

# **Would Chinese Repression Disappear If You Abandon the Goal of Independence?**

**By Hada**

**August 29, 2015**

The Inner Mongolian People's Party, established in 1997 in the United States, declared from the outset its resolute goal: the independence of Southern Mongolia. This foundational principle was adopted by the party's general assembly and its leadership, including then-President Temtsiltu Shobtsood. It is well documented that Temtsiltu upheld this principle until May 2011.

On May 11, 2011, tens of thousands of Southern Mongolian students and herders took to the streets in protest of the brutal killing of the herder Mr. Mergen in Shiliin-gol League. In solidarity, Southern Mongolians abroad staged protests around the world. Meanwhile, within Southern Mongolia, Chinese authorities mobilized police and paramilitary forces to crack down on the movement.

Amid this unrest, Temtsiltu, then president of the Inner Mongolian People's Party, unilaterally abandoned the goal of Southern Mongolian independence—this sacred and inalienable right. More troubling still, he made this announcement not in a personal capacity, but on behalf of the Party. A journalist promptly reported the statement, broadcasting that the Inner Mongolian People's Party no longer pursued independence.

In the same interview, Temtsiltu unveiled his so-called “Dual-Ownership Theory,” claiming that both Chinese colonizers and indigenous Southern Mongolians could coexist peacefully without harming each other. I will not spend time refuting this flawed theory here. However, it caused considerable controversy, particularly when the well-known exiled writer Tumenulzei Buyanmend, who criticized the theory, was smeared by Temtsiltu and falsely labeled a “Chinese agent.”

The main purpose of this article is to debunk Temtsiltu's unfounded, distorted, and harmful claim that “independence is merely a tool to pressure Chinese authorities,” and that “repression would cease if the call for independence were abandoned”.

It is an established fact that the Chinese colonial regime has never ceased its surveillance, repression, and brutality in its effort to extinguish Southern Mongolians' aspirations for freedom. One need not belabor the point that Southern Mongolians' pursuit of political independence is a just and legitimate cause, rooted in unbearable suffering under colonial rule and fully aligned with international humanitarian law. There is abundant literature to support this.

Temtsiltu's claim that “repression will disappear if we give up our struggle for independence” is not only groundless but dangerously naive. Consider the major movements in recent history: the 1981 Student Protests, the May 2011 Uprising, and ongoing herders' protests, none of which explicitly advocated independence. Yet all were brutally suppressed. If “foreign interference” is

to blame, how does one explain the 1956–1957 “Anti-National Rightist” purges, which occurred absent any foreign involvement?

The core issue is clear: China’s interest in Southern Mongolia lies in stripping away political rights from the indigenous Mongolian people, denying their national identity, and plundering their natural resources. Every act of protest or resistance has been triggered by this colonial agenda. The regime has always found excuses to justify its repression, often glorifying those who commit atrocities while vilifying dissenters.

The root cause of today’s atrocities dates back to the establishment of colonial rule and can be traced even further to the Xinhai Revolution of 1911. These violent legacies are not forgotten; they are foundational to the current regime’s behavior. Repression serves to obscure the regime’s true nature.

A closer examination reveals that the violation of Southern Mongolians’ indigenous rights has never ceased. In turn, resistance by the indigenous population has also never ceased. Those who dare to speak up are labeled “separatists” or “threats to national unity.”

Southern Mongolians face two choices: remain silent while their rights are stripped away, or stand up and fight. Silence does not guarantee safety; even the obedient are often subjected to repression. Resistance, while riskier, offers hope. Imprisonment or even death is a real possibility, but many willingly choose this path in defense of their people and their future.

So, what should we Mongolians do? The answer is simple: resist. Without resistance, our identity, culture, and people will disappear. Yes, resistance involves risk. But abandoning resistance guarantees defeat. Some are willing to face prison. Others may choose silence, and we must not condemn them for this. But those who resist must not hesitate to accept the potential consequences of fighting for national freedom and justice.

It is absurd to argue that the goal of independence must be abandoned in order to focus on more “achievable” short-term goals. In fact, those pursuing immediate improvements for the people can still uphold the long-term vision of independence. These two objectives are not mutually exclusive. In today’s context, both the Inner Mongolian People’s Party which advocates independence and other groups that do not, are essentially engaged in the same struggle against repression. Temtsiltu should be well aware of this.

As a political party, the Inner Mongolian People’s Party must have a clear political goal: whether it be establishing an independent state or unifying with the independent nation of Mongolia. If it abandons its long-term purpose to focus only on short-term issues, it ceases to be a political party and becomes just another advocacy group. Political parties earn international recognition by representing the collective will of a nation. Activist groups, by contrast, garner only limited and temporary support.

Finally, being the president of a party should not be regarded as a special privilege. It is simply a role defined by a division of responsibilities. The president must be equal to all other party members under the party constitution. In fact, the president should set an example and shoulder

greater responsibilities. If Temtsiltu, as president, believed that the party's guiding principle and ultimate goal needed to be revised, he should have submitted a written proposal and brought it before the party for discussion. It would not have been a serious violation of the party's constitution or bylaws if he had first obtained majority consent before making any public announcement. What is truly unacceptable is that he not only disregarded the party's rules and procedures but also ignored the strong criticism from members and stubbornly rejected the party's overwhelming decision to remove him from his position. It is regrettable that, even after living in a democratic society for more than two decades, he continues to reject a democratic decision. Worse still, he has resorted to smear campaigns against his critics, labeling them all as "Chinese spies." One of the main purposes of this article is to urge the young Southern Mongolians who followed Temtsiltu, and who have aided and abetted his reckless behavior, unethical conduct, and harmful actions, to recognize their mistakes and clear their conscience. Of course, Temtsiltu is welcome to write a counter-article if he believes his actions are justifiable