang. Internally, Wu formed his own faction of four within NACPU. Externally, he used the donation from Jiang Hongfeng, issued titles to others, lost 24 documents, and wrote letters to demonize me. In addition, he decided to prevent me from accessing

NACPU's information. With control over NACPU's website, Wu achieved monopoly over everything about the organization and kept me outside.

On 16 November 2007, NACPU organized a global summit forum, my highest goal over the past 60 years of activism. I asked the Associations for China's Peaceful Unification in Beijing and Taipei as well as the All China Taiwanese Association to co-sponsor the event. Or we could co-sponsor the summit with GWU's Student Association for China's Peaceful Unification and the All America Chinese Youth Association for China's Peaceful Unification. All of them answered positively. However, arguing that GWU's Student Association for China's Peaceful Unification was not registered, Wu rejected the idea of co-sponsoring the event. He lacked the understanding of collaborating with other organizations on a grand project and always pursued monopoly. Since Peng agreed with Wu's dictatorial position, I had nothing to say.

IV. Discharge from NACPU

In feudal times, members of a family could not listen to outsiders, the rich could not work for the poor, and the commoners could not compare themselves with the ruling class. When Wu returned from Beijing in June 2007, he became more arrogant, not only trying to marginalize me but also to sweep me out of the organization on 22 December 2007. According to him, "poured water cannot be retrieved."

His domineering attitude reminded me of Ning Hui-e, a journalist who slept in my house with four of his colleagues on 11 January 1984. After reading my article "No interest in personal longevity, but strong desire for China's unification" (18 September 1982), Ning said that "there are two ways of working on China's unification..." "First, do business in Beijing in the name of peaceful unification. Or, commit time, resources and even life, as revolutionary martyrs. Theoretically, the second method is glorious, but that does not help. Beijing will by no means trust you, no matter how good you are. They always rely on their own people, and benefits are shared among themselves. You are sacrificing yourself in vain." Yet I am into justice instead of money and did not believe what Ning said. I was also reminded of Lin Zexu, who said that "as long as the nation achieves unification and revival, I am willing to sacrifice my life to make it happen and will not avoid it because of difficulties." Finally, I recalled my own promise: prepare to sacrifice personal health, happiness, or even life to pursue China's peaceful unification ("Launch the Peaceful Unification Movement," 1 September 1982).

As a result, I decided that as long as Wu could manage the summit forum well and bring benefits to China's peaceful unification, I would tolerate his monopoly over NACPU. Wu wanted to raise funds. I asked to sell "Huang Qizhi's Collection" (four volumes) in Beijing twice and told him that if the return was not enough, I would be willing to give out more to fulfill my obligation. Yet Wu saw me as an enemy and refused to let me sell my books for NACPU's purpose. He pretended that I did not even exist (See Wu's activity summary on 26 November 2007, which he sent to me in an email on 29 November 2007).

On 13 August 1943, I wrote in my diary: By writing diary consistently, I would cultivate the spirit of persistence, endurance, and politeness, all of which would become the preconditions for me to serve society and the people. After over seven decades of struggle, I am confident that I am the most tolerant, but most resentful of people who pursue private benefits at the cost of public interests and justice.

V. Deception

Upon reading Wu's Activity Summary with regard to the Summit Forum on 26 November 2007, I thought the report was a lie to outsiders, and a unacceptable attempt to cover up facts internally.

To manipulate construction materials when building a dam, a house, a bridge or a road will cause harm on the local level, but that is still absolutely not allowed. To facilitate China's peaceful unification is a splendid, historical project, the starting point and foundation for China's cultural revival to coexist with world peace. Since Columbus discovered America in 1492, occupied land and robbed the continent of its resources, humans have been fighting with each other for five centuries. today, the earth needs a rest badly. At the critical moment for peace, the 2007 Global Summit Forum for China's Peaceful Unification could not allow dishonest, low-quality work as well as the pursuit of personal wealth and fame at the cost of public interests. In the age of Internet and information, a lie will harm the liar ten times harder than the targets. A deceptive attempt may start quickly, but it ends fast as well. NACPU's 2007 Activity Summary was inconsistent with the spirits of transparency, justice, diligence and bravery, or the spirit of the 17th National Congress of the Chinese Communist Party: pragmatism. NACPU need to be revised thoroughly!

