

# On Maoism

by Xiang Guanqi

Laiyin Publishing House

December 26, 2023

**I dedicate this book to our beloved  
Chairman Mao  
In commemoration of Chairman Mao's  
130th birthday**

## Table of Contents

<b>Preface</b>	<b>Page 7</b>
<b>I. The basic meaning of Maoism</b>	<b>Page 9</b>
<b>II. The historical status of Maoism</b>	<b>Page 10</b>
<b>III. The philosophical contribution of Maoism</b>	<b>Page 11</b>
<b>IV. Mao Zedong's theory of new democratic revolution — Theory of people's democratic socialist revolution</b>	<b>Page 13</b>
<b>V. Mao Zedong's theory of continued socialist revolution</b>	<b>Page 18</b>
<b>1. The theory of continued socialist revolution has rich content covering all aspects of society</b>	<b>Page 19</b>
<b>2. The theory of continued socialist revolution focuses on the rectification of those in power within the party who follow the capitalist road.</b>	<b>Page 32</b>
<b>3. The positive and negative historical experiences and lessons left by the Cultural Revolution.</b>	<b>Page 47</b>
<b>4. We must re-learn and study the form of government of the proletarian dictatorship.</b>	<b>Page 134</b>
<b>VI. The Maoist Theory of Socialist Re-Revolution</b>	<b>Page 191</b>
<b>1. Socialist re-revolution is the only way to defeat the restoration of capitalism.</b>	<b>Page 191</b>
<b>2. The struggle for political freedom and democracy is an important step in launching the socialist re-revolution.</b>	<b>Page 202</b>
<b>3. Adhere to the internationalism of Maoism and remove the interference of bourgeois patriotism and national chauvinism in the launching of the socialist re-revolution .</b>	<b>Page 217</b>

4. Historical conditions for socialist re-revolution	Page 232
5. The path and form of socialist re-revolution can only be the mass revolutionary rebel movement	Page 245
VII. The Maoist theory of the three worlds	Page 259
1. The theory of the three world divisions is a contemporary development of the theory of imperialism	Page 260
2. The three worlds theory is the basic strategy against imperialism	Page 262
3. The three worlds theory embodies proletarian internationalism	Page 267
VIII. Concluding Remarks	Page 273
Appendix:	Page 275

## Translator's Preface

Xiang Guanqi was born in Jinan, Shandong Province in 1943. He graduated from Shanghai's Fudan University in 1966 and participated in the Cultural Revolution as a rebel member. Later, he was assigned to teach in the Department of History of Shandong University. During the Cultural Revolution, Xiang Guanqi was the head of the rebel mass organization in Shandong Province and a representative figure in ideology and theory.

Since 1970, Xiang Guanqi has lost his personal freedom three times, and has been detained for more than ten years. Since 1970, Xiang Guanqi has lost his personal freedom three times, and has been retained for more than ten years. Although Xiang Guanqi has repeatedly asked to join the party, this has been refused.

In 1988, Xiang Guanqi was invited to visit Germany. In 1990, he was a visiting professor at the Department of Sinology, University of Heidelberg, Germany. He became a German citizen in 2002 and later joined the Marxist-Leninist Party of Germany (MLPD).

Earlier this year, the comrades at bannedthought.net sent me a 2014 document from China which I translated. The comrades at ICOR then sent me Xiang Guanqi's "On Maoism", which I have now also translated.

Xi Jinping has striven to cloak the rule of China's capitalist class and Party bourgeoisie in the garb of Marxism. This fools some people within the Left outside China who also see Chinese social-imperialism's rivalry with the United States as a championable opposition to US imperialism.

The value of documents like Xiang Guanqi's, and others that I have translated, lies in helping people within the Left, outside of China, aware that Chinese capitalism has its opponents within China. Some have taken up Mao's call to integrate with the working class and serve them in revolutionary struggle, and have paid a heavy price for this.

There are some differences of opinion between the authors of the various documents I have translated. This is understandable. In the absence so far of a single authoritative Marxist-Leninist-Maoist Party in China, the process of resolving differences and of unifying ideology will take some time.

Comrade Xiang Guanqi is a controversial figure within Left circles in China. In 2009 the Utopia website (<https://m.wyxxwk.com/>) provided information on Xiang Guanqi which was very positive and supportive. However, the same website attacked him in 2011 for his interpretations of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and for belonging to a foreign Party, the MLPD.

That same year, Redstone Forum website (<http://www.hst1966.net/>) criticised him for advocating making use of reforms promised by Premier Wen Jiabao: "Why does Xiang Guanqi, a Marxist with deep class feelings for the Chinese proletariat, still make the Chinese working class and the broad masses of labourers pin their hopes of getting rid of exploitation and oppression on bourgeois democratic reforms? The aim is to guide the Chinese working class to the path of constitutional democracy that he strongly advocates, and to bring China, which has long since entered the stage of monopoly capitalism, back to the stage of capitalist free competition."

Xiang Guanqi's article was in support of the political reform proposed by Wen Jiabao at that time. It was a strategy to take advantage of the contradictions between Wen Jiabao, who had bourgeois democratic tendencies, and Hu Jintao and Wu Bangguo, who were more stubbornly conservative,

and to expose the reactionary nature of the revisionist rulers who rejected democracy and insisted on fascist bourgeois autocracy. This was just like the attitude towards Bo Xilai later. It was all to take advantage of all contradictions that could be used to oppose the reactionary rulers.

I will let the readers of "On Maoism" judge for themselves whether the Redstone Forum criticism is valid.

My Chinese is far from perfect. I can get around China on my own but get lost easily in conversations that deal with specific topics. I take responsibility for any errors in this translation. I hope the footnotes I have added make some parts of the text clearer for readers of English who may not be aware of some of Xiang Guangqi's references.

The genuine Communists of China have friends all over the world.

Hopefully this document will be of value to some of them.

Nick G.

12 November 2024

## Preface

I have been studying and researching the subject of Maoism<sup>1</sup> all my life, and I have sporadically written some research results and published nearly 20 pamphlets on the subject (see appendix).

However, to write 'On Maoism' in a systematic and complete manner and at a high level requires a considerable amount of work, and even more so requires a high level of ideological and theoretical sophistication, which is beyond my capacity. Even if I were to rewrite the little research I have done in the past, I am afraid that, at the age of eighty, I would not be able to give sufficient guarantees in terms of energy and time.

After much thought, I decided to give up my extravagant hopes and proceed from the practical possibilities. Based on my own experience of studying and researching Chairman Mao's theories and participating in revolutionary practice, combined with some controversial issues that have arisen among comrades in the current process of learning and applying Mao Zedong Thought, I will write a simple and complex experience of studying Mao Zedong Thought from the perspective of combining theory with practice, including combining some of my own personal experiences, with the entire theoretical system of Mao Zedong Thought as the framework, focusing on chapters 5, 6, and 7. Doing so may be more in line with my current actual situation.

I hope that readers will understand the title and content of this book only from this perspective.

I have done my best to make such an effort, mainly to leave others, including future generations, with ideological materials for reference.

As a loyal student and soldier of Chairman Mao who was once taught directly by Chairman Mao, received by Chairman Mao, followed Chairman Mao to participate in the continued socialist revolution (first and foremost, the Cultural Revolution), the re-revolutionary struggle, and was also protected by Chairman Mao in the difficult time of being rounded up, it is my historical responsibility to leave behind such an ideological material for the study of Maoism, which is of more or less a certain special significance.

A special note should be made that what is discussed in this pamphlet is a little elaboration based on my own understanding of Maoism. If there are mistakes, naturally the responsibility lies with me, and they should and must be criticised and corrected. I welcome this. Because I understand that it is only by recognising mistakes and correcting them that people make progress. Of course, as far as subjective motives are concerned, I am still particularly careful not to contradict, let alone distort, Chairman Mao's thinking and theories.

Maoism is the theoretical weapon for the Chinese proletariat and the broad masses of the people in the world to fight for their own liberation. The liberation of the human spirit is the premise of human liberation. If you understand this, you will always feel that learning Maoism is a kind of happiness. Because only by learning this theoretical weapon from Chairman Mao can we become relatively smart, conscious, and brave, and become selfless and fearless fighters to smash the old world of capitalism

---

<sup>1</sup> The author uses the term "Mao Zedongism", which I have retained in the title. However, I have shortened to "Maoism" as a term more familiar to English-language readers, although fully aware that Chairman Mao disliked the term and forbade its use, preferring the clumsier (in English translation), but less elevated, "Mao Zedong Thought" – Trans.

and fight for the new world of communism where all mankind will be liberated, and become a completely free new person who has completely broken free from the alienation of the old world!

Isn't this the greatest happiness as a truly free person?



## I. Basic meaning of Maoism

Maoism is Chairman Mao's great historical contribution to all mankind.

Maoism is Chairman Mao's new contribution to, and development of, Marxism and Leninism, guided by the basic theories of Marxism and Leninism and combined with the new revolutionary practices in China and throughout the world, in the new historical stage and under the new historical conditions of the era of imperialist and proletarian socialist revolution.

Maoism can and should be juxtaposed with Marxism and Leninism as the third stage in the development of Marxism - the stage of Maoism, which can and should now be referred to as Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

Maoism, with its rich content, is a large, complete and organically linked scientific system; however, it can also be briefly summarised as 'One Philosophy and Four Theories': One Philosophy refers to Maoism's new contribution to, and development of, materialist dialectics and materialist epistemology, and it mainly solves the problems of methods of understanding and methods of thought; The 'Four Theories' refer to the theory of the People's Democratic Socialist Revolution (i.e., the theory of the New Democratic Revolution), the theory of continued socialist revolution, the theory of socialist re-revolution, and the theory of the division of the three worlds. The 'four theories' are united in the 'one theory', the theory of socialist revolution.

The Maoist theory of socialist revolution is the theory of the new historical stage in the development of capitalism and imperialism throughout the world, in which the proletariat and the masses of working people, under new historical conditions, are to carry out a socialist revolution, a continuing socialist revolution, the theory of opposing the bourgeoisie, opposing capitalism, and opposing imperialism; and the theory of opposing the bourgeois deputies who have blended in with the Communist Party, the revisionism of the parties in power that follow the path of capitalism.

The new contributions and developments of Maoism constitute the third great theoretical content and theoretical system of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

Maoism has not only Chinese significance, but also international significance that can be applied to all countries.

To write 'On Maoism' is a major historical task that the contemporary Communists must carry out and complete.

This pamphlet is only a preliminary attempt, an exploration.

## II. The historical status of Maoism

Just as it cannot be said that Leninism is the Russianisation of Marxism, it cannot be said that Maoism is the Chineseisation of Marxism.

The greatest and most fundamental error in saying this is that it actually denies that under the new contemporary historical conditions, Maoism has a worldwide and universal truthful significance for the development of Marxism, which is actually a fundamental denial that Marxism should be developed, can be developed, and must be developed.

The four major theories of Maoism on socialist revolution: the theory of the people's democratic socialist revolution (the theory of the new democratic revolution), the theory of the continuation of the socialist revolution, the theory of the socialist re-revolution, and the theory of the three divisions of the world, are by no means merely 'Chinese', but have an international, world-wide significance.

Chairman Mao's Four Theories are based on the basic theories and methods of Marxism and Leninism, mainly in the context of China's revolutionary practice, and at the same time in the context of the revolutionary practice of the international communist movement. This scientific theoretical system has significance not only in China but also in the world.

As for the philosophical, that is, epistemological, contributions, as people's methods of understanding and thinking, they cannot be explained by 'Chineseisation', but are universally applicable to all people. The naming of the 'Mao Particle' is a good proof that international scientists have fully affirmed Chairman Mao's philosophical contributions.<sup>2</sup>

If Mao Zedong Thought had been defined as the product of the combination of Marxism-Leninism and the practice of the Chinese revolution; then it is not enough to define Maoism in this way; Maoism should be the product of the combination of Marxism-Leninism and the practice of the Chinese and world revolutions, and it should be further said that Maoism is the inheritance, and even more so, the innovation and the development of Marxism-Leninism, which has elevated Marxism to its third stage - the stage of Maoism, the stage of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

Is this not the case?

Therefore, one cannot use the 'Chineseisation of Marxism' to summarise, explain or discuss Maoism - a new contribution to and development of Marxism under the new historical conditions of the present time - and to say so fundamentally belittles and denies the historical status of Maoism.

We cannot accept this statement and must oppose, criticise and discard it.

---

<sup>2</sup> Mao Zedong believed that particle physics – the physics of sub-atomic matter – provided proof of dialectical materialism and explicitly advocated the theory of the infinite divisibility of matter. Sheldon Glashow, a Nobel prize winning physicist, suggested that if the straton particle theorised by Chinese physicists should be found, it be name the "Mao particle" – Trans.

### III. The philosophical contribution of Maoism

One of the major contributions of Marxism is historical materialism. Historical materialism is the main and most fundamental ideological weapon for Marxists to understand human society, and it is the general outline of historical epistemology about human society.

On this issue, I have written 'A little view on the methodological system of Marxism' (in the book *New Reflections on Epistemology*), and I will not repeat the discussion here.

Historical materialism is not only materialistic - mainly in the sense that it sees human society in terms of its human material production activities as a starting point; but also dialectical - mainly in the sense that it sees the whole system of human society's movements, its many and varied forms of movement, as a contradictory dialectical and at the same time unifying process of development.

In this sense, historical materialism is a dialectical materialist understanding of human society. Historical materialism and dialectical materialism are united.

This is actually an epistemological problem, a problem of ideological methodology, or what is customarily often called a philosophical problem.

It is to this problem of Marxist epistemology and methodology that Maoism first made a new contribution, a new development.

From the perspective of materialist dialectics, materialist dialectics was originally understood as three parallel laws. Maoism clearly proposed that materialist dialectics should be understood with one major law, namely the law of the unity of opposites, as the main and core, and that the law of the unity of opposites should be used to command other laws and categories. It is also believed that the law of "negation of negation" should be changed to the law of "affirmation of negation". Chairman Mao also particularly emphasized the importance of the pair of categories "analysis and synthesis" as a method of thinking in the application of materialist dialectics.

This is Chairman Mao's inheritance and development of Lenin's "On the Question of Dialectics" (draft written in 1915, Selected Works of Lenin, Volume 2, pages 711-715) (Chairman Mao attached great importance to this unfinished short article of Lenin. When talking about Lenin's contribution with foreign party delegations, he specifically mentioned this article, which shows how much he valued it).

Chairman Mao made a full analysis of this law mainly in the book "On Contradiction" and in many other articles, instructions and talks. This is a new contribution and new development of Maoism to Marxist materialist dialectics.

From the perspective of materialist epistemology, marked by the publication of Chairman Mao's "On Practice" (Chairman Mao particularly liked and valued this work, and even rated it higher than "On Contradiction"), Mao Zedong Thought elevated practice to the top of the list of cognition, the source of cognition, the foundation of cognition, the motive force of cognition, and the test of cognition, and made a scientific analysis of the dialectical relationship between practice and cognition, and thereby proposed the cognitive line of "starting from reality in everything" and cognitive methods such as "investigation and research". These are all new contributions and new developments of Maoism to materialist epistemology.

In my book *New Reflections on Epistemology*, I have some of my unique understandings and thoughts with certain new supplementary significance on Chairman Mao's contribution in this regard, which can be used as a reference for comrades.

The contribution of Maoism to Marxist philosophy is united with the founding of Maoism. It is this contribution that determines that Chairman Mao was able to unify historical materialism with materialist dialectics and materialist epistemology, and was able to better implement and apply the ideological method of historical materialism to understand the major historical issues raised by the contemporary Chinese revolution and world revolution in all their aspects, and to arrive at Maoism, a new achievement embodying Marxism adapted to the needs of the contemporary social and historical development of mankind, as a new level and stage.

This once again proves that the level of thinking of people as the subject of cognition and the level of cognition of the objective world are completely unified. The great historical role of great historical figures always starts from this.

## **IV. Maoism's theory of the new democratic revolution -- The Theory of the People's Democratic Socialist Revolution**

The Maoist theory of new democratic revolution, that is, the theory of people's democratic socialist revolution, is the first important theory of the Maoist theory of socialist revolution.

China's democratic revolution can be roughly divided into two stages. The first stage was the old democratic revolution led by Dr. Sun Yat-sen, that is, the bourgeois democratic revolution; the second stage was the new democratic revolution led by Chairman Mao, that is, the proletarian democratic revolution - the people's democratic revolution led by the proletariat (through the Communist Party), and more specifically, the people's democratic socialist revolution led by the proletariat (through the Communist Party).

The 'newness' of China's new democratic revolution lies in the fact that it is a proletarian-democratic revolution under the leadership of the Communist Party of China (CPC), the vanguard of the proletariat, whose definition and connotation should be as follows The definition and connotation should be a people's democratic revolution led by the proletariat (through the CPC), and a people's democratic socialist revolution at that.

Therefore, the founding of the CPC in 1921 is a landmark event in China's modern history. The founding of the CPC marked the official beginning of the historical stage of China's new democratic revolution. The great anti-imperialist and anti-feudal 'May Fourth Movement' prepared the ideological, theoretical and organisational talents for the founding of the CPC.

Once founded, the CPC, in the course of the arduous struggle to lead China's new democratic revolution, bravely and without pause explored the road and the course of China's new democratic revolution with a great revolutionary spirit and at the cost of the bloodshed of countless martyrs.

Chairman Mao is the shining representative of this quest. After more than a decade of trials and tribulations in the tortuous class struggle, and after summing up experiences and lessons learnt from successes and failures on both the positive and negative sides, Chairman MAO has finally become the leader whom the Chinese Communists jointly and wholeheartedly embrace. It was Chairman Mao who, through revolutionary practice, correctly summed up the theory of the New Democratic Revolution and formulated for the Party the road, line, guidelines and policies of the New Democratic Revolution. The theory of the New Democratic Revolution is the first major element, the first major constituent of the Maoist theory of socialist revolution.

The road of the Chinese revolution is a new creation completely different from the road of the Russian October revolution, a new contribution to, and a new development of, the Marxist principle that proletarian revolution must necessarily be carried out as a violent revolution.

It is a historical necessity determined by new historical conditions.

Maoism's theory of the New Democratic Revolution created theories, guidelines, policies and strategies in political, military, economic, ideological and cultural aspects, raising the level of the proletarian people's democratic revolutionary struggle to an unprecedented historical height, forming a complete set of theories and strategies of the New Democratic Revolution, and in particular raising the level of the armed struggle to the level of pure perfection. It is also a form of dance and theatre art. All these are the characteristics of the Chinese revolutionary road and the merits of the Chinese revolutionary road.

Careful readers may notice that my understanding of the nature and significance of the New Democratic Revolution is a new insight. This is because, in my opinion, the previous understanding of the nature and significance of the New Democratic Revolution was still limited. I broke through this limitation. In a higher sense and more in line with historical reality, I redefined the nature and significance of the New Democratic Revolution.

In short, it has been believed in the past that the nature of the New Democratic Revolution is still the nature of the bourgeois democratic revolution, which is incorrect.

Maoism's theory of new democratic revolution inherits the theories and strategies of Marxism and Leninism on the proletariat in the bourgeois democratic revolution, and under the specific historical conditions of China, develops the old theory of the proletariat's participation in the bourgeois democratic revolution into a new theory of the proletariat's democratic revolution led by the proletariat (the Communist Party of China).

How should the nature of this new democratic revolution led by the proletariat, or the proletarian people's democratic revolution, be understood?

This is essentially because under new and specific historical conditions, the proletariat independently grasped the leadership of the revolution, thus elevating the historical task that originally belonged to the bourgeois democratic revolution to the historical task of the proletarian democratic revolution, that is, the proletarian people's democratic revolution. Moreover, this will inevitably elevate the nature of the revolution to a people's democratic socialist revolution led by the proletariat (through the Communist Party).

Therefore, we can use today's new understanding of the new democratic revolution to make a new and further theoretical summary: the new democratic revolution is essentially a special form of people's democratic socialist revolution led by the proletariat (through the Communist Party) with the people's democratic revolution as its starting point.

History speaks the most eloquently, and history has verified this theoretical viewpoint.

Undoubtedly, this is a new and significant leap in the understanding of the nature and significance of the Chinese revolution.

Unfortunately, Chairman Mao is no longer with us. Otherwise, I think Chairman Mao would support this opinion. There is a basis for saying this, because Chairman Mao actually had such an idea.

Chairman Mao once said in his article "The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party" written in December 1939, "The so-called new democratic revolution is the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution of the masses of the people under the leadership of the proletariat." In "On the Ten Major Relationships" written in 1956, the concept of "people's democratic revolution" was directly used. From Lenin to Stalin to Chairman Mao, they have repeatedly emphasized that "the new democratic revolution is part of the world proletarian socialist revolution, and it is resolutely opposed to imperialism and international capitalism." ("The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party", "Selected Works of Mao Zedong" Volume 2, page 610.)

Under such specific historical conditions, the New Democratic Revolution certainly no longer has the nature of a bourgeois democratic revolution, but must have the nature of a proletarian democratic revolution led by the proletariat.

The so-called "people's democratic revolution" is actually and can only be a democratic revolution led by the proletariat (through the Communist Party). Because only under the leadership of the proletariat

(through the Communist Party) can a true and thorough people's democratic revolution be achieved, which is a historical level that the democratic revolution led by the bourgeoisie cannot reach.

Moreover, history has proven that the class nature of the people's democratic revolution led by the proletariat (through the Communist Party) determines that it must be a special form of people's democratic socialist revolution under special historical conditions.

That is to say, Maoism's theory of new democratic revolution not only has the nature of a new democratic revolution and must accomplish the historical tasks of the proletarian people's democratic revolution; but also has the nature of a people's democratic socialist revolution and must accomplish the historical tasks of the people's democratic socialist revolution.

From this perspective, this is a new form of revolution in socialist revolution under new and special historical conditions.

From this perspective, we can more correctly understand and more correctly evaluate the great historical significance of Maoism's theory of new democratic revolution as a new contribution and new development to Marxism.

The victory of China's new democratic revolution and the beginning of the historical stage of Chinese people's democratic socialism fully prove this point.

As Chairman Mao said, the founding of the People's Republic of China on October 1, 1949 marked the end of the historical stage of the new democratic revolution and the beginning of the historical stage of the socialist revolution. The establishment of the people's democratic dictatorship in the form of a "coalition government" is essentially the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship in a special form at a lower level; and this is precisely the great achievement obtained through the new democratic revolution, that is, the people's democratic revolution led by the proletariat (through the Communist Party).

It can be seen from this that this is a special revolutionary path to realize people's democratic socialism, starting from the proletarian people's democratic revolution at a lower historical level.

This historical fact fully proves that it is not in line with historical facts and is incorrect to attribute the nature of the new democratic revolution to the bourgeois democratic revolution in the past. The reason may be a misunderstanding of Lenin's thought under the historical conditions at that time.

The significance of clarifying this principle is that only by understanding the problem in this way can we correctly realize that Chairman Mao's theory of new democratic revolution, that is, the theory of proletarian people's democratic revolution, can and should be regarded as a special Maoist theory of socialist revolution in semi-feudal, semi-colonial and colonial countries, which takes the proletarian democratic revolution as its starting point and aims to achieve the lowest form of people's democratic socialist revolution.

It can be said, and should be said, that the victory of the New Democratic Revolution is not only the victory of the proletarian people's democratic revolution, but also the victory of the proletarian people's democratic socialist revolution.

Moreover, its line, principles, policies, and strategies will remain valid and should be implemented in the historical stage of people's democratic socialism under the people's democratic dictatorship for a fairly long historical period. They are necessary preparations and necessary steps for the transition from incomplete socialism to complete socialism.

These understandings are new, deeper and more accurate theoretical understandings gained when we look back and re-examine the problems after revolutionary practice.

This is in line with the epistemological law that Chairman Mao often emphasized that theory comes from the continuous summary of practice. It seems that this is a new understanding today, but in fact, this is the practice we have done under the leadership of Chairman Mao, and it is the true knowledge that has been obtained in the process of practice.

Therefore, we can now confidently and boldly put forward that Mao Zedong's theory of new democratic revolution has both theoretical significance for the proletarian people's democratic revolution and theoretical significance for the proletarian people's democratic socialist revolution.

This is a relatively correct new understanding and new judgment on the basic nature and great significance of Mao Zedong's theory of China's new democratic revolution.

In my opinion, Chairman Mao may have roughly seen this when he wrote "On New Democracy" in January 1940.

There is a passage in *On New Democracy*: "The politics, economy and culture of New Democracy, because they are all led by the proletariat, all contain socialist elements, and not just ordinary elements, but elements that play a decisive role. However, in terms of the overall political, economic and cultural situation, it is not yet socialist, but New Democratic." (Mao Zedong: *On New Democracy*, Selected Works of Mao Zedong, Volume 2, p. 665.) It is very clear that since the socialist elements in the political, economic and cultural aspects of society are playing a "decisive role", then this of course determines the nature of this society. The reason why Chairman Mao said "it is not yet socialist, but New Democratic" is obviously because the basic characteristics of the "New Democratic Society" he discussed are not yet complete socialism in the typical sense.

Here, "the politics, economy, and culture of New Democracy, because they are all led by the proletariat, all have socialist elements, and these are not ordinary elements, but decisive elements." This is enough to show that such a society with a socio-economic form, a socio-political and cultural form can only be a people's democratic socialist society. This is not only the correct understanding in theory, but more importantly, this understanding has been proven by the subsequent practice of the Chinese revolution.

We have not established a bourgeois democratic society, but a society of people's democratic dictatorship led by the proletariat (through the Communist Party). Based on the revolutionary practice we have gone through and our improved understanding today after re-studying Maoism, we can theoretically summarize the historical stage of a people's democratic socialist society with a people's democratic dictatorship led by the proletariat (through the Communist Party) in the form of a coalition government.

This is indeed a great breakthrough and leap in theory. Chairman Mao has left us the key, which makes it possible for us to use this key to unlock this theoretical topic. This is a process of continuous improvement and development of people's understanding, which conforms to the law of people's understanding.

It is based on this understanding that we can understand Chairman Mao's theory of new democratic revolution as one of the contents of Maoism's theory of socialist revolution - the theory of people's democratic socialist revolution.

In fact, this issue can be traced back not only to the theories of Marx and Engels, but also to Lenin in particular. In leading the Communist International and guiding the great struggle of "uniting the



proletarians and oppressed nations of the world", Lenin has put forward extremely scientific and brilliant theoretical insights and practical directions. At the "Second Congress of the Communist International" held from July to August 1920, Lenin once gave such guidance: "In all colonies and backward countries, we should not only form a basic team that can fight independently, that is, a party organization, and not only should we immediately publicize and organize peasant Soviets and try to adapt such Soviets to pre-capitalist conditions, but the Communist International should also point out and explain theoretically that with the help of the proletariat in advanced countries, backward countries can transition to the Soviet system without going through the capitalist development stage, and then transition to communism after a certain stage of development." Lenin also very realistically pointed out: "What means must be adopted to achieve this goal? This is difficult to predict in advance. Practical experience will give us inspiration. But it can be said with certainty that among the nations most distant from us, Soviet ideas are also very close to all working people. Soviet organizations will certainly be able to adapt to the social system before capitalist countries. The Communist Party should immediately carry out work in this regard throughout the world." (Lenin: *The Second Congress of the Communist International*, "Collected Works of Lenin", Volume 31, pp. 213-214.)

It is no exaggeration to say that it was under the guidance of the great Lenin and the Communist International under Lenin's leadership that not only the Communist Party of China was founded, but also the exploration of the road of China's new democratic revolution was carried out. Chairman Mao was the most successful and outstanding representative of this exploration who held high the banner of Leninism, thus further developing Leninism into Maoism.

It is based on Lenin's teachings that we can more deeply understand that the theory of China's revolutionary path proposed by Maoism is a new contribution and new development of Marxism. It not only has the truth significance suitable for the Chinese Communists to lead the proletarian people's democratic revolution, but also has the truth significance for the Communists in all countries under roughly the same historical conditions to lead the proletarian people's democratic revolution.

The experience of the victory of the proletarian people's democratic revolution in many countries with roughly the same national conditions as China has fully proved this point.

Moreover, looking at the problem from the point of view of the actual level of social development throughout the world today, I am afraid that even in some of the more developed capitalist countries, if the proletariat (through the Communist Party) leads a successful socialist revolution, it would be a universal choice to start with the lower form of socialism of the People's Democratic Dictatorship, that is, People's Democratic Socialism.

The theoretical writings of Maoism on the New Democratic Revolution are basically contained in the five-volume Selected Works of Mao Zedong and other officially published writings such as Chairman Mao's manuscripts and collections. Therefore, I will not repeat here the details of the Maoist theory of the new democratic revolution, that is, the theory of the people's democratic socialist revolution.

What we want to emphasize here is how this theory of Maoism should be characterized, and what great theoretical, practical and historical significance this new contribution and new development of Marxism has.

## V. Mao Zedong's theory of continued socialist revolution

The theory of continuing socialist revolution is the second important theory of Mao Zedong's theory of socialist revolution.

The founding of the People's Republic of China on October 1, 1949 marked the basic victory of China's new democratic revolution, the proletarian people's democratic revolution; at the same time, it also essentially marked the basic victory of China's socialist revolution, the proletarian people's democratic socialist revolution, and thus began China's people's democratic dictatorship, the people's democratic socialist historical stage, and began the continued revolution under the conditions of people's democratic socialism.

History has eloquently proved that after the victory of the proletarian socialist revolution, there will inevitably be a socialist historical stage as the lowest stage of communist society.

History has also eloquently proved that, from Marx and Engels, through Lenin and Stalin, to Chairman Mao, their common and unanimous foresight of the long and arduous nature of the historical stage of socialism was correct. The historical stage of socialism can by no means be short-lived, but is a very long historical period, and is not a historical task that can be accomplished in one generation or two, but one that can be accomplished only through the constant endeavours of several generations, and it has been irrefutably proved by history that the road of continued socialist revolution is difficult and tortuous, and that whether or not the model of the social form of a socialist society can fully conform to the specific and concrete possibilities and needs of the historical conditions is a very difficult subject, and the occurrence of a capitalist restoration is always possible if this problem is not solved properly.

The historical stage of socialist society is the historical stage aimed at achieving the transition to communism. In hindsight, this historical task is indeed extremely arduous. As Chairman Mao taught us in his essay 'On the People's Democratic Dictatorship,' the past work of seizing power was 'only like the first step in the Long March.' (Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, p. 1369) This whole-society, all-encompassing, completely new process of transformation is an exceptionally onerous and arduous historical task in order to bring the whole of society, the whole of mankind, to the conditions demanded by communist society through socialism's continual and continuous revolutions.

Chairman Mao took over the baton of continued socialist revolution from Lenin and Stalin and led the Communist Party of China and the Chinese people to embark on the difficult journey of continued socialist revolution in China. On the basis of this great practice, the Maoist theory of continued socialist revolution gradually took shape, becoming a new content and stage of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

However, just as Chairman Mao had stressed on many occasions, there was always a feeling that the problem of continuing the socialist revolution had not been solved, that is, the Cultural Revolution had been carried out, or that the problem could not be completely solved by a single Cultural Revolution, and that it would inevitably have to be carried out many times in the future. Judging from the facts that followed, Chairman Mao's fears were by no means unwarranted. The practical difficulties encountered on all fronts in avoiding the rise to power of revisionism and the restoration of capitalism, both in terms of objective and subjective conditions, are far more serious and far greater than we had originally contemplated.

This is a real and present historical dilemma facing all mankind. This calls for serious study and reflection, especially on the basis of the theoretical ideas already provided by Maoism, so that we can continue to move forward and continue to upgrade them.

Here, I would like to talk about my learning experience in this regard.

## **1. The theory of continued socialist revolution has rich content covering all aspects of society**

### **(i) A new form of proletarian dictatorship under specific historical conditions - people's democratic dictatorship.**

Maoism developed the Marxist and Leninist theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat with the theory of the people's democratic dictatorship, creating the people's democratic dictatorship - the joint dictatorship of the revolutionary classes under the leadership of the proletariat (through the Communist Party) ('coalition government') - a new form of what is essentially the dictatorship of the proletariat under the new historical conditions, delineating for the Marxist theory of scientific socialism a historical stage of people's democratic socialist society under the people's democratic dictatorship.

This is a bold but realistic scientific creation. People's democratic dictatorship is essentially the dictatorship of the proletariat, but it is realised by uniting eight progressive bourgeois democratic parties to form a 'coalition government'. This was a major breakthrough in the theory and practice of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This new form of dictatorship of the proletariat met the demands of all classes in the political, economic, ideological and cultural spheres under the historical conditions of China at that time, and facilitated the transition from incomplete socialism to complete socialism at that time.

This is the core of the Maoist theory of continued socialist revolution. It is the general outline of the historical stage of people's democratic socialism. It is only by grasping this programme and by improving the people's democratic dictatorship that the continued revolution under the conditions of people's democratic socialism can be improved, and that it can be ensured that people's democratic socialism, which is an incomplete form of socialist society, can steadily and continuously make the transition to a higher and complete form of socialist society.

The lessons of history are heavy. The historical fact is that the form of people's democratic dictatorship that we are actually practising lacks further forward and upward development. Not only have the eight democratic parties participating in the 'coalition government' gradually become vases and ornaments, the main problem is that no solution has been found to the question of how to enable the broad masses of workers, peasants and working people to participate better and more directly in the management of the people's democratic dictatorship, but on the contrary, it has gradually evolved into 'one-party dictatorship', which is divorced from the supervision of the vast number of party members and the broad masses of working people. This became the main cause of all the subsequent problems, above all the problems of the rise to power of revisionism and the restoration of capitalism, and the main problem that the later Maoist theory of continued revolution confronted and tried to solve.

From the lessons left behind by the historical tragedy of the rise to power of revisionism and the restoration of capitalism, from the Soviet East to China, it is clear that the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the people's democratic dictatorship, which is a special form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, require a form of political system that goes with it, that is, a system of political institutions. The system of state and the system of government are united. The state system is the substance and the political

system is the form. The dictatorship of the proletariat is the body of the state, the substance; the proletarian system of government is the form, the guarantee. The form is not unimportant; the content, the substance, must always be reflected through the form. The essence of the state system of the dictatorship of the proletariat can only be realized through the political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Conversely, without the guarantee of the political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat, there can be no essence of the state system of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The state system of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat are of equal importance. The historical lessons of revisionism and the degeneration of the nature of the state in socialist countries clearly tell us that the political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat or the people's democratic dictatorship has not been gradually reformed and developed, but has regressed to the "one-party dictatorship" that is superior to the proletariat and the broad masses of the people. Therefore, accordingly, the essence of the state system of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship will inevitably and unavoidably degenerate. The problem of the political system has brought about the problem of the state system. This fully shows that despising the political system, not understanding the significance of the political system, and not solving the construction of the political system is essentially not understanding the significance of the dictatorship of the proletariat. In the end, it is inevitable that the dictatorship of the proletariat will fail and degenerate.

History has proven that the political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat must be a comprehensive, systematic and strict system that can ensure that the dictatorship of the proletariat does not degenerate. It is not enough to have only a political system such as the Soviets or the People's Congress. Without a complete set of organically linked political systems that can check and balance each other in coordination with the Soviets or the People's Congress, the original nature and role of the Soviets or the People's Congress will also degenerate, and they will become a decoration, a "vase" or a "voting machine" of the "one-party dictatorship", and in essence, they will degenerate into a political tool of the bourgeois dictatorship. The dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship will no longer exist.

