

中国人是不是人？
Are Chinese People Not Humans?

Translated by Hemant Adlakha
Honorary Fellow, ICS, and Associate Professor,
Centre for Chinese and Southeast Asian Studies, JNU, New Delhi
haidemeng@gmail.com



Image: Ding Zhongli asks: Are we Chinese not human?
Source: aydaynews.cc

Article title in Chinese: 中国人是不是人？

Article source: Lin Aiyue Blog post

https://www.163.com/dy/article/G9NMK4S30515PPQC.html?f=post2020_dy_recommends

(Published in Chinese on 10-05-21)

Author: 林爱玥

The ICS is an interdisciplinary research institution, which has a leadership role in the promotion of Chinese and East Asian Studies in India. ICS Translations aims to introduce views of the P R China scholars, analysts, and commentators coming from across disciplines.

Editor's note

The question 中国人是不是人? first captured everyone's imagination in China when well-known TV journalist cum anchor 柴静 Chái jìng interviewed 丁仲礼 Dīng Zhònglǐ for CCTV¹ in 2015. Ding Zhongli, at the time of interview, was vice president of the China Academy of Sciences and China's representative at the IPCC at the UN. Subsequently, Ding, a geologist and politician, was appointed president of China Democratic League, one of the political parties in the People's Republic of China and vice chairperson of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress in 2017 and in 2018, respectively. Since December last year, Ding, along with other 13 NPC vice chairpersons remains under sanctions imposed by the US Department of Treasury for "undermining Hong Kong's autonomy and restricting the freedom of expression or assembly."

Summary

It is not only hypocritical but reflects on the ugly face of the West for demanding high standards for the others but very low requirements for themselves.

On 6 May, a US company called Rhodium Group released a new "survey report" on carbon emissions. The Report points out, China's greenhouse gas emissions are higher than that of all the developed countries

combined. Despite numerous flaws in its objectivity, authenticity and scientific character, the "investigative report" is being treated as treasure trove by the western media. Media such as CNN and BBC have been since screaming out to the world, saying: "China's greenhouse gas emissions in 2019 accounted for 27% of the world's total emissions, the largest by any country. The United States accounts for 11% and is the second largest polluter. The third place is India, which accounts for about 6.6% of global greenhouse gas emissions."



Image: TV 'star' journalist Chai Jing who interviewed Academician Ding Zhongli in 2015
Source: medium.com

Nothing is known about the source of the data compiled by the report, but its conclusion that China and the US accounted for 27% and 11% greenhouse gas emissions in 2019 respectively, is nevertheless not untrue. In 2019, the total population of China and the US stood at 1.4 billion and 330 million respectively – China being more than 4 times populated than America. However, China's total emissions are only 2.45 times that of the US. Furthermore, in terms of per capita emissions, China's only a little more than half of the United States. Meaning, whichever way one may look at it, it is disadvantage China.

¹<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=d6SOV4FX1DE>

Or someone might say China's population is same as that of India but how come India's emissions are as low as 6.6%? Such people, in my view, suffer from low IQ. Secondly, why China should be compared with India and not with the United States? India is an agricultural country and China is industrial economy. Is it comparable? Not to mention, Indians are still depending on drinking cow urine to fight corona virus!

The right to carbon emissions means right to development. China's approach to emission reduction is very clear and positive, but this should not mean China sacrifice its development. Or in other words, China's emission reduction should not come at the expense of development. If at all China is made to sacrifice development, it should be sacrifice by all. Chinese people are kind, but kindness does not mean being foolish. Any conspiracy aimed at stopping China's development is bound to end up in a joke.



Image: Chai Jing's controversial Environment docufilm Under The Dome (2015) earned her the title Pollution Crusader

Source: senseofchina.com

Unlike on the Japanese tepid attitude on the issue of discharging nuclear sewage into the ocean, this time, the Swedish environment saviour Thunberg too has joined the issue. Using her personal Twitter account, she tweeted on 7 May, stating: "Unless China completely changes its course, we will not be able to solve the climate crisis." It is obvious that the US per capita emissions are nearly twice that of China, but Thunberg is targeting only China. There is a Chinese saying: some people are lame-ass.

The truth is Thunberg did not surprise me at all as something similar to her logic we had learnt long time ago. In April 2010, President Obama had said in an interview with the Australian media, if Chinese people start living like the Americans and Australians, then all of us will fall into a miserable situation. Obama reckoned that the American population was only 300 million, and if China's over 1 billion people acquired the American living standards, then they will consume a lot of natural resources and may even exceed the earth's endurance limit. Hence, it is necessary that the Chinese find some other way (of living).