VI. A Not So Noble Summit Forum

On 1 December 2007, I listened to Professor Min Weifang's interpretation of the 17th National Congress. As the President of NACPU and the Forum, I wrote to Wu and He, demanding an activity summary on the Summit Forum and a review meeting, just like the 17th National Congress: raise questions courageously and implement corrective measures instead of boasting of achievements. I would like to ask the following questions:

1. How were the Forum's President and Vice President chosen? Before the Forum, was it legal to name a guest as the President within 12 hours?
2. Why did the date of the Forum change four times? Why was the date different on the fliers distributed in Shaoxing, Macao, Taiwan and Washington D.C.? Who made the decision? Why were 600 copies distributed at Macao?
3. Why did the promotional literature say "NACPU expects your support" and "Your support will be answered with a support from the organization?" Wu said he had printed out 200 copies of the literature, which cost over \$200. He insisted that they should not be changed. I told him I would pay, and he made the revision. Who paid for the consequence? No answer yet.
4. The badge of NACPU is composed of three doves representing peace and flying neck-and-neck. On 5 September 2007, Wu wrote to Chairman Wang Jinping that the badge should have

only one dove. What does this represent? Monopoly? Wu also unilaterally changed the address and contact information of the organization to his home.

5. I always encountered problems when trying to reach Wu via fax. On 26 July 2007, I tried to send my article "An Criticism of Taiwan's Referendum to pursue UN membership" six times over 105 minutes. Why?

6. Wu expected that the Forum would receive 500 guests. In reality, we received 130 guests from abroad, 20 from other U.S. locations, and 60 locally (one fifty of the expected size; many older leaders of Chinese American communities did not participate), 210 in total (almost equal to the number I had been able to gather as an individual for NACPU's 30th anniversary in 2002). In the Activity Summary, however, Wu said that the event was extremely popular and received a large number of applications. Wasn't this a lie? NACPU had bought 500 gifts for our participants. Wasn't this a waste? Was the airfare paid?

7. Wu proposed that the Forum should welcome experts on Taiwan from the U.S. and the Greater China to speak. Why didn't we receive any representative from Hong Kong, Macao, and Taiwan? We had heard that Taiwan would send two delegations. Why didn't anyone arrive at the last minute? Even the globally renowned Guo Junci didn't come. Was it because Wu insisted that he should be the only director of the event?

8. Why didn't any U.S. officials or congressmen/congresswomen show up? Why didn't any one of them send a greeting letter? Only one expert from a think tank showed up. Was it irrelevant to the fact that Wu illegally dictated the invitations?

9. Wu expected the Forum to cost almost \$80,000 and asked me to donate money. I visited Beijing twice at my own expense and many agreed to buy my books or provide sponsorship. Wu and He agreed to establish a Unification Fund at San Fransisco on 30 April 2007 and promote the integration of younger immigrants and older ones. It's been 22 months. How much money has been gathered? Why would Wu isolate older immigrants locally while trying to integrate with older immigrants at San Fransisco?

10. The Forum did not discuss a declaration, nor did it conclude with a closing ceremony. Before the evening performance on the 18th, Wu closed the office of the Forum, checked out from the hotel, and left without telling us. Those guests who were returning on the 19th did not know what to do and complained about the irresponsible arrangement.

On 16 May 2005, I told Wu: "You are doing well. Recently I let you completely in charge of NACPU in the hope that you will take over the position as soon as possible." Wu answered that "Our work needs you. It is not enough for you to be an Honorary President. As for the specific arrangement, He, you and I need to discuss as a group before we make a decision." On 13 October 2005, I discovered for the first time that Wu lied about spending eight years in building the website. What was his intention? I began to be suspicious of him. As a result, on 18 November 2005, I only agreed to let Wu be NACPU's Co-President.

ON 12 January 2006, a senior official told me that "You are the steer of the organization; your position is irreplaceable; if you have any request in the future, ask Wu and He and let them do it for you; if there is anything inappropriate about them, feel free to let us know. Internal coordination and solidarity is the most important." Because Wu controlled the computer, he

never wanted solidarity with me sincerely. Peng also kept some distance from me. I was consequently marginalized and eventually cut off from the organization.