If the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democracy is an essential feature of socialism, then it is clear that the central task of the continuing socialist revolution is the constant reform of its form of government in order to continuously consolidate and develop the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democracy. The essential requirement of this reform is to enable the proletariat and the mass of the working people to participate more and more directly and practically in the management of the State. Let us not forget Lenin's teaching that the dictatorship of the proletariat and proletarian democracy are synonymous, and by the same token, the dictatorship of the people's democracy and people's democracy are also synonymous. The most complete meaning of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship is proletarian democracy and people's democracy, and the ultimate and most complete implementation and manifestation of this democracy is the direct participation of the proletariat and the masses of the working people in the management of the State. Only by realising this can the aim of truly consolidating and developing the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship be achieved, and this is the fundamental guarantee that the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship will not undergo a metamorphosis.

Chairman Mao is right in saying that the most fundamental right of the people is the right to administer the State. Only when this is realised can the class essence of the state system of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship be manifested; but in order to realise this, it is necessary to have a corresponding and compatible form of political system. However, the limitations,

inadequacies and weaknesses of the political system practised in the past in all socialist countries, including China, are mainly manifested in this point. The implementation of Chairman Mao's views should be the political task, the central task and the first priority of the continuing socialist revolution.

The revolutionary mentors taught us that politics is the commander-in-chief. Politics commands the economy. The dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship command the socialist economy. Once the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship are lost, the socialist economy will inevitably deteriorate, and no matter what the form of economic ownership is, the essence of the economy will inevitably undergo a metamorphosis, and it will cease to be a socialist economy. This is a profound lesson that history has cruelly proved.

It is from this point of view that one of the central tasks of the continuing socialist revolution is the necessity of constantly reforming the political system, of constantly perfecting the forms of the socialist political system, so that the proletariat and the masses of the working people can participate more and more and more directly in the management of the State. Such a reform of the political system, which in essence has the significance of a political revolution, must take the lead.

A real solution to the political system of socialism, that is, to the political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship, would greatly enrich the content of the Maoist theory of continued socialist revolution.

## **(ii) Presentation of the general line of socialist transformation**

Chairman Mao creatively put forward the general line of transition from incomplete socialism to more complete socialism in this particular period of history.

Chairman Mao's summary of the general line is: 'The time between the founding of the People's Republic of China and the basic completion of socialist transformation is a period of transition. The Party's general line or general task for the transition period is basically to accomplish the country's industrialization and the socialist transformation of agriculture, handicrafts and capitalist industry and commerce over a fairly long period of time. This general line should be the beacon illuminating all our work, and wherever we deviate from it, we shall make Right or "Left" mistakes.' (Mao Zedong, 'The Party's General Line in the Transitional Period,' (August 1953), Selected Works of Mao Zedong, Vol. V, p. 89.)

In order to achieve the transition from incomplete socialism to relatively complete socialism in terms of economic relations, Chairman Mao creatively proposed that under the historical conditions where the proletariat has already gained political power, it is possible to consider peaceful transformation of the capitalist economy. Practice has proved that such peaceful transformation is feasible, successful and correct.

At the same time, the socialist transformation of the forms of ownership in agriculture and handicrafts through the path of co-operation, collectivisation and people's communalisation under the leadership of the Communist Party has proved to be basically feasible, successful and correct in the course of the bold, difficult and tortuous exploration of these socialist transformations.

These specific policies were guided by Chairman Mao's 'General Line for the Transition to Socialism', which has proved to be a correct line of socialist revolutionary significance.

All these are important elements belonging to the Maoist theory of continued socialist revolution in the economic aspect. This socialist transformation has the significance of socialist revolution. It is only that it is carried out under the socialist conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat and in the

manner of dealing with the internal contradictions of the people. This is the first of its kind in the history of socialist revolution and is undoubtedly a new contribution to, and a new development of, the Marxist theory of socialist revolution.

### **(iii) Presentation of the general line of socialist construction**

Chairman Mao also made bold explorations and innovations on how to develop the socialist economy, and proposed the general line of "going all out, aiming high and achieving greater, faster, better and more economical results", and established a new type of socialist production relationship in the field of industrial and agricultural production that encourages workers to participate in socialist labour with a master's attitude and status. The "Anshan Constitution" and the "Dazhai Experience" are typical creations of this new type of socialist production relationship.

At the same time, it was theoretically demonstrated that it is possible to achieve a "Great Leap Forward" by developing productivity under socialist conditions. In practice, preliminary beneficial explorations were carried out, although there were mistakes and lessons, but mainly based on successful experiences. On the basis of both positive and negative experiences and lessons, people have come to a deeper understanding that under socialist conditions, a "Great Leap Forward" is not only completely possible, but also completely necessary. This theoretical understanding, as Chairman Mao emphasized, is not just bragging or exaggeration, but has been proven to be feasible in practice as long as the subjective understanding conforms to the objective economic laws.

This is not only a task of economic development, but also a requirement of political development, because only highly developed modern productive forces can provide a reliable material basis for socialism, and can uphold and develop socialism under the siege of capitalism and imperialism. This is a very important theory and strategy of continuing the socialist revolution that has been repeatedly emphasized since Lenin.

The three red flags of the general line, the Great Leap Forward, and the people's commune are the three red flags of building socialism.

The fundamental significance of the "three red flags" tells us that establishing a socialist mode of production is not just a matter of developing social productive forces. What is more important and essential is to establish socialist production relations. As Marx said, it is not enough to judge the nature of a production relationship by simply looking at the form of ownership embodied in the law. Instead, the entire production process, including the entire process of production, exchange, and distribution, should be examined to finally determine the nature of this production relationship. In this process, the status and relationship of workers in production, as well as the distribution of the final product, are very important contents in the production relationship. On this issue, Chairman Mao, based on summarizing the experience and lessons of Stalin's Soviet model (for example, in "On the Ten Major Relationships" in 1956, Chairman Mao made clear discussions on this), and made new breakthroughs, new contributions, and new developments from theory to practice.

The Chinese socialist construction model created under the leadership of Chairman Mao has greatly surpassed the Soviet model of Stalin. It has both new creations and new sublimations in theory and summaries of valuable mass practical experience such as the "Anshan Constitution", "Daqing Spirit" and "Dazhai Spirit", which fully demonstrate the "superiority of socialism" and the revolutionary significance of socialist production relations. In simple terms, the working people had truly become the masters of production.



This is a great historical creation and historical change, and is an important part of Mao Zedong's theory of socialist continued revolution.

It is not surprising that revisionists deny the "three red flags". This is determined by their class standpoint and their short-sighted historical vision.

They always talk about mistakes and costs. They do not understand the dialectics of historical progress at all, let alone the overall situation, mainstream and essence of history.

On the one hand, the creation and establishment of a new production relationship is not a simple matter. For example, the form of the people's commune went through a tortuous process and was finally implemented in the form of "three-level ownership, with the team as the basis". In this groping process, some stupid things were done and a heavy price was paid. This is an inevitable phenomenon in the process of history moving forward.

On the other hand, from the perspective of the historical creators who shoulder the great historical tasks, the level of the Party and the level of the masses are always historical and limited. In the process of creating history, mistakes are naturally inevitable. We never need to conceal mistakes, but admit them, face them, and correct them. However, compared with the historical progress achieved, such mistakes are secondary and minor after all. Moreover, as long as we treat these mistakes correctly and seriously sum up the experience and lessons, mistakes will be transformed into precious wealth that promotes the further progress of history.

Doesn't our history fully prove this truth? It's just that revisionists can never see this truth.

#### **(iv) Adhere to class struggle as the key link in the ideological and cultural fields**

We should persist in criticizing bourgeois ideology and culture in the field of ideology and culture, and at the same time, implement the policy of "letting a hundred schools of thought contend and a hundred flowers blossom", and encourage the creation of new ideas, new culture and new art that embody the spirit of communism.

This is an important content and a major feature of Mao Zedong's theory of continuing socialist revolution.

From the initial criticism of "The Legend of Wu Xun"<sup>3</sup> and the criticism of historical idealism, to the subsequent continuous criticism of the dregs of bourgeois ideology and culture and feudal ideology

---

<sup>3</sup> Wu Xun (1838 – 1896) was born into a poor family in Shandong Province. He spent most of his life wandering and begging for money to pursue his own education and establish a school for the poor. A biographical film based on his life and deeds was released in China at the end of 1950. A private screening for around 100 senior party leaders raised no objections to the film's content, but Mao initiated a critical discussion of it, and the film was banned in 1951. Part of what Mao said of the film follows:

The questions raised in the Legend of Wu Xun are of a fundamental nature. In the era of the great struggle of the Chinese people against foreign invaders and against the reactionary feudal rulers at home in the last years of the Qing Dynasty, people like Wu Xun did not touch a single hair of the feudal economic foundation and its superstructure, but fanatically propagated feudal culture, and in order to gain the status of propagating feudal culture that they did not have, they did everything they could to subservient the reactionary feudal rulers. Can we tolerate singing the praises of such ugly acts to the masses of the people, even under the revolutionary banner of "serving the people", and even using the defeat of the revolutionary peasant struggle as a backdrop? To recognize or tolerate such praise is to recognize or tolerate the reactionary propaganda that slanders the revolutionary struggle of the peasants, to slander Chinese history, and to slander the Chinese nation, and to regard reactionary propaganda as legitimate... Is it not true that the reactionary ideas of the bourgeoisie have

and culture in philosophy, economics, history, literature, and art, all of these promoted the proletariat's comprehensive occupation of the ideological and cultural fields and prevented the restoration of capitalism from occurring in the ideological and cultural fields. Even though there have been some simplistic and inappropriate practices in this process, in terms of the overall social effect, the effect has been positive and very great; in particular, the general direction, theoretically and practically, has been correct.

At the same time, on the positive side, a large number of new ideas, new cultures, and new arts emerged and achieved great success. For example, the communist spirit promoted by various fronts and model figures of that era, represented by the "Lei Feng Spirit", has not lost its brilliance to this day; and in literature and art, the new socialist literature and art represented by model operas has also achieved unprecedented and unsurpassed great achievements today.

This is a dazzling page in the international communist movement, and it will surely be re-promoted in the future international communist movement.

### **(v) Building a New Socialist Society**

Maoism stresses the need for socialist society to revolutionise the whole of society and to strive to create a new socialist society that is truly and fundamentally different from capitalist private society, as the first stage of communist society. This is an important and profound element of Maoism's theory of continued socialist revolution.

Under the guidance of the Maoist general principle and strategy of correctly dealing with internal contradictions among the people, Chairman Mao has personally taken the lead in advocating the development of the communist spirit among the whole nation, and in the activity of 'Learning from Comrade Lei Feng' has led the whole nation to endeavour to bring about a revolution in their thinking; and a number of advanced and exemplary figures have appeared on various fronts as models for the whole nation to follow. At the same time, taking the nature of internal contradictions among the people as a prerequisite, we have implemented the formula of 'unity, criticism and solidarity' to help the backward people to overcome some of the shortcomings and errors in their thinking and actions, and to gradually strengthen the transformation of their own subjective world, so that they can achieve, step by step, the revolutionisation of their thinking, and to keep pace with the requirements of the times for building socialism.

The famous 'May 7 Instruction', written by Chairman Mao on 7 May 1966, is the theoretical idea of building a genuinely new socialist society, a new innovation of the international communist movement.

It is not a long text, so it is worth quoting in full here:

Dear Comrade Lin Piao,

I have received the report from the Rear Service Department which you sent me on 6 May. I think it is an excellent plan. Is it possible to send this report to all the military districts and ask them to hold discussions of it among the cadres at the army and division levels? Their views should be reported to the Military Commission and through it to the Centre for approval. After that, suitable directives should be issued to them. Please consider this [suggestion].

---

invaded the fighting Communist Party? Where did some Communist Party members who claimed to have learned Marxism go?  
(Mao Zedong: Attention should be paid to the discussion of the film "The Legend of Wu Xun".)



In the absence of a world war, our army should be a big school. Even under conditions of the third world war, it can still serve as a big school. In addition to fighting the war, it must do other work. In the eight years of the second world war, did we not do just that in the anti-Japanese base areas? In this big school, the army should learn politics, military affairs, and culture, and engage in agricultural production. It can build up its own middle- and small-size workshops to produce goods for its own use and the exchange of other goods of equal value. It can take part in mass work, factory work, and rural socialist education. After socialist education, there are always other kinds of mass work for it to do, to unite the army and people as one. The army should also participate in the revolutionary struggle against capitalist culture. In this way, it carries out military-educational, military-agricultural, military-industrial, and military-civilian work. Naturally, [these kinds of work] should be properly coordinated and a distinction should be made between major and subsidiary work. A unit can select one or two from the agricultural, industrial, and civilian combination, but not all three. In this way, the tremendous power of several million soldiers will be felt.

Likewise, workers should, in addition to their main industrial work, learn military affairs, politics, and culture, and take part in the socialist educational movement and in criticizing the capitalist class. Under adequate conditions, they should also engage in agricultural production, following the example of the Tach'ing (Daqing) Oilfield.

The communes do their main agricultural work (including forestry, fishing, animal husbandry, and subsidiary trades), but they must also learn military affairs, politics, and culture. When circumstances allow, they should collectively set up small-scale factories and take part in criticizing the capitalist class.

The students are in a similar position. Their studies are their chief work; they must also learn other things. In other words, they ought to learn industrial, agricultural, and military work in addition to class work. The school years should be shortened, education should be revolutionized, and the domination of our schools by bourgeois intellectuals should by no means be allowed to continue.

Under favourable conditions, people in commerce, service trades, and party and government offices should do likewise.

What has been said above is neither new nor original. Many people have been doing this for some time, but it has not yet become a widespread phenomenon. Our army has been working in this way for decades. Now it is on the threshold of new developments.

When it comes to a new socialist society, the new China of that time under the leadership of Chairman Mao was indeed a new society, a new society in which the whole society was filled with the spirit of communism. It was a great creation. If we look at China at that time not only at the level of development of the productive forces, but also at the level of comprehensive development of society as a whole, and especially at the level of development of human beings, we can say without exaggeration and in all truthfulness that China has surpassed not only the Soviet Union, but also the developed capitalist countries of the West.

Lei Feng is learnt everywhere. Under the leadership of Chairman Mao, China is truly an advanced socialist country holding aloft the red flag of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism; it is a new society in which 'one person is for all, and all people are for one person', in which there is both liveliness and unity of will, in which the free development of each individual is united with that of the whole society; and this is the road to the realisation of the historical task of socialism and to communism step by step.

Nowadays, many people do not understand why people of the older generation who came from that era are always nostalgic for a time when the economy was not yet developed, when life was not yet affluent, and even when many people were still poor. The answer lies in the fact that Chairman Mao led the entire nation to create a new society full of the spirit of communism and nurtured a new generation of people who adopted the communist ideology as their outlook on life.

Just as the revolutionary mentors taught, once human beings completely got rid of their animal nature and the alienation brought about by private ownership, and truly began to live as human beings, the free and happy life of human beings also began. Today's nostalgia for Chairman Mao's era is precisely a reflection of people's longing for the pursuit of this free and happy life of mankind - the life of communism.

This can in no way be described as 'nostalgia', but rather as 'seeking newness'.

### **(vi) Adherence to the line of continued socialist revolution in foreign policy.**

Socialism continues the revolution, not only in its internal but also in its external lines, guidelines and policies.

Under the correct leadership of Chairman Mao, the basic point of China's foreign policy at that time was to carry out the line of proletarian internationalism, the line of support for all the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat and of the oppressed peoples and nations throughout the world.

This is the only correct line of proletarian internationalism for a socialist country that has already gained power, and which, in the international arena, adheres to the class struggle as the programme and to the continuation of the revolution.

This is an important element that we must not ignore when studying the Maoist theory of continued socialist revolution.

The Marxist theory of communism is not a theory of nationalism, but a theory for the common liberation of the proletariat of the world and for the common liberation of all mankind. Therefore, the Marxist line of proletarian revolution and socialist revolution have always been internationalist. In an era when capitalism is moving towards imperialism, the international character of imperialism is inevitably all the more decisive in making only higher and more thoroughly internationalist demands on the revolutionary activities of the proletariat and the masses of working people.

The proletarian internationalist line upheld and defended by Maoism fully and correctly reflects the requirements of the times. It is under the guidance of the correct proletarian internationalist line of Maoism that the Communist Party of China and the Chinese people were able to make the contribution they should have made to the liberation movement of the proletariat and the masses of the working people throughout the world and to fulfil the internationalist obligations they should have fulfilled.

The War to Resist U.S. Aggression and Aid Korea and the War to Resist U.S. Aggression and Aid Vietnam were armed struggles to support the fight against imperialism headed by U.S. imperialism.

Assisting the national democratic revolutionary struggles and economic construction for the thriving national liberation and national independence in Asia, Africa and Latin America was a great struggle to support the fight against old and new colonialism and imperialism and to win the victory of the proletariat and the broad masses of working people throughout the world.

Resolutely opposing and resisting the revisionism and hegemonism of the Soviet revisionists is not only a struggle to defend the correct direction of the international communist movement, but also a struggle against the bullying of weak countries by social imperialism.

All these struggles on an international scale fully demonstrate that the theory of Mao Zedong's socialist continued revolution is not a narrow nationalist revolutionary theory limited to China, but a thorough internationalist revolutionary theory for the realization of the great ideal of communism.

This is the true Marxist-Leninist-Maoist revolutionary theory of socialism and communism based on Capital, Imperialism and the Three Worlds Theory.

**(vii) The theory of continued socialist revolution has another theoretical and practical aspect that cannot be ignored - 'the theory of the inevitability of error'.**

From Marx and Engels to Lenin to Chairman Mao, it has been stressed time and again that mistakes are inevitable. Chairman Mao even explicitly said that 'we are the theorists of the inevitability of mistakes'.

This is an important argument and practice of the Maoist theory of continued socialist revolution that cannot be ignored or forgotten.

As Chairman Mao said in 1958 when he visited the people's commune in the outskirts of Jinan, man, the animal, is always proud. Chairman Mao was right, speaking practically. This is a shortcoming that people usually have. It is not good for people to be unconfident, but it is not good for them to be overconfident. Without a correct way of thinking, it is not easy to handle the relationship between the two. The common fault is that one is only confident but not unconfident; one sees only achievements but not failures; one sees only right but not wrong. If a person makes such a mistake in his method of thought, it will bring losses to his work; and if a party makes such a mistake, the seriousness of the consequences is even more conceivable.

In my book *New Reflections on Epistemology*, there is an article titled "Human Knowledge is Always Limited", which aims to explore this issue from the perspective of epistemology. The cognitive ability of any person is always limited. It is impossible to "know everything". Not to mention that the world is infinitely vast and infinitely complex, no one can know everything in an all-encompassing way; even if one wants to deeply understand any specific thing and grasp the specific regularity in it, it is already very difficult for anyone, and it is always limited by one's own cognitive ability and objective conditions. In other words, cognition is always limited. Moreover, people always understand objective things at a specific time, in a specific scope, and under specific conditions, while objective things are always developing and changing, and new things are always emerging. In this case, the knowledge obtained by anyone, even if it is correct, can only be unified with specific conditions. For the infinitely developing objective things, this correct knowledge is still conditional, that is, it is still limited. This is what is often said that the truth recognized by people always has only relative significance.

Because there are always limits to human understanding, even correct understanding can be transformed into error if it is applied to conditions that have evolved and changed, and if it is inappropriately removed from the specific conditions that are linked to its truthfulness. This is what Lenin was talking about when he said that truth transformed into error if it went one step further. Dogmatists make mistakes because they do not understand this truth.

Chairman Mao was a master of materialistic dialectics. Throughout his life, he always paid great attention to the question of the methodology of thought, that is, the question of epistemology. The Maoist theory of continued socialist revolution also contains this important ideological and epistemological methodology. The 'theory of the inevitability of error' is one of these important ideological and epistemological methodologies.

Since ancient times, many correct epistemological truths have been left to us, both in terms of personal 'cultivation' and in terms of national governance. Although these truths, in terms of their class essence, are naturally in defence of the interests of the exploiting class, in terms of epistemology and method of thought, the emphasis on 'introspection' and 'accepting advice' is actually to see that there are always limitations to one's understanding, and that mistakes are always made, which can also be regarded as a kind of 'reflection' and 'admonition'. It can also be regarded as a kind of 'theory of the inevitability of mistakes'. This demonstrates the wisdom of our nation in its method of thinking and understanding. Chairman Mao has critically inherited the essence of this epistemology provided to us by the ancients and raised it to the level of a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist epistemology belonging to the proletariat and the broad masses of the people, and has become the ideological weapon of the proletariat and the broad masses of the labouring masses in carrying out socialist revolutions and in transforming the objective world.

From the point of view of political practice, especially from the point of view of guiding the continuation of the socialist revolution, adherence to the 'theory of the inevitability of error' is of great practical significance.

A simple truth known to all is that if one makes a mistake, does not admit it and continues to insist on it, then the mistake cannot be corrected in time, nor can the harm be stopped in time, but one will only sink deeper and deeper into the pit of mistakes, and the evil consequences of mistakes will become more and more serious. As Lenin said in his famous book "Left-Wing Communism'- an Infantile Disorder": 'A wise man is not a man who does not make mistakes; there is no such thing as a man who does not make mistakes and there can be no such thing as a man who does not make mistakes. A wise man is one who does not make major mistakes and at the same time can correct them easily and quickly.' (Lenin's Selected Works, Vol. IV, p. 192.) Moreover, Lenin particularly stressed that 'the attitude of a party towards its own mistakes is the most important and reliable measure of the party's solemnity and of the **true** fulfilment of the obligations it owes to its **class** and the working masses. To admit errors openly, to reveal their causes, to analyse the circumstances which gave rise to them, to discuss carefully the methods of correcting them, -this is the mark of a solemn party, this is the party's fulfilment of its obligations, and this is the education and training of **the class**, and therefore of the masses.' (Ibid., p. 213.)

Lenin's views and Chairman Mao's views are consistent in that they both adhere to the 'theory of the inevitability of error', which is a sign of intelligence, and in fact a sign of a correct way of thinking. This is particularly important for any individual, especially for communists and the Communist Party, which is often said to be a question of whether one can truly uphold the party spirit of communists. No matter how great the achievements of any revolutionary and progressive political party, including the Communist Party, there will inevitably always be limitations in its understanding in the face of new historical tasks, and mistakes will always be frequent in the course of actually leading a revolutionary movement. The same reasoning applies to the leadership of a continuing socialist revolution. If mistakes are made and not admitted, then it is only the cause of continued socialist revolution and the interests of the proletariat and the masses of the working people that will be harmed. This is a simple but heavy truth proved by countless mistakes and setbacks.

The path of continued socialist revolution that we have actually experienced has not been straight, but rather tortuous. This is true not only from the point of view of the general dialectic of history, but in fact it has come about in this way.

Under the leadership of Chairman Mao, we have made great achievements in continuing the socialist revolution; however, we must also see that in this historical process of exploration and creation, because of the lack of subjective understanding and the limitations of objective conditions, mistakes not only used to occur, but also some were very serious, with very heavy consequences. There were those in economic construction and those in political construction. We can only say that this is the price we inevitably have to pay in the process of moving forward with difficulty in order to uphold socialism and continue the revolution and to build a better socialist society.

The most acute problem, of course, is that socialism has suffered a common failure from the Soviet Union to China. If we do not look for the reasons, limitations, and mistakes made by the Communists and the masses themselves, this problem will never be solved.

Therefore, for a true communist, a true Marxist-Leninist-Maoist, it is very important and necessary to accept Chairman Mao's 'theory of the inevitability of mistakes', to admit mistakes bravely, to face them squarely, to reflect deeply on them, to learn from them seriously, and to avoid repeating the same mistakes in the future. That everything is good, absolutely good, is a metaphysical and erroneous understanding that is not in line with the laws of development of human society and history. We must adhere to the scientific materialist epistemology of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism in dealing with our own history-making activities.

At the same time, we must also insist that human understanding always has limitations, always has shortcomings, and always fails to keep pace with the needs of the development of the situation. We can see that the Maoist theory of continued socialist revolution has made a great practical and theoretical contribution to the transition from incomplete socialism at a lower level to complete socialism at a higher level, but at the same time we must also admit that there are still gaps in many theoretical and practical problems, which is an important reason why socialism will meet with failure. As later generations of the revolution, we have the responsibility to solve these problems theoretically and practically, so as to push Marxism-Leninism-Maoism further forward and develop it.

Chairman Mao wrote a very important instruction in December 1964: "The history of mankind is a history of continuous development from the kingdom of necessity to the kingdom of freedom. This history will never end. In a society with classes, class struggle will never end. In a society without classes, the struggle between the new and the old, between right and wrong will never end. Within the scope of production struggle and scientific experiment, mankind is always developing, and nature is always developing, and will never stop at one level. Therefore, mankind must constantly sum up experience, make discoveries, invent, create, and make progress. Arguments of stagnation, pessimism, inaction, and complacency are all wrong. They are wrong because they do not conform to the historical facts of the development of human society over the past one million years, nor do they conform to the historical facts of the natural world we know so far (such as the natural world reflected in the history of celestial bodies, the history of the earth, the history of biology, and the history of various other natural sciences)." Chairman Mao specifically mentioned here that "the struggle between the new and the old, between right and wrong will never end", and emphasized that "humankind must constantly sum up experience, make discoveries, invent, create, and make progress. The arguments of stagnation, pessimism, inaction and complacency are all wrong. They are wrong because these arguments do not conform to the historical facts of the development of human society over the past one million years, nor to the historical facts of nature as we know it so far (such as the history of

celestial bodies, the history of the earth, the history of biology, and the nature reflected in the history of various other natural sciences)." This is the scientific dialectical materialist epistemology left to us by Chairman Mao, and we should naturally implement it in our understanding of the continued socialist revolution.

By accepting the theory that "mistakes are inevitable" and solving the problem of ideological method, we can have a clearer and more correct understanding of the mistakes we have made in the practice of continuing socialist revolution. Below, we will give a few examples.

For example, in politics, although some "movements" were carried out, which played a positive role in promoting the socialist revolution, as Chairman Mao later said, it was still felt that the problem could not be completely solved, so the Cultural Revolution was launched to mobilize the broad masses of the people from the bottom up. But even so, it still could not really solve the problem of revisionism coming to power and capitalism being restored.

Now everyone is very anxious to see what should be done, what measures should be taken, and what revolutionary results should be achieved in the continued socialist revolutionary struggle in order to more effectively prevent revisionism from coming to power and capitalism from being restored; and, if problems with the line and regime occur, how can the majority of party members and the broad masses of the people exercise their democratic rights under the protection of a certain system, eliminate the careerists, conspirators, and revisionist leaders, and promptly resolve the problem of possible restoration and regression.

This is a major historical topic and historical task left to us by history for the socialist continued revolution.

How to better handle some specific issues in the socialist continued revolution still needs to be specifically summarized from historical experience and lessons.

How to correctly handle the division of two types of contradictions of different natures, especially how to correctly handle contradictions among the people, is also a very practical and important specific issue encountered in the process of the socialist continued revolution.

In 1957, Chairman Mao delivered a famous speech entitled "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People". After revision, it was officially published and became a programmatic work guiding my country's political life. However, despite having such a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist work in hand, in practice, on the issue of how to correctly and specifically handle contradictions among the people, many profound historical lessons were left. One is that Chairman Mao later said that there were limitations in the understanding and errors in practice regarding the criteria for dividing the two types of contradictions of different natures. Another is that when actually handling the two types of contradictions of different natures, the judgment of the nature of the contradictions was sometimes not accurate enough, and the handling method was even more inappropriate, confusing the two types of contradictions of different natures, leaving behind painful historical lessons. The correct redress of some cases during this period was actually a reflection and correction of this error.

If we look at it in detail, there are still many mistakes and lessons that should be reflected upon.

For example, in the handling of economic construction and economic relations, as Chairman Mao once said to Comrade Wu Lengxi on a special train to Henan: "We are prepared to make mistakes"; and in fact, mistakes have been made.



However, as Chairman Mao also said, "We live by summing up experience" (conversation with Li Zongren). On the basis of summing up experience, especially summing up mistakes and lessons, we adjust policies and make mistakes become the forerunners of correctness.

Let me give you a specific example mentioned above: In 1958, when dealing with the rural people's commune system, there was no experience in the form of ownership. Initially, there were various forms of ownership, including commune ownership, brigade ownership, and production team ownership. Which ownership form was more in line with the level of development of productivity and the level of consciousness of the peasant masses at that time needed to be tested in practice. Later, after continuous adjustments, it was finally implemented in a collective ownership form of "three-level ownership, with the team as the basis" that was more in line with the requirements of productivity development at that time. Judging from the historical conditions at that time, everyone felt that this problem was solved relatively well and correctly. This is completely in line with the inevitable process of people's practice and cognition.

For example, some struggles in the field of ideology and culture, whether in terms of determining the nature of the problem or in terms of the way of criticizing the struggle, have left important historical experience and valuable historical lessons.

In the field of ideology and culture, it is correct and necessary to adhere to class struggle as the key link and to criticize the ideas of the bourgeoisie and all other exploiting classes. It is a requirement for the continued socialist revolution.

The problem is how to do this struggle and this work well and handle it well. On the one hand, we must adhere to the principle of "letting a hundred flowers bloom and a hundred schools of thought contend" and let people speak out in a lively manner; on the other hand, we must pay attention to distinguishing between "fragrant flowers and poisonous weeds" and correctly handle the two types of contradictions of different natures. It is not easy to grasp the right balance in theory and practice.

From the lessons of history, we can see that in the criticism of the bourgeoisie and all other exploiting classes, including the criticism of some erroneous ideas, it is still necessary to adhere to Chairman Mao's repeated emphasis on 'presenting the facts and reasoning' and 'convincing people by reasoning', rather than leaving the facts aside or even distorting the facts and putting labels on them at will. We must not leave the facts, or even distort the facts, and go to the top, beating and labelling people at will. Doing so will not help people better accept the communist ideology, remove the erroneous ideas of the bourgeoisie and all other exploiting classes, and make people's thinking more progressive and revolutionary. Some lessons tell us that if we don't handle things properly, it will cause people to be disgusted and the result will be counterproductive. For example, in 1975, at the end of the Cultural Revolution, Chairman Mao wrote a comment on "The Builders": "This film has no major mistakes, and it is recommended to be released. Don't blame it completely. Moreover, there are as many as ten charges, which are too excessive and not conducive to adjusting the party's literary and artistic policies."<sup>4</sup> This is a typical example. The reason why such a mistake occurred, from a political point of view, is mainly because of the failure to correctly distinguish and correctly handle two types of contradictions of different natures; moreover, it is mainly to treat contradictions within the people, and problems in people's thoughts and world outlook as contradictions between enemies and

---

<sup>4</sup> "The Builders" (1974) depicts the difficulties of China's petroleum industry and the style of the oil field during the pioneering period. It begins in 1949 when workers at the Yuming oilfield are guarding their mine in anticipation of Liberation. In the years that follow, the workers resist expert opinion that China's oil is 'too poor' and waged a resolute struggle to change the oil industry from its backward state into an advanced industry typified by the "Daqing Spirit".

ourselves. Chairman Mao's criticism, in the final analysis, is to warn us that we must adhere to class struggle as the key link, adhere to the viewpoint of class struggle and the method of class analysis, and have a correct understanding of the nature of the class struggle that actually exists. In other words, we must correctly distinguish between the two types of contradictions of different natures, especially the problem of correctly handling the contradictions among the people. Now it seems that even in handling contradictions between enemies and ourselves, sometimes our grasp of policies is often inappropriate. From the highest and most fundamental legal principle, whether it is handling contradictions among the people or handling contradictions between enemies and ourselves, we cannot leave the Constitution. The Constitution is the highest legal principle. Any person and any political party must abide by the Constitution and use the Constitution as a criterion to formulate policies and handle problems.

This is a very prominent and realistic problem that socialist continued revolution often encounters, and it is a problem that still deserves our serious consideration and study even today.

The above seven points are but a brief review and a superficial understanding of the road of continued socialist revolution travelled by the Chinese people under the leadership of the Communist Party of China under the guidance of the Maoist theory of continued socialist revolution. The content of these points is not exhaustive, the understanding is not deep enough, and they are bound to be the 'theory of inevitable mistakes', so they are for reference only.

## **2. The theory of continued socialist revolution focuses on the rectification of those in power within the party who follow the capitalist road.**

Lenin once said: "Socialism means the abolition of classes." This is the fundamental historical content of the continued socialist revolution and the fundamental historical task of socialist society.

Historical experience and lessons tell us that building socialism (in a broad sense) is not just a question of economic construction. What is more important and of general significance is how to uphold the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship, how to persist in gradually eliminating classes through the dictatorship of the proletariat, and achieve the "two breaks", thereby achieving the transition from incomplete socialism to complete socialism and then to communist society.

In theory, this is also the question of how to uphold socialism and continue the revolution.

### **(i) The formulation and development of the theory of continued socialist revolution.**

In *The Class Struggle in France 1848-1850*, Marx states, 'Revolutionary socialism is the proclamation of constant revolution, the class dictatorship of the proletariat, a dictatorship which is the necessary transitional stage for the attainment of the elimination of all class distinctions, for the elimination of all the relations of production from which these distinctions derive, and for the elimination of all the social relations which correspond to these relations of production. It reaches the inevitable transitional stage of changing all the concepts that arise from these social relations.' This is Marx's highly abstract scientific analysis of the historical tasks of the historical stage of socialism, the scientific exposition and initial formulation of the theoretical principles of the continuing revolution of socialism.

Later, in his famous *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, Marx even more clearly delineated the first stage of a communist society - what we now commonly refer to as the socialist stage. Marx particularly emphasised that 'what we are talking about here is such a communist society, which is not already



developed on its own basis, but, on the contrary, has just arisen out of a capitalist society, and which therefore still carries with it, in all respects, economically, morally and spiritually, traces of the same old society out of which it was born.' Next, Marx analyses in particular that even when the system of ownership has been completely made public, in the field of distribution of products the distribution according to work has to be practised, and that the distribution according to work in reality still does not go beyond the principle of equivalence in the exchange of commodities, that is to say, it does not go beyond the principle of bourgeois right, and that it is a formal equality concealing actual inequality, and that it is contrary to the true and complete conception of equality of communism. However, Marx believed that, due to historical conditions, the existence of such a historical stage of transition to communism was inevitable. Of course, the socialism that was actually built later, because it all started from backward national conditions, was still quite different from the relatively complete socialism envisioned by Marx. The seriousness of the problem and the arduousness of the historical task were no longer just a matter of bourgeois right in the field of distribution. However, the theoretical principle left by Marx that the dictatorship of the proletariat must be upheld and the revolution must be continued during the socialist historical stage was very correct and far-sighted.