Don't you see any similarity in Thunberg's "change of course" and Obama's "way of living?" The question is why only China must change? What about America? It is this discriminatory attitude that compels me to wonder what Ding Zingli had said a few years

ago: *Are we Chinese not humans? (Emphasis added)*

Let me dare ask those who look at China with coloured glasses, if we Chinese are humans, then why not Americans, Germans, the British but only the Chinese must change? I am sorry, if you do not regard we Chinese as humans then why should we treat you as humans? Why are you special?

Let me switch topic for a while. In 2013, the American “Chicken Feather Show” organised a “Children’s Round Table Conference,” in which they were asked to express opinion on the issue of the US government shutdown. On being asked how to payback 1.3 trillion USD the US owed to China, a child’s reply shocked everyone: we should crossover to the other side of the earth and kill all the Chinese. The child’s answer was dismissed as a “joke.” When China posted a photo of fire (this is with reference to a recent article in Chinese media juxtaposing China’s satellite launch with a picture showing mass dead bodies burning in an open funeral ground in India) you accused China of being “inhuman,” “showing no empathy.” And when people abroad say Kill all Chinese you say it was a joke! You think you have a great sense of humour, do you? Come on, be yourself! If Chinese children say kill all Americans, you will scream and cry out loud condemning China’s “education and political systems, right?”



Image: In December 2020, US sanctions all 14 vice chairmen/women of the NPC including Ding Zhongli
Source: gnews.org

Don’t you see hypocritical and ugly face of the media, the politicians and the “environmentalists” in the West? For everything related to China they have set very high standards. But the requirements for themselves are rather low. If one follows their logic, only they can enjoy to eat more, to possess more. When it is China, the Chinese must “look for other means.” Why can’t they themselves look the other way? Is it because they are born with a golden spoon and the Chinese are “destined” to live a wretched life?

In fact, it is not only the hypocritical and the ugly West who have high standards for others while least requirement from themselves. Just the other day, a fellow Chinese accused me of making money by writing “patriotic” commentaries and advised that I “stop doing yeoman and stop being a sycophant.” Although he (the fellow Chinese) was 大帽子 *Dà màozi* [*Dà màozi* is a Chinese slang or political metaphor prevalent during the Cultural Revolution, when anyone could be easily labeled as class enemy or counter revolutionary

– *editor*] or putting labels on me right, left and centre, but to be fair to him, at least he did not challenge my point of view. Instead, he was merely questioning the manner in which I was expressing myself.

Anyway, idleness has no substitute, let me give this much credit to the fellow netizen who accused me of making money by being “patriotic.” The truth is, I am happy being rewarded with a dozen or so readers appreciating my writings. To write my articles, I go to internet café nearby after dinner (as I can’t smoke at home). I spend 20 Yuan as internet fee, 10 Yuan for a set of Chinese tea and 20 Yuan for a pack of cigarettes; to some people 50 Yuan spent to write one article might seem nothing when compared with big “fortune” I am paid for the article! Thank you for your support anyway – I might be losing some money “occasionally” by writing but my overall “earning” is indeed great! But let me request this fellow netizen to answer this: don’t I deserve to at least earn money for two packets of cigarettes for having to go out and spend family time in internet café? Don’t I deserve at least earn some pittance for spending hours putting words together which make some sense? Or let me put to him a crude question: won’t I earn much more if my time was spent in washing dishes at the KFC outlet next door?



Image: Prof. Ding Zhongli was appointed President, China Academy of Sciences in 2014

Source: asianscientist.com

Of course, I don’t deny there might be this thriving “patriotic business,” but as I see it, such people who earn their living by writing “patriotic” articles might only be handful. Isn’t there this saying that the eyes of the masses are all discerning? Isn’t it true that it is not hard to distinguish a “false” patriot from a genuine one? Therefore, to “label” everyone as fraud just because there are some people out there who “survive” because of their false “patriotic earning,” is to me very unfair and unscrupulous.

According to what this fellow netizen had to say in the screen shot, if it is true that by writing patriotic articles one cannot earn living, on the other hand someone actually doing brisk business out of “patriotic writings,” then “to earn one’s living by exploiting peoples’ patriotic feelings” is tantamount to indulging in most boring and most meaningless conversation. You can very well imagine, people being realistic and practical, it is not easy to be rewarded financially by relying on writing patriotic commentaries. On the other hand, if it were possible then imagine the

heavy burden of living with its mental costs or psychological shackles? What will happen to the life of such people?