VII. The People Have Four Rights

Wen Jiabao said that the people have four rights: the right to know, the right to participate, the right to express ideas, and the right to supervise. I am the founding President of NACPU. Why did I not enjoy any right during the Summit Forum? I will reflect on my situation according to the spirit of 17th National Congress and pursue my rights based on the spirit of the 7/7 Resistance.

Before NACPU was registered officially on 22 January 2007, it was run by myself individually. Over 35 years, I committed my life to the preservation of the organization despite various kinds of difficulties. Did Wu join the organization so as to share the dividends? On 21 March 2007, Wu wrote to Jiang Hongfeng and invited him to be our advisor. Wu said that "I made the decision unilaterally. It was an exception since I did not wait for a group meeting according to the rule. Thanks for your financial support." How much did Jiang donate? How much did Wei Yu give? What was the total? How much was spent?

On 15 December and 22 December 2005, Wu illegally changed an organization review meeting to a constitution revision meeting. Moreover, Wu made himself the only NACPU President based on his new, illegitimate constitution. What kind of lesson would such an incident leave? How would he be able to improve the organization in the future? On the eve of the review meeting, Wu had called me and described me as the steer.

Before Wu usurped the position of Chairman for the All America Alliance for China's Peaceful Unification, our partner organizations in North Carolina, South Carolina, New York, Washington and Taiwan had been well-connected and highly responsive to any new development in the Taiwan independence movement. After the two years since Wu became the Chairman, has the project of China's peaceful unification improved as Wu said? Or is it much worse?

As I became marginalized, Wu shared with me NACPU's documents only when he felt glad to do so; when he did not feel glad, he would not keep me informed at all. That reminded me of my experience as a child laborer 70 years ago. When my master felt happy, I would be able to eat more; when he felt unhappy, I would eat less. That was during China's Resistance War against Japan. No one led a good life. When I was a teenager, my material life was poor and exploited. In my 80s, is my spiritual life exploited? Should I be dependent on Wu? What kind of world do I live in if a volunteer for China's unification is constantly exploited? Since "we have been united as one over more than one decade" and "we fully understand where my commitment lies," why can't Wu comprehend my status and intention, but used the method of red guards to discharge me from the organization? Why was I prevented from speaking and participating in democratic discussion at the review meeting (22 December 2007) or the seminar (22 December 2008)? On the eve of the seminar (21 December 2008), Wu sent me an email asking me to discuss NACPU's activity in year 2007 on the following day. I truly felt that the review meeting, which had been postponed for a year, would be my day of vindication.

Wu emphasized that the meeting on 22 December 2007 was NACPU's first democratic election, an internal matter that did not require an outside party to coordinate. "If you would like to publicize it in the news and be open, that's your right and freedom" (14 February 2008). With patience, a strong belief in peaceful development and the intention to hide the organization's embarrassment from the outside, I tolerated and hoped. Forty months has passed, and spring is coming again. I can say directly that Wu's so-called democratic election is an illegitimate and deceptive conspiracy.