Later, Lenin further proposed through the practice of socialist revolution that socialism is the elimination of classes. The dictatorship of the proletariat is the continuation of class struggle under the condition that the proletariat holds political power, and is "a new form of proletarian class struggle (in other words, a new stage with new tasks)". (Collected Works of Lenin, Vol. 30, p. 74) This is the question of "why Lenin said dictatorship over the bourgeoisie" as mentioned by Chairman Mao in his "Theoretical Instructions".<sup>5</sup>

As we all know, Lenin had a very high level of Marxism and thought extremely sharply. In just a few years, Lenin came to the profound realisation that after the proletariat had seized power, it would be confronted with a longer historical period of class struggle, mainly with the bourgeoisie, and that this would be a class struggle with a 'new task, a new form, and a new stage'. Therefore, it is necessary to adapt to the requirements of this new class struggle, to continue to uphold and strengthen the dictatorship of the proletariat, that is to say, it is necessary to continue the class struggle against the bourgeoisie under the conditions of the proletariat's assumption of power, in accordance with the new requirements of 'new tasks, new forms and new stages'.

This is the content and substance of Lenin's definition of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Lenin left us an extremely valuable wealth of ideas. I have written a book entitled *On the Two Valuable Ideas Left by Lenin*, in which I have made some preliminary discussions on this issue and proposed that Leninism should be redefined. The definition of Leninism given by Stalin mainly describes one contribution, but Leninism should include two contributions: the theory of the socialist revolution, in which the proletariat seized power, and the theory of the construction of socialism (in a broader sense) under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, or the theory of the continuation of the socialist revolution.

In this book, I also quoted Chairman Mao's Speech at the Second Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee of the Communist Party of China on 15 November 1956, stating, 'Before the Cultural Revolution, when Chairman Mao talked about Lenin's contributions, he talked about three

---

<sup>5</sup> The "Theoretical Instructions" were a series of remarks made by Chairman Mao between September and December 1974. In relation to Lenin, it was reported that "Recently, when Comrades Enlai and Hongwen were reporting on their work, Chairman Mao again gave extremely important instructions on domestic work, instructing us in particular to study Lenin's thesis on the dictatorship of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie, and to write an article so that the whole country would know about it." – Trans.

aspects, one was the contribution to the theory of proletarian revolution, the other to the theory of the construction of socialism, and the other was the contribution to the method of thought. Chairman Mao did not copy Stalin's statement.'

Chairman Mao's exact words were these: 'The doctrine of Leninism has developed Marxism. In what respects has it done so? First, in world outlook, that is, in materialism and dialectics; and second, in revolutionary theory and tactics, particularly on the questions of class struggle, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the political party of the proletariat. And then there are Lenin's teachings on socialist construction. Beginning from the October Revolution of 1917, construction went on in the midst of revolution, and thus Lenin had seven years of practical experience in construction, something denied to Marx. It is precisely these fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism that we have been learning.' (Selected Works of Mao Zedong, Volume V, p. 322, People's Publishing, 1977 edition).

These theoretical thoughts and practical activities of Marx and Lenin are in essence the theoretical creation and practical exploration of the theory of continued socialist revolution.

In the past, we always thought that the theoretical idea of continued socialist revolution was first put forward by Chairman Mao. This is actually a misunderstanding that does not correspond to historical reality. It is mainly because we have not studied enough, researched enough and understood inappropriately the theories and practices of Marx, and especially Lenin, on the necessity of continued socialist revolution. It is neither in line with historical facts nor with Chairman Mao's thinking. Chairman Mao clearly said that 'Lenin never stopped', referring to Lenin's insistence on continuing the revolution. It should not be difficult to understand this point, given the existence of the writings of Marx and Lenin and their practice.

Unfortunately, Stalin did not have a correct understanding of Marx's and Lenin's ideas and theories of continued socialist revolution, continued adherence to the class struggle and continued adherence to the dictatorship of the proletariat. Chairman Mao believed that Stalin had made a 'big mistake' on the question of whether class struggle existed in socialist society and whether it should be maintained as a programme (see Document No. 4 of 1976 of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China).

However, in analysing this problem, we should not just see the responsibility of individuals, or even the responsibility of the Party, but we should rather try to find the historical inevitability and historical regularity contained therein. Only by doing so will it be more realistic for us today and in the future to avoid repeating the mistakes we have already made. Moreover, if we look at the reality squarely, it is that up to the present day, we have still not yet completely got rid of our blindness on this issue, have not truly and fully realised the profound lessons left behind by history, and are still bound by all sorts of erroneous understandings of socialist society.

It is indeed difficult to understand this problem. The difficulty lies in the fact that the socialist society we are facing is a completely new but transitional society that is completely different from the previous exploitative class society. The basic characteristics and basic historical tasks of this society are completely and fundamentally different from the basic characteristics and basic historical tasks of the previous exploitative class society. Moreover, in specific countries with different levels of development and historical and cultural backgrounds, the historical conditions provided for building socialism are even more varied. In this case, it is inevitable that we cannot simply apply the concepts and theories of class and class struggle that were applicable to the general class society in the past, but must put forward new theoretical understandings based on the new, especially the basic laws of class and class struggle under the historical conditions of the specific socialist society of each country and the historical tasks of transitioning to a new and higher level of communist society.

Moreover, there is another point, too, to which special attention must be paid, that, contrary to the conception of Marx and Engels, the first victories of the socialist revolutions took place not in the more developed capitalist countries, but in the relatively backward Russia, and especially in the even more backward China. This was due to various special historical conditions. Lenin, Stalin and Chairman Mao have all made many scientific statements on this question. However, these special historical conditions determine that it is possible to win the socialist revolution first in these countries, but they also determine that there are special difficulties in carrying the socialist revolution to the end in these countries. This is true both from the point of view of the subjective forces that carry out socialist revolutions and from the point of view of the objective objects with which they are confronted.

This was seen, above all, profoundly by Lenin. In his 1919 article, 'The Third International and its Place in History,' he wrote: 'I have repeatedly said that it was easier for the Russians **to begin** the great proletarian revolution than for all the advanced countries, but it was more difficult to **continue** it to the point of obtaining the final victory, i.e., the complete completion of a socialist society.' (Selected Works of Lenin, Vol. III, p. 812.) The following year, in 1920, Lenin emphasised again in "'Left-Wing Communism' – An Infantile Disorder": 'It is much more difficult to create truly revolutionary parliamentary groups in the parliaments of Europe than in Russia. This is self-evident. But this is only part of the whole truth, and the whole truth is that it was easy to **start** a socialist revolution in Russia in the very unique and specific historical situation of 1917, but it was more difficult to **continue** the revolution and carry it through to the end than it was in the countries of Europe. I had also pointed this out at the beginning of 1918, and the experience of the two years that followed this has fully confirmed the correctness of this judgement.' (Selected Works of Lenin, Vol. IV, p. 219.) Lenin puts emphasis on **the beginning** and **the continuation** in all these discourses. The '**continuation**' that Lenin refers to here is actually what we now often call the continuation of the revolution, the continuation of the socialist revolution. During the short years of his rule, Lenin, through practice, summed up a great deal of experience and lessons concerning all aspects of socialist continued revolution, which is a valuable theoretical treasure left to us.

Chairman Mao has had longer and more practice, a fuller understanding and more summing up, leaving behind a large number of theoretical ideas, which, in a nutshell, eventually led to the formation of the theory of continued socialist revolution.

But, frankly speaking, this historical task has not yet been completed, and it has to be continued.

Now, after more than 40 years of revisionism coming to power and the restoration of capitalism, we are faced with the difficulties of launching a socialist re-revolution, and we have at last seen this problem more clearly, and have come to feel and realise more deeply that this is a very difficult and realistic historical problem before communists all over the world.

When it comes to Stalin and Chairman Mao's criticism of Stalin's insufficient understanding of the existence of classes and class struggle in socialist society, we have to have a correct understanding and a correct attitude. The legacy left behind by Stalin, be it positive or negative, is very valuable to us and needs to be analysed and studied scientifically, and we must not be like Khrushchev, who totally rejected Stalin and killed him with a stick.

There is no history without regrets. But it is regret that teaches people to move on.

Marx put forward theoretical principles, Lenin made further theoretical and practical advances, and as their successors, it is always necessary to make new contributions, new developments, both theoretically and practically, on the basis of the inheritance of the Marxist and Leninist theories on the necessity of continuing the revolution in socialism, and in the light of the new socialist practice.

Unfortunately, the Soviet Party became revisionist; fortunately, Chairman Mao took on this historical task.

Since the founding of the People's Republic of China, Chairman Mao pointed out in a timely and sharp way that "after the enemies with guns are defeated, the enemies without guns will still exist". The victory won by the revolution now is only the first step in the Long March. Next, we have to accept the test of "going to Beijing to take the exam". We must continue to persist in class struggle and the people's democratic dictatorship, that is, we must persist in socialism and continue the revolution.

According to Chairman Mao's ideological and political lines, there were a series of continuous "movements". For example, the "Suppression of Counterrevolutionaries Movement", the "Three Antis and Five Antis Movement", the Anti-Rightist Movement, and the Socialist Education Movement (abbreviated as the "Four Cleanups Movement"); within the Party, there was the struggle to eliminate the "Gao-Rao Anti-Party Group" and the struggle against right-wing opportunism; at the same time, in the field of ideology and culture, there was a continuous criticism of the widely influential bourgeois idealism, historical views, and other erroneous ideas. In particular, in conjunction with the international debate on Khrushchev's revisionism, criticism of revisionist trends was also launched at home.

These struggles were of great political significance to the consolidation and development of the newly established socialist China. They were the first of their kind in the international communist movement and the initial embodiment of Mao Zedong's theory of continuing socialist revolution, which was to "take class struggle as the key link."

Of course, looking back today and reflecting on these movements and struggles, as mentioned above, while affirming their positive and active significance, we have also gradually realized that there are indeed certain shortcomings and mistakes, which are mainly reflected in the judgment and handling of the two types of contradictions of different natures mentioned above. These negative historical lessons and positive historical experiences are equally important to us Communists today.

## **(ii) The new contribution and development of Maoism to the theory of continued socialist revolution.**

With the development of socialist society, Chairman Mao found that these above struggles were not a complete solution to the problem, and that a new understanding had to be gained of the classes and class struggles that existed in such a long historical stage as socialist society.

Two sharp and bitter class struggles advanced Chairman Mao's understanding of class and class struggle in the historical period of socialist society. One was the international struggle with the Soviet revisionist party represented by Khrushchev; the other was the domestic struggle with the party revisionists represented by Liu Shaoqi over the issues of 'contracting production to the household' and 'capitalists-roaders' raised in the 'Four Clean-ups Movement'.

It was these two international and domestic class struggles that gave Chairman Mao a new scientific understanding of the class struggle at the historical stage of socialist society. This is what Chairman Mao later emphasised: 'The class struggle was reintroduced in 1962'.<sup>6</sup>

The 'reintroduction' here is no longer a 'reintroduction' of the original understanding of the real class struggle, but a 'reintroduction' of the new understanding of the class under the new socialist socio-

---

<sup>6</sup> i.e., with the "Four Clean-ups Movement" – trans.

historical conditions, Instead, it is 'reintroducing' a new understanding of class and class struggle under the new historical conditions of socialist society, in effect 'reintroducing' the theory of continued revolution under socialist conditions. The 'reintroduction' is in fact a new introduction, a new creation, a new development, a theoretical cornerstone for the Maoist theory of continued revolution under socialism. Hence, Chairman Mao proposed the basic line of the Party for the entire socialist historical period: "Socialist society is a relatively long historical stage. In this historical stage of socialism, there are still classes, class contradictions and class struggles, there is a struggle between the two roads of socialism and capitalism, and there is the danger of capitalist restoration. We must recognize the long-term and complexity of this struggle. We must be vigilant. We must carry out socialist education. We must correctly understand and handle the problems of class contradictions and class struggles, and correctly distinguish and handle contradictions between ourselves and the enemy and contradictions among the people. Otherwise, a socialist country like ours will go to the opposite side, will degenerate, and will see restoration. From now on, we must talk about this every year, every month, and every day, so that we can have a clearer understanding of this issue and have a Marxist-Leninist line."

This basic line formulated by Chairman Mao for our Party reveals the objective laws of class struggle in the historical stage of socialism, clarifies the nature, object, task and future of the continued socialist revolution, is the lifeline of our Party and country, and is the guideline for us to do a good job in all aspects of our work. In short, this is a basic line of "taking class struggle as the key link". Subsequently, with the development of class struggle, especially after the practice of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, the basic content and key points of this basic line have also been continuously developed.

We must see that this was a new historical issue that had not yet been answered by Marxism in theory and practice. Many Communist parties that had already come to power, especially those in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, were unable to correctly answer this new historical issue. As Chairman Mao said, more than 100 parties in the world no longer believe in Marxism-Leninism. As a result, sliding into revisionism became a historical inevitability.

After the proletariat has seized political power and carried out the socialist transformation of the means of production, how to understand the historical task of continuing the revolution in socialist society, especially how to understand whether classes and class struggle still exist in socialist society, whether to persist in the dictatorship of the proletariat, and how to gradually resolve the issue of eliminating classes, is a new historical issue facing the international communist movement.

In particular, historical facts at that time tell us that as socialist practice gradually progressed, the historical conditions faced by Lenin's era had undergone fundamental changes. Whether in China or in the Soviet Union and Eastern European socialist countries, some new phenomena and new problems of class and class struggle that needed to be solved urgently did emerge.

This is a new historical issue raised by the times. The Communist parties in the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and other countries have not been able to answer this historical issue. The historical task of answering this historical issue fell on the shoulders of Chairman Mao.

Chairman Mao inherited and developed Marx and Lenin, and elevated the Marxist-Leninist theory that socialism must continue to revolutionize to a new stage of Maoism.

Chairman Mao himself probably saw it this way, as reflected in his self-evaluation of "two things I did in my life". Chairman Mao himself said that the so-called two things were the New Democratic Revolution and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. Today, from a theoretical point of view, these two things are essentially the theory of the New Democratic Revolution and the theory of the Socialist

Revolution (the theory of the Socialist Revolution includes the theory of the continued socialist revolution and the theory of the socialist re-revolution).

By the way, let me explain. The idea of "two things" was Chairman Mao's. However, the so-called "conversation on two things" with Hua Guofeng and others was fabricated. The key point is that it fabricated the following passage: "The other thing, as you know, is to launch the Cultural Revolution. There are not many supporters of this matter, but there are many opponents. These two things have not been decided. How to hand over this legacy to the next generation? Peaceful handover is not possible. It seems that it will have to be handed over in turmoil, and it may be bloody. What will you do, what will the next generation do, only God knows." This carefully concocted "conversation" took place in the summer and autumn of 1976, when rumours were flying everywhere in order to interfere with the "criticism of Deng." It can be seen that this 'talk', firstly, came from the top because there was a reason for it, and the President had the idea of 'two things', which was obviously fabricated by those who were in the know; and secondly, the so-called 'bloody storm' was to create public opinion for the coup, which was in line with the thinking behind the 'April Fifth Incident' launched at that time.<sup>7</sup> I and other comrades have written articles on this 'talk' (my article is: 'Examination of the Authenticity of Chairman Mao's Talk on Two Matters'). In particular, when I asked Comrade Mao Yuanxin whether there was such a talk, Comrade Mao Yuanxin said in a phone call to me at 23:00 on 15 September 2016 that he had been by Chairman Mao's side during that time and that he could say with certainty that there was no such talk. (Note 1) And, according to some comrades' articles, Mao Yuanxin and Hua Guofeng, both of whom had written negative proof materials to the Central Committee on this issue. I also interviewed my teacher, Professor Jin Chongji, who told me that he had personally interviewed Zhang Yufeng and Wu Xujun<sup>8</sup>, and they both proved that Chairman Mao did say "I did two things in my life," and that Chairman Mao also explained that "these are the two things that can be mentioned." However, regarding that "conversation," the teacher said that he had never looked it up, and that he first learned about it from Ye Jianying's public speech. In summary, Chairman Mao had the idea of "doing two things in his life," which is an important self-evaluation. However, that "conversation" was fabricated, and some of its contents were definitely not Chairman Mao's thoughts. For example, the so-called "not many people support it, but many oppose it. "How to hand over this legacy to the next generation? Peaceful handover is not possible. It seems that it will have to be handed over in turmoil, and it may be bloody. What will you do, what will the next generation do, only God knows." And so on. This is completely opposite and completely opposed to the thoughts reflected in Chairman Mao's "important instructions" officially announced in the Central Document No. 4, which Chairman Mao "agreed" at the time. It is nothing more than preparing public opinion for the counter-revolutionary coup.

Chairman Mao insisted on applying the viewpoints and methods of historical materialism to the observation of socialist society, and profoundly argued that, due to the specific realities of the

---

<sup>7</sup> Comrade Zhou Enlai died on January 8, 1976. On the occasion of the Qing Ming Festival, when Chinese pay their respects to those who have died, many people who felt that Zhou's passing had not been sufficiently mourned, took wreaths for Zhou to Tiananmen Square. Deng Xiaoping and Hu Yaobang conspired to turn the event into a repudiation of the "Gang of Four" and the event took an anti-Party turn and was described as a counter-revolutionary incident - Trans.

<sup>8</sup> Zhang Yufeng worked as a dining car attendant and broadcaster for the Mudanjiang Railway Bureau in the 1960s, after which she was transferred to the Special Transportation Department of the Ministry of Railways as an attendant on Mao Zedong's special train, and served as the Chairman's confidential secretary for a long time since July 1970. Wu Xujun, female, former head nurse of Mao Zedong's health care programme and former deputy director of PLA Hospital 305 -Trans.



historical conditions, in this very long transitional stage of history there will inevitably exist a variety of classes and class struggles, the main contradiction and dominant struggle of which will be that of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and that of the two paths of socialism and capitalism, and thus the danger of the restoration of capitalism. and thus the danger of capitalist restoration. This class struggle is reflected in the Communist Party in the struggle between the Marxist line of continued socialist revolution and the revisionist line of capitalist road and restoration of capitalism.

To this day, the revisionists are still afraid to admit this fact, and many comrades tend to stand still in the face of this issue.

Chairman Mao is different. Chairman Mao has always insisted that this fact should be recognised, that it should be respected, that the law of class struggle reflected in this fact should be respected, and that there should be no 'stopping', but that the revolution should continue and move forward.

On the basis of summarizing the practical experience of class struggle after the founding of the People's Republic of China, especially on the basis of summarizing the practical experience of the Cultural Revolution, Chairman Mao further explored and theoretically summarized the basic laws of class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie under socialist conditions, thereby achieving further theoretical development, which is: "You are making revolution and yet you don't know where the bourgeoisie is. It is right in the Communist Party. . those in power taking the capitalist road. The capitalist-roaders are still on the capitalist road."

This identifies the dominant and main class contradiction among the many class contradictions that lead to the existence of classes and class struggles under socialist conditions. This is a leap in the understanding of class struggle in socialist society. It is precisely because of this understanding that it is possible not only to see that class contradictions and class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie still exist in socialist society, but also to find the main point and the general programme for leading the proletariat and the masses of the people to continue the class struggle against the bourgeoisie.

This is the central Maoist theory on the need for continued revolution under the conditions of a socialist society.

This is a theory that has never been taught by any Marxist revolutionary mentor, and it is a theory that has never been proposed in the history of the development of Marxist theory. However, this is precisely the core idea, core content, and core theory of Mao Zedong's theory of continuing socialist revolution. Its understanding of the class struggle that exists in socialist society and of "taking class struggle as the key link" is a new qualitative leap. It further clarifies the main contradictions and dominant contradictions of this class struggle, thereby making the understanding of this class struggle more profound, concrete, and scientific. This is of great significance in theory, and especially in practice, for formulating the proletarian strategy for continuing the revolution under socialist conditions.

This is the most significant new breakthrough, new contribution and new development of Maoism to the Marxist theory of socialist revolution. T

o be able to do this requires great theoretical courage and extraordinary theoretical talent.

Chairman Mao is just such a giant. Chairman Mao met the needs of history.

### **(iii) The struggle against capitalist-roaders is the key to "taking class struggle as the key link"**

We must thoroughly study and truly understand Maoism's theory on capitalist-roaders. This is the core of Maoist theory on the continued socialist revolution, a very scientific conclusion on the object, nature and tasks of the continued socialist revolution, and the key to the key—"taking class struggle as the key link."

It is completely understandable that revisionists do not understand and hate this theory. It has its historical inevitability. For example, Chairman Mao criticized Deng Xiaoping: "He represents the bourgeoisie, but he says that class contradictions are not clear." It is an objective fact that there is class struggle between the proletariat represented by true Marxists and the bourgeoisie represented by capitalist-roaders in the party, but how can the capitalist-roaders recognize this objective fact? In January 1965, when discussing the documents of the "Four Cleanups Movement", namely the "Twenty-three Articles", the debate between Chairman Mao and Liu Shaoqi on the issue of capitalist-roaders was a typical example of this historical inevitability.

The restoration and anti-restoration struggles that have developed to this day for more than 40 years have always revolved around "taking class struggle as the key link", especially around "taking class struggle with opposition to capitalist-roaders as the key link".

In order to more deeply understand and comprehend the importance and correctness of this theory, we also need to use historical materialism as an analytical method to study the deep-seated reasons on the social basis why such classes and basic laws of class struggle must exist in socialist society, which is a lower stage of communist society.

We return to Lenin's teaching, the very profound idea of historical materialism which Lenin repeatedly expounded, that it is easier for backward countries to launch socialist revolutions, but it is more difficult to carry them on to the end. From the perspective of historical materialist methodology, Lenin's thought tells us that when studying the laws of continued revolution in socialist society, we must start from the level of development of the social form of a specific socialist society and the various social and historical conditions determined by the level of development of this social form.

Chairman Mao inherited this idea from Lenin.

Chairman Mao promptly analysed the inevitable limitations of the socialist society we actually faced in terms of economy, politics, ideology and culture based on the realistic historical conditions of the socialist society we actually faced. At the same time, he also analysed the limitations of the Party, the masses of the people and the entire society that were inevitably brought about by these limitations. He scientifically demonstrated the fact that revisionism and capitalist restoration had inevitably arisen or were arising in socialist countries such as the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and China to varying degrees, and revealed that this was the social root of the inevitable existence of classes and class struggle under socialist conditions.

Chairman Mao made many such statements, and they should also include those written by a writing team under the personal guidance and revision of Chairman Mao, such as the Chinese Communist Party's "Proposal on the General Line of International Communism" and "Nine Commentaries", as well as other articles opposing international revisionism such as that of France's Thorez and Italy's Togliatti.

Practice produces true knowledge. In order to respond to and master the new classes and class struggle in this new situation in a timely manner, Chairman Mao creatively put forward a whole set of theories, including a whole set of routes, guidelines, and policies, for the continuation of the socialist revolution against revisionism and against the restoration of capitalism, and he personally initiated and led the practice of the Proletarian Cultural Revolution 'as a serious exercise'.



The theories and practices put forward by Chairman Mao around this theme constitute the main and central element of Maoism's theory of continued socialist revolution.

Maoism's theoretical thinking on this issue deserves our serious study and research. Here, I will briefly discuss a little of my learning experience.

Chairman Mao had two predictions about the restoration of capitalism, which were proven to be completely correct through practical tests.

One is that "if Lin Biao and his kind come to power, it will be easy to establish a capitalist system." The fact that capitalism has been restored in China proves this point. It is really "easy to establish a capitalist system."

Another is that if revisionism comes to power and capitalism is restored, a fascist bourgeois dictatorship and the worst kind of capitalism will be established. They also make a vivid comparison, saying: "Hitler is worse than de Gaulle" and "it is the rule of a group of big gangsters." The fact that capitalism has been restored in China also proves this point. We have suffered the "worst" and are still suffering today.

Chairman Mao's scientific foresight did not come out of thin air, but was summarized from historical experience.

From the Soviet Union to China, a common fact is that the so-called revisionism came to power, that is, the revisionist leaders, the revisionist leader group, that is, the biggest capitalist-roaders in the party came to power. From Khrushchev, to Gorbachev, to Deng Xiaoping, and even to "Yi Zun"<sup>9</sup>, this is the fact.

As far as the political system of countries ruled by a Communist Party is concerned, as long as the leadership of the Communist Party is in control, it is equivalent to controlling the political power, and which class holds the political power determines everything. Chairman Mao also talked about this issue more than once, saying that things are often like this, once the leader changes, everything changes.

In this case, what the 'deputy commander-in-chief' said is indeed manifested in the following: 'Leadership is power'.<sup>10</sup> Whichever class holds the power determines which class's line it is, and whether the line is correct or not, as Chairman Mao said, determines everything. The struggle between Marxism and revisionism, the struggle between the socialist road and the capitalist road, the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, that is, the struggle between the communists and the capitalists, is centred in the struggle for leadership and for the line. Revisionism's struggle for leadership is what we often call revisionism coming to power, that is, the revisionist line coming to power. Under the rule of the revisionist line, the restoration of capitalism is inevitable, and since power is in the hands of the vice-commander-in-chief, as he put it, 'power is the power of repression', and since the power of repression is in the hands of the vice-commander-in-chief, the restoration of capitalism is 'very easy' to carry out. The proletarian revolutionaries in China have learnt this most profoundly after the 'October 6th coup d'état'<sup>11</sup> and the brutal counter-attacks and counter-counter-attacks throughout the country.

---

<sup>9</sup> A code word used by Chinese netizens to refer to Xi Jinping as the one and only authority within the party and China - Trans.

<sup>10</sup> These are comments made by Lin Biao in a Speech at the Enlarged Session of the Political Bureau of the CPC Central Committee on May 18, 1966 – Trans.

<sup>11</sup> This refers to the arrest of the Gang of Four by Hua Guofeng, Ye Jianying on October 6, 1976 – Trans.

The historical inevitability of the emergence of revisionist leaders requires further explanation and understanding.

Chairman Mao said: Whether the ideological and political line is correct or not determines everything. Why did Chairman Mao use the concept of "ideological" here? This tells us a truth: the reason why the revisionist leaders and capitalist-roaders put forward the revisionist line and stubbornly insisted on taking the capitalist road is inseparable from their ideology and world outlook. The ideological line determines the political line. It is the bourgeois nature of their ideology and world outlook that determines that they will inevitably put forward the revisionist political line and restore capitalism. The political line is the concentrated expression of class nature. The line struggle is the concentrated expression of class struggle. In this case, the ideological line problem of the revisionist leaders and capitalist-roaders who usurped the leadership of the party is not a general problem of cognitive error, but has the significance of representing the bourgeoisie and the significance of class and class struggle. Chairman Mao said that the bourgeoisie is within the Communist Party, and it is in this sense that he raised the issue.

This is an important ideological theory, but it seems a little incredible. As a Communist Party member who has participated in the revolution under the banner of communism for decades and has become the highest-level leader of the Communist Party, how could he become a revisionist, a representative of the bourgeoisie, and ultimately a class enemy who destroyed socialism?

Those who have transformed from "old comrades" to capitalist-roaders certainly do not understand, accept, or resist this issue; and the general public has not figured it out for quite a long time, which inevitably provides an opportunity for the "easy" restoration of capitalism.

However, this does not affect the fact that Chairman Mao's point that "the bourgeoisie is within the Communist Party" is a truth that has been cruelly proven by facts.

The great Chairman Mao bravely and timely summarized this truth from practice. This is a brand-new understanding and a brand-new theory. It is the cornerstone of Mao Zedong's theory of continuing socialist revolution, a scientific summary of the experience of the struggle of the line within the Communist Party under socialist conditions, and a new contribution and new development to the Marxist theory of the existence of classes and class struggle in socialist society.

Comrades who are familiar with the history of the international communist movement know that the struggle against opportunist and revisionist leaders and the struggle against opportunist and revisionist lines have always been class struggles between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie; if the opportunist and revisionist lines succeed, the party will degenerate and the revolution will suffer a tragic defeat. The Marxist revolutionary mentors have made a lot of discussions on this, and the international communist movement has also had a lot of experience and lessons in this regard. However, under the socialist conditions where the Communist Party leads and implements the dictatorship of the proletariat, how should we understand this issue, especially in the historical period of defeating the open enemy, stabilizing the regime of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and starting peaceful construction, how should we understand that new classes and class struggles will appear in the Communist Party under the new historical conditions, and how should we understand their severity and regularity, which has become a brand new topic facing the Communists.

Theory always follows practice. To solve this theoretical problem, practice is needed to gain true knowledge.

It was during the practice of the Cultural Revolution that this theoretical question was first raised. I mentioned this question again in my article "Only Socialism Can Save Itself" written not long ago. For the concept of class under socialist conditions, we cannot dogmatically apply Lenin's definition of class and understand it only from the perspective of economic relations, but we must also understand it from the perspective of ideology and politics. Especially for the revisionist leaders, we must insist on judging their class attributes from the perspective of ideology, politics, and line. Chairman Mao's statement that the bourgeoisie "is within the Communist Party" refers to this. This is a completely new understanding and theory of the existence of classes and class struggle under socialist conditions, especially within the Communist Party.

From Khrushchev to Gorbachev, to Deng Xiaoping, to "Yizun", they all served as the best negative teachers for the Communists on this issue. The serious disaster of capitalist restoration they brought deeply stimulated the Communists to face up to this reality and to think about Marxism-Leninism-Maoism from this reality.

Chairman Mao explained this issue scientifically.

Chairman Mao had a scientific class characterization of the revisionist leaders. In the May 16th Notice of 1966, Chairman Mao characterized them as "representatives of the bourgeoisie". In the "Important Instructions" of 1976, Chairman Mao more clearly characterized them as the bourgeoisie within the Party and as the targets of the socialist revolution.

This clearly tells us that the existence of revisionist leaders is not an accidental social phenomenon of an individual; nor is it merely an ideological problem. The harm they bring is not the result of an individual sin, but a historical necessity with a class basis, and is the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie under socialist conditions.

This is the principal contradiction among the many class contradictions under socialist conditions, and is the general principle of classes and class struggle under socialist conditions.

Chairman Mao's view of the capitalist-roader phenomenon as a class phenomenon, a bourgeois phenomenon, is based on profound theoretical analysis and sufficient theoretical basis.

Chairman Mao wrote in his famous instruction on April 23, 1975: "Not many people in our party really understand Marxism-Leninism." The problem is, as Chairman Mao said, in terms of ideology and world outlook, there are two schools, either proletarian or bourgeois; similarly, either Marxist or revisionist. Not understanding Marxism-Leninism means accepting the revisionist ideology of the bourgeoisie. Chairman Mao criticized Deng Xiaoping in 1976: "He does not understand Marxism-Leninism, but represents the bourgeoisie." He further criticized Deng Xiaoping by saying, "He represents the bourgeoisie, but says that class contradictions are not clear." It can be seen that not understanding Marxism-Leninism and representing the bourgeoisie are unified. If you do not understand Marxism-Leninism, you will inevitably represent the bourgeoisie.

Chairman Mao made the following analysis on the ideological and world outlook problems of the old comrades: "Some comrades, mainly the old comrades, are still stuck in the stage of bourgeois democratic revolution. They do not understand the socialist revolution, and they are resistant to it and even oppose it. Why didn't Lenin stop? After the democratic revolution, the workers and the poor and lower-middle peasants did not stop. They wanted revolution, but some party members did not want to move forward. Some retreated and opposed the revolution."

Chairman Mao's analysis here is the ideological root of the emergence of capitalist-roads, which also shows that capitalist-roads are not a phenomenon of individuals, but a phenomenon of a class.

What happened later fully proved this point.

At that time, the leadership group headed by Deng Xiaoping, Chen Yun, Hua Guofeng, Ye Jianying, Li Xiannian, Hu Yaobang, Zhao Ziyang, Wan Li, etc. was basically a capitalist-roader group and a revisionist group; the so-called "4,000-person conference"<sup>12</sup> that accused and opposed Chairman Mao, the "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee, and the actual capitalist restoration activities that supported Deng Xiaoping and Deng Xiaoping's line, and the counterattack against the proletarian revolutionaries, all fully proved that this was a class behavior and class struggle phenomenon that was by no means accidental under socialist conditions. Moreover, its cruelty and intensity were no less than the class and class struggle process that the proletariat had experienced in the past to seize power. It was just that this was a reactionary counterattack by the bourgeoisie to seize power and restore power.

As early as December 1964, Chairman Mao pointed out the fact of class and class antagonism in his "Instructions on the Socialist Education Movement". Chairman Mao wrote in his instructions: "Management is also socialist education. If management personnel do not go to the workshop group to do the three samenesses<sup>13</sup>, worship the teacher<sup>14</sup>, and learn one or several skills, they will be in a state of sharp class struggle with the working class for the rest of their lives, and will inevitably be overthrown by the working class as the bourgeoisie." Chairman Mao further analysed: "The bureaucratic class and the working class and the poor and lower-middle peasants are two sharply antagonistic classes. These leaders who are taking the capitalist road have become or are becoming bourgeois elements who suck the blood of workers. How can they fully understand the necessity of socialist revolution? These people are the objects of struggle and revolution. The socialist education movement cannot rely on them. We can only rely on those cadres who have no hatred for the workers and have a revolutionary spirit. "These brilliant and profound remarks of Chairman Mao tell us that in the socialist education movement before the Cultural Revolution (that is, the "Four Cleanups" movement), Chairman Mao had already seen the problems of the new bourgeoisie and saw that this new bourgeoisie was the "object of revolution" under socialist conditions. From these instructions, we can also see that the "leaders who are taking the capitalist road" proposed by Chairman Mao and the "capitalist roaders in power (capitalist roaders)" used later are actually of the same meaning and are the initial formation and proposal of this concept.

After the practice of the Cultural Revolution, Chairman Mao further analyzed the problem of the new bourgeoisie from the perspective of economic status. After saying that "some party members do not want to move forward, some retreat and oppose the revolution", he asked himself, "Why?" Then he answered himself: "Because they have become high officials and want to protect the interests of high officials. They have a good house, a car, a high salary, and waiters, and are more powerful than the capitalists. With the socialist revolution they themselves come under fire. At the time of the cooperative transformation of agriculture there were people in the Party who opposed it, and when it comes to criticising bourgeois right, they resent it. You are making the socialist revolution. and yet

---

<sup>12</sup> In February 1980, Deng Xiaoping commissioned a drafting group headed by Hu Qiaomu to begin writing a "Resolution on Several Historical Issues Since the Founding of the People's Republic of China". In the middle of the year, the General Office of the CPC Central Committee organized a month-long discussion of the Draft among 4,000 senior party cadres (about 1,000 in central organs and 3,000 at the local and provincial military levels). More than 5,600 people actually participated, including 1,548 students from the Central Party School. Reflecting the ascendant capitalist-roader ideology, many criticisms were made of the draft for not condemning Chairman Mao strongly enough -Trans.

<sup>13</sup> This was the requirement that cadres going to learn from the masses should share the same conditions, including food and accommodation – Trans..

<sup>14</sup> "The teacher" being the workers and peasants that cadres were sent to learn from – Trans.

don't know where the bourgeoisie is. It is right in the Communist Party-those in power taking the capitalist road. The capitalist-roads are still on the capitalist road." Here, Chairman Mao talked about economic relations and political positions, and explained clearly and profoundly the class basis for the revisionist leaders to come to power and the restoration of capitalism. This is a scientific summary of the practice of the socialist continued revolution, especially the Cultural Revolution, which has been carried out since the founding of the People's Republic of China. It is a major theoretical leap and a complete and systematic theoretical view that the bourgeoisie is within the Communist Party.

If we further analyse the historical inevitability of this historical phenomenon from the perspective of historical materialism, in the final analysis, it is still determined by the current historical conditions.

The historical phenomenon of "not many people in our party really understand Marxism-Leninism" is not limited to the Chinese Communist Party, but is universal. If you want to ask, why is there such a strange historical phenomenon that "not many Communists really understand Marxism-Leninism"?