An easy and simple answer is: if you can't afford it, then be discreet about it. Or in other words, this would mean many people knowingly or unknowingly avoid writing patriotic commentaries. Because after all if by writing patriotic articles if you become a "victim" of ethical judgement or morality, then you better stay away from it. Therefore, my standpoint is just opposite to that of the view expressed in the screen shot mentioned above. In my view, if one has the talent and the capability, then one must not be judged ethically or morally for writing such commentaries. On the contrary, such commentaries should be welcomed and endorsed. After all, all revolutionaries also must be fed and looked after. Given our intellectual capabilities, we must be rewarded and compensated both materially and spiritually. Why not?

True, some people are so arrogant that they make others go speechless. "Public intellectuals" are churning out articles relentlessly and without any moral dilemma ["public intellectuals" is euphemism in today's popular Chinese discourse directed at "liberal" intellectuals, including political and cultural elite. In other words, the term is increasingly being employed by patriotic, nationalist/leftist intelligentsia to politically attack anyone who either questions or disagrees with the CPC or the party line - *editor*]. Even all those who are writing with the aim to discredit China too seem to be facing no difficulty. But just because someone is writing articles and making money to buy 2 packs of cigarettes is problematic, do you think such "patriotic" commentators are living in a fool's paradise? On the contrary, the problem lies with 9 out of 10 people who think people make profit out of "patriotism."

[Series editor: Hemant Adlakha]

The views expressed here are those of the original author and not necessarily of the translator or of the Institute of Chinese Studies

ICS Translations *Back Issues*

Issue No/ Month	Title	Translator
No.31 Apr 2021	Divorce Application Turned Down 4 Times in 5 Years, Why is Divorce so Difficult in China?	Hemant Adlakha
No. 30 Apr 2021	On a visit to the Soviet Union in 1957 Chairman Mao was shown three “secret films,” inspiring him to launch a top-secret mission on his return	Madhurendra Jha
No. 29 Mar 2021	Illegal and Viewed as Unethical, China’s Surrogacy Debate is Caught between Blood Affinity and Parenting	Snigdha Konar
No. 28 Mar 2021	Wedding Gift New Regulations 2021: Is it really true Caili is gone? Is demanding ‘bride price’ now against the law?	Hemant Adlakha
No.27 Mar 2021	Xiang Jingyu: The Only Woman among the CPC Founding Members	Hemant Adlakha and Usha Chandran
No.26 Feb 2021	Mutual Aid Sanitary Napkin’ Groups: A Small Step, Giant Leap to End ‘Menstrual Shame’	Tanvi Negi
No.25 Feb 2021	Bukharin Inspired Deng Xiaoping to Change China	Hemant Adlakha
No.24 Feb 2021	Imagine China, If Mao was Gandhi	Prashant Kaushik
No.23 Jan 2021	Why are people in Japan and South Korea rich but unhappy?	Arghya Jana

PRINCIPAL SUPPORTERS TO ICS RESEARCH FUND

TATA TRUSTS



MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA



INDIAN COUNCIL OF
SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

GARGI AND VIDYA
PRAKASH DUTT FOUNDATION



JAMNALAL BAJAJ
FOUNDATION

PIROJSHA GODREJ FOUNDATION

ICS PUBLICATIONS



A short brief on a topic of contemporary interest with policy-related inputs



Platform for ongoing research of the ICS faculty and associates



Authored by the faculty, also emerging from research projects and international conferences



Draft paper of ongoing research

ICS JOURNAL



In its 57th year, *China Report* is a refereed journal in the field of social sciences and international relations. It welcomes and offers a platform for original research from a multi-disciplinary perspective, in new and emerging areas, by scholars and research students. It seeks to promote analysis and vigorous debate on all aspects of Sino-Indian relations, India-China comparative studies and multilateral and bilateral initiatives and collaborations across Asia.

China Report is brought out by Sage Publications Ltd, New Delhi.

Editor
Associate Editor
Assistant Editor
Book Review Editor

Sreemati Chakrabarti
G. Balachandirane
Rityusha Mani Tiwari
Vijay K Nambiar



INSTITUTE OF CHINESE STUDIES
B-371 (3rd floor), Chittaranjan Park,
Kalkaji, New Delhi - 110 019
Landline Telephone: +91-11-4056 4823

<http://www.icsin.org/>

info@icsin.org



twitter.com/ics_delhi



facebook.com/icsin.delhi



in.linkedin.com/icsdelhi



soundcloud.com/ICSIN



youtube.com/ICSWEB



instagram.com/icsdelhi