VIII. Election Conspiracy

1. According to the rule, revision of NACPU's constitution needs to be passed by its members (Wu violated the rule);
2. According to the rule, members who pay membership fees have the right to vote and be voted for (Wu violated the rule);
3. According to the rule, before each election, a democratic discussion is required (Wu violated the rule);
4. According to the record, what happened on 15 December 2007 and 22 December 2005 should have been a review meeting, not an election for president (W violated the rule);
5. After Wu and He gave a brief report on the organization's activity, Wu's gang of four used the method of red guards, hijacked the meeting, pounced the table, shrieked, quarreled, and made excessive noise to force the meeting to become an election. In America's heartland (Wu's description of Washington D.C.), such an election is not acceptable (I wrote down for myself: maintain the peace of your mind, coexist with others and tolerate differences, and wait).
6. I opposed the result of the election (together with Lu Mei, President of Peking University Alumni) and argued with the gang of four. In the last scheduled minute of the meeting, Wu and He distributed their self-made election tickets. I announced the conclusion of the meeting immediately and did not participate in the illegal election.
7. Wu printed tickets illegally and commissioned others to vote on his behalf. If U.S. Senators need to vote, they can't even ask for sick leaves or ask other people to vote for them.
8. Commissioned votes were not reviewed or authenticated and therefore should be invalid.
9. Wu's self-directed election was a conspiracy. From printing unofficial tickets to making fake votes, the process was entirely dishonest, undemocratic and short of transparency.
10. During the board meetings on 24 February 2007, 15 December 2007 and 22 December 2007, the number of attendees did not exceed half of the number defined by the constitution.
11. Wu's election seriously violated Beijing's 10 regulations on leadership transition.
12. After the meeting on 22 December 2007, Wu released a deceptive report on the World Journal. Wu wrote that "21 board members attended the board meeting, and 18 of them (86%) chose Wu to be the new NACPU President. According to the constitution as well as Huang Qizhi's will, Huang will serve in the organization's honorary position to help prepare for the Summit Forum and provide constructive advice." Can Wu list the 21 board members who reportedly attended the meeting? Based on the above-mentioned reasons, I need to fight for my rights. I am the legal President. To rob a bank, you don't own the money legally because the money is in your hands.

IX. Four Lessons

After an official in Taiwan was found to have engaged in deceptive or illegal activities, he was sentenced for 10 years. In Jiangxi, an official who violated the law lost his position. Only in NACPU did a violator manage to be promoted to the top leadership. Why? Wu lacks any sense of law; he believes that he masters law as long as he enjoys power. That is an embarrassment of NACPU, and 12 December 2007 should be the organization's Day of Humiliation.

A sage used to say that when an evil person holds a top position, he will spread his evilness to the public. Consequently, society will be contaminated and spirit damaged. A sage also said that a country or organization can prosper because of an individual; it can also collapse because of an individual. A successful organization requires a self-less leader who is willing to sacrifice first and enjoy life later. Before the 1980s, nine out of ten organizations established by older Chinese immigrants succeeded because of one individual and collapsed because of one. Over 40 years, NACPU is the only durable organization that survived and remains strong. Because my mind has become open, I don't believe in the argument that "the rich could not work for the poor, and the commoners could not compare themselves with the ruling class." Instead, I believe that the evil cannot overwhelm the just. When justice is in my hand, I am strong enough to confront thousands of hundreds of challengers.

Thirty-one years ago, I wrote in my article "Counter Sue the Lawyer and Judge" (28 April 1980) that "I am politically useless, but I will spawn and burn the remaining value of the useless to release the last piece of heat and warm up millions of kind hearts." In a society that pursues wealth and power at the expense of justice, I won't hurt others or be hurt by others. Moreover, I am unwilling to see other kind Chinese immigrants hurt. However, I am willing to sacrifice my personal well-being to make a tiny bit of contribution to the common dreams shared by humanity and the prosperity of the 21 century. Yet the shared dreams of humanity cannot be achieved by a single individual, nor can it be accomplished within two decades. Therefore I would like to publish the pursuit of justice within NACPU and hope to have your help to nurture the seed of China's peaceful unification, cultivate it with care, let it take roots and blossom in the light of justice and national unity. Please visit mrunification.com to read more.

Author: Huang Qizhi (Hunter)

Drafted on 9 March 2009 and finished on 4 July 2011

PS:

1. General Shen Min, NACPU's honorary president, and Dr. Qin Deqian, NACPU's founding member, each committed 40 years to China's national unification and the Chinese nation's revival. Their writing consisted of over a million characters. Unfortunately, both passed away in 2008. The article is in memory of them.
2. Wu emailed me again on 19 March 2009 and said that "what do you really want? As long as you tell me directly, I can report to the board (my note: all board members were named by Wu)

and will support you as best as I can.” Hence I wrote down the four points which Chou En-lai had raised during the KMT-CCP negotiations on 12 January 1946:

1. Recognize each other instead of looking at each other with enmity;
2. Discuss with each other instead of making unilateral decisions;
3. Make concessions to each other instead of dominate each other
4. To compete with each other instead of countering each other

I hope NACPU's board and friends of the organization will consider my writing seriously to benefit cross-Strait peaceful development. The article received additional content on 24 March 2009 and was finalized and published online on 4 July 2011.