This is a question that is very worthy of study. In fact, it is not strange to say that it is strange. Analysing from the perspective of historical materialism, this is still an inevitable phenomenon determined by the conditions of the times that the cognitive ability of the proletariat and the broad masses of working people, including the Communists, will inevitably be limited.

We all acknowledge that Marx, Lenin, and Mao were great figures and great geniuses, but it was they who always dared to emphasize that it is quite difficult to correctly understand the regularity of the unfolding historical phenomena, and that people will inevitably show limitations in their understanding and even make mistakes. Therefore, they never avoided the fact that they had made such mistakes in their understanding, and repeatedly stated that once a mistake was made, it was necessary to admit it and correct it, and to correctly understand and treat the valuable historical lessons contained therein. This is not a question of modesty or not, but a question of whether one dares to fearlessly respect science and facts.

It is quite difficult to have a correct understanding of the laws of the unprecedented and grand historical subject of socialist revolution and socialist continued revolution in the process of its specific development and specific movement.

The relationship between people's subjective cognitive ability, subjective activity ability and the objective reality they face is a contradictory relationship of unity of opposites. People's subjective cognitive ability and subjective activity ability are not infinite, but limited, and they always develop gradually with the development of objective reality; they always carry out historical creation activities in the process of continuous development and transformation of the dialectic between the subjective and the objective. From the perspective of epistemology, this is unified with the cognitive process of "practice, cognition, re-practice, and re-cognition" proposed by Chairman Mao.

As far as the actual situation in the world we are facing now is concerned, there is still a considerable gap in the cognitive ability of not only the Chinese proletariat and the broad masses of working people, but also the proletariat and the broad masses of working people in the world, in their grasp of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, and especially in their use of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism as a theoretical guide to understand the laws of the socialist revolution and the continuing socialist revolution in the world today. This is the subjective reason why the world today is still a world dominated by imperialism and the socialist movement is still at a low ebb among the proletariat and the broad masses of working people.

The revolutionary Marxist-Leninist-Maoist teachers, faced with the historical issues of the times, still emphasized that there are considerable difficulties in theoretical understanding and practical movement. Moreover, facts have repeatedly proved that in the process of revolutionary practice, not only are there often limitations in understanding, but even mistakes, sometimes serious mistakes, will occur. As ordinary party members and ordinary working people, under the current conditions of the times, they cannot truly understand Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, cannot truly understand the historical inevitability and necessity of socialism replacing capitalism, and cannot truly recognize the historical mission that their class should undertake in this era. Isn't it easy to understand?

Don't forget the constraints of the times. The four characters "times"<sup>15</sup> contain rich historical content. At least we should see that we are still in an era where private ownership is dominant and capitalism is dominant in the world. Moreover, there are thousands of years of influence from various exploiting class ideas. Each of us inevitably has to live in this powerful encirclement. Such times and conditions inevitably limit each of our worldviews and ways of thinking.

Social science is also a science. To master social science and reach a high level, just like mastering natural science, one needs rich knowledge and high cognitive ability.

It is precisely because of the limitations of the conditions of the times and the high requirements of social sciences for the level of cognition that it is quite difficult for a person to completely free his world outlook and thinking methods from the influence of bourgeois and various non-proletarian ideas and to deeply understand the laws of the development of existing social movements. If there is no process of self-transformation of the subjective world, the process of diligently studying Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, and if Deng Xiaoping and others, who were criticized by Chairman Mao, "do not read books or newspapers", lack not only social science knowledge but also natural science knowledge, it is impossible to truly accept and understand Marxism-Leninism-Maoism; if one does not accept and understand Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, it is naturally impossible to stand at a higher level of this era and reach a higher level of ideological cognition. This includes both class limitations and cognitive limitations.

This is an important reason for the emergence of revisionism from the point of view of man's subjective cognitive ability, and it is an important reason that cannot be ignored. From Khrushchev to Deng Xiaoping to Yizun, when they had their way for a while, they all felt that they were very capable, but in fact, not in terms of class position, but in terms of cognitive ability alone, they all had what Chairman Mao criticised as 'not reading books and newspapers', and fell into a kind of arrogant and ignorant blindness in the midst of their arrogance and self-importance. Their low cognitive ability and ignorance is evidenced by the absurd 'theories' they put forward, which are not theories.

Therefore, we cannot analyse the question of why revisionist leaders engage in revisionism primarily in terms of how good or bad their personal qualities are. As Engels said, sincere opportunism is worse. These leaders may be 'sincere' socialists, but their 'socialism' is 'revisionism'. Why is there such a self-contradiction? It is mainly due to the problem of class status, the problem of the level of ideological understanding, and the associated problem of whether to adhere to the communist or capitalist outlook on life and the world. As a result, different theories, different routes, different directions and different paths of Marxism and revisionism are inevitably created, which in turn inevitably give rise to the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the struggle between the Marxist line and the revisionist line, and the struggle between the road of socialism and the road of capitalism. The revisionist leaders are all such negative teachers. Understanding why they become revisionists and

---

<sup>15</sup> In Chinese, "times" is expressed as “时代条件” (shídài tiáojiàn) – Trans.



studying the regularity and inevitability in this process is an important historical subject before us. These principles tell us that no matter what they are called, whether they are representatives of the bourgeoisie, revisionist leaders, capitalist-roaders, or figuratively called "emperors" or "the one and only", they are not individual phenomena, but class phenomena, phenomena of the new bourgeoisie that emerged from the party under new historical conditions. When we talk about "taking class struggle as the key link", in fact, we mainly want to take the class struggle with this new bourgeoisie as the key link - as mentioned earlier: the key link within the key link.

It is obvious that this is a theory that does not exist in Marxism and Leninism, and is a new contribution and development of Maoism.

### **3. The positive and negative historical experiences and lessons left behind by the Cultural Revolution**

The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution was a great practice of socialist continued revolution initiated and led by Chairman Mao himself and guided by Chairman Mao's theory of socialist continued revolution. Chairman Mao called it "a serious exercise".

Chairman Mao said: "The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution is essentially a great political revolution of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie and all exploiting classes under socialist conditions. It is a continuation of the long struggle between the Chinese Communist Party and the broad revolutionary masses under its leadership and the Kuomintang reactionaries, and a continuation of the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie."

Chairman Mao is right. The Cultural Revolution was essentially a political revolution, a real class struggle guided by Chairman Mao's basic line for the Party, which states that in a socialist society there are classes and class struggles, and that the class struggle must be taken as the programme. The soul of the Cultural Revolution is the class struggle, the continuation of the revolution.

Any great revolution leaves behind great principles and endless debates. This is something in accordance with the law. To use an old colloquialism, it is called: whatever class you are is the way you speak.

We have our class standpoint. We always believe that we should persist in using the scientific attitude and method of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism to analyse and understand the Cultural Revolution. On this issue, Chairman Mao has set an example and a guide for us. In the "Important Instructions" he left us, which is the last and most important one and can almost be regarded as a political will, he said: "The overall view of the Cultural Revolution: basically correct, but with some shortcomings. 70% achievement, 30% error."

The theory and practice of the Cultural Revolution is a valuable legacy for the proletariat and the masses of working people. Looking at the issue from the perspective of today's historical conditions, in order to launch and carry out a socialist re-revolution, an important and unavoidable historical task is to sum up the experience and lessons of the Cultural Revolution, both positive and negative.

As we all know, in his last years, Chairman Mao once proposed that Deng Xiaoping take the lead in summarizing the Cultural Revolution. But Deng Xiaoping flatly refused. It is natural to make a summary of the Cultural Revolution. However, Chairman Mao himself did not explain why he proposed that Deng Xiaoping take the lead in doing this. According to my understanding, first, this is something that must be done; second, letting Deng Xiaoping, the No. 2 capitalist-roader who had

been overthrown, do this is both a test and a means to prevent future reversals. Deng Xiaoping's flat refusal was not accidental. Precisely because it was not accidental, the subsequent criticism of Deng and the fight against the rightist reversal of verdicts were not accidental. Then, under the leadership of Deng Xiaoping, the Sixth Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee made a "Resolution" that denied Chairman Mao, denied Chairman Mao's ideological theories and revolutionary practice after the founding of the People's Republic of China, and especially denied the Cultural Revolution. Of course, it was even more not accidental.

It can be seen that how to understand, summarize and evaluate the Cultural Revolution is always a class struggle.

Today, we must seriously and scientifically summarize the positive and negative experiences and lessons of the Cultural Revolution from the standpoint of the proletariat and the broad masses of working people, that is, from the standpoint of opposing and struggling with the revisionist leaders, bourgeois representatives, or capitalist-roaders.

We will not adopt a simple "going against the grain" thinking method, but adhere to the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist thinking method of starting from reality, seeking truth from facts and making concrete analysis of specific situations. Deng Xiaoping also said that everything should start from reality, and also talked about seeking truth from facts, and even said that seeking truth from facts is the soul of Mao Zedong Thought; however, he did not understand that whether one can start from reality and seek truth from facts is also a problem of subjective cognition, which includes the problem of class standpoint and thinking method. The problem of him and his revisionist group lies precisely in the class standpoint and thinking method.

Chairman Mao said in response to Mr. Li Zongren's question that we Communists make our living by summing up our experience. In other speeches on other occasions, he also repeatedly said that we Communists make our living by truth and science. We must listen to Chairman Mao and adopt such a scientific attitude.

### **(i) The principles of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution will last forever**

Just as the important historical experience left by the Paris Commune became the principles of the Paris Commune and lasted forever, the important historical experience left by the proletarian Cultural Revolution also became the principles of the Cultural Revolution that lasted forever. The principles of the Cultural Revolution are the inheritance and development of the principles of the Paris Commune. We affirm the principles of the Cultural Revolution, defend the principles of the Cultural Revolution, and inherit the principles of the Cultural Revolution.

There is a process of understanding that class struggle will still exist in socialist society. From the Paris Commune to the October Revolution to the Chinese Revolution, the initial understanding of this issue was that the overthrown bourgeoisie was unwilling to perish, which led to the inevitable class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in politics, military, economy, and ideology and culture. With the gradual development of socialist society, the main class contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the content and form of class struggle, are changing.

As a new class struggle under this new historical condition, the reflection in the theory of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism is the birth of Chairman Mao's theory of continuing socialist revolution. The principles of the Cultural Revolution are the concrete development of this theory.



It is no exaggeration to say that in the future historical process of socialist re-revolution and socialist continuing revolution, these principles will once again play their great historical role and once again demonstrate their great historical significance.

**(a) The main danger of capitalist restoration comes from the capitalist roaders in the party.**

The historical experience left by the Cultural Revolution proves that after defeating the bourgeois enemies with guns, the bourgeois enemies that the proletariat faces, which will bring the danger of restoring capitalism, have been transformed into the party bourgeoisie concentrated by the capitalist roaders in the party. Moreover, the historical experience left by the Cultural Revolution also proves that the biggest danger of the bourgeoisie in the party and the one who is most likely to bring about the restoration of capitalism is the biggest capitalist roader in the party, that is, the biggest representative of the bourgeoisie and the biggest revisionist leader.

Therefore, bombarding the biggest capitalist roader in the party and bombarding the bourgeois headquarters is an important principle of the Cultural Revolution.

**(b) Capitalist restoration is mainly achieved through the implementation of the revisionist line.**

The historical experience left by the Cultural Revolution proves that the so-called capitalist roaders, the so-called revisionist leaders, and the so-called representatives of the bourgeoisie are mainly concentrated in the line they want to implement, which is a revisionist line of bourgeois restoration of capitalism.

It is based on this law that the struggle against the three bourgeois headquarters<sup>16</sup> in the Cultural Revolution was ultimately reflected in the struggle between the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist line of continuing socialist revolution and the revisionist line of restoring capitalism.

The ten years of the Cultural Revolution tested this principle. After the Cultural Revolution, the fact of the restoration of capitalism further tested this principle.

"The line is a guideline, and the guideline is clear." This principle is equally applicable to socialism or capitalism.

This principle left behind by the Cultural Revolution tells us that in order to continue the socialist revolution and wage class struggle against the bourgeoisie represented by the biggest capitalist roaders in the Party, we must grasp the link of line struggle. This is a further concrete and highest manifestation of "taking class struggle as the key link."

Judging from the positive and negative experiences and lessons learned from the Cultural Revolution, in order to ensure that a correct line of continuing socialist revolution is correctly understood and firmly defended by the whole Party and the entire people, it is very important that, on the basis of the practice of continuing socialist revolution, the specific content of the correct line must be scientifically and fully explained in theory, and specific and feasible policies must be formulated.

This question is based on practical experience. In the early days of the Cultural Revolution, the masses were divided into two groups. One of the reasons (but not the only reason) was that there was a difference of understanding on whether the people in power in their units were capitalist-roaders. People were not clear about what the criteria for capitalist-roaders were. Although the "Sixteen

---

<sup>16</sup> At the start of the Cultural Revolution, several key "bourgeois headquarters" within the Communist Party were identified. They were the President of China, Liu Shaoqi; General Secretary of the Communist Party, Deng Xiaoping; and Mayor of Beijing and a senior Party official, Peng Zhen.

Articles" divided cadres into four categories, the criteria for determining which people in power belonged to the fourth category, that is, whether they were capitalist-roaders who were anti-Party and anti-socialist, were not clear, and the policy boundaries were not clear. Therefore, there were differences, and even two groups were divided. This problem even ran through the entire process of the Cultural Revolution. Later, in fact, the criteria for overthrowing or not overthrowing were whether or not there were historical problems, whether or not they were traitors, spies, etc., not whether or not they were capitalist-roaders. Liu Shaoqi was also overthrown mainly because of the "historical problems" of being a "traitor, spy, and labor traitor" in the end; while Deng Xiaoping was liberated because he had no such historical problems (at that time, Chairman Mao only mentioned the two problems of "deserting in the face of the enemy" during the Red Seventh Army and "shaking a goose feather fan" after liberation).<sup>17</sup> In the end, history tells us that Deng's real problem happened to be the line, and he was a true and uncompromising capitalist-roader.

This is a historical lesson that is still worth our serious study. If we want to truly understand, especially if we want to truly grasp the principles of the Cultural Revolution, I am afraid we still need a process of re-understanding this issue.

**(c) We must be vigilant and prevent counter-revolutionary coups.**

During the Cultural Revolution, under the leadership of Chairman Mao, the plot of the Lin Biao clique to attempt a counter-revolutionary coup was successfully thwarted. However, not even a month after the death of Chairman Mao, Hua Guofeng, Ye Jianying, Li Xiannian and Wang Dongxing succeeded in staging a counter-revolutionary coup d'état in which revisionism came to power and capitalism was restored.

This painful lesson left by the Cultural Revolution tells us that we must be vigilant and prevent counter-revolutionary coups.

This danger is related to the fact that the spearhead of the socialist continued revolution and the spearhead of the class struggle are directly directed at the revisionism of the Central Committee, especially at the biggest revisionist leader of the Central Committee.

As the saying goes: A cornered dog will jump over a wall. Faced with the cruel and sharp class struggle with the political purpose of seizing power from the capitalist-roaders, the capitalist-roaders who are unwilling to perish will launch a counter-revolutionary coup. This is a law of this class struggle and a historical necessity. Moreover, these people are different from the landlords and the bourgeoisie who openly and nakedly show their vicious class nature. They have rich experience in political struggle and are well versed in some characteristics of the struggle within the Communist Party. In order to get away with it, they can write false self-criticisms and express that they "will never overturn the verdict", but deep down, their class nature will not change, and their class stand is very firm. It is very accurate to say that they "are unrepentant." Moreover, they are all ruthless and cruel. Once the time is right, they will not hesitate to stage a coup and will take up the butcher knife to kill people without mercy.

---

<sup>17</sup> "Shaking the goose feather fan" is a Chinese idiom for military planning and strategising. According to legend, Zhuge Liang of the Shu Han Dynasty of the Three Kingdoms often held a feather fan in his hand and commanded battles. That is what Mao Zedong said during the 12th Plenary Session of the 8th Central Committee of the Communist Party of China on October 13, 1968, when he quelled people's demands for Deng Xiaoping's expulsion from the party. Mao Zedong said: "Deng Xiaoping has always engaged in armed struggle and has made no major mistakes in history. He only escaped from battle once; in the Liu and Deng clique, Deng Xiaoping was the person who shook the goose feather fan, unlike Liu Shaoqi; let him keep his party membership and become a 'negative teacher'." Chairman Mao spoke up for Deng Xiaoping, and people no longer mentioned Deng Xiaoping's expulsion from the party – Trans.

This is a common characteristic of the bourgeois representatives and revisionist leaders within the Communist Party, which has been repeatedly tested in practice. From Khrushchev to Lin Biao, to Deng Xiaoping, to Hua Guofeng, Ye Jianying, Li Xiannian, Wang Dongxing, etc., all these revisionist leaders are such dangerous and terrifyingly extreme bad people. This is a profound and painful historical lesson that we have learned after paying the price of blood and will never forget.

Based on this lesson, we must bear in mind that in order to continue the socialist revolution, we must be highly vigilant and guard against counter-revolutionary coups. Once faced with this danger, we must never be lenient and must never forget Chairman Mao's earnest warnings: class enemies are sharpening their knives, and they are sharpening their knives to kill people!

Hua Guofeng and others who were actually plotting a coup d'état, cried thief, and spread rumors that the proletarian revolutionaries in the Central Committee were preparing to launch a coup d'état. This was just an excuse for these bourgeois representatives and revisionist leaders to launch a coup d'état. The actual situation was just the opposite. It was the proletarian revolutionaries who were not sufficiently vigilant and prepared for the possibility that these bourgeois representatives and revisionist leaders might launch a counter-revolutionary coup d'état.

From a positive perspective, this is an important principle left by the Cultural Revolution. From a negative perspective, this is an important lesson left by the Cultural Revolution. To solve this problem, we must find the root cause of this problem, so as to solve the problem not only from the subjective understanding, but also from the political system.

We will continue to explore this topic later under the topic of studying the lessons of the Cultural Revolution.

**(d) The working people must care about state affairs and directly participate in the management of the country.**

Chairman Mao once issued such a call in the early days of the Cultural Revolution: "You must care about state affairs and carry the proletarian cultural revolution through to the end."

Later, when Chairman Mao inspected the country, he said: "An important sign that the situation is very good is that the masses have been mobilized." He also specifically mentioned that in the past, when the masses got together, they always talked about some trivial things, but now they are all talking about the Cultural Revolution. Chairman Mao was very satisfied and very happy that the masses cared about politics and national affairs.

This is Chairman Mao's consistent thinking. In Chairman Mao's view, the most fundamental right of the working people is the right to manage the country.

This thinking of Chairman Mao's is very important. It is the concrete embodiment of the Marxist idea that "the liberation of the working class is the business of the working class itself." If the working class wants to achieve its own liberation, it must first be ideologically conscious, from being a class in itself to being a class for itself. One of the most basic and main manifestations of this class consciousness is to change from caring about personal trifles and family affairs to caring about the major affairs of the country. It can be said that the degree to which a person cares about major national affairs is a measure of the degree of his or her ideological consciousness. Only when the working class and the broad masses of the working people are truly ideologically conscious can they actually participate in state management.

The so-called state affairs are the major affairs of the class. Caring about national affairs means caring about the major affairs of the class. Only when the working people consciously care about the major affairs of the working people to which they belong, can the working people unite for a common class interest and class purpose, hold their chests high, hold their heads high, and link their arms to carry out class revolution, seize power if they do not have it, and consolidate it if they have it, and ultimately realize the complete liberation of the class.

A fact that can stand the test of history is that it is precisely because of the tempering of the Cultural Revolution that the political consciousness and theoretical level of the broad masses of the people have been generally improved, leaving behind a powerful and valuable material force to oppose the rise of revisionism and the restoration of capitalism. We are all beneficiaries of this revolution. The Cultural Revolution is our university, this revolutionary university, which has enabled us to weather storms and see the world, especially the tortuous and cruel class struggle in the form of "being persecuted", which is the best textbook. It is only when we lose our freedom that we know the significance of fighting for freedom and liberation. Ten years of the Cultural Revolution, ten years of university. It has made us deeply understand the truth that "you must care about state affairs and carry the proletarian cultural revolution through to the end." In this sense, the Cultural Revolution has indeed played a role in cultivating millions of successors to the proletarian revolutionary cause.

It is no exaggeration to say that without the Cultural Revolution, there would be no such tenacious and continuous struggle against revisionism and capitalist restoration in China today. It is easier to understand this by comparing the history of the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe" with the current situation. To use a phrase that was often said in the past but is very correct: This is Chairman Mao's great strategic deployment!

This principle of the Cultural Revolution has very important practical significance today.

Compared with Chairman Mao's requirements, our awareness is still far from enough. We cannot be proud, nor are we qualified to be proud. Please think about why the revisionist leaders can succeed for a while, why the revisionist line can be implemented unimpeded, it is because our working people do not or dare not care about state affairs, dare not fight, in a word, dare not follow Chairman Mao's instructions: rebel! The heroic resistance of individual comrades will inevitably be brutally suppressed. In such a background, there is no talk of launching and carrying out the socialist revolution. Therefore, it is inevitable that the restoration of the capitalist system will "be very easy", a historical tragedy that seems strange but is not strange.

The indifference of each of us to national affairs has led to the overall weakness of our entire class, which inevitably leads to the apparent strength of the ruling class.

Therefore, we must have a clear and correct understanding of ourselves. We must re-stimulate the passion and courage we had in the early days of the Cultural Revolution, and for the liberation of our class, we must care about state affairs and participate in state affairs; we must bravely fight for the resolution of state affairs.

**(e) "Speak freely," "air your views freely," "write big character posters," "engage in big debates" (simplified to the "four bigs") as embodied in freedom of speech, freedom of assembly and freedom of publication.**

Being concerned with affairs of state and participating in the management of the country must be guaranteed by democratic rights. If there are no democratic rights to guarantee, caring about national affairs and participating in the management of the country will only be empty talk and will not be put

into practice. The revolutionary mentors of Marxism-Leninism and Maoism have all had very profound and specific discussions on this issue.

enin criticized the democratic rights declared by the bourgeoisie as just empty words, because the working class and the broad masses of working people do not have specific conditions to exercise their democratic rights. For example, without places of assembly, without printing and publishing institutions, the so-called freedom of speech and freedom of publication can only be empty words in the end. After the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, in order to realize true proletarian democracy, it is necessary to solve the specific conditions for the working class and the broad masses of working people to exercise their democratic rights. For example, the best theaters must be provided to the working people as places for free assembly; the best paper mills and printing houses must be handed over to the workers as institutions for free publication of printed materials.

Chairman Mao's statements were even more numerous and familiar to us. He always stressed that if people were allowed to speak, the sky would not fall and neither would he himself collapse. If people were not allowed to speak, he would inevitably collapse one day. Since the 1950s, especially during the Cultural Revolution, Chairman Mao firmly supported the so-called "Four Bigs" – big speaking freely, big airing views freely, big-character posters, and big debates. He supported the masses in using the "Four Bigs" as weapons to oppose the bureaucracy of some cadres, the perverse actions of a handful of capitalist-roaders, and especially the revisionist line of taking the capitalist road concocted by the revisionist leaders.

Most importantly, when the Constitution was revised<sup>18</sup>, the "Four Bigs" were written into the Constitution as the unshakable and inalienable democratic rights of the masses.

This was a major breakthrough at the time. In particular, it broke the shackles of the capitalist-roaders who would easily label the masses who dared to raise opinions with the party's leading cadres as "anti-party and anti-socialist".

In June and July after the start of the Cultural Revolution, under the rule of the bourgeois reactionary line, students who dared to rebel were labelled "counter-revolutionaries," "fake leftists, true rightists," and other names all over the country, mainly in colleges and universities. Chairman Mao firmly opposed this wrong approach. Chairman Mao supported the article "Cheering for a Big-Character Poster at Peking University" written by the People's Daily commentator in June 1966, and later (August 5) added a special sentence: "Wrong leadership that endangers the revolution should not be accepted unconditionally, but should be firmly resisted." During this Cultural Revolution, the revolutionary teachers, students and cadres had widely resisted the wrong leadership. "Chairman Mao's support for the big-character poster by Nie Yuanzi and seven others from Peking University and the passage he added were spread all over the country as the "highest instruction". Its political significance lies in that it used Chairman Mao's authority to break the political shackles that had long bound and suppressed the masses, and enabled the proletariat and the broad masses of working people to gain ideological liberation and freedom of speech. The "Four Bigs" were established in this way and written into the Constitution.

This shows that the "Four Bigs" is an important principle left over from the Cultural Revolution, an important part of the theory of continuing socialist revolution, and an important form of carrying out continuing socialist revolution.

---

<sup>18</sup> The "four bigs" were written into the revised 1975 State Constitution, but removed after Deng's coup.

At that time, with the support of Chairman Mao's revolutionary line, big-character poster columns and big-character poster areas were set up all over the country, first of all in colleges and universities. For a time, big-character posters were everywhere, and were described as "cannonballs fired at the revisionist leaders". Chairman Mao personally took the lead in writing a famous big-character poster on August 5, 1966 - "Bombard the Headquarters - My Big-Character Poster". (This big-character poster was probably circulated all over the country on August 25, causing a great shock. College students in many places were inspired by this big-character poster to rise up in rebellion, break through the blockade, and march in the streets. As a result, the so-called "August 25 Incident" and "August 26 Incident" occurred in many places.)<sup>19</sup> Chairman Mao highly praised the form of big-character posters, believing that it was an important form for the broad masses of working people to supervise cadres and directly participate in state management.

The famous "Xidan Wall"<sup>20</sup> that appeared in Beijing later should be the end of the big-character poster form. Then, Deng Xiaoping, who originally used the "Xidan Wall" to oppose the Cultural Revolution and Chairman Mao, saw that some people began to propose the "fifth modernization", that is, political modernization, that is, political democratization. This violated the political purpose of the revisionist group headed by Deng Xiaoping to establish a fascist bourgeois dictatorship. Therefore, he immediately carried out brutal suppression and abolished the "Xidan Wall".

The right to "speak out, air views freely, post big-character posters, and debate" originally written into the Constitution was completely abolished. Not only was this article amended when the Constitution was revised; but in actual political life, this article was completely denied.

However, this proves that these democratic rights are of great significance for the proletariat and the broad masses of working people to be concerned about state affairs and directly participate in the management of the country. They are an indispensable form for realizing proletarian democracy, the essence of proletarian dictatorship, and the fundamental difference between proletarian democracy and bourgeois democracy.

Those mass meetings of various contents and forms not only embodied the freedom of assembly, but also embodied the broad masses' concern for national affairs. Moreover, through the criticism of revisionism and capitalist-roaders at these mass meetings, the masses' political consciousness and political level were greatly improved, creating conditions for the broad masses to directly manage the country.

This is the fundamental purpose of freedom of assembly under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Now, under the dictatorship of the fascist bourgeoisie, even a relatively large number of people having a meal together will alert the tools of dictatorship to come and ask questions, and of course it is even more impossible to talk about allowing freedom of assembly.

In 1966 and 1967 of the Cultural Revolution, when the masses of people were justified in their rebellion against those in power who took the capitalist road, the tabloids and leaflets printed by the masses

---

<sup>19</sup> These were incidents of mass killings of alleged "bad elements" and "Rightists" by different factions of Red Guards – Trans.

<sup>20</sup> From November 1978 to December 1979, thousands of people put up "big character posters" on a long brick wall of Xidan Street, Xicheng District of Beijing, to protest about political and social issues associated with the Gang of Four; the wall became known as the Democracy Wall. It was closed down when activists like Wei Jingsheng extended the attacks on Mao to Deng Xiaoping, and advocated bourgeois democracy - Trans.



themselves played a huge role, and it was really a fiery and tangible phenomenon of freedom of the press (I myself have had the experience of having steel plates engraved and materials printed in oil).

Freedom of the press means freedom of communication. It was the various forms of communication created by the people that united the revolutionary masses throughout the country, uniting them, caring for each other, supporting each other, and taking positive revolutionary action together to fight against the capitalists.

This is the first time in Chinese history that the people's freedom of the press has been fully realised. It is this great revolutionary practice that tells us how politically important the freedom of the press is for the proletariat and the masses of working people to be concerned about the affairs of state and to participate directly in the management of the country. This point, from the tight control of today's rulers over the Internet and the exchange of information, also gives us enough historical lessons from the opposite side.

Rights and power are united. The democratic rights of the proletariat are united with the dictatorship of the proletariat. The deprivation of the democratic rights of the proletariat and the masses of working people is an inevitable consequence of the fact that the dictatorship of the proletariat has degenerated into the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

From Marx and Engels to Lenin, in the process of guiding the European working class to carry out the proletarian revolutionary struggle, they repeatedly emphasized that democracy must be won first. The fundamental significance is that even if this struggle only won bourgeois democracy, as Lenin said, it won a stage for the proletariat to launch class struggle and was a "shortcut" to the proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship. Under the socialist conditions of the proletarian dictatorship, defending the democratic rights of the proletariat has a higher significance in consolidating the proletarian dictatorship.

It can be seen that the theoretical and practical significance of studying and researching the "Four Bigs" left by the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution - "big speaking freely, big airing views freely, big-character posters, and big debates" is still an important historical topic we face today.

**(f) Freedom of association embodied in the freedom to organise various forms of combat teams and mass organisations.**

Ever since the Communist Manifesto, the first programme document of the proletariat, issued the great call: 'Proletarians of the world, unite!' For more than 170 years, this slogan has been the battle cry of the proletariat and the masses of working people all over the world! The slogan of unity!

In 1864, when the First International, the 'International Workingmen's Association', was founded, Marx, in his 'Manifesto of the Establishment of the International Workingmen's Association', advised the proletariat and the masses of working people all over the world: 'The workers already have the numbers which are one of the factors of success. But it is only when the masses are organised and guided by knowledge that numbers can play a decisive role in victory or defeat. Past experience has proved that to neglect the fraternal solidarity which should exist among the workers of all countries, and which should encourage them to stand firm side by side in the struggle for emancipation, is to punish them, -to bring about the common defeat of their scattered endeavours. This realisation led to the creation of the International Association by the workers of the various countries who were present at the public assembly at St Martin's Hall on 28 September 1864.' (Marx, 'Declaration of the Establishment of the International Workingmen's Association,' The Complete Works of Marx and Engels, vol. 16, p. 13.)

It seems to be a very simple truth that everyone knows, but it is also a very profound truth, and one that is not always deeply known and deeply understood by the proletariat and the masses of working people. However, without understanding this truth, as Marx said, even the greatest number of people cannot play a decisive role in victory or defeat.

To be united, to be linked together, we need organisation. This is the fundamental reason for the founding of the International Workingmen's Association and for the formation of communist parties by the working classes of all countries.

It is in this sense that Lenin emphasised at the end of his famous work *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back*: 'The proletariat has no other weapon in its struggle for power than organisation. The proletariat, scattered by the anarchic rivalries which dominate the bourgeois world, suppressed by that forced labour for capital, always thrown to the 'bottom' of abject poverty, coarseness, and degradation, is and will inevitably be an invincible force because the unity of thought which it has formed according to the principles of Marxism is consolidated with the material unity of an organisation which unites millions of workers into an army of the working class. In the face of this army, neither the decaying Russian dictatorship nor the decaying regime of international capital can be supported. No matter what twists and turns and retreats, no matter what opportunistic platitudes are uttered by the Girondist wing of the modern social-democratic party, no matter how complacently people praise backward group habits, no matter how much they flaunt and clamour about intellectual anarchism, this army is bound to unite its ranks ever more closely.' (Selected Works of Lenin, Vol. I, p. 510.) We all like to recite Marx's saying that 'material force must be destroyed by material force', and we all adhere to the principle of violent revolution, whereas the revolutionary teachers tell us that the acquisition of such material force, the acquisition of such violence, can be achieved only through the organisation of the proletariat and the masses of the working people. The organised proletariat and the mass of working people are the most powerful material force and the most powerful instrument of violent revolution. It is in this sense that we can understand why 'organisation' is the only 'weapon' of the proletariat and the masses of working people.

It is from this most basic Marxist principle that we can see how important it is to strive for "freedom of association", that is, to strive for the freedom of the proletariat and the broad masses of working people to organize themselves in various forms, including political parties, for the socialist revolution and the socialist continued revolution.

The Cultural Revolution was a great "exercise" and a great creation on this issue.

From the initial student "Red Guard" organization to the various forms of "combat teams" and mass organizations of the broad revolutionary masses in all walks of life that followed, they swept across the entire land of China. Although initially interfered with, obstructed, and even suppressed by the wrong line, after the resolute struggle of the broad masses, especially with the personal support of Chairman Mao, this right of the broad masses of the people was finally established. The Shanghai "Anting Incident"<sup>21</sup>, in which Shanghai workers finally won the right to organize the "General Workers'

---

<sup>21</sup> In November 1966, workers in Shanghai began to press for their own right to form city-wide rebel organizations. Their request was refused, and on November 10, around 1,000 workers led by Wang Hongwen's Shanghai Revolutionary Rebel Worker Headquarters commandeered a train and set out for Beijing to petition the central government. They were halted at Anting on the outskirts of Shanghai, and their refusal to disembark resulted in all traffic on the Beijing line being halted for over 31 hours. The mayor of Shanghai, Cao Duiqi, demanded that the workers immediately return to their units. Wang's rebels refused to back down until their demands had been met: the recognition of their mass organizations and an acknowledgement that their actions were legal. They also demanded public criticism of Cao Duiqi. Zhang Chunqiao, the negotiator sent by



General Office" ("Shanghai Workers' Rebellion Headquarters"), is a very typical example. At that time, after the Anting Incident, Comrade Zhang Chunqiao arrived in Anting as a representative of the Central Cultural Revolution Group to deal with the "Anting Incident". Comrade Zhang Chunqiao, under pressure from the Shanghai Municipal Committee and taking great political risks, signed and agreed that the "General Labor Union" would be a legal workers' mass organization. This was a breakthrough in that it went beyond the education sector and allowed the broad masses of workers to have the right to organize combat teams and various forms of mass organizations to participate in the Cultural Revolution. After Comrade Zhang Chunqiao returned to Beijing, he received support and praise from Chairman Mao.

This fact tells us that in order to uphold the dictatorship of the proletariat, consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat, and carry out the socialist revolution, whether the broad masses of the people have the right to follow the provisions of the Constitution on "freedom of association" and freely organize various forms of mass organizations in order to exercise their right to be concerned with state affairs and directly participate in the management of the country was still a question at the time. The Cultural Revolution made a major breakthrough on this issue. Both in theory and in practice, it affirmed and implemented the people's right to freely associate, freely organize various forms of revolutionary mass organizations, directly care about national affairs, and directly participate in the management of the country.

This is an important historical experience and an important principle left to us by the Cultural Revolution. Realizing and consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat is inseparable from this important and basic revolutionary principle.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is nothing more than the political rule of the organized proletariat. If the proletariat does not even have the right to freely organize its own class organization, how can there be a dictatorship of the proletariat? The class struggle carried out by the proletariat is by no means a struggle carried out by an individual, but a struggle carried out by the entire class. As stated in the Manifesto of the First International, the numerical advantage of the proletariat can only be transformed into a real advantage if it is organized. If it is only individual resistance, there will be no such advantage. In order to realize this advantage, only by organizing can it become a real great material force that is sufficient to defeat the bourgeoisie. The Cultural Revolution proved that even under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the revolutionary masses need to organize if they want to carry out the socialist continued revolution, and they also need to embody their powerful material power in the form of organization. This is one of the important conditions for whether the socialist continued revolution can be carried out and whether it can succeed.

The creation of various forms of mass organizations and the ways of activities of various forms of mass organizations by the broad masses of revolutionary people during the Cultural Revolution are all valuable legacies left by the Cultural Revolution. They are not only necessary conditions for the continued socialist revolution, but also necessary conditions for the socialist re-revolution.

No matter what historical conditions we are in, we must clearly see that there is no proletarian revolutionary movement without organizations. This principle is just as Chairman Mao said, if we want revolution, we must have a revolutionary party.

---

the Cultural Revolution Leading Group from Beijing, eventually signed off on the rebels' demands with Mao's support.

On this issue, the opinions of the revolutionary mentors are completely consistent. The valuable teachings they left behind, especially the several classic works they left on this issue, are still worth our serious study, and we should strive to understand and comprehend the principles more and better.

**(g) The highest form of the Cultural Revolution is for the proletarian revolutionaries to unite and seize power from the capitalist-roaders.**

The fundamental issue of revolution is the issue of political power. Since the Cultural Revolution was a revolution, and in essence a political revolution, it was natural that the primary issue of this revolution was also the issue of political power.

This was mainly reflected in the struggle to seize power from the capitalist roaders in the "January Revolution". Under the personal command of Chairman Mao, proletarian revolutionaries from all over the country united to seize power from the small number of capitalist roaders in power who actually existed in their localities and units. "The whole country was red", marking the complete victory of this struggle to seize power. This was a great class struggle, a great revolution, the highest form of the Cultural Revolution, and the most valuable, core, and main principle left by the Cultural Revolution.

This was of course a seizure of power from the capitalist-roaders under the socialist conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The Party Central Committee, led by Chairman Mao, was the proletarian headquarters that directed this struggle for power. The Chinese People's Liberation Army, under the personal command of Chairman Mao, was a reliable pillar of this struggle for power. Chairman Mao personally led the formulation of the policy of "three supports and two armies" (supporting the left, supporting workers, supporting farmers, military control, and military training). Under the guidance of this policy, the problem that some local armies had actually intervened in the Cultural Revolution but made mistakes in direction and line was corrected in a timely manner (this was not accidental, and the subsequent struggles continued to reflect the serious existence of this problem), ensuring the smooth development of the struggle for power and the subsequent emergence of the "three-in-one" revolutionary committee.

This fully shows that the victory of the Cultural Revolution's struggle for power had historical premises and historical conditions, which was the existence of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Under the historical conditions that capitalism has been restored and the proletarian dictatorship has degenerated into the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, some comrades simply believe that a second Cultural Revolution should be carried out. This is a wrong fantasy that completely forgets the premise on which the Cultural Revolution is based.

However, the principle that the proletarian revolutionaries unite to seize power from the capitalist-roaders is still valid today. The most fundamental meaning of this principle is that the proletarian revolutionaries and the broad masses of the revolutionary people must unite, and the purpose of the unity is to seize power from the capitalist-roaders.

That is to say, the prerequisite for achieving the revolution to seize power is that the masses must rise up and must unite. Chairman Mao saw the "January Storm" sweeping across the country and repeatedly said happily that as long as the masses rose up, things would be easy to handle. Comrades Zhang Chunqiao and Yao Wenyuan were going back to Shanghai to lead the "January Revolution". Before leaving, Chairman Mao gave them many important opinions, including: Shanghai's students and workers have risen up, and now the cadres in the government have also risen up. Shanghai has great hope (Comrade Zhang Chunqiao conveyed this to the people of the city at the mass meeting and through television).

This is a very important basic theoretical thought of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. The so-called weapon of criticism cannot replace the criticism of weapons. Material forces must be destroyed by material forces, and the most fundamental and powerful material forces come from the masses. As Marx said, as long as the theory is thorough and correct, it can be mastered by the masses. The masses who have mastered the theoretical consciousness will transform from a class in itself to a class for itself, and thus transform into the most powerful material force to realize the historical mission of seizing power and liberating themselves.

This is a truth repeatedly expounded by the revolutionary mentors. The first is to organize a political party, and the second is to seize power.

The Cultural Revolution is just a re-verification of this truth, and it also allows the broad masses of people to learn this truth again, and it has also conducted a serious exercise in practice.

Today, although we have lost the dictatorship of the proletariat and are in the historical conditions of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, we should not forget that as long as the proletariat and the broad masses of the people rise up, they will be the most powerful material force, the material force that can seize power and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. We can even say that once we have such material force, there will be the dictatorship of the proletariat, there will be a dictatorship of the proletariat that can confront the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, there will be a dictatorship of the proletariat that can eliminate the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

Today, it is of great practical significance for the proletariat and the broad masses of the people to understand this truth, believe in this truth and uphold this truth. It can be said that once the proletariat and the broad masses of the people are armed with this truth, it will not be easy to launch a socialist revolution and fight for the liberation of their own class. However, through unyielding struggle, victory is definitely guaranteed.

As mentioned in the Manifesto of the First International cited above, the numerical superiority of the proletariat and the broad masses of the working people will be transformed into a superiority of strength at this time. If there are no tools of violence, they can be seized; the old army can be disintegrated and the old state can be smashed. This is the correct understanding of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism on the violent smashing of the bourgeois state machine, and it is also the correct understanding of the "January Revolution" principle of the Cultural Revolution, that is, the principle of the proletarian revolutionaries uniting to seize power from the capitalist-roads.

If we understand this revolutionary principle of the Cultural Revolution in this way, its practical significance will be very clear, and we can understand that it is still a principle that must be implemented in the socialist re-revolution.

**(h) The continuous improvement of the state machinery in parts is an important step in the continued socialist revolution.**

There are many requirements for consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Eliminating the capitalist-roads is undoubtedly an important and indispensable revolutionary means to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is of decisive significance to ensure the purity of the proletarian state apparatus and prevent the restoration of capitalism. The Cultural Revolution has left us this valuable revolutionary principle.

At the same time, we must also realize that consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat and improving the state apparatus of the proletariat dictatorship involves a more profound, more

important, and more fundamental historical task, which is to constantly and gradually resolve the issue of the direct participation of the working people in state management, that is, to constantly partially improve the state apparatus and to constantly carry out political system reform.

This is a question that Lenin often and repeatedly raised after the October Revolution and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. He also made many practical attempts to address this question, especially in his later years, when he considered and dealt with this question more. Lenin repeatedly emphasized that due to the backwardness of Russia's national conditions, the cultural knowledge and theoretical level of the working people were still relatively low, and could not reach the level where all the working people could directly manage the country. In this case, it was necessary to implement a representative system and entrust a few people to manage the country. Under this limited political system that had to be adopted, Lenin repeatedly emphasized that bureaucracy was inevitable; he repeatedly warned us that only when all the working people directly managed the country could bureaucracy no longer exist, the state could be eliminated, and the transition to communism where the state no longer existed could be achieved. But it was impossible to realize this at that time. It required the preparation of historical conditions, which in turn required a historical process. In this process, Lenin thought deeply about how to prevent the state apparatus of the dictatorship of the proletariat from degenerating, and he put forward some suggestions and took some measures. This is the precious theoretical and practical wealth that Lenin left us on how to realize and consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Chairman Mao inherited and developed Lenin. After the founding of the People's Republic of China, he constantly used the continuous solution of the relationship between cadres and the masses as a lever in practice and gradually solved this issue raised by history through various forms. Chairman Mao left us a famous saying: The most fundamental right of the working people is the right to manage the country.

The Cultural Revolution made great innovations on the important and fundamental issues of the working people's direct participation in state management and partial improvement of the state machinery, leaving us important and valuable revolutionary principles.

Theoretically, this is the continuous and partial improvement of the proletarian state machinery under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

On this issue, during the "January Revolution" of the Cultural Revolution, many places across the country were disturbed by some extreme leftist trends of thought, mainly from young students, especially some high school students. They completely denied our state apparatus of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and proposed to "thoroughly smash the bourgeois state apparatus" or "thoroughly improve the state apparatus of the dictatorship of the proletariat." Some even said that there was a "contradiction between the new Cultural Revolution and the old government" and that they wanted to "overthrow the old government," actually pointing the finger at Premier Zhou. In response to this erroneous trend of thought, Chairman Mao pointed out that under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, it is not right to say that the dictatorship of the proletariat has been completely improved, but it is possible to say that it has been partially improved. For the love of young people, Chairman Mao also quoted Lenin's famous saying that God allows young people to make mistakes for a certain period of time.

This partial improvement of the proletarian state apparatus was most prominently manifested in the creation of the Revolutionary Committee. The new regime established in Shanghai after the "January Revolution" was initially called the "Shanghai People's Commune". The reason for this name was

related to a sentence Chairman Mao once said when commenting on the big-character posters of Peking University in 1966: "This is the Beijing Commune Manifesto of the 1960s!" However, in 1967, when Comrades Zhang Chunqiao and Yao Wenyuan reported to Chairman Mao on the situation of the "January Revolution" in Shanghai, they touched on the question of whether to call it the "Shanghai People's Commune". Chairman Mao pointed out that this question involved the entire political system of our country, for example, whether our country could be called the Chinese People's Commune in the future? Chairman Mao finally said, I think it is better to call it the Revolutionary Committee, and you should go back and discuss it with the people of Shanghai. This is the source of the political system form of the Revolutionary Committee, and also the source of Chairman Mao's instructions on this issue that were later officially published: "In those places and units where power needs to be seized, it is necessary to implement the revolutionary "three-in-one" policy and establish a revolutionary, representative, and proletarian authoritative temporary power organ. The name of this power organ is better to be called the Revolutionary Committee."

The important historical significance of the Revolutionary Committee and the revolutionary principles it left behind lie in its content. The Revolutionary Committee is composed of the "three-in-one" of revolutionary cadres, military representatives and representatives of the revolutionary masses. Its revolutionary significance has at least two aspects.

The establishment of the Revolutionary Committee means victory in seizing power from the capitalist-roaders, and means that the political power that was once partially usurped by the capitalist-roaders and degenerated into a bourgeois dictatorship has returned to the hands of the proletariat and has restored its nature of proletarian dictatorship. This is a great revolutionary achievement and a partial, but very important and profound improvement in the proletarian state apparatus.

A major feature of this temporary form of the newly born proletarian state apparatus is that the revolutionary mass representatives, as one of the members of the "three-in-one combination", directly participate in state management. Revolutionary cadres and military representatives are originally the controllers or pillars of the state apparatus, and the direct participation of revolutionary mass representatives in state management is a great new creation and a new revolutionary practice that has never been seen since the founding of New China. The revolutionary mass representatives mainly come from workers, peasants and young students. Until the death of Chairman Mao, they have been shouldering the heavy responsibility of managing the state for revolutionary committees at all levels, and they have basically been successful. This fully proves what the revolutionary mentors since Marx have repeatedly emphasized that the working class is fully capable of managing the country themselves.

Precisely because this was an important political measure for the continuation of the socialist revolution to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat, the large-scale arrests, the so-called investigation of the "three types of people"<sup>22</sup>, the so-called "clearing out those who came in by helicopter" and other measures taken in the subsequent counterattack were all aimed at the representatives of the revolutionary masses. This proves that whether the revolutionary masses can directly participate in state management is related to whether the political power of the dictatorship of the proletariat is in the hands of the working people.

---

<sup>22</sup> The so-called three kinds of people refer to "those who followed Lin Biao and Jiang Qing's counterrevolutionary clique to start a rebellion, those who had serious gang ideas, and those who smashed and looted" – Trans.

The struggle for and against the seizure of power is essentially the highest form of class struggle under socialist conditions.

The success of the revolutionary committees in administering the State proves that the representatives of the revolutionary masses not only should participate directly in the administration of the State, but also have the capacity to do so, and this finds the right way to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In addition, there is a higher and more important level of struggle for power, also part of the improvement of the proletarian state apparatus, which is often overlooked and not properly understood, and which needs to be explained here.

That is, with Chairman Mao's big-character poster "Bombard the Headquarters" as the clarion call, the criticism and struggle against the three bourgeois headquarters was launched across the country, and finally the power-seizing struggle against the three bourgeois headquarters was achieved. The largest state-level capitalist-roaders were eliminated from the central party, government, and military departments, and the consolidation of the proletarian dictatorship was achieved in terms of state power.

This is a power-seizing struggle for state power that is higher than the local power-seizing struggle.

When we talk about power, we are talking about which class is in control of the power that decides everything, and the power we are talking about here is the state power. The removal of the three bourgeois commands was a struggle to seize power centred around state power, whereas the 'October 6 coup d'état'<sup>23</sup> that took place later was a struggle against the seizure of power centred around state power.

We all know first-hand that this struggle to seize power and to oppose the seizure of power is the highest form of class struggle and decisive.

In the Cultural Revolution, after the removal of the three bourgeois commands, the state apparatus of the supreme Central Committee was also partially improved, and the most striking point was the entry of a number of well-known representatives of the rebels and exemplary labourers into the Central Committee of the Party, the National People's Congress, and other organs of state administration. When these comrades entered the leading organs of the Central Committee, they still received their original salaries and enjoyed no privileges.

This is the highest embodiment of the Cultural Revolution's partial improvement of the state apparatus of the proletarian dictatorship.

As an improvement of the state apparatus of the proletarian dictatorship, there is another important feature, that is, the new revolutionary committee has made new breakthroughs and improvements in the work style of the proletarian dictatorship state apparatus, which must serve the people and must have the work style of serving the people. It also left important principles.

On June 7, 1967, the Shandong Provincial Revolutionary Committee issued "Several Provisions on Seriously Changing Work Style" (abbreviated as "Ten Articles"), which is such a landmark document.

The Ten Articles proposed that in order to carry the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution through to the end, consolidate the proletarian dictatorship, and prevent the restoration of capitalism, all members of the Revolutionary Committee must take the lead in studying Chairman Mao's works,

---

<sup>23</sup> See note 11.

must bear in mind Chairman Mao's teachings on serving the people wholeheartedly, frequently carry out criticism and self-criticism, and realize revolutionization in thought, work, style, and life, appear in the posture of ordinary workers everywhere, and resolutely oppose special treatment and resolutely oppose all styles of separation from the masses. To this end, the Shandong Provincial Revolutionary Committee specifically stipulated ten articles:

First, it is forbidden to sing the praises of the members of the Revolutionary Committee, and it is forbidden to post large-character posters and slogans flattering the members of the Revolutionary Committee;

Second, without collective discussion, members of the Revolutionary Committee cannot speak on behalf of the Revolutionary Committee;

Third, members of the Revolutionary Committee should not be greeted or seen off when they depart or attend mass gatherings;

Fourth, members of the Revolutionary Committee should spend a certain amount of time doing physical labor;

Fifth, members of the Revolutionary Committee should not give or receive gifts in their personal names;

Sixth, the names of members of the Revolutionary Committee are generally not published in newspapers;

Seventh, members of the Revolutionary Committee should live a simple and frugal life and should not be extravagant or wasteful. They are not allowed to take public cars for personal matters;

Eighth, members of the Revolutionary Committee should take a certain amount of time to personally receive visits from the masses and handle letters from the people;

Ninth, members of the Revolutionary Committee should often go among the masses, hold investigation meetings and seminars with the attitude of being willing to be primary school students, and listen to opinions and criticisms;

Tenth, the Revolutionary Committee should take a certain amount of time to carry out a small rectification.

At that time, the Red Flag magazine published a commentary article titled "Preventing the Corrosion of Bourgeois Ideology", which highly praised this incident. Many revolutionary committees across the country learned from Shandong's experience.

This is obviously the institutionalization of Chairman Mao's theoretical thought of proletarian dictatorship, and it is also obviously the inheritance and development of the principles of the Paris Commune under new historical conditions.

Compared with today's rampant corruption among officials, isn't this principle of the Cultural Revolution easier for people to understand and admire?

Now, after decades of talking about political system reform, the result is that the more it is reformed, the more authoritarian and corrupt it becomes. The Cultural Revolution, however, was a real and substantial improvement in the state apparatus of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It was a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist political system reform that was in line with the interests of the working people. Only



this kind of political system reform can truly play a historical role in consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat and consolidating the working people's right to be masters of their own country.

**(i) "Fight self, repudiate revisionism", the Cultural Revolution was a great revolution that touched people's souls.**

As Chairman Mao said, the Cultural Revolution was a serious 'exercise' against revisionism. It was through this exercise that a generation or several generations of proletarian revolutionaries who firmly adhere to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and oppose the rise to power of revisionism and the restoration of capitalism were nurtured in China.

This is a great achievement.

The great historical significance of the Cultural Revolution can be clearly seen by comparing it with the historical process of revisionism and the 'dramatic changes' that took place in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

Despite the historical fact that revisionism came to power and capitalism was restored in China, the proletarian revolutionaries in China, who adhered to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, did not fall or succumb, and over the decades have always persisted in the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie.

Such a strong and tremendous revolutionary material force is the great fruit of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. It can be said that without the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, which Chairman Mao personally initiated and led, the existence of such a powerful material force would not have been possible. This can be seen clearly by a simple comparison with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

Throughout the 10-year Cultural Revolution, Chairman Mao and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China repeatedly stressed that it was a great revolution that touched people's souls, calling on the masses of the revolutionary people to transform their subjective world while transforming the objective world through 'Fight Self, Repudiate Revisionism', and to cultivate their own opposition to revisionism by taking an interest in and participating in the affairs of the State, political capacity and political level to oppose the restoration of capitalism. The Cultural Revolution served this purpose. I personally have such personal experience. Without the Cultural Revolution, I might have been a scholar; however, I could not have become a revolutionary. It was through the Cultural Revolution, the 'green woods university' of learning<sup>24</sup>, and especially through the repeated beatings of great storms and waves, that I finally honed myself into a loyal student and soldier of Chairman Mao. I think that many of the staunch and outstanding Maoist fighters nowadays will have the same feelings as I did. Even old comrades such as Li Erzhong, Ma Bin and Wei Wei were not like this.

I understand that the 'fight for privacy and criticism of cultivation' has a two-fold significance.

Fighting self means putting oneself in the real class struggle, constantly criticizing one's own bourgeois ideas, transforming one's subjective world, gradually establishing a proletarian worldview, and understanding more of the theories of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. For example, holding study classes

---

<sup>24</sup> In his "Talk on Questions of Philosophy" on 18 August, 1964, Chairman Mao said "They argue about which is better, Peking University or People's University. For my part, I am a graduate of the university of the greenwoods". At the end of the Western Han Dynasty, Xinshi people Wang Kuang and Wang Feng led the Greenwoods Mountain Uprising. Mao used it as a reference to non-academic learning, to the beneficial learning that came from gathering in the mountains and forests to rebel against the rulers – Trans.

at that time and carrying out self-ideological transformation to criticize and overcome factionalism is a good example.

Criticising revisionism means, first, criticising revisionist trends, thereby improving one's own theoretical level of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism; second, engaging in the actual political struggle of criticising capitalist-roaders, thereby improving one's own political level in the struggle against the bourgeoisie within the party.

Practice has proved that this is an important part of carrying out the socialist continued revolution under socialist conditions, and an important way to cultivate millions of successors to the proletarian revolutionary cause. Only in this way can the revolutionisation of people be realised, and the revolutionisation of people is the premise of the revolutionisation of the entire society. Only by realising the revolutionisation of people can the revolutionisation of the entire society be realised.

It is from this perspective that the Cultural Revolution is not only a political revolution in essence, but also a great ideological revolution, which embodies the Cultural Revolution in the most profound sense.

#### **(j) Grasp revolution and promote production.**

The Cultural Revolution was a revolution in the strict scientific sense. Those who completely deny the Cultural Revolution always say that the Cultural Revolution was nothing more than a chaotic struggle, a revolution against culture, which affected and destroyed social production, and even brought the Chinese economy to the brink of collapse. This is determined by their class standpoint and class viewpoint, and is not worth refuting.

The slogan of "grasping revolution and promoting production" that was upheld during the Cultural Revolution is a powerful criticism of this erroneous viewpoint.

The Cultural Revolution was a class struggle, a political struggle, but that does not mean that it had nothing to do with production or the economy; on the contrary, politics commanded the economy, politics led the economy, and it was the political revolution of the Cultural Revolution that brought about the economic revolution and promoted the development of production.

The so-called Cultural Revolution, which brought the economy to the brink of collapse, has long since been clarified as a distortion of the facts and a fabrication made out of political necessity. In individual cases, for a short period of time, there were disruptions in production activities. However, in the country as a whole, and in the course of the 10-year Cultural Revolution, not only did the economy not 'reach the brink of collapse', but it achieved great development and success.

This is the inevitable result of "grasping revolution and promoting production". "Grasping revolution and promoting production" is not just a slogan or an empty talk, but a real historical process with content and figures to prove it.

The "grasping revolution" here not only has the general content of the Cultural Revolution, but also has the specific content of the socialist continued revolution in the economic field.

First, the revisionist economic construction line was criticized, and the revisionist erroneous policies such as "profit-oriented", "material incentives" and "worshiping foreign things" that denied self-reliance were liquidated under the influence of the revisionist economic construction line.

Secondly, it criticized the fact that under the influence of the revisionist economic construction line, the capitalists of the old society moved a set of rules and regulations for hiring workers into socialist enterprises, implemented "control, restriction, and oppression" on workers, and implemented "bonus-

based leadership", and even scolded and punished people at every turn, making the relationship between cadres and the masses very tense. After the Cultural Revolution, through the rebellion movement of the workers, using big-character posters as weapons, all these old capitalist customs and habits were swept away. When Chairman Mao inspected the country in 1967, he was very happy to express his appreciation for this revolutionary process.

Thirdly, after the establishment of revolutionary committees at all levels, representatives of the working masses directly participated in the management of enterprises, truly realizing that the working class is the master of the enterprise. The "two participations, one reform, and three combinations" of the "Anshan Constitution" have been further developed and implemented.

Revolution will always liberate productivity. The Cultural Revolution fully reflects this point. It was the Cultural Revolution that ensured the correct direction of my country's socialist economic development, consolidated and developed socialist public ownership production relations, and thus greatly mobilized the labour enthusiasm of the working class, the peasant class and revolutionary intellectuals, and promoted the rapid development of socialist production.

This is the important principle of "grasping revolution and promoting production" left to us by the Cultural Revolution.

**(k) Persist in the revolution in all areas of the superstructure and exercise comprehensive dictatorship over the bourgeoisie.**

Marxist historical materialism tells us that once a new economic base is created with the development of social productivity, it is inevitable to establish a new superstructure that adapts to the needs of this new economic base. It is in this sense that we often say that the economic base determines the superstructure. This is correct.

However, we must also see that the superstructure is not merely passive and negative. The historical mission of the establishment and existence of a superstructure is to protect the economic base and serve the economic base. To achieve this historical mission, the superstructure must be active and proactive. This is especially true during the period of great social change when the old and new social forms are replaced by new ones. In such a period of historical change, it is often the fate of the superstructure that determines the fate of the economic base. This is not difficult to understand. The essence of great historical changes is the great struggle of classes, and classes are just groups that embody certain economic relations. Whichever class wins will establish its own superstructure in order to protect the economic relations on which it depends. It is under such historical conditions that we see that the fate of the superstructure determines the fate of the economic base. It can be seen that the relationship between the superstructure and the economic base is a dialectical relationship in which the determining effects can be transformed into each other.

Socialist society is in such a historical stage. Socialist society is a society of great historical change. Specifically and mainly, it is a society of great historical change with fierce struggles between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and between the socialist road and the capitalist road.

Under such historical conditions, whether the socialist economic base can exist, consolidate and develop depends entirely on whether the superstructure can play the historical role it should play. In such a historical period and in such a sense, it can be said that the success or failure of the superstructure determines the success or failure of the economic base.

This is the same as what the revolutionary mentors emphasized: the primary issue of revolution is the issue of power, and which class holds power determines everything. Power is the core of the

superstructure. If you control power, you control the superstructure, and you can decide the fate of the economic base.

We reiterate this great principle of Marxist historical materialism simply to illustrate the importance of the principle left by the Cultural Revolution that we must persist in continuing the revolution in all areas of the superstructure and realize the comprehensive dictatorship of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie.

The superstructure is a vast field, and the political power is the core of this field. Seizing power from the capitalist-roaders is to seize this core. Once this key is grasped, the key will be clear. The key is multifaceted and multi-disciplinary, and we must follow it.

This is what the Cultural Revolution did. The Cultural Revolution was launched in the cultural field. During the entire Cultural Revolution, this revolution has been continued, and a lot of work has been done, leaving behind valuable historical experience, and of course, lessons.

Such revolutions have been launched in the fields of education, literature and art, theory, and so on, leaving us with valuable experience.

These struggles, in essence, are all struggles against bourgeois, including revisionist and feudal ideology and culture. Chairman Mao's series of instructions on "education must be revolutionized", his two famous instructions on the literary and art circles, as well as his criticisms and opinions on various social sciences such as philosophy, history, and economics, fully illustrate this truth. The core of them is nothing more than a question of class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, that is, a question of the proletariat exercising comprehensive dictatorship over the bourgeoisie in all fields.

This is a valuable principle left by the Cultural Revolution, and it is also a principle emphasized in Comrade Zhang Chunqiao's article "On the All-Round Dictatorship over the Bourgeoisie". Only by deeply understanding this principle can we correctly understand the profound content and great significance of the Cultural Revolution, and the profound content and great significance of the theory of socialist continued revolution.

The Cultural Revolution is not just to solve the problem of one or two biggest capitalist-roaders or one or two bourgeois headquarters, but to solve the problem of the line, the problem of the road, the problem of which class dictatorship, and this involves the comprehensive class struggle in all aspects and fields of society. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution is to launch the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie in all fields of society, to launch the proletariat's revolution against the bourgeoisie, and ultimately to implement the key point of exercising comprehensive dictatorship over the bourgeoisie.

From this perspective, the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution is a thorough socialist continued revolution under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and its great significance will be recorded in history forever.

Limited by my personal level of thought and cognitive ability, I only recognize these eleven precious and everlasting principles of the Cultural Revolution. Even limited to this, it can already demonstrate the great historical significance and great historical contribution of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

These principles are everlasting and are the precious ideological weapons left by the Cultural Revolution to the proletariat and the broad masses of the revolutionary people. They will surely

demonstrate their guiding significance again in the future socialist re-revolution and continued revolution. They are like a beacon, guiding the proletariat and the broad masses of the people to continue to advance victoriously on the road of socialist continued revolution.

The principles of the proletarian Cultural Revolution are actually the principles of Chairman Mao's theory of socialist continued revolution, and are an important and great content of Maoism.

Precisely because we have seen all this, no matter what disasters, setbacks and failures we have suffered, we will always have reason to shout with confidence:

Long live the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution!

Long live the principles of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution!

## **(ii) The lessons learnt from the failure of the Cultural Revolution as a stepping stone to socialist re-revolution.**

Like any great revolutionary movement, whether it is victorious or defeated, it will leave valuable historical experience and lessons from both positive and negative aspects. This is how the history of the international communist movement came about. Similarly, the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, a great theoretical treasure trove of socialist continued revolution that was obtained at a great cost, is also composed of valuable historical experience and lessons from both positive and negative aspects.

However, people often like to talk about positive experiences and do not like to talk about negative lessons, especially the negative lessons that led to failure. Although everyone knows the philosophy of this issue and verbally admits it, in practice it is always the opposite. Not liking to admit mistakes and not liking to accept criticism are natural weaknesses that people find difficult to overcome.

We are now facing the same difficulties.

However, in order to move forward, to stand up from failure, to launch the socialist revolution again, and to strive for the victory of the socialist revolution again, we must bravely reveal the mistakes we have made, bravely admit the mistakes we have made, and through serious and profound reflection, find historical lessons to avoid repeating similar mistakes.

This is the only correct choice for us to correctly deal with the proletarian cultural revolution and adhere to the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist ideological method.

### **(a) Was the Cultural Revolution a failure?**

This is an obvious fact that the Cultural Revolution has failed. However, some comrades just do not want to admit this fact, and they always try to find all sorts of reasons to obliterate it, a bit like the proverbial saying: Drunkenness denies the money for the pot of wine.

In fact, some of their views on denying the failure of the Cultural Revolution are very reluctant.

Some comrades say that the Cultural Revolution was actually a three-year process, and that the victory over the capitalists after the nationwide 'January Revolution' was a victory, not a defeat, of the Cultural Revolution. Some comrades said that the Cultural Revolution was only the first of its kind, and that there would be many more in the future, and that it was only after many more Cultural Revolutions that the complete victory of the continuing socialist revolution could be achieved, and that the transition to a communist society could be gradually realised, and the complete liberation of the whole

of mankind realised, and that, looking at the issue in this sense, it could not be said that the Cultural Revolution was a failure, but that it could be said, at best, to have been an 'interruption'.

I may not have a comprehensive understanding, and there may be more opinions, but the central idea is clear, which is to deny that the Cultural Revolution failed. Not only did it not fail, but in their view, the Cultural Revolution was victorious.

This spirit of defiance, of not being afraid of setbacks, of not being afraid of momentary failures is entirely understandable. However, what is more important is that our understanding should be in line with the objective reality. Failure is failure, and if we do not dare to admit failure, the greatest negative consequence will be that it will affect our ability to make a serious and scientific summing up of the failure and to draw extremely valuable historical lessons from it, so as to avoid suffering another defeat in the next great class struggle.

As Lenin's teaching has been quoted earlier, whether a political party can correctly deal with its own failures and mistakes is a very serious and principled issue of great importance.

We often say that the fundamental issue of revolution is the issue of power. Which class holds power determines everything. It is based on this principle and this law that the fundamental issue of a revolution is and can only be to seize power. Seizing power and suppressing the resistance of class enemies means that the revolution has achieved basic victory; not seizing power, or losing it again and encountering suppression by class enemies means the failure of the revolution.

Through the Cultural Revolution, from the central government to the local government, the three bourgeois headquarters were overthrown, the capitalist-roaders in the government were eliminated, and the power of the dictatorship of the proletariat was consolidated. This is indeed a great victory achieved by the Cultural Revolution.

However, after the counter-revolutionary "October 6th coup" in 1976, the power from the central to the local was taken back by the capitalist-roaders, and the proletarian dictatorship degenerated into the bourgeois dictatorship. What followed was a brutal counterattack against the proletarian revolutionaries represented by Comrade Jiang Qing and Zhang Chunqiao across the country, with minor punishments such as sentencing and imprisonment, and even more serious punishments such as direct execution. On the basis of such a major change in class relations, revisionism came to power, and Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line of restoring capitalism was fully implemented until a worst-case bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalist society with fascist bourgeois dictatorship was restored.

This cruel fact of the comprehensive restoration of capitalism clearly tells people that the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution has failed and the fruits of victory that the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution had achieved have been lost. Moreover, this cruel fact also shows that China's socialist revolution has failed.

In the face of this cruel fact, how can we still say that the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution did not fail? To deny failure and cover up failure is not in line with the facts, and therefore incorrect, and naturally not in line with Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

The greatest harm of this erroneous understanding is that it is not conducive to us learning lessons from failure. If we fail to recognise failure, we naturally fail to recognise lessons. Comrades who deny the failure of the Cultural Revolution have fallen into such a misunderstanding. It is impossible for them to correctly and seriously summarise, recognise, and accept the historical lessons left by the failure of the Cultural Revolution.

Such a wrong understanding will directly affect the improvement of the comrades' level of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, will directly affect the launch of the socialist re-revolution, and will even directly affect the future socialist continued revolution.

Therefore, this ideological error cannot be underestimated.

### **(b) Were there any mistakes in the Cultural Revolution?**

This is an obvious fact, and a cruel one. The Cultural Revolution had mistakes, as Chairman Mao said: "Three-point mistakes".

However, in conjunction with not admitting the failure of the Cultural Revolution, it will inevitably lead to another erroneous understanding, that is, not admitting that the Cultural Revolution had mistakes. Since we do not admit that we made mistakes, there is no question of learning historical lessons from these mistakes.

Chairman Mao did not view the Cultural Revolution in this way. Chairman Mao admitted that the Cultural Revolution had its mistakes on the basis of basically affirming it. In the "Important Instructions" issued by "CPC Central Committee Document No. 4 in 1976", which Chairman Mao left us, there is a comment on the Cultural Revolution. Chairman Mao said: "The general view of the Cultural Revolution: basically correct, but with some shortcomings. Now we need to (focus on) studying the shortcomings. It is 30% to 70%, 70% achievements and 30% mistakes. There is no consensus on this view. The Cultural Revolution made two mistakes: 1. Overthrowing everything, 2. All-out civil war. Some of them were right to overthrow everything, such as the Liu-Lin group. Some of them were wrong, such as with many old comrades. These people also made mistakes, and it is okay to criticize them. We have had no experience of war for more than ten years. In an all-out civil war, we seized most of the guns and distributed them. Fighting is also a training. However, beating people to death and not rescuing the wounded is not good."

Chairman Mao left us an important way of thinking here, that is, to admit the shortcomings and mistakes of the Cultural Revolution while recognizing its basic correctness. The view that the Cultural Revolution was correct and without any mistakes is not in line with reality and covers up the historical truth; secondly, it is not daring to take historical responsibility and not daring to make self-criticism. For serious Communists, this is incorrect in terms of thinking and is not in line with the consistent teachings of the revolutionary mentors of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

Now, the Cultural Revolution has been over for nearly 50 years, and it is also nearly 50 years since the restoration of capitalism. Based on the positive and negative practical processes, we may have a calmer and deeper understanding of the mistakes that occurred during the Cultural Revolution.

Chairman Mao's 'general view of the Cultural Revolution: basically correct, but with some shortcomings.' 'The Cultural Revolution made two mistakes: 1. Overthrowing everything, 2. All-out civil war.' This should be our guiding principle in discussing the mistakes and lessons learnt in the Cultural Revolution.

In other words, on the basis of the general view that the Cultural Revolution was basically correct, with some shortcomings, and that seven out of seven were achievements and three out of three were mistakes, we are going to explore the mistakes made in the Cultural Revolution and the historical lessons left behind by taking 'The Cultural Revolution made two mistakes: 1. Overthrowing everything, 2. All-out civil war.' as a guideline. In doing so, we have drawn a clear line between the reactionary position and viewpoint of the revisionists, who reject the Cultural Revolution in its entirety.



### **(c) The seriousness of the mistake of “overthrowing everything”**

"Overthrow everything" was indeed a real mistake that occurred during the Cultural Revolution. It cannot be covered up or erased. The correct attitude should be to have sufficient understanding of the seriousness of this mistake and to seriously sum up the historical lessons.

The 'overthrowing of everything' has covered a wide range of areas and involved a wide range of people, and has led to tragedies of a serious nature, with many deaths occurring. Chairman Mao mainly talked about 'overthrowing everything' against the 'old comrades', but in fact, in universities and colleges, in literary and artistic units, including some industrial and mining enterprises, this kind of problem occurred, and the intellectuals bore the brunt of it, and the losses incurred were quite serious, leaving behind a heavy lesson in history.

Chairman Mao's famous big-character poster "Bombard the Headquarters" posted on August 5, 1966, contains an important statement: "But in the past fifty days, some leading comrades from the central government to the local governments have done the opposite, standing on the reactionary bourgeois standpoint, implementing bourgeois dictatorship, suppressing the vigorous proletarian Cultural Revolution movement, reversing right and wrong, confusing black and white, encircling and suppressing revolutionaries, suppressing different opinions, implementing white terror, and thinking they were proud of themselves, increasing the prestige of the bourgeoisie and destroying the aspirations of the proletariat. How poisonous they are!" This line of theirs was later called the "bourgeois reactionary line". Although Chairman Mao did not name them, he clearly pointed out that it was "certain leading comrades from the central government to the local governments" who were promoting this bourgeois reactionary line.

This is indeed the historical fact. It is precisely because of "certain leading comrades from the central government to the local governments" that this bourgeois reactionary line was promoted, the general direction of the struggle was shifted, "the pawns were sacrificed to save the chariot", "the chariot was sacrificed to save the commander", the reactionary "bloodline theory" was rampant, homes were confiscated, "the four olds" were destroyed, the evil spirits were fought, paraded through the streets, all kinds of monsters and demons were swept away, reactionary academic authorities were overthrown, "counter-revolutionaries" beaten, "swimming fish"<sup>25</sup> caught, "rightists" were arrested, etc., etc., all these wrong practices are what Chairman Mao criticized as "reversing right and wrong, confusing black and white, encircling and suppressing revolutionaries, suppressing different opinions, and implementing white terror". This is actually the beginning of "overthrowing everything".

Nowadays, the popular general statement is to blame all this on the rebels, saying that it was the rebels who did it. This does not conform to historical facts. During this period, even in colleges and universities, it cannot be said that there were rebels. At most, there were a very small number of students who rebelled. As far as the whole society is concerned, there was no rebel at all. At that time, these wrong (or should we say illegal) practices were all carried out in a planned and organized manner under the leadership of the party organization (in some places and some units, under the leadership of the dispatched working group), mainly by college and high school students, especially those from the so-called "five red categories" (referring to revolutionary cadres, revolutionary soldiers,

---

<sup>25</sup> In an effort to suppress the Cultural Revolution, Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping used one of Mao's comments that a "swimming fish creates three waves" to advocate "catching the swimming fish and countering interference". Their meaning was that the work groups sent to oppose the Cultural Revolution should round up revolutionary students and prevent them from interfering in the activities of the work groups. The "catching fish and countering interference" line lasted approximately fifty days and was ended by the Cultural Revolution Group - Trans.

revolutionary martyrs, workers, and poor and lower-middle peasant families) with "good backgrounds", including the Red Guards under the direct leadership and control of the party organization, and with the guidance and cooperation of the public security, procuratorate, and courts. The brutal beatings of teachers and classmates also began from this time, leading to the crime of beating people to death. The famous case of Vice President Bian Zhongyun of Beijing Normal University who was beaten to death happened at this time - August 5, 1966. It is perhaps no coincidence that on August 1, 1966, Chairman Mao wrote back to the "Red Guards of Tsinghua University Affiliated Middle School": "I have received the two big-character posters you sent me on July 28 and the letter you forwarded to me for my reply. Your two big-character posters on June 24 and July 4 expressed your anger and denunciation of the landlord class, the bourgeoisie, imperialism, revisionism and their running dogs who exploit and oppress workers, peasants, revolutionary intellectuals and revolutionary parties, and explained that rebellion against the reactionaries is justified. I express my warm support for you. At the same time, I express my warm support for the big-character poster of the Red Flag Combat Group of Peking University Affiliated Middle School explaining that rebellion against the reactionaries is justified and for the excellent revolutionary speech made by Comrade Peng Xiaomeng on behalf of the Red Flag Combat Group at the general meeting of all teachers, students and staff of Peking University on July 25. Here, I want to say that my revolutionary comrades and I all adopt the same attitude. Whether in Beijing, across the country, or in the Cultural Revolution, we will give warm support to all those who adopt the same revolutionary attitude as you. "Chairman Mao also emphasized: "I support you, and we also ask you to pay attention to uniting all those who can be united. For those who have made serious mistakes, after pointing out their mistakes, we should also give them a way out of work and correcting their mistakes to start a new life. Marx said that the proletariat must not only liberate itself, but also liberate all mankind. If it cannot liberate all mankind, the proletariat itself cannot be finally liberated. Comrades, please pay attention to this principle." However, when the tragedy happened, people may not have known that Chairman Mao had written this reply. Moreover, even if they knew about Chairman Mao's reply, I am afraid that the ideological and political level of these middle school students at that time would not be able to truly understand this important theory of Marx. Not to mention the students, when the incident was immediately reported to the then mayor of Beijing, Wu De, not only did he not pay enough attention, let alone insist on Marx's idea of emancipating all mankind, but he said calmly: "If you die, you die." A typical disregard for human life. "Wu De has no morals."

However, if we look back today and re-examine the whole process of these tragedies, we can see that behind these people, these events, and these tragedies, there are deeper and more fundamental social reasons. If it is said that the students at that time had anarchist tendencies and violated discipline and law, then we must see that the revolution was launched under the dictatorship of the proletariat, that is, it was launched under the conditions of a government, and the government, that is, the dictatorship of the proletariat, was led by the party and was composed of the various components of the specific state apparatus - the public security, procuratorial and judicial organs. Looking at the problem from this historical premise, it is not difficult to realize that under these specific historical conditions at that time, various political forces, under a specific political system, political rules, and political life, plus the rule of the so-called bourgeois reactionary line (which was actually strongly feudal) that inevitably followed from this, worked together to produce such tragedies. Only by deeply exploring the various factors that led to the historical tragedies can we correctly explain where the fundamental responsibility and root causes of all these historical tragedies lie.

These erroneous and illegal activities were also carried out under the banner of "revolutionary rebellion". The big-character poster "Long Live the Proletarian Revolutionary Rebellious Spirit" written by students of Tsinghua High School was a typical example that spread throughout the country.

However, these things that happened at that time had nothing to do with the rebels that appeared later. The people who participated in these activities were not called rebels at that time. The name of their organization was "Red Guards" (according to research, Tsinghua High School began to use this name on May 29, 1966). Later, when criticizing the bourgeois reactionary line, the liberated rebels attributed these problems that occurred at that time to the results of promoting the bourgeois reactionary line. In fact, this was basically in line with reality.

It is necessary to make this fact clear now. Not only is the truth of history not to be distorted, more importantly, only by making the truth of history clear can we have a correct understanding of the inevitability and regularity of history, and can we really learn the lessons of history.

After clarifying the historical facts at that time, we can conduct in-depth studies and analyses, and we can see that the reason why these erroneous practices at that time were able to be implemented nationwide - rather than in certain places or sectors - without resistance is no accident.

During that period, Chairman Mao repeatedly said that if revisionism came to power, it would establish a fascist bourgeois dictatorship. The facts we face are that Chairman Mao's opinions are repeatedly verified to be in line with the truth of reality. Under the conditions of the so-called "dictatorship of the proletariat", the ruling Communist Party organizations at all levels (including the working groups sent in) actually abused their power and led the masses to do such things. The painful historical lessons it left behind must be re-recognized and seriously reflected upon today. If we blame all these mistakes on the "rebels", it is not only inconsistent with historical facts, but also a distortion of historical facts. More importantly, this understanding actually conceals how the mistakes actually happened at that time, especially the real responsibility and root causes of these problems. Therefore, it is impossible to correctly draw lessons from history and avoid repeating such mistakes in the future. It is not enough to simply blame the students who beat people at that time, simply accept or not accept the apology of these students, or even just blame Liu and Deng, because this understanding does not deeply reveal the ultimate reason for all this. Don't forget that all this happened nationwide under the leadership of the Communist Party of China. Even if, as Chairman Mao said, "certain leading comrades from the central government to the local governments" are responsible, "certain leading comrades" (such as Liu and Deng) are responsible, but the party should be held more responsible, because any political party must be responsible for the actions of its members. This requires looking for deeper historical reasons from the characteristics of the ruling party, the political system implemented by the ruling party, the political rules it operates, the prevailing political life, and the social foundation of China that inevitably gave rise to all this.

Only by re-conducting such research can we scientifically answer why all this could happen under the leadership of the Communist Party of China? Why were the people unable to resist, let alone rebel?

This cannot be replaced by simply expressing a little fierce indignation and condemnation around the countless specific events and specific people that occurred during the Cultural Revolution. This still requires us to use historical materialism more deeply and scientifically to find the reasons from the socialist system we have established, especially the political system, mainly the political system, political rules, and political life.

Today, this should be a historical question that is not too difficult to answer, because such mistakes and such illegal acts still exist in our real life, and the people are still unable to resist or even rebel against them.

It should be noted that in the current criminal activities of revisionism and capitalist restoration, the reactionary "bloodline theory"<sup>26</sup> still dominates our society under the new historical conditions. Chen Yun is a representative figure who advocates the "bloodline theory". His notorious instruction openly advocates the "bloodline theory". Under his protection, the children of some cadres who committed crimes in the early stage of the movement not only did not get liquidated, but also quickly stole state-owned assets and quickly became rich in the process of capitalist restoration, becoming the class basis of the new bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie, and finally putting the "bloodline theory" into practice.

It is certainly good and desirable that students who made mistakes back then, whether they were indirectly or directly responsible, are able to reflect on their mistakes, make self-criticisms and apologise to their teachers and classmates. But more people have not only failed to do so, but have metamorphosed into the mainstay of capitalist restoration, becoming new bourgeois elements sucking the blood of the working people one by one. This historical fact fully proves that the 'revolutionary' slogans they chanted back then actually concealed the essence of counter-revolutionary revisionism and the worst kind of bureaucratic dictatorship and monopoly capitalism, which ultimately transformed them into the class base of the bureaucratic dictatorship and monopoly bourgeoisie.

Understanding these facts and the regularities contained in them is the practical significance of our study of the 'overthrowing of everything' errors that occurred during the Cultural Revolution. Only by doing so can we ascertain the historical responsibility for the nationwide 'overthrow of all things' errors that occurred at that time, and can we find the root causes of the nationwide 'overthrow of all things' errors.

What is worth pondering is that the seriousness of the "overthrow everything" error lies in the fact that even after the victory of the "January Revolution" and the establishment of the Three-in-One Revolutionary Committee, under the slogan of the so-called "mass dictatorship", the movements such as "cleansing the class ranks", "strike three evils", "eliminate the May 16 counter-revolutionary group", etc., all contained the error of "overthrowing everything", deprivation of personal freedom was a common occurrence, the means of struggle were also cruel, and the number of deaths was even more serious than in the early stages of the movement.

If these problems that occurred at this time were simply attributed to the so-called "capitalist roaders" as some people always like to do, it would not be in line with the historical facts at that time.

I personally have such a personal experience: I was "exposed" in the "Criticize Lin Biao and Confucius" movement in 1970. In the following decade, I was always labelled as a "member of a counter-revolutionary group" and "anti-Party, anti-socialist and anti-proletarian dictatorship element". I was treated as an enemy and a class enemy and lost my freedom three times. I was constantly criticized in endless meetings and big-character posters were posted on the door of my dormitory (it's funny and a pity that one of the big-character posters posted on my door was copied by Professor Jiang Weisong, the host of the "Chinese Dictionary Group" and a calligrapher in Building 6 where I lived at the time. If it hadn't been stuck to the wall with sweet potato flour paste, I really wanted to peel it off and keep it

---

<sup>26</sup> The theory of descent is a kind of theory that advocates that the bloodline and identity of ancestors and elders determine the future, destiny and direction of development of individuals. It was applied to so-called "black five" or "black seven" families, including classification of children. Early in the Cultural Revolution, under the influence of the theory of descent, and of class origin, people in these categories were discriminated against in the aspects of joining the party, graduating from the army, enlisting in the army, and promoting love and marriage. The "black five" were landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements and Rightists – Trans.

as a calligraphy work). The whole country was carrying out the campaign of criticizing Lin Biao and Confucius, and Shandong University where I was studying was actually carrying out the "Criticize Xiang Movement".<sup>27</sup> It was not until 1977, when the 1977 class of students entered school, that the first political education class they attended was the criticism of me by the third department of liberal arts organized on the small playground of the new campus of Shandong University (a well-known person among the Maoists today might have been sitting among the students at that time). Comrade Gao Zhonghan, a reporter for the school newspaper (an acquaintance), even rushed to the scene to take pictures. I smiled calmly at him and nodded to the camera, which resulted in a burst of laughter from the students - a comedy in the tragedy. History finally made a conclusion for me, that it was wrong to persecute me, and that the way I was treated was also wrong. In June 1989, all the materials persecuted against me were moved to an open-air garbage dump outside the new campus's literature and history building, and were burned in the presence of me and the representatives of the organization. I said that the external investigation cost so much money, and these materials were still valuable for studying history, so could they be left to me? The comrade said firmly that this was the organization's requirement and must be burned.

I cite this small historical detail of my personal experience only to illustrate that the reason why there were tragedies of persecution and death far exceeding the little experience I had, and the reason why the mistake of "overthrowing everything" occurred nationwide at that time, was not accidental, but regular, and was related to and unified with the entire historical characteristics of our country, especially with the situation of our party at that time, the situation of the masses, and especially the political system, political rules, and political life. This is a problem of the party, a problem of the country's political system, a problem of the form of operation of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and a problem of how the socialist continued revolution should be carried out under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

This is a very heavy and important historical topic. Without serious and realistic scientific research based on the real historical facts that actually occurred at that time, it is impossible to clearly explain the fundamental nature and root causes of the problems that actually occurred at that time. It can be said that this is a heavy history written at the cost of blood and life. In order to be responsible for history and even more for future generations, we must summarize the painful lessons left by this period of history.

It must be seen that it is precisely this cruel mistake of "overthrowing everything" that has led to a large majority of the masses, not accidentally, to hold a negative view of the Cultural Revolution and "taking class struggle as the key link". Their one-sided and erroneous understanding cannot be regarded as the same thing as the revisionists, especially those revisionist leaders, who deny the Cultural Revolution and "taking class struggle as the key link". This is a mistake that inevitably results from our mistakes, "one tendency covering up another tendency". In this regard, some of our comrades only emphasize the correct aspects of the Cultural Revolution, the "seven points" aspects, but cannot face up to the wrong aspects, the "three points" aspects, and even use various untenable reasons to defend "overthrowing everything" and those cruel and erroneous methods of struggle. This is not a correct attitude towards the Cultural Revolution. It is a prejudice influenced by non-proletarian erroneous ideas. In essence, it is a dangerous and erroneous trend of thought that is against Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. Persisting in such a wrong understanding and wrong attitude can only discredit the Cultural Revolution and "taking class struggle as the key link", and arouse greater resentment among some people. They are worried that the mistake of "overthrowing everything" will be repeated in the

---

<sup>27</sup> That is, a movement to criticise the author, Xiang Guanqi – Trans.

future, which is the reason. This is understandable and not without reason. If this problem is not solved, it will be difficult to avoid repeating such historical mistakes.

I'm afraid all this is determined by our current historical conditions.

First, the revisionist rulers are practicing fascist dictatorship, not only "overthrowing everything" but also suppressing everything; not only making mistakes but committing crimes. In this context, they inevitably always distort the truth of history, cover up their own mistakes and crimes, and are even less likely to reveal the political system reasons, especially the ruling party system reasons, for the "overthrow everything" problem during the Cultural Revolution. Their only habitual method is to push all mistakes and crimes onto Lin Biao, the "Gang of Four", or onto the rebels. Under such operation, no matter whether they scold or denounce certain mistakes or crimes, or make a seemingly sincere confession for certain mistakes or crimes, they cannot correctly explain the real profound social reasons in various aspects, especially the reasons on the ruling party side, for the occurrence of "overthrowing everything". It is also impossible to truly find and accept the lessons of history. On the contrary, they continue to make such mistakes without justification. Isn't this the reality we are facing?

Second, from the perspective of the general public, we cannot help but notice that some people, until today, have taken an attitude of defending and treating indifferently such serious mistakes of "overthrowing everything", including the cruel methods of struggle and even the phenomenon of persecution to death, and even defended them with a strong sense of justice, saying that this is the iron means and necessity of the dictatorship of the proletariat (there was a very wrong saying of "red terror" in the early days of the Cultural Revolution). It is precisely because of the existence of such wrong thoughts, wrong emotions, wrong attitudes, and wrong positions that not only do many people worry that similar mistakes of "overthrowing everything" in the Cultural Revolution will happen again in the future, but it also shows that the mistakes of "overthrowing everything" at that time were not accidental from the perspective of the masses and young students.

It is precisely because of the historical limitations of these two levels that we need a historical process to truly reflect on and recognize the mistakes of "overthrowing everything" during the Cultural Revolution. I am afraid that only with the overall progress of Chinese society can we truly and correctly recognize the mistakes of "overthrowing everything" that have occurred and truly avoid such mistakes and tragedies from happening again. This is the basic requirement for using the ideological method of historical materialism to understand history and reality.

The reality we face tells us that we are probably not able to do this now. Because facts tell us that the reason why the fascist bourgeois dictatorship can still work and the persecution can still happen everywhere is fundamentally because the political system and social foundation that produced all these problems have not been solved; this is not a problem of any one person, but a problem of the entire society.

This is the same as the "cruel struggle and ruthless attack" that occurred in the history of our party (in fact, not just the Chinese party). It has its profound class and social foundations, and is an inevitable reflection of the social conditions of China's history. All historical phenomena have their historical foundation, historical basis, and historical necessity.

This is a debt left to us by history, and it is a historical topic that we must give a correct answer to.

The seriousness of the mistake of "overthrowing everything" lies in the fact that it fundamentally confuses two types of contradictions of different natures.



Since Chairman Mao published "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People" in 1957, he has repeatedly pointed out that in this historical stage of socialist society, correctly handling contradictions among the people is a general topic. It is necessary to correctly and strictly distinguish between the two types of contradictions of different natures, namely, contradictions between enemies and ourselves and contradictions among the people, and adopt different ways and methods of handling them respectively. The reason why "overthrowing everything" is a mistake is that it overthrows people who should not be overthrown, and fails to correctly distinguish between the two types of contradictions of different natures.

If we ask further, why did the two types of contradictions of different natures appear to be confused, and thus the mistake of "overthrowing everything" occurred?

First, from the perspective of combining theory and practice, this involves the question of whether the understanding of the class struggle situation inside and outside the party at that time in my country was correct and accurate; related to this, there is also the question of how to correctly and accurately handle it.

At that time, there was a debate on the "two basic estimates" (after the founding of the People's Republic of China, in the field of education, the revisionist bourgeois line basically occupied a dominant position; the world outlook of intellectuals was basically bourgeois). This also involved Chairman Mao's statement that "the phenomenon of bourgeois intellectuals ruling our schools can no longer continue" and different views on the two famous instructions of the Ministry of Culture. This mainly involved the understanding and estimation of the class struggle situation in the education, culture and art circles.

The Cultural Revolution was a political revolution involving the whole party and society, so we must have a correct understanding, correct assessment and correct approach to the situation of class struggle in the whole party and society. During the "Four Cleanups", there was a saying that "one-third of the political power is not in our hands". The "May 16 Notice" in 1966 talked about "a group of bourgeois representatives who have sneaked into the party, the government, the army and various cultural circles". There was no clear concept of how many people were in the "group" mentioned here (the "resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee tampered with it to "a large group" with ulterior motives); even when it was later mentioned as "a small handful", there was still no clear concept. On April 11, 1968, Chairman Mao also said: "Whether this Cultural Revolution is called a great revolution or not is up to historians to decide. It can be called the Cultural Revolution because it started with the Cultural Revolution. No matter what it is called, it has always touched the superstructure, from the central government to factories, institutions, and schools, which were not in our hands in the past." (Chronicle of Mao Zedong, Volume 6, page 242). These theoretical opinions are all major opinions, all of which are theoretical opinions on class struggle in the socialist period, that is, theoretical opinions on the continued socialist revolution. They all involve the assessment of the class and class struggle situation under socialist conditions, the understanding of the new characteristics and new laws of this class struggle, and the policies and strategies that should be adopted to correctly deal with this class struggle. All of these have had a direct impact on the Cultural Revolution.

Facts have proved that whether or not there is a correct understanding of class struggle in the socialist society directly determines whether the line, principles and policies of leadership in conducting this class struggle are correct. If this issue of general significance is not properly resolved, when it is put into practice and becomes a specific guiding line, principle and policy, mistakes such as "overthrowing everything" will become an inevitable consequence.



This principle applies not only to the Cultural Revolution, but also to all political movements since the founding of the People's Republic of China, and even to the serious mistakes of the so-called "growth" that occurred in all socialist countries. This is not difficult to understand, because the formulation of any correct line, principle, policy, and strategy for the proletarian revolution must be unified with the correct analysis and understanding of the situation of class struggle.

In my book "On Mao Zedong's Historical Thought" written in 2006, there are some specific opinions that are both criticisms and self-criticisms, which can be used as a reference for the question raised here, and I will not repeat them here.

This issue, in the final analysis, is a question of the theory, line, principle, and policy of continuing the revolution under socialist conditions. The occurrence of the "overthrow everything" mistake, fundamentally speaking, is still the problem here.

Looking back today, the "May 16th Notice", "Sixteen Articles" and other central documents during the Cultural Revolution, including the "Editorials of Two Newspapers and One Journal" that were constantly published, have not actually solved or met the theoretical needs of the socialist revolution. Chairman Mao has always led us forward on this theoretical issue, but we seem to be too passive, too inadequate, and too dependent on Chairman Mao. As someone sarcastically said, "You only have Mao Zedong Thought, and you don't think at all." We did not do the theoretical work we should have done well. Some people who bravely explored it were suppressed and sacrificed.

The inadequacy of theory will inevitably lead to inadequacy of practice. "Overthrow everything" is the punishment for this inadequacy.

The "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee completely negated Chairman Mao's theory of continuing the socialist revolution, completely negated the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, and especially negated "taking class struggle as the key link". This is not in line with the reality of socialist society and is therefore wrong; this is the theoretical root cause of all revisionism, including Deng Xiaoping's revisionism and its revisionist line. There is a fundamental contradiction between us and them in terms of class theory and line. Their goal is to completely negate the socialist continued revolution, while our goal is to learn how to better carry out the socialist continued revolution. This is itself a class struggle. The question we are discussing here is how to more correctly and accurately grasp the situation of class struggle, so as to more correctly and accurately grasp the line of "taking class struggle as the key link", avoid the mistake of "expanding class struggle" that people often say, and make the theory, line, principles and policies of the socialist continued revolution more in line with reality, so as to better lead the socialist continued revolution to victory.

Otherwise, it is inevitable that two types of contradictions of different natures will be confused, and the mistake of "overthrowing everything" will inevitably occur. The proletarian revolutionary strategy of uniting the majority that Chairman Mao has always emphasized will fail.

This is a very serious, very important, and very difficult theoretical issue of the socialist continued revolution that cannot be avoided.

Second, from a policy perspective, there were no strict policy boundaries and no strict legal procedures for what issues were considered to be contradictions between the enemy and us and what should be overthrown.

Thirdly, in terms of leadership, party organisations at one level and mass organisations at another can arbitrarily and indefinitely condemn a lawful citizen as being in conflict as an enemy and belonging to the category of those who can be 'knocked down'. This fact is a grim reflection of the fact that if the

dictatorship of the proletariat is not accompanied by a corresponding form of proletarian dictatorship in the form of a political system, the result will inevitably be that the mistake of 'overthrowing everything' will be committed.

The seriousness of the error of 'knocking down everything' is not only reflected in the number of people involved and the wrong characterisation, but also in the way the struggle is conducted.

They arbitrarily deprived people of their personal freedom, and adopted various cruel and barbaric means of struggle that the ruling class of the exploiting class society usually uses, such as wearing dunce caps, hanging plaques, parading people through the streets, etc. This is the main reason why many people committed suicide. At that time, without considering the current historical conditions, Chairman Mao's famous words in the "Report on an Investigation of the Peasant Movement in Hunan" written in 1927 were abused: "A revolution is not a dinner party, or writing an essay, or painting a picture, or doing embroidery; it cannot be so refined, so leisurely and gentle, so temperate, kind, courteous, restrained and magnanimous. A revolution is an insurrection, an act of violence by which one class overthrows another." ("Selected Works of Mao Zedong", Volume 1, page 17, People's Publishing House, 1966 edition.) Moreover, music was composed for this passage, and it was made into a "quotation song" and sung all over the country. Chairman Mao did not approve of such abuse of his works without considering the specific historical conditions. In a conversation, he specifically mentioned this phenomenon, criticized it, and clearly opposed these practices. He also specifically imitated the jet-like position<sup>28</sup>, saying that "it makes people very uncomfortable." At that time, the Central Committee also had a document, which pointed out that these practices were all "armed struggle" and were prohibited according to Chairman Mao's instructions. However, despite the ban, they continued to occur all over the country. At that time, in colleges and middle schools, a division of "five red categories" and "five black categories" (referring to students from landlord, rich peasant, counter-revolutionary, bad elements, and rightist families) was made, and students with bad family backgrounds were called "dog cubs." The famous couplet coined by Tan Lifu (a son of a high-ranking official and the head of the conservative Red Guard organization at the Beijing Institute of Technology): "If the father is a hero, the son is a hero; if the father is a reactionary, the son is a bastard, that's basically it" became popular all over the country. And the "Revolutionary Rebel Song" goes: "Pick up the pen, make it a sword or a gun, concentrate firepower to fight the gangs. Dare to think, dare to speak, dare to rebel, be a pioneer in the Cultural Revolution. Be loyal to the revolution and the party, the party is my dear parent. Whoever dares to say that the party is not good, send him to hell immediately." At the end, they would shout: "Kill kill kill - hey!" or "Get out - get the hell out of here" which also became popular all over the country. This feudal and reactionary "bloodline theory" is just like the current "second generation of red" theory<sup>29</sup>. In essence, it is a theory of privilege, a privileged class, and aristocratic hierarchy. It is nothing more than a combination of the traditional dregs of Chinese feudal society and new class conditions. It was under the prevalence of this reactionary theory that cruel persecution of teachers and students occurred in schools across the country. Among them, Beijing was the most serious. Later, there was an exhibition about these crimes in Beijing, which was really shocking and outrageous. The truth of this period of history is clear. Not only was it not done by the rebels, but it was precisely the rebels who opposed the "bloodline theory", opposed the diversion of the general direction of the struggle, and opposed the persecution of innocent teachers and students.

---

<sup>28</sup> Overthrown persons were often taken to struggle sessions where they were forced to stand facing the masses, their heads forced down to waist level, and their arms pulled back behind them like the wings of a jet – Trans.

<sup>29</sup> This refers to the sons and daughters, nephews and nieces, of Mao's generation of first red leaders – Trans.

Later, the fathers of some high-ranking officials' children were persecuted, and their fathers were no longer "heroes" but became "gangsters". They suddenly became what everyone called at the time, "parent-protecting faction", "royalist faction", and "gangster children". They were not convinced, so they organized the "Red Guard Joint Action Committee", abbreviated as "United Action", which was said to be aimed at Jiang Qing (it was no surprise that Jiang Qing was then attacked by them in the same hatred), but in fact it was aimed at Chairman Mao, claiming that "only Mao Zedong Thought before 1960 is recognized". Later, some of them were arrested, but because they had high-ranking family backgrounds and were young, they were all released after Chairman Mao intervened. However, this was the same as the so-called "February Countercurrent" of the old marshals and vice premiers, and the "April 5 Tiananmen Incident" in 1976. They were all just a reflection of the struggle between the two classes and the two paths during the Cultural Revolution. The counterattacks that occurred after the counter-revolutionary coup, and even the fascist bourgeois dictatorship until today, were not accidental historical phenomena, but inevitable phenomena of classes and class struggle under socialist conditions. Moreover, the means of struggle are always very cruel.

Looking back at these historical phenomena today, we all feel shocked and believe that such things should not have happened under the socialist conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat. However, why it came to this point and revealing the historical inevitability involved is a historical issue that has not yet been fully resolved.

This actually puts forward the historical question of how the socialist revolution should be carried out under the socialist conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat. To summarize the reasons for the failure of the Cultural Revolution, we must ultimately answer this question. We must find a more correct and more practical form of revolution to carry out the socialist revolution, which can avoid the two mistakes and avoid failure again.

Unfortunately, few people have seriously explored this major historical issue that has been raised in theory and practice, and some are even unaware of the existence of such a major historical issue. I have made a superficial exploration of this issue in this book, which is at most of some significance to stimulate discussion.

However, this problem can only be solved by the Communists who adhere to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. For the revisionist rulers, they can only distort the truth of history, and there is no question of revealing the inevitability and regularity of history. They can only blame all the crimes on the rebels and denounce them; they also impose false statements on Chairman Mao based on facts and theories, such as the infamous "Resolution"<sup>30</sup>; under the rule of such a regime, how could they explain the historical reasons, historical inevitability, and historical regularity of all that happened in China at that time? Of course, for them, there is no question of studying the form of continuing socialist revolution; on the contrary, what they want to do is to deny the correctness and necessity of the theory of continuing socialist revolution; what they want to affirm is nothing more than the historical rationality and legitimacy of capitalist restoration under the revisionist line.

"Overthrow everything" is a very heavy topic, a topic full of blood and tears. As for the tragedies and losses caused by "overthrowing everything", it is not an exaggeration to say that it is a "disaster". The question, and more importantly, is why these "disasters" happened? What historical lessons have these "disasters" left behind? How to avoid such "disasters" from happening again in the future is

---

<sup>30</sup> i.e. the 1981 Resolution on Certain Questions in the History of Our Party since the Founding of the People's Republic of China – Trans.

what we must figure out. However, this is only possible under the historical conditions of ending the revisionist rule.

I am a witness of the Cultural Revolution at Fudan University and Shandong University, and also a witness of the Cultural Revolution in Shanghai and Shandong. My above views are based on the heavy facts I personally experienced.

If I do not respect the facts, do not proceed from the facts, and accommodate the wrong trend of thought that distorts the dictatorship of the proletariat into a place where violence can be abused and human lives can be taken lightly, then I will be sorry for those outstanding sons and daughters of the Chinese nation and the Communist Party of China who sacrificed their lives for the progress of China during the Cultural Revolution.

The mistake of “overthrowing everything” made during the Cultural Revolution cannot be simply covered up by saying that it was an inevitable loss in the revolutionary process, nor can the absurd defence be made by saying that “revolution is not a dinner party.”

This is not what happened in the war years of armed struggle to seize power, but a tragedy and loss that occurred in a socialist society under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat. If we should uphold the dictatorship of the proletariat, then we should be responsible for the mistakes that occurred due to the failure to correctly exercise the dictatorship of the proletariat, and we should conduct serious self-criticism, especially to find and learn from historical lessons.

This problem is not primarily a historical problem, but a very serious and realistic problem. The seriousness and reality of this problem lies in the fact that if this problem is not solved, if the understanding of the dictatorship of the proletariat is not solved, and if the understanding of the political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat is not solved, it will be impossible to have a correct understanding of the fascist bourgeois dictatorship, and people will mistakenly think that this fascist bourgeois dictatorship is the dictatorship of the proletariat, and they will become accomplices and thugs of this fascist bourgeoisie. The current armed police, public security, procuratorate and courts are playing such a role, and in 1989, the former people's army actually degenerated into an army that used guns and artillery to suppress the people.

Chairman Mao once analysed this type of problem that occurred in socialist countries, saying that such problems would not occur even in bourgeois democratic republics. That is why he said that "Hitler was worse than De Gaulle."<sup>31</sup>

The actual fact is that the understanding of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the minds of some of our comrades has not yet reached the level of understanding of bourgeois democracy. Although these comrades often criticise the bourgeois dictatorship with confidence, they have never realized that they are actually using feudal imperial autocratic ideas to criticise the bourgeois dictatorship. They do not understand the slogans of human rights, democracy, freedom, equality, etc. that the bourgeoisie once used as their revolutionary banner. The weapons they use to criticise these bourgeois slogans are the slogans and ideas of feudal imperial autocracy. The result is that the more they criticise, the more reactionary they become, and the more they criticise, the more they move

---

<sup>31</sup> These comments were recorded as “Some Interjections at the Report of the Leading Group of the Planning Commission on the Third Five-Year Plan” (11 May 1964). Mao was reported as saying; “Fifth, the current Soviet Union is the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, the dictatorship of the big bourgeoisie, the dictatorship of German fascism, the dictatorship of Hitler, a bunch of hooligans, worse than de Gaulle)” - Trans.

towards the fascist bourgeois dictatorship. In layman's terms, the more they criticise, the more they move towards "Hitler" (a synonym for fascist autocracy).

This is a kind of self-ironic ignorance. However, this is also a very practical and realistic problem in China.

In the final analysis, this is still a question of whether we can correctly understand and handle the dictatorship of the proletariat, that is, proletarian democracy, in theory and practice. This is directly related to the fundamental interests and life and death of the broad masses of working people, with workers and peasants as the main body.

#### **(d) The seriousness of the error of 'all-out civil war'.**

The 'all-out civil war' of the Cultural Revolution occurred mainly because the revolutionary masses were divided into two opposing factions. The struggle developed from a cultural struggle to a military struggle, giving rise to the 'all-out civil war' referred to by Chairman Mao.

The struggle between the two major factions that emerged during the Cultural Revolution can be broadly distinguished into two distinct phases.

The first stage was the early days of the Cultural Revolution, mainly in 1966, when, without exception, there was a confrontation between conservatives and rebels all over the country.

Why is this a historical phenomenon? There has never been a good scientific explanation.

In the past, it was always said that it was the result of the capitalist-roaders' implementation of the bourgeois reactionary line and their provocation of the masses to fight against the masses.

This is reasonable as far as the phenomenon is concerned. However, it is not enough just to understand and explain the problem in this way; we must also see that there are deeper social and historical reasons.

At that time, there was a common fact in all parts of China: most party and league members, including so-called "activists", stood on the side of the conservatives; while there were very few party and league members among the rebels, and even a few people who were usually regarded as "backward masses". Colleges and universities were the birthplace of the Cultural Revolution. Not only did this phenomenon occur, but the initial dare to rebel was mainly junior students (the student movement in 1989 repeated this phenomenon).

Since this is generally the case across the country, it shows that this historical phenomenon did not occur by chance.

I think there are several reasons: First, most people, especially party members and league members, do not think that the party organization and the leaders of their units are capitalist-roaders, or in other words, the fourth type of cadres mentioned in the "Sixteen Articles".<sup>32</sup>

The Sixteen Articles stipulate that "Cadres can be roughly divided into the following four categories: (1) good ones. (2) relatively good ones. (3) those who have made serious mistakes but are not yet anti-Party and anti-socialist rightists. (4) a small number of anti-Party and anti-socialist rightists. Under normal circumstances, the first two categories (the good ones and the relatively good ones) are the majority. Anti-Party and anti-socialist rightists must be fully exposed, fought against, crushed,

---

<sup>32</sup> The "Sixteen Articles" was adopted on 8 August 1966 at the the 11th Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee presided over by Mao Zedong – Trans.

discredited, their influence eliminated, and at the same time given a way out so that they can start a new life."

Those who believed that the party organization of their unit, especially the leaders of the party organization, were not the fourth category of people were considered conservatives, while those who were skeptical about the party organization of their unit, especially the leaders of the party organization, or directly believe that they were the fourth category of people were considered rebels.

As far as the actual situation of the movements in Fudan University, Shandong University, and many industrial and mining enterprises in Shanghai and Shandong that I have personally experienced, at that time, the rebels could not produce sufficient evidence to prove that the party organizations in their units, especially the leaders of the party organizations, did indeed belong to the fourth category of cadres.

At Fudan University, on June 20, 1966, Chen Jianwei, a freshman in the Department of Physics, wrote a sentence on a large piece of paper and posted it on a wooden board in the middle of the so-called "Nanjing Road" (the main east-west road) of Fudan University: "Turn the spearhead to the monsters and demons in the Party Committee." However, many students questioned, "What basis do you have to say that there are monsters and demons in the Party Committee?" He never answered this question with any specific materials, and simply never answered it. This should be considered the earliest big-character poster of the rebels. Shandong University also had a similar situation. Also on June 20, a group of people in the third year of the Chinese Department, led by Liu Quanfu (a transferred cadre student. After I arrived at Shandong University, we became good friends), jointly printed a small poster (leaflet) to question the Party Committee of Shandong University and the person in charge of the Party Committee (Comrade Cheng Fangwu). This should be considered the earliest small poster of the rebels at Shandong University. Liu Quanfu later became the leader of the rebels at Shandong University. However, this small poster only raised questions to a limited extent, and did not produce any materials to prove that the Party Committee of Shandong University or the person in charge of the Party Committee belonged to the fourth category.

This is a typical and specific example. This is different from the units where work teams were stationed to suppress the masses, such as Tsinghua University and Peking University. This was more common across the country. A specific analysis of this phenomenon will make it easier to understand why the historical phenomenon of sharp confrontation between conservatives and rebels occurred throughout the country in the early stages of the movement.

It was not surprising that this situation occurred at that time. This was related to our political system at that time. Even today, can an ordinary grassroots person explain the situation of the party committee of his unit? I am afraid it is still impossible. Simply put, it is because the political activities of our party organizations at all levels are not open, and we emphasize organizational discipline and confidentiality, and have never emphasized political transparency, which is what is often said now as "black box operation". Under such a political system, the grassroots masses have no idea about the actual situation of the party organization or the person in charge of the party organization, let alone supervision. Therefore, it is difficult and impossible to ask the grassroots masses to classify the party organizations or the leaders of the party organizations; it is even more difficult and impossible to judge whether they belong to the fourth category. In this case, since there is no sufficient factual basis, it is impossible to judge which category the first-level party organizations and the leaders of the party organizations belong to, and of course there is no question of overthrowing or rebelling. This inevitably became a basic reason why conservatives accounted for the majority among the masses in the early stages of the movement.



However, the reasons are not limited to this, there are also deeper reasons in the historical background.

That is, for a long time, the problem of the proletarian democratic system and democratic atmosphere that are unified with the true Marxist-Leninist-Maoist theory of proletarian dictatorship has not been solved.

Moreover, the facts are the opposite, and it has gone in the opposite direction.

Especially after the "Anti-Rightist Struggle" in 1957, due to serious deviations in the understanding and handling of democratic issues, a politically erroneous tendency emerged: as long as opinions were raised about the first-level party organizations or the leaders of party organizations, they could be convicted of "anti-party and anti-socialist" crimes, labelled as "rightists" who were "anti-party and anti-socialist", and treated as enemy-enemy contradictions.

It was in such a political background that a series of mistakes in the early days of the Cultural Revolution inevitably occurred. Many party committees, including working groups, did just that, which was the so-called "bourgeois reactionary line" promoted at the time.

The problem of "suppressing the masses" criticized by Chairman Mao also occurred in this way.

At that time, everyone was afraid that they would be labelled as "rightists" for giving opinions to the party organization or the person in charge of the party organization. At that time, there was indeed such public opinion, so-called "rightists have jumped out again", "rightists will be arrested in the later stage of the movement", etc. This made the masses very scared. This had already happened in various parts of the country, especially in places where work teams had been stationed. For example, the work teams stationed in 24 colleges and universities in Beijing had labelled 10,211 students as "rightists" and 2,591 teachers as "counter-revolutionaries". The situation in Tsinghua University and Peking University is the most prominent and well-known, so there is no need to elaborate here. It is precisely such strong political pressure that is the reason for the social basis of the politics of the conservatives, and the majority of party and league members basically stand on the conservative position.

Later, the party committees in various places collapsed one after another, and the work teams were withdrawn, which was mainly related to this. At that time, it was called the implementation of the "bourgeois reactionary line". This is the fact. At that time, many party organizations (work teams were even more serious) had already begun to deal with the black materials of the revolutionary masses. However, they misjudged the situation and did not understand what Chairman Mao was going to do this time. They never expected that in October 1966, the Central Committee (CPC Central Committee, State Council, Central Cultural Revolution Group, Central Military Commission) issued the "Fifteenth Directive", requiring party organizations at all levels to destroy all materials on the masses. This was like a spring thunder at the time. The rebels rose up to fight, rushed into the party committee, rushed into the archives, and searched for materials to persecute the masses. The rebels called it "grabbing the black materials", and the conservatives called it "grabbing the archives" by storming the archives. The final result was the victory of the rebels, because the fact was that many party organizations did keep the black materials of persecuting the revolutionary masses. At this time, the situation took a fundamental turn. Next, the party committees were very passive, and as the situation developed, after the "January Revolution", their power was seized.

The collection of black materials and their filing is a serious problem that cannot be avoided when studying the political system and political life of socialist countries.



Such a struggle took place at Fudan University. At that time, I personally had such a personal experience.

At that time, the political counsellor, Mr. Wang Ruixiang, kindly warned me: 'In 1957, it was the Department of Foreign Languages and the Department of Physics that had a lot of "rightists", and now the "rightists" of these two departments have jumped out again. You must be careful.' This was not Mr Wang's personal idea, but a popular idea in society at that time. This was one of the basic reasons why the masses did not dare to rebel and why the rebels were always in the minority.

It was in this political context that Chairman Mao added a note to the document "People's Daily Commentary: Hailing a Big-Character Poster at Peking University" (published on June 2, 1966) issued by the 11th Plenary Session of the 8th Central Committee on August 5, 1966: "Wrong leadership that endangers the revolution should not be accepted unconditionally, but should be resolutely resisted." Chairman Mao's opinion had a deafening effect at the time. It was a heavy artillery shell that broke the long-standing situation that the leaders of the first-level party organizations could use the name of the party to engage in autocracy. It was a major breakthrough in opposing the random labelling of "anti-party and anti-socialist" and defending the people's right to directly manage the country, thus enabling the broad masses of the people to gain a great liberation politically and ideologically. This not only directly affected the disintegration of the conservative ranks and the expansion of the rebel ranks, but also had a more profound impact on the subsequent development of China's political situation up until today.

In addition to the two basic reasons mentioned above, there is another practical problem, or practical difficulty.

That is, at that time, the broad masses of the people had no idea what the Cultural Revolution was going to do. Therefore, they did not dare to act rashly, and they felt at a loss as to what to do. This was also an important reason why conservatives were in the majority in the early stages of the movement, and also an important reason why the initial rebellion of the rebels was quite blind.

From the "February Outline" written by the original "Cultural Revolution Group" and later criticized, to the "May 16 Notice" rewritten by the reorganized "Cultural Revolution Group", there is one thing in common, that is, the struggle is characterized as the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution". Only Chairman Mao added the following sentence when reviewing the "May 16 Notice": "The bourgeois representatives who have sneaked into the party, the government, the army and various cultural circles are a group of counter-revolutionary revisionists. Once the time is ripe, they will seize power and change the dictatorship of the proletariat into the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Some of these people have been identified by us, some have not been identified yet, and some are being trusted by us and being trained as our successors, such as people like Khrushchev, who are now sleeping beside us. Party committees at all levels must pay full attention to this." This was a clear focus of the struggle on 'bourgeois representatives who have infiltrated the Party, the government, the army and various cultural circles'. However, as Zhang Chunqiao later emphasised in a televised public speech, he took part in the drafting of the 'May 16th Circular', and watched Chairman Mao add the words, but at the time he did not think of who Chairman Mao was referring to, let alone associating them with Liu Shaoqi. Therefore, in the minds of the masses at that time, the revolution was still a 'cultural' revolution, specifically a revolution in the educational and cultural circles. What Chairman Mao later called the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution was in fact a political revolution, which had already taken place after the 'January Revolution'.

The facts in the early days of the Cultural Revolution also unfolded in this way. From the publication of "Sweep Away All Monsters and Demons" in the People's Daily on June 1, 1966, to the nationwide criticism of "Three Family Village"<sup>33</sup>, criticism of various "reactionary academic authorities", and representatives of the reactionary black line in literature and art, to the "destroy the four olds and establish the four new" and even the house-raiding activities in various parts of the country, in short, all manifested themselves as the narrow "Cultural Revolution" in the education sector and various cultural and artistic circles.

These activities were still carried out under the leadership of the Party committees at all levels. I also had such personal experience. Our History Department of Fudan University secretly formed a writing group under the leadership of the Party organization at that time, and undertook the "political task" of criticizing the "two Zhous" (that is, the two old gentlemen Zhou Gucheng and Zhou Yutong). I was one of the members of the writing group secretly formed by six fifth-year students in the History Department, and the task was to write articles criticizing Mr. Zhou Yutong. Several teachers in the department with good writing skills also secretly organized a group to take on the task of criticizing Mr. Zhou Gucheng. Prior to this, a writing team, Luo Siding, had been organized under the direct leadership of the Municipal Party Committee by five teachers, Jin Chongji (team leader. Later, he followed Comrade Shi Ximin to the Central Ministry of Culture. Teacher Zhu Yongjia<sup>34</sup> became the team leader), Zhu Yongjia, Wu Ruiwu, Zhu Weizheng, and Wang Zhichang. They not only helped Yao Wenyan provide the historical data of Ming Dynasty needed for his article "Hai Rui Dismissed from Office" criticizing Wu Han, but also wrote many influential articles in the discussion of criticizing "Hai Rui Dismissed from Office" at that time, and later became a famous writing team on par with "Liang Xiao".<sup>35</sup>

Just like the "Three-Family Village" was exposed in Beijing, the "Three-Family Village" was exposed all over the country. It was in such a political background that not only the "Three-Family Village" was exposed in Beijing, but also "Three-Family Village" of all sizes were exposed all over the country, including Shanghai. Fudan University exposed "Two Zhous", which is such a case. Shandong University exposed the so-called "Ideological History Discussion Class" in the History Department, and the "Dazhong Daily" criticized the deputy governor of Shandong Province, Comrade Yu Xiu, who was exposed. It was generally like this from Beijing to all over the country.

Under such a political background, various places and colleges and universities, under the leadership and command of the party organization, dug out some so-called revisionists, reactionary academic

---

<sup>33</sup> "Notes from Three Family Village" was a series of articles critical of Mao's policies and written by Deng Tuo, Wu Han and Liao Mosha. In May 1966, Yao Wenyan in Shanghai published "On 'Three-Family Village'—The Reactionary Nature of Evening Chats at Yenshan and Notes from Three-Family Village".

<sup>34</sup> Zhu Yongjia (1931-), a male historian and former member of the Standing Committee of the Shanghai Municipal Committee, was born in 1931 and studied at the Department of History of Fudan University under the tutelage of Tan Qichang and Zhou Yubing. He later engaged in teaching and research on the history of the Qin and Han dynasties, the Three Kingdoms and Ming history. He is the author of *The Inside Story of Mao Zedong's Rereading of Ancient Texts in Later Years* and *On Cao Cao*, among others. In the 1960s, Zhu Yongjia became an important figure in Shanghai's political scene as a member of the Writing Group of the Shanghai Municipal Party Committee, which was used exclusively by Zhang Chunqiao, Yao Wenyan and the then official Shanghai government, and was relied upon by Zhang and Yao as their inner circle. In 1983, Zhu Yongjia was sentenced to 14 years in prison for "counter-revolutionary crimes" and other offences. Prior to that, he had been held in isolation for six years in Shanghai's Tilanqiao Prison. In 1988, at the age of 57, Zhu Yongjia was released early on medical parole. After his release from prison, he wrote four to five million words of books and received substantial fees for them.

<sup>35</sup> "Liang Xiao" was a team of writers prominent in the 1975 campaign to criticise Lin Biao and Confucius – Trans.

authorities, and reactionary gangs, such as the article "Sweep Away All Monsters and Demons" in the People's Daily. For example, under the specific leadership of the Party branch, the History Department of Fudan University first dug out the deputy director of the department, Mr. Hu Shengwu, as a revisionist and paraded him on Fudan's "Nanjing Road". The tall hat he wore was made by several students in the dormitory where I lived, with a wastepaper basket wrapped in newspapers, in the presence of the political counsellor and the secretary of the Youth League branch. When the procession passed by Building 6, where we lived, a student rushed to the front of the procession with a tall hat and put it on Teacher Hu's head. Years later, when I called on Mr Hu at Renmin University and talked about this incident, Mr Hu said, 'You should write your memoirs. So, today I am writing about this incident here in passing, as a way of carrying out one of Teacher Hu's last wishes, and, I should add, this is an apology to Teacher Hu Juanwu. It was during this time, probably in August, that all the students of our class, still under the leadership of the political counsellor, Mr Wang Ruixiang, and the secretary of the Youth League branch, Mr Wu Kequan, took turns to go into Mr Wang Zaoshi's<sup>36</sup> home (which had already been raided), mainly to interrogate him as to whether he had discussed with Mr Sun Dayu (who had already been arrested) that, in the event of a counter-attack by Chiang Kai-shek against the continent, it would be Mr Wang Zaoshi who would step in to organise the Third Party, and to put Chairman Mao on trial. Wu Kequan presided over the whole night and asked Mr. Wang to stand there and explain the problem. Mr. Wang refused to admit it. Liang Huazhong then walked up and slapped Mr. Wang on his bald head. Wu Kequan and his classmates immediately reprimanded Liang Huazhong. Mr. Wang said angrily: People are not afraid of death, so why scare them with death. That night, I accompanied him and slept on the long table. Mr. Wang had taught us the modern history of the world for a year, so I talked to him about some past events in class. He also said to me with concern, classmate, you go to sleep, I will be fine. And my responsibility was to take care of him, fearing that something would happen. I still asked Mr. Wang to sleep first. I watched him silently all night. The next day, we returned to school, and Mr. Wang was arrested by the public security bureau.

Although he was a rare revolutionary in the torrent of modern Chinese revolution and one of the famous "Seven Gentlemen of the National Salvation Association", he was first blamed for being "anti-Soviet" and then labelled a "rightist". Disasters followed one after another and he died of illness in prison at the age of 68. He had four children, two boys and two girls. Three of them became mentally ill under tremendous political pressure, and all four died before him. This is a tragic family history left by Mr. Wang. I remember that Mr. Wang was writing a "memoir" at the time, and our classmates circulated it, but I don't know if it was preserved. Mr. Wang was rehabilitated after the Cultural

---

<sup>36</sup> Wang Zaoshi (1903-September 1971), took an active part in the May Fourth Movement. In August 1925, he went to the United States and studied political science and obtained a doctorate in political science from the University of Wisconsin. In August 1929 he went to England and entered the London School of Economics, to be a researcher, with the UK Fabian Society. He left London in May 1930 and travelled to continental Europe, returning home via the Soviet Union and being hired by the Shanghai Guanghua University. After the September 18 Incident in 1931, he published the "Two Policies for Salvation", advocated the War of Resistance against Japan, and initiated the organization of the Anti-Japanese Salvation Association of professors from various universities in Shanghai, and served as the executive director. He also participated in the organization of various anti-Japanese and national salvation organizations in Shanghai. On November 23, 1936, the Kuomintang government in Nanjing arrested the seven leaders of the All-China National Salvation Federation on charges of "endangering the Republic of China." The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China demanded their release. After the founding of the People's Republic of China, he served as a member of the East China Military and Political Commission and a member of the East China Culture and Education Commission. Denounced as a Rightist in 1957, he was cleared in 1960, then criticised again during the Cultural Revolution. He died in 1971 – Trans.

Revolution. I miss my teacher Mr. Wang Zaoshi very much, and I feel deeply ashamed of Mr. Wang. That night, the shame of our classmates was forever written in the history of Fudan University.

What is worth studying now is why we were already fifth-year college students about to graduate, but we did not know that we should abide by the basic rights of citizens stipulated in the Constitution, and did not know that this was not only a mistake, but also a violation of the law and a crime. This can also make us wonder why middle school students in Beijing and other places would beat their teachers and classmates so cruelly, until they even beat the principals to death. However, we should not forget that all this happened in the name of "revolution" and under the specific leadership and deployment of the party organization (there were no rebels at the time, but there were "Red Guards" under the leadership of the party organization). Aren't the deep political reasons contained here more worthy of our profound reflection today? It was the party organization that led and created these tragedies from a high position; it was also the party organization that condescended to "rehabilitate" these tragedies, as if the occurrence of the tragedy had nothing to do with the party organization, and the party organization did not need to apologize to the victims and the people, and even had to thank the party organization for its "wisdom" again. How absurd is this to reverse history!

In addition to the fact that each department had identified some reactionary academic authorities under the leadership and deployment of the departmental general branch, the entire school identified the propaganda minister Xu Zhen and other comrades as revisionists. On the evening of August 5, starting from the small playground on campus, Xu Zhen and a bunch of other so-called counter-revolutionary revisionists, reactionary academic authorities, and traitors (the teacher Huang Ping from the Foreign Languages Department who was arrested and betrayed and gave out Liu Shaoqi's address. He is the father of Comrade Huang Jian, a famous coach of the national track and field team who trained high jumpers such as Zheng Fengrong and Ni Zhiqin who broke the world record, and Zheng Dazhen and Yang Wenqin who set the Asian record. That night, he told about his betrayal on the stage.) They were dragged to the "Nanjing Road" of Fudan University for criticism and struggle. Ink was splashed on Comrade Xu Zhen's face (because the term "black gang" was used at that time). I remember that when the team entered "Nanjing Road" from the small playground, a student named Pu Xingzu from the Department of Politics ran to the front of the team and tried his best to stop the team from moving forward. He meant to oppose targeting such leaders and professors. He was very righteous, very brave, and very extraordinary. Later, he was naturally a rebel. At that time, the biggest so-called revisionist that Fudan University uncovered was Comrade Chen Chuangang<sup>37</sup>, the vice president. President Chen had a high prestige among Fudan students. He was an old comrade who participated in the "December 9th Student Movement" and had a high rank. It was said that he had been wrongly persecuted during the Yan'an Rectification Movement. After he was thrown out, he immediately chose to commit suicide.

---

<sup>37</sup> Chen Chuangang (1912-1966), was appointed Deputy Secretary of the Party Committee and Vice President of Fudan University in September 1958. After the September 18 Incident in 1931, he participated in the Anti-Japanese Salvation Association of Fudan University and served as the commander-in-chief of the first student petition brigade in Beijing. Students of various institutions of higher learning in Shanghai held anti-Japanese demonstrations to save the country, and Chen Chuangang was the deputy commander-in-chief of Fudan University. In 1940, he went to Yan'an and successively served as the director of the Education Department and the Research Division of the Yan'an School of Administration, the head of the Economic Group of the Political Research Office of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, and secretary of the Preparatory Committee of the People's Congress of the Yan'an Liberated Area - Trans.

People need dignity. Under socialist conditions, the rights and dignity of every citizen should be protected. However, the cruel form of struggle adopted at that time inevitably led to death. Our nation has the tradition of "a scholar can be killed but not humiliated". Some gentlemen committed suicide to show the resistance of an innocent person to persecution; while more people, mainly unable to endure humiliation and torture, had to make this forced and helpless choice. History has proved that many of them were not only innocent, but also had made contributions to our nation and were excellent and precious assets of our nation. And what about those thugs who killed people? I will not comment on it, history will comment on them.

Everything that happened at Fudan University and that I personally experienced was just a microcosm of what was happening across the country at that time.

Why did such an inhumane and cruel struggle take place? Why did people die and still be labelled as "disowning the people and the Party"? This barbaric, cruel and reactionary practice has left us with a heavy historical lesson - a historical lesson written with blood and lives, a historical lesson that our descendants will never forget! We must make a profound review to history and the victims through serious reflection and self-criticism, so that our nation will never have such a tragedy and shame in its history again.

These things at Fudan were certainly not decided by the Fudan Party Committee (the deputy secretary at the time was Comrade Wang Ling), and the party secretary at Fudan was Yang Xiguang, who was the alternate secretary of the Shanghai Municipal Party Committee and the actual host behind the scenes. Fudan classmates and teachers had a lot of opinions about him, and he was criticized many times at Fudan and in the city. He cannot wash away his responsibility for President Chen's suicide. After the Cultural Revolution, he was transferred to Guangming Daily as editor-in-chief and published "Practice is the only criterion for testing truth", which directly pointed the finger at Chairman Mao. It seems that the criticism of him for being good at political speculation was not wrong.

Since all of this was carried out under the direct leadership of the Party Committee at that time, and this revolution was called the "Cultural Revolution", and was not called a political revolution, nor was it emphasized as a revolution against "capitalist roaders in power within the Party", it is easy to understand that the masses, especially the majority of Party and League members, still stood on the side of the first-level Party organizations and Party organization leaders and defended the first-level Party organizations and Party organization leaders.

The above historical and political reasons were organically combined, which inevitably led to the fact that in the early days of the Cultural Revolution, the masses were divided into two major factions: conservatives and rebels, and the conservatives were the majority and had an absolute advantage.

This also explains why party organizations all over the country implemented and carried out a so-called "bourgeois reactionary line" in the early days of the Cultural Revolution, and even the Shanghai Municipal Committee, which was the first to publish "Hai Rui Dismissed from Office", was no exception. This fact tells us that this cannot be explained by individual responsibility, but rather by the historical regularity and inevitability.

At that time, there was a term called "Liu and Deng's bourgeois reactionary line". Liu and Deng naturally had their historical responsibilities, and they also made self-criticism at that time. However, if we only understand the emergence of the "bourgeois reactionary line" from this point, and the reasons why this "bourgeois reactionary line" can be implemented and implemented nationwide, I think it is far from enough and does not conform to the viewpoint of historical materialism. Chairman

Mao had extremely high prestige at that time. Why did party organizations across the country not implement Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line, but instead implement the "Liu and Deng bourgeois reactionary line"? If we only explain the problem from the perspective of personal responsibility, we cannot deeply explain the essential reasons and historical inevitability of this phenomenon.

The reason why I am writing on this heavy subject, which I have personally experienced, is that I want to analyse realistically and scientifically, through the actual historical process of that time, the reasons why the 'bourgeois reactionary line' and the disasters it brought about at the beginning of the Cultural Revolution, as well as the antagonism between conservatives and rebels, were created; I can say that this was the reason why the 'bourgeois reactionary line' was inevitably implemented throughout the country, especially in the industrial and mining enterprises later on, and why the confrontation between conservatives and rebels inevitably arose.

Is such an analysis and understanding of the problem not more in line with the historical reality of the time, more indicative of the deep-rooted social causes of the line problem and the heavy disaster, and therefore more in line with the historical materialist method of analysing the problem, than attributing the line problem of the time and the resulting disasters, which seemed to be unwarranted but did occur, to personal causes alone?

The most valuable historical lesson left here is that under the conditions of socialism, that is, under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, or its special form, the people's democratic dictatorship, we have not yet solved what kind of political system should be created to implement and operate the dictatorship of the proletariat; what kind of political system, political rules, and political life should be created that are conducive to the working people's direct management of the country to operate the dictatorship of the proletariat.

This is not a problem that only exists in China. From the Soviet Union to Eastern Europe, including several other socialist countries, this problem has not been solved well. In a political system that does not conform to the principles of socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat, in political rules and political life that do not conform to the principles of socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat, the so-called "bourgeois reactionary line" is inevitable; unjust, false, and wrong cases and even persecution to death are inevitable; it is precisely this historical limitation that determines that after the revisionists came to power, the transformation into the fascist bourgeois dictatorship is also inevitable.

Precisely because the masses were split into two major factions, the conservatives and the rebels, and because this contradictory struggle inevitably manifested itself very sharply at that time because it was linked to everyone's interests, especially political interests, this struggle, and the estrangement between the two factions resulting from it, not only lasted throughout the 10-year Cultural Revolution, but also spilled over into the aftermath of the Cultural Revolution.

In places where the struggle between the two factions was particularly intense, especially when the masses of workers were also involved in the struggle between the two factions, it rose to the level of an armed struggle in some places, which led to what Chairman Mao criticised as a 'full-scale civil war'. Wuhan, for example, was a typical case at that time, and in the end, the Central Government had to intervene directly to solve the problem. This was despite the fact that Chairman Mao's instruction was published at the time: 'There is no fundamental conflict of interest within the working class. Within the working class under the dictatorship of the proletariat, there is all the more no reason why it must split into two incompatible organisations.' However, once the immediate



struggle is linked to personal interests, and the masses of China, including the working masses, are a reality with a historical inheritance, Chairman Mao's words fall on deaf ears, and in the end they can only be resolved by strong intervention from the centre or from above.

The above is only one scenario leading to 'all-out civil war', that is, the emergence of the split between the conservatives and the rebels and its causes and consequences.

However, there is another situation that leads to 'all-out civil war'.

That is, in the process of seizing power, the rebels split into two major factions. This is also a historical phenomenon that is common throughout the country, and it is the main content of the "all-out civil war". In many places, the most intense and highest form of expression is "armed struggle", and even the phenomenon of "grabbing guns" has occurred. In the words of Chairman Mao, "most of them were issued." It is this kind of "armed struggle" that not only brought bloodshed, but also caused a large number of deaths. "Heaven faction", "Earth faction", "good faction", "fart faction", there are many names, almost all over the country, they split into two or even three factions, and launched fierce confrontation and struggle.

Why did such a historical phenomenon occur? At that time, everyone was puzzled. Chairman Mao also said at that time: "In a factory, all are working class, there is no fundamental conflict of interests, why should it split into two irreconcilable factions? I can't understand it. This is manipulated by someone, nothing more than: one is the manipulation of capitalist roaders, the second is the manipulation of landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries and bad elements, and the third is the influence of small group thoughts." ("The main spirit of Chairman Mao's speech during his inspection of North China, South Central and East China", Conveyed by Comrade Zhang Chunqiao in Henan.)

Based on my understanding at the time and looking back today, I think there are three reasons why the struggle between the two major factions occurred.

(1) We need to make a class analysis of "factionalism".

At that time, the opposition between the two major factions was mainly criticized from the perspective of "factionalism". From my personal experience with many rebel leaders, I deeply felt that "factionalism" must be analysed by class. In my opinion, the emergence of "factionalism" and its stubborn and fierce expression mainly stemmed from the petty-bourgeois class attributes and class characteristics of the leaders of these factions and their fierce elements.

At that time, there was an article in the People's Daily saying that factionalism was mainly caused by people's love of arguing for correctness. I disagreed with this analysis at the time. If it was just for the sake of arguing for correctness, it would be just a matter of work style, a matter of overconfidence, over-arrogance and complacency. But that's not the case. Behind the struggle for correctness, there are personal interests, and especially for the leaders, there is also the issue of the temptation of power.

At that time, in response to these problems, Chairman Mao repeatedly and timely pointed out that "we must be good at guiding the petty-bourgeois ideology in our ranks onto the track of proletarian revolution. This is a key issue for the victory of the proletarian Cultural Revolution." "We must guide the petty-bourgeois anarchism onto the track of proletarian revolution." Chairman Mao's opinion is completely correct, and it is completely accurate to characterize it as petty-bourgeois ideology. The



subsequent "great alliance"<sup>38</sup> and the so-called "consultation" conducted by the establishment of the Revolutionary Committee actually carried the meaning of power redistribution. The so-called "make-up"<sup>39</sup> in Shandong after the "debriefing meeting"<sup>40</sup> in 1974, which I experienced, actually had this nature.

This actually reflects the weakness of the mass ranks. They always loudly call themselves "proletarian revolutionaries", but in fact, they have profound petty-bourgeois weaknesses. This is exactly consistent with our national conditions and our social existence. Later, their weakness and even surrender in the counterattack fully proved this point, and it is still proving this point to this day. This fully reflects the fundamental difference between mass organizations and Communist Party organizations. Mass organizations cannot replace the Communist Party.

The "factional fighting" not only caused serious losses, but also resulted in deaths; more importantly, it disrupted the direction of the Cultural Revolution and seriously affected the completion of the Cultural Revolution's historical mission. This lesson is worthy of our deep reflection, profound understanding, and serious self-criticism.

This also fully shows that in the struggle to criticize Deng and fight against the rightist trend of reversing verdicts, Chairman Mao proposed "no more fighting teams this time", which was a timely summary of historical experience and lessons. Under the specific historical conditions of launching the Cultural Revolution, the masses rose up and formed organizations such as fighting teams to attack the leadership of the capitalist-roaders who usurped the party and power. This played a positive historical role. However, as far as the entire socialist continuing revolutionary movement is concerned, without the corresponding laws and regulations, mass organizations cannot replace the leadership role of the Communist Party. We still have to uphold the leadership of the Communist Party, not only the overall leadership, but also the specific leadership. We just need to find an appropriate form that can directly and specifically realize the leadership of the Communist Party. Only by upholding the leadership of the Communist Party can we completely and thoroughly eliminate factionalism.

(2) Faced with the struggle to seize power, which involves the fundamental interests of every class, every stratum, and every group, the struggle between the two or three opposing factions at the time inevitably escalated into an "all-out civil war" under the interference and even manipulation of important figures from the capitalist-roaders and the former conservatives.

The sharp, fierce and long-term factional confrontation inevitably escalated into armed struggle in most places, with not only hands, sticks, knives, but even guns. Not only were prisoners cruelly abused, but they were even massacred in various criminal forms. In Guangxi, there was even the

---

<sup>38</sup> On October 17, 1967, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, the State Council, the Central Military Commission, and the Central Committee of the Cultural Revolution promulgated the Circular on Implementing the Great Revolutionary Alliance – Trans.

<sup>39</sup> Make-up was originally an idiom used in stage performances, but was extended to remediate the occurrence of unexpected situations, and correct the deficiencies in time so that the incident can be successfully completed – Trans.

<sup>40</sup> The debriefing meeting is a meeting held by subordinates to summarise their work, introduce the situation, and reflect problems to their superiors. As far as ideological and political work is concerned, it is a meeting in which ideological and political workers make formal reports to the principal responsible persons. Usually, the party organization or administrative leaders listen to the report, and the person in charge of the ideological work department mainly speaks – Trans.

heinous crime of cutting open the abdomen, removing the heart, and frying the liver for consumption.

Armed struggles broke out in most provinces across the country, and the most brutal one was in Guangxi. Chairman Mao criticized the Cultural Revolution for being a "full-scale civil war" based on reality and the facts that actually occurred.

As quoted above, the reason for the nationwide "full-scale civil war" was that Chairman Mao analysed it when he inspected North China, South Central China and East China at the time: "This is manipulated by someone, and there are only two types: one is the manipulation of capitalist-roaders, the second is the manipulation of landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries and bad elements, and the third is the influence of small group thoughts."

All three points mentioned by Chairman Mao are reasonable, and the main reason for the dominance of the capitalist-roaders is their manipulation. The historical lessons left behind must be studied carefully and must not be forgotten.

(3) The army intervened, supporting the conservatives instead of the left, which not only led to a long-term confrontation between the two major factions, but also led to the escalation of armed struggle and the death of people because of the "distribution of guns".

Regarding the so-called "snatching" among the masses for armed struggle, Chairman Mao saw the reason and profoundly pointed out that "most of them were distributed." This is a fact.

After the army nationwide first intervened in the Cultural Revolution, they generally supported the conservatives instead of the rebels, making the so-called mistakes in direction and line. This was not accidental. First, it reflected the problems of the ideological and political line of the military leaders. Second, some family members of military leaders worked in local areas. Their special identity and status determined that most of them tended to be conservative. The issue of military support and protection was unified with the "February Countercurrent" of the old marshals, especially the issue of the Lin Biao group's opposition to the Cultural Revolution. They were all determined by class status and political inclination. This was a sharp problem that must be solved in the socialist continued revolution centred on opposing revisionism.

In January 1967, Chairman Mao instructed the army, "The local Cultural Revolution is being carried out vigorously, and the struggle for power is still going on fiercely. Our army must support the local revolutionary left in their struggle for power." (Chairman Mao: "Instructions on the Cultural Revolution in the Army.") Chairman Mao also said, "In the future, whenever there are real revolutionaries who ask the army for support and assistance, we should do so. The so-called non-intervention is false, we have already intervened." ("Chairman Mao's Comments on the Nanjing Military Region Party Committee's Report on Whether to Send Troops to Support the Rebels") Chairman Mao promptly and keenly saw the actual problems that already existed at the time.

Chairman Mao first saw that it was impossible for the army not to intervene, and in fact it had already intervened; second, he saw that after the intervention, which faction to support was actually a question of direction and line.

Moreover, the facts were contrary to Chairman Mao's subjective wishes. When the army first intervened, it did not support what Chairman Mao called the "revolutionary left" (that is, the rebels), but supported the conservatives.

Although the Party Central Committee and the Central Military Commission issued documents to correct the mistakes in direction and line made by the troops in the process of "supporting the left", "there are policies from the top and countermeasures from the bottom", and many troops did not really change their stance, but instead pretended to obey and secretly violated the policies, combined with the capitalist-roaders, and continued to interfere in mass movements, especially the "armed struggles" that had already occurred at that time. The so-called "distribution of guns" reflected this background. There are some typical examples of this all over the country. The reason why the armed struggle in Guangxi led to such a situation was related to the open and covert intervention of the army. At that time, there was a saying of "Liu-Deng line with guns" and "arresting a handful of people in the army", and Chen Zaidao<sup>41</sup> of the Wuhan Military Region, Zhao Yongfu of the Qinghai Military Region, etc., were typical representatives of this type of people, and the biggest and most representative one was Lin Biao and the Lin Biao Group.

It is not accidental that such problems have arisen in the army. As Chairman Mao said in the sentence he added to the "May 16 Notice", these people are a group of representatives of the bourgeoisie who have infiltrated the party, the government, and the army. The "in the army" Chairman Mao mentioned here is not an empty phrase. The slogan "arrest a handful of people in the army" that appeared later was actually an extension of the Chairman's thought and a reflection of the facts.

As for the fact that the editorial was written about "arresting a handful of people in the army", Wang Li and Guan Feng were arrested first, and then Qi Benyu<sup>42</sup> was arrested. Judging from the comments Chairman Mao added to Qi Benyu's self-criticism letter, at that time, Chairman Mao still characterized their mistakes as contradictions among the people. However, why did they arrest people, put them in jail, and never release them? There must be a reason. I asked Comrade Qi Benyu about this issue, and he said that he never understood it. In his memoirs, he mentioned Comrade Guan Feng's views. These historical details are left to historians to study.

The more important question is, how should we understand these problems in the army? Further question, is the theory of the capitalist roaders applicable to the army? If applicable, how should the problems of the army be solved? When Chairman Mao was alive, the mistakes in direction and line made by the army could be corrected in time, but what if Chairman Mao was gone?

---

<sup>41</sup> Chen Zaidao (1909-1993) from April 1926, participated in the Peasant Association and the Peasants' Self-Defense Army. After participating in the Autumn Harvest Uprising at the southern foot of the Dabie Mountains in September 1927, he was incorporated into the Workers' and Peasants' Revolutionary Army of the Eastern Hubei Army with the Peasant Self-Defense Army. He joined the Communist Party of China in 1928. After a distinguished military career, he was awarded the rank of general in 1955. In July 1967, when Mao Zedong was in Wuhan, Xie Fuzhi, Wang Li and others were besieged by the mass organization of "Million Heroes"; Mao Zedong boarded a plane and flew to Shanghai in a hurry. Subsequently, Chen Zaidao and Zhong Hanhua, political commissar of the Wuhan Military Region, were accused of supporting the "Million Heroes" and fell, known as the "July 20 Incident". After 1972, he served as deputy commander of the Fuzhou Military Region, consultant to the Central Military Commission, and commander of the Railway Corps. On July 26, 1978, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China issued a notice, deciding to rehabilitate the "July 20 Incident" – Trans.

<sup>42</sup> Qi Benyu worked closely with Mao until mistakes he made early in the Cultural Revolution led to his dismissal and incarceration. Throughout the years of his imprisonment, he remained loyal to Chairman Mao and to Mao Zedong Thought, and when he finally wrote his reminiscences, he provided valuable insight into the two-line struggle within the Party and the eventual ascendancy of the capitalist-roaders. See my translation of his very valuable "Memoirs" here: [Qi Benyu's Memoirs](#) – Trans.

Lin Biao and the Lin Biao group wanted to stage a coup; the army entered Beijing in 1989, which were both practical answers to this question.

This is a very practical, serious and acute problem that must be faced in carrying out the socialist continued revolution under socialist conditions. Without a correct understanding of this problem, a correct line and a correct strategy, it is impossible to carry out the socialist continued revolution. The barrel of the gun is the pillar of the regime. How the regime of the dictatorship of the proletariat should handle the relationship between it and the barrel of the gun is a very practical problem raised in the struggle for the socialist continued revolution.

When we talk about continuing the socialist revolution and reforming the political system, we are talking about the military, the public security, the procuratorate, the judiciary, etc. Chairman Mao not only said that the coup by the Lin Biao group was "shocking", but also said that he supported the slogan of "smashing the public security, the procuratorate, and the judiciary". These opinions of Chairman Mao are of enlightenment to us in theory and practice. We need to start from the facts that have already happened, and after careful analysis and research, break through the old framework of erroneous understanding that violates Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, and make a new correct answer of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

Now it seems that the Paris Commune's practice of "replacing the standing army with the armed forces of the whole people" and Chairman Mao's era's practices of "everyone is a soldier" and "establishing militia divisions" all have profound significance for the military system of the proletarian dictatorship. We have never understood it, and naturally have not paid enough attention to it. Now we need to re-learn, re-study, and re-consider the question of how the military system of the proletarian dictatorship and the military system should be built. Speaking of political system reform, this is an important content that cannot be ignored.

The fact is that many Maoist comrades who believe in Marxism-Leninism-Maoism have not even thought about this question seriously, let alone being able to give a new and correct answer. This is not surprising. This is a new historical topic on the dictatorship of the proletariat with considerable difficulty.

#### **(e) Explore the historical lessons left by the "two mistakes" of the Cultural Revolution.**

Chairman Mao said: "Whether the ideological and political line is correct or not determines everything." A correct ideological and political line must be guided by Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, proceed from reality, and conform to actual conditions.

We often say that to carry out a proletarian socialist revolutionary movement, we must rely on correct theories, lines, principles, and policies. Theories and lines are both the foundation and the commander. Only with the guidance of correct theories and lines can we have correct principles and policies; conversely, once the principles and policies deviate from the correct theories and lines, mistakes will occur. It is from this perspective that Chairman Mao said that "policies and strategies are the life of the party."

The Cultural Revolution was personally initiated and led by Chairman Mao. It dealt with the issue of continuing the revolution under socialist conditions and guided the Cultural Revolution in terms of the basic theory and line of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, mainly Maoism, the theory of continuing the socialist revolution.

This is the most basic, main, and naturally the most important principle that cannot be shaken in carrying out the continuing socialist revolution.

The Cultural Revolution adhered to the basic theory and line of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, mainly Maoism, of continued socialist revolution, and was a great revolutionary practice guided by this basic theory and line, which, in Chairman Mao's words, was 'a serious manoeuvre'. Therefore, we are in favour of Chairman Mao's 'view of the Cultural Revolution: basically correct, with some shortcomings.'

It is from this point of view that I have written 'The Principles of the Cultural Revolution Live On! The Principles of the January Revolution Live On!' and other articles in defence of the principles of the Cultural Revolution, that is to say, in defence of the basic theory and basic line of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, mainly Maoism, for the continuation of the socialist revolution.

Here, just as Chairman Mao said, 'What we should now focus on is in the area of having shortcomings.' That is to say, we should study the subjective lessons of history as to why the Cultural Revolution made the mistakes of 'overthrowing everything' and 'all-out civil war', and even the ultimate failure of the Cultural Revolution.

As for these specific mistakes, they were made when the basic theory and basic line of the socialist continuing revolution were transformed into specific principles and policies to guide the Cultural Revolution. The core of the theory of the socialist continuing revolution is to recognize that class struggle still exists in the historical stage of socialist society. Failure to recognize class struggle and not daring to take class struggle as the key link will lead to revisionism. If the situation, nature and solution of class struggle are not correctly analysed and understood, mistakes such as "overthrow everything" and "all-out civil war" will occur.

This is our characterisation of the root cause of the 'two mistakes'.

This is quite important. Only with such a characterisation can we scientifically and correctly understand the causes of the errors, scientifically and correctly sum up the lessons of history, and cognitively and theoretically transform the errors into correct truths that will be truly useful in promoting the next step in the revolutionary struggle.

Moreover, only by insisting on this can we draw a clear line with the erroneous position and misconception that completely rejects the Cultural Revolution; at the same time, we can also draw a clear line with the emotional and simplistic misconception that fails to recognise that the Cultural Revolution made mistakes and simply affirms all the practices of the Cultural Revolution.

Learning from the lessons of history, we need to re-understand the situation and nature of the class struggle under socialist conditions and the methods of dealing with it, once again from the point of view of adhering to the class struggle.

**(1) The focus of the political revolution under socialist conditions should be correctly understood and correctly handled.**

Chairman Mao said: 'The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution is essentially a political revolution of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie and all exploiting classes under socialist conditions, a continuation of the long struggle between the Communist Party of China (CPC) and its revolutionary masses under its leadership and the reactionaries of the Kuomintang, and a continuation of the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie'. ' (See the editorial in the People's Daily and the People's Liberation Army Newspaper, 21 April 1968, 'The Hibiscus Country is Full of Morning Glory'.)

This means that the Cultural Revolution was not a cultural revolution in the narrow sense of the term, but was essentially a political revolution. This is a scientific understanding and a correct generalisation of the Cultural Revolution.

Precisely because this revolution is essentially a political revolution of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie and all exploiting classes under the conditions of socialism, it is entirely correct to define the object and the focus of this revolution as those in power who follow the capitalist road.

However, in the course of the Cultural Revolution, many old comrades, that is, many leading cadres at all levels of the Party and the Government, were struck down as capitalists, thus committing the mistake of 'striking down everything'.

Moreover, under the guidance of the slogan "Sweep Away All Monsters and Demons", old intellectuals, old literary artists, and old theorists who were not the focus of the Cultural Revolution at all were regarded as "reactionary academic authorities", "reactionary intellectuals", and "anti-party and anti-socialist elements". They were all swept away, which also made the mistake of "overthrowing everything". Moreover, the terms such as "sweep away" and "monsters and demons" will inevitably lead to cruel struggles without considering policies.

Today, based on existing practice, I rethink this issue. I believe that in launching such a political revolution, the highest form of socialist continuing revolution, in order to avoid the mistake of "overthrowing everything" and to avoid "chaos in the whole country" and "all-out civil war", the focus should not only be on rectifying the capitalist power cliques within the party, but also on rectifying the largest capitalist roaders in the party. In other words, the focus and scope of the struggle should be mainly on rectifying the Party Central Committee, and mainly on rectifying the largest capitalist roaders in the Party Central Committee and naturally the whole country.

I think this way, at least based on the following considerations.

A. This is Chairman Mao's important theoretical thought.

Chairman Mao has repeatedly emphasized since before the Cultural Revolution that the central government may have revisionism, which is the most dangerous. He also repeatedly emphasized that if the central government has revisionism, what should the local governments do? Chairman Mao's opinion is very clear, that is, the local governments should rebel, including learning from Cai E<sup>43</sup> and rising up to oppose the revisionism of the central government.

Chairman Mao's conversation with Edgar Snow on the Tiananmen Tower also reflects that the reason why he personally launched and led the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution was that he had long seen, at least since 1962, that Liu Shaoqi and others were going to engage in revisionism. Chairman Mao regarded Snow as an old friend, and his conversation with Snow was very frank, fully reflecting Chairman Mao's true thoughts. This conversation also shows that the so-called power struggle

---

<sup>43</sup> Cai E (December 18, 1882 - November 8, 1916), was a modern Chinese politician, military strategist, democratic revolutionary, and great patriot. He fought the troops of the Qing Dynasty, established a military government and served as the governor of Yunnan. This was followed by a series of reforms, based on the teachings of Sun Yat-sen, which were quite effective. When Yuan Shikai seized the Presidency of the new Republic of China in 1914, declaring himself Emperor the following year, he fought the troops of the dictator. After the death of Yuan Shikai in June 1916, Cai Ye served as the overseer of Sichuan and the chief of civil affairs, but died later that year following medical treatment in Japan. In 1951, the Central People's Government posthumously recognized Cai Yiwei as a Revolutionary martyr. Chairman Mao personally issued his family the Beijing Zi No. 00005 Martyr's Certificate – Trans.



between Mao and Liu for Chairman Mao's launching of the Cultural Revolution is not in line with reality; the accurate statement should be a struggle of lines and roads.

History has fully proved that Chairman Mao's theoretical thought is completely in line with reality and is very correct (even Comrade Wang Guangmei<sup>44</sup>, who was once deeply persecuted, later solemnly said on TV that from the current reality in China, Chairman Mao was right).

The focus of classes and class contradictions in the historical period of socialist society is: whether to take the socialist road or the capitalist road.

Further, which road to take is determined by the line, that is, as Chairman Mao said, whether the ideological and political line is correct or not determines everything.

Going further, the route is determined by the Party Central Committee and the Party leaders.

That is to say, the route set by the Party Central Committee and the Party leaders determines what path to take.

This is not a simple logical reasoning issue, but a truth that has been proven by historical facts.

Chairman Mao stressed that revisionism had emerged in the Central Committee, which actually meant that revisionism had emerged in the Central Committee and its leaders. This kind of revisionism was mainly manifested in that they wanted to pursue a revisionist line and, under the guidance of this line, take the capitalist road. They were truly the ruling clique taking the capitalist road and the representatives of the bourgeoisie.

It is this theoretical thought of Chairman Mao that clearly tells us that as long as we carry out the highest form of political revolution of socialist continued revolution, the most important thing is to deal with the largest capitalist roaders in the country who have infiltrated the Party Central Committee. The sentence Chairman Mao added in the "May 16 Notice" that "a group of bourgeois representatives who have infiltrated the Party, the government, and the army" is the first clear expression of this thought; but it did not say "the Party Central Committee" or "the largest".

B. The practice of the Cultural Revolution proved this point.

Under the personal leadership of Chairman Mao, the Cultural Revolution as a class struggle was launched in this way. "Bombard the headquarters" and "Bombard the largest capitalist roader in power" are the general principles that command the entire class struggle of the Cultural Revolution.

Chairman Mao is the commander, the leader, and the helmsman who overcomes the stormy waves. The big-character poster "Bombard the Headquarters" on August 5, 1966 was a red flag raised by Chairman Mao to lead the whole party and the people of the country to charge against the largest capitalist roader in power.

It was under the guidance of this red flag that, during the entire Cultural Revolution, the three largest capitalist roaders in power in the country, Liu, Lin, and Deng, were overthrown, the three bourgeois headquarters represented by them were destroyed, and the revisionist line they promoted in the political, economic, ideological and cultural fields was thoroughly exposed and criticized, which fully reflected the essence and significance of the Cultural Revolution and fully verified Chairman Mao's theory that the Cultural Revolution was a political revolution in which the proletariat opposed the bourgeoisie and insisted on taking the socialist road and opposed taking the capitalist road.

---

<sup>44</sup> The widow of Liu Shaoqi – Trans.



In the later period of the Cultural Revolution, when "The debate on "Water Margin"<sup>45</sup> and "Criticise Deng and Beat Back the Rightist Deviationist Wind to Reverse Correct Verdicts", Chairman Mao repeatedly emphasized this theoretical thought.

Chairman Mao studied "Water Margin" very closely, and he focused on looking at issues from the perspective of political experience. On December 21, 1973, when meeting with comrades attending the Central Military Commission meeting, Chairman Mao said: "If there is revisionism in China, everyone should pay attention!" In order to attract everyone's attention, he also cited Water Margin as an example, saying: "'Water Margin' only opposes corrupt officials, it does not oppose the emperor...Later, Song Jiang accepted the amnesty." He also said to Zhang Yufeng who was reading "Water Margin": Song Jiang is a capitulationist.

In 1975, Lu Di, a teacher at Peking University who was studying for Chairman Mao, mentioned this to Chairman Mao again because he heard that Chairman Mao had said that "Water Margin is only against corrupt officials, not against the emperor." This led Chairman Mao to combine many details of "Water Margin" and conduct a profound analysis and scientific summary of the historical lessons left by "Water Margin". Its significance has far exceeded general literary criticism and has risen to the discussion of the laws of socialist revolution in Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. Therefore, its theoretical and practical significance are very important. The instruction to study and research Chairman Mao's comments on "Water Margin" throughout the country at that time was by no means a conspiracy, but was completely necessary and very timely. On the contrary, those who said it was a conspiracy were actually playing a conspiracy.

Chairman Mao said, "The good thing in the book Water Margin is in the surrender [of the rebels]. This serves as education by negative example, allowing people to understand the capitulators." He also said, "Water Margin only opposes corrupt officials, it does not oppose the emperor. Chao Gai was excluded from the one hundred and eights. Song Jiang surrendered, practiced revisionism, and turned [the name of] Chao Gai's Pavilion for the Rendezvous of Rebellions into the Hall of Loyalty, and eventually allowed himself to be co-opted [by the emperor's army]. The struggles between Song Jiang and Gao Qiu were internal struggles of the landlord class, where one faction fought against another faction. After Song Jiang surrendered, he [was ordered to] attack Fang La." He praised "Lu Xun's good comments on Water Margin. He said: 'One book of Water Margin made it very clear: because the rebels did not oppose the emperor, they surrendered when the big army [of the emperor] arrived, and they were enlisted in the emperor's army to attack other rebels for the state – they were totally not the rebels who 'enforced justice on behalf of the heaven.' In the end they were flunkies.'"

Chairman Mao's important comments on "Water Margin" use the past to illustrate the present and teach us very important and profound Marxist-Leninist-Maoist principles.

Chairman Mao pointed out that Song Jiang was a capitulator. Song Jiang was the biggest power holder on Liangshan at that time, but it was this biggest power holder who stopped rebelling and revolutionizing and wanted to be a capitulator, surrender to the landlord class, surrender to the emperor, follow the path of the feudal landlord class's imperial autocracy, and become a slave of the emperor. This is instructive for us to understand the laws of class struggle in socialist society. In short, the biggest capitulator in power in the Liangshan rebel team like Song Jiang is the biggest capitalist-roader in the party in real life.

---

<sup>45</sup> For Mao's comments on "Water Margin" see [WaterMargins\\_post.pdf](#) - Trans.

As the biggest authority in Liangshan, Song Jiang, once degenerated into a capitulationist, the consequences were just as Chairman Mao said: "Song Jiang surrendered and engaged in revisionism", "expelled Chao Gai from the 108 people", and "changed Chao's Rebels Gathering Hall into Loyalty Hall and asked people to recruit him." This tells us that the greatest harm caused by the capitulationists, or capitalist-roaders, is that they betrayed Chao Gai, the revolutionary leader of the Liangshan rebel team, "engaged in revisionism", and "changed the Rebels Gathering Hall into Loyalty Hall", that is, they changed socialism to capitalism, surrendered to capitalism and imperialism, and "asked people to recruit him."

Chairman Mao also emphasized that "After Song Jiang surrendered, he was sent to fight Fang La." He highly praised Mr. Lu Xun's comments on this. He said: "Lu Xun commented on Water Margin well. He said: 'One book of Water Margin made it very clear: because the rebels did not oppose the emperor, they surrendered when the big army [of the emperor] arrived, and they were enlisted in the emperor's army to attack other rebels for the state – they were totally not the rebels who 'enforced justice on behalf of the heaven.' In the end they were flunkies.'" This principle, in today's words, means that the capitalist-roaders are all capitulationists. When the capitalists come to power, they have to 'fight other robbers' - the rebels - on behalf of the fascist bourgeois dictatorship of the country, and they have to implement the fascist bourgeois dictatorship. Is this not how the historical facts that we have subsequently experienced unfolded?

It is based on these principles that Chairman Mao criticized Water Margin for "only opposing corrupt officials, not the emperor." He also said in a negative sense: "The good thing in the book Water Margin is in the surrender [of the rebels]. This serves as education by negative example, allowing people to understand the capitulators."

Chairman Mao used Water Margin as a very good negative political teaching material to introduce it to the whole party and the people of the whole country. The purpose was to "let the people know about the capitulationists" and to be vigilant against the capitulationists within the revolutionary ranks, because the fortress is most easily breached from within. In connection with reality, it was actually to let the people know about the capitalist-roaders, especially the biggest capitulationists and capitalist-roaders like Song Jiang who excluded Chao Gai from the 108 people, changed the Rebels Gathering Hall into Loyalty Hall, and pursued the revisionist line. They are the most dangerous and the main class enemies.

The capitulationists are revisionists, and the revisionists are capitulationists. Because those who engage in revisionism are all capitulating to the bourgeoisie. The key issue of the capitulationists is the line. Chairman Mao said, "Water Margin only opposes corrupt officials, not the emperor. Chao Gai was excluded from the 108 people. Song Jiang surrendered, engaged in revisionism, and changed Chao's Rebels Gathering Hall into Loyalty Hall, and was recruited." "Excluding Chao Gai from the 108 people" refers to usurping the party and seizing power; "changing Chao's Rebels Gathering Hall into Loyalty Hall" refers to promoting the revisionist line.

The class nature of the capitulationists is to accept the amnesty, become slaves, and be thugs. Chairman Mao said, "Song Jiang surrendered and went to fight Fang La," and quoted Lu Xun's words: "They surrendered when the big army [of the emperor] arrived, and they were enlisted in the emperor's army to attack other rebels for the state – they were totally not the rebels who 'enforced justice on behalf of the heaven.' In the end they were flunkies."

It can be seen that Chairman Mao's comments on "Water Margin" are not general literary criticism, but the opinions of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism on the theory of continuing socialist revolution,

especially the opinions on the theory of capitalist-roaders and capitulationists. Like Chairman Mao's opinions on learning the "theoretical instructions" of the dictatorship of the proletariat, launching such a learning movement can be said to be an important strategic deployment of Chairman Mao to further arm the proletariat and the broad masses of working people ideologically and theoretically. As Marx said, this is to hand over the weapon of criticism to the masses in order to transform it into a criticism of weapons. Don't we feel this deeply today?

The subsequent campaign to criticize Deng and back the Right deviationist wind of reversing correct verdicts was another practice of Chairman Mao's theoretical thought. Wasn't Deng Xiaoping a representative of the capitulation faction like Song Jiang?

The campaign to criticize Deng and beat back the Right deviationist wind of reversing correct verdicts was initiated by Chairman Mao himself, and the focus was very clear, which was to attack Deng Xiaoping's bourgeois headquarters.

The target of Chairman Mao's repeated criticism was mainly Deng Xiaoping, and the revisionist bourgeois fallacies he criticized also mainly came from Deng Xiaoping.

For a long time, many comrades did not understand why Chairman Mao invited Deng Xiaoping to come out and entrusted him with important tasks; nor did they understand why Deng Xiaoping was overthrown because he forwarded a letter from Liu Bing of Tsinghua University.<sup>46</sup>

This incomprehension is completely understandable. In a specific system of political opacity, political struggle has its own special complexity. Incomprehension is an inevitable norm. This is certainly not good, but it is a reality.

In fact, whether Deng Xiaoping was invited out<sup>47</sup> or brought down, it was all in Chairman Mao's plan, a two-step move in a game of chess. However, this can only be properly understood and correctly answered by placing it in the context of the struggle between the two classes and two lines that always existed in the Cultural Revolution.

We try to make such an analysis here.

Let me start by talking about Deng Xiaoping being invited out.

The failure of the Lin Biao clique is essentially the failure of the bourgeois military clique within the military that resisted and opposed the Cultural Revolution, and it can also be said that it is the failure of the faction in power within the military that took the capitalist road. Viewed from such a class analysis, the essence of the Lin Biao clique is, of course, the extreme right.

---

<sup>46</sup> Liu Bing was deputy secretary of the party committee of Tsinghua University, and was in conflict with Chi Qun, secretary of the party committee of Tsinghua University, and Xie Jingyi, deputy secretary of the party committee, at work. Liu Bing was a veteran cadre, while Chi Qun and Xie Jingyi were young people. Xie Jingyi had been sent by Chairman Mao to Tsinghua University to participate in its Cultural Revolution. Liu Bing wrote a letter of complaint about the two younger comrades to Chairman Mao through Deng Xiaoping. He was dissatisfied with Deng Xiaoping for two reasons, one was that Deng Xiaoping forwarded the letter from Liu Bing and others, and the other was that Liu Bing and others were dissatisfied with the Cultural Revolution in the letter. He believed that Liu Bing and others represented the opinions of those who were dissatisfied with the Cultural Revolution, and that Deng Xiaoping's letter to Liu Bing showed that he was also dissatisfied with the Cultural Revolution. He concluded that Deng Xiaoping was indeed the representative of those who rejected the Cultural Revolution within the Central Committee – Trans.

<sup>47</sup> i.e. To be brought back into the leadership and given responsibilities- Trans.

However, the defeat of the Lin Biao clique did not mean that the struggle between the two classes, the two lines and the two paths had come to an end. Under the same banner of criticising Lin and Confucius, this struggle was still going on fiercely.

The rebels who were beaten down in movements such as the "Seize May 16" movement<sup>48</sup> were then engaged in struggles such as "anti-restoration" and "anti-old". I personally experienced the Shandong rebels' struggle against "restoration" in 1973 (the first big-character poster against restoration posted at the Shandong Papermaking General Factory was drafted by me at the request of Comrade Wang Wenfu, the rebel leader of the factory). The subsequent struggle against restoration in various parts of Shandong led to the "Report Meeting on Solving Shandong Issues" held from January to July 1974 at the Second Guest House of the State Council in Beijing (I was a representative of the rebels participating in the provincial group, and was in the same group with veteran comrades such as Liao Zhigao, Ye Fei, Su Yiran, Qin Hezhen, and veteran comrades such as Jiang Hua and Jiang Weiqing were in other groups in Jinan). After this struggle, the situation of the Shandong rebels improved. All this belongs to the class struggle of this period in which the rebels rose again to revolt and were supported by Chairman Mao's Proletarian Command.

It was precisely because of our class position in the class struggle at that time that we rebels believed that the Lin Biao group represented the extreme right bourgeois forces. Comrade Zhang Chunqiao believed that the Lin Biao group represented the extreme right forces, and it was very clear that he represented the opinions of the proletarian revolutionaries. This opinion was supported by Chairman Mao.

At the same time, there was another class force and political force that was stubbornly expressing itself, that is, the old comrades who were impacted during the Cultural Revolution.

As the "Criticize Lin" campaign progressed, many old comrades were liberated, and some erroneous characterizations and formulations were corrected, such as the "February Countercurrent." Against this background, a trend was formed at the time. As a reflection of this trend in thought, it was believed that the Lin Biao group represented "extreme leftism." The "extreme leftism" mentioned here mainly reflects the opinions of the old comrades who had been impacted, and it was directed at the rebels and the Cultural Revolution. Everyone knows that Premier Zhou supported this opinion and had a dispute with Zhang Chunqiao. In the end, it was Chairman Mao who expressed his position and characterized it as "extreme rightism."

It was during this process that Comrade Chen Yi passed away. Chen Yi was a good comrade. Chairman Mao said so, and so did the historical facts. Comrade Chen Yi suffered during the Cultural Revolution, and of course he was protected by the Chairman and the Premier. When Comrade Chen Yi passed away, a high-profile memorial service was held. In particular, Chairman Mao decided to

---

<sup>48</sup> The original group established to oversee the development of the Cultural Revolution was dominated by capitalist-roaders within the Party's leadership. On May 16, 1966, the Party abolished this group and created a new Cultural Revolution Group of Mao's supporters headed by Chen Boda. On May 16, 1966, a circular was released clarifying the aims of the Cultural Revolution. However, ultra-Leftist elements took control of the implementation of the circular and began the May 16 Movement. They demanded units compile inventories of "the five black categories", enlarging the targets of the Cultural Revolution and harming many innocent people. In June 1967, the "Capital May 16 Red Guards," a small ultra-left organization in Beijing, opposed Zhou Enlai and other central leaders in the name of implementing the May 16 Notice. In September, Mao Zedong instructed the Party to expose and crack down on the "May 16" counterrevolutionary clique. In 1968, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China set up a leading group for the "May 16" project, headed by Chen Boda, to carry out a nationwide investigation campaign. This led to widespread arrests of May 16 "elements" and a "Seize May 16" movement – Trans.

rush to the memorial service venue on short notice and expressed his condolences to Comrade Zhang Qian, leaving behind the comment that "Chen Yi was a good comrade", which fully demonstrated the fighting friendship between Chairman Mao and Chen Yi. However, at the memorial service, there was a lot of crying, which had never happened before. It is normal for everyone to be sad when a good comrade passes away. However, at this time and in such an occasion, crying loudly no longer reflects emotions, but politics. In the early days of the Cultural Revolution, Comrade Wan Xiaotang, Secretary of the Tianjin Municipal Party Committee, passed away. Some people took this opportunity to hold large-scale demonstrations. Chairman Mao criticized that this was "using the dead to oppress the living." In the Central Document No. 4 of 1976, there was an important instruction from Chairman Mao: "Some people have been shocked, and they are unhappy and angry. This is understandable and can be forgiven. But we cannot vent our anger on the majority of people, on the masses, and stand on the opposite side to accuse them." This sentence is also applicable to the "crying at the funeral" that occurred at Comrade Chen Yi's memorial service. It is not to say that it was a demonstration to Chairman Mao, but at least it was an expression of dissatisfaction with Chairman Mao, which is nothing more than "using the dead to oppress the living." Chairman Mao later stopped attending memorial services for old comrades, including the Premier's memorial service. I think this is at least one reason.

How could this incident not have greatly stimulated Chairman Mao? Just like the speeches of some people before and after the 7,000-person meeting in 1962 stimulated Chairman Mao. This incident must have had a profound impact on Chairman Mao. Chairman Mao, who was well versed in the laws of class struggle, must have felt the fierceness of class struggle and the heavy political pressure.

It was against such a background of fierce struggle between two classes, two lines and two political forces that it was inevitable that Wang Hongwen, with the support of Jiang Qing and Zhang Chunqiao, went to Changsha to report the problems in Beijing to Chairman Mao.<sup>49</sup> So far, no one has said that Wang Hongwen fabricated anything, which proves that the situation reported by Wang should be true. Regardless of how Chairman Mao responded as publicised now, judging from the struggle to criticise Deng (rather than criticise Zhou) and fight back against the rightist trend of reversing verdicts that unfolded nearly a year later, Chairman Mao obviously had a more far-sighted, more in line with China's national conditions, and more appropriate strategic deployment at that time.

By the way, the "anti-Zhou" trend that has emerged among Maoists in recent times is nothing more than a repetition of the "anti-Zhou" mistake that occurred many times during the Cultural Revolution. At that time, it was Chairman Mao and the Central Cultural Revolution Group that stopped this political mistake. In 1973, when the Politburo, which Chairman Mao personally presided over, criticized Premier Zhou for some mistakes in the process of establishing diplomatic relations with the United States, it did not agree to raise this criticism to the level of a struggle over the line. This is an important political principle that Chairman Mao left us. No one knows Premier Zhou better than Chairman Mao. On this issue, we must unwaveringly believe in Chairman Mao and respect Chairman Mao, and not try to be smart but actually stupid and do something else.

We must see that at that time, Chairman Mao probably saw all this more clearly and understood it better than anyone else. However, Chairman Mao did not engage in conspiracy or overt plotting, but

---

<sup>49</sup> Following a disagreement between Deng Xiaoping and Jiang Qing in Beijing, Wang Hongwen twice visited Chairman Mao in Changsha, Hunan. In between the two visits, on 4 October 1974 Mao had asked Zhang Yufeng to instruct Deng by telephone to become the First Vice-Premier. On his second visit, Wang Hongwen said that the atmosphere in Beijing was like that at the Lushan Conference, and advised Mao not to proceed with Deng's appointment. But with the support of Zhou Enlai, Deng's new position was confirmed that same month - Trans.

fought a roundabout war, retreating to advance, which was the fundamental reason for asking Deng Xiaoping to come out. (Don't forget that at the Ninth National Congress<sup>50</sup>, Chairman Mao said that Deng would not be able to do anything big in the future, and could be in charge of receiving and sending under Wang Dongxing.) Therefore, Chairman Mao deliberately wrote that it was "Comrade Jianying's suggestion" to ask Deng Xiaoping to come out.

Having understood why Chairman Mao invited Deng Xiaoping to come out, it is not difficult to understand, next, why Chairman Mao wanted to bring down Deng Xiaoping again.

Chairman Mao still understood Deng Xiaoping well. Deng Xiaoping had written a 'confession of guilt' in which he completely denied his guilt and promised that he would 'never overturn his conviction'. However, as Chairman Mao said later, 'Never to be overturned, it cannot be relied upon.' Chairman Mao, of course, was well-intentioned and, in accordance with the Party's tradition, hoped that Deng Xiaoping could be cured and saved, and that he could repent. It's not hard to measure, firstly, by his attitude towards the Cultural Revolution, and secondly, by his practice after coming back out to work. For the former, in order to give Deng Xiaoping a chance, Chairman Mao offered to ask him to lead a summary of the Cultural Revolution. However, Deng Xiaoping misjudged the situation. Probably he thought that the Cultural Revolution had got it wrong, had screwed him up, and he did not want to clean up this mess for Chairman Mao. So, to borrow a classical saying, he did not take part in the Cultural Revolution, he was a man in the Peach Blossom Garden<sup>51</sup>, he did not know that there was the Han Dynasty, and he did not know how to talk about the Wei and Jin Dynasties. Therefore, he could not lead people to make a summary of the Cultural Revolution, and he categorically refused Chairman Mao's request. Did Chairman Mao really want him to make a summary of the Cultural Revolution? I do not think so. It might be more appropriate to ask Zhang Chunqiao or other comrades to do a summary of the Cultural Revolution. I think this is just a test paper. Deng Xiaoping's answer prompted Chairman Mao's determination to criticise Deng.

It was in the context of such a fierce and irreconcilable struggle between the two classes that we, the young fighters loyal to Chairman Mao, tightened the strings of class struggle and were ready to fight another great battle alongside Chairman Mao.

I say this today based on my personal experience at that time.

Comrades who have not had such personal experience as us may not easily understand our strong feelings at that time.

Here, I will introduce a typical example to everyone.

---

<sup>50</sup> The Ninth National Congress of the CPC was held between April 1 and 24, 1969. It formally ratified the purge of Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping. Lin Bao delivered the keynote political report at the congress - Trans.

<sup>51</sup> In November 1975, Liu Bing, Deputy Secretary of the Party Committee of Tsinghua University, wrote twice to Mao Zedong, then Chairman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China (CPC), reflecting the problems of Chi Qun and Xie Jingyi 's style of life and ideology. Mao Zedong analysed the spearhead as pointing at his own Cultural Revolution and asked Deng Xiaoping to endorse his view at a meeting of the Political Bureau of the CPC Central Committee on 20 November, but Deng quoted from the Book of Peach Blossom Garden, saying: 'I am from the Peach Blossom Garden' and 'I do not know that there is a Han, let alone a Wei and Jin.' Tao Yuanming's "The Story of the Peach Blossom Spring" is commonly used to describe people who have been detached from reality for a long time and are ignorant of social conditions, especially new things. (Recently, in 2021, Zhang Jian, former president of the Anhui Provincial High People's Court, accepted bribes of more than 71.79 million yuan and was sentenced to 15 years in prison and fined 5 million yuan. According to media reports, before Zhang Jian was censored and investigated, he pretended to be relaxed and said that he was a "man from the Peach Blossom Garden") – Trans.



It was under such political circumstances at that time that Chairman Mao, at a central working conference, specifically talked about the story of "Three Attacks on Zhujiazhuang" in "Water Margin". He talked about it in great detail. What happened the first time, what happened the second time, and finally, after repeated investigations and studies, Zhujiazhuang was taken the third time. In his conversation, Chairman Mao very clearly linked this issue to the real class struggle and the Cultural Revolution. This conversation should not be difficult to find now.<sup>52</sup>

At that time, everyone was very concerned about the new talks and instructions issued by Chairman Mao and took them very seriously. Firstly, there was the so-called 'conveying Chairman Mao's instructions overnight', and secondly, and mainly, everyone immediately studied, researched and comprehended them in earnest.

After seeing the mimeographed version of Chairman Mao's talk on "Three Attacks on Zhujiazhuang", we were all greatly shocked. I and several rebel leaders of Shandong University (comrades Liu Quanfu, Song Shuxing, etc.) all felt that this talk was very important, and especially we all thought about why Chairman Mao talked about the story of "Three Attacks on Zhujiazhuang", and why he talked about this story in connection with the real class struggle, especially the Cultural Revolution, and emphasized investigation and research, and emphasized the process of repeated understanding. We discussed this issue repeatedly and came to a common view: Chairman Mao wanted to "attack Zhujiazhuang three times", and on the basis of summarizing the first two struggles, he wanted to better and more successfully launch the third struggle against the bourgeois headquarters.

We did not randomly guess who Chairman Mao would attack or how he would deploy the forces. However, we were relatively firm in our thinking at the time, and that was that we believed that Chairman Mao would lead us in another "three attacks," "three attacks" against the bourgeois headquarters, and "three attacks" against the biggest capitalist roaders in power within the Party.

Therefore, later, when Chairman Mao launched the struggle to "criticize Deng and beat back the right deviationist wind of reversing correct verdicts," we in Shandong immediately organized ourselves and posted a big-character poster (drafted by me) in front of the provincial party committee, signed by three worker leaders, Zhu Zhonghou, Meng Xianqi, and Xiang Suiying, asking the provincial party committee secretary Bai Rubing to "turn around" (a specific political term at the time, meaning to correct the mistakes in the line).

History is the best political textbook. By reviewing the details of a period of history that I personally experienced, my purpose is to explain that Chairman Mao's launching of the criticism of Deng and the fight against the rightist reversal of verdicts was not accidental, nor was it because he believed Comrade Mao Yuanxin's report<sup>53</sup>, nor was it a whim. It was the inevitable result of the development of the struggle between the two classes and the two lines of the Cultural Revolution in the past decade. It was a strategic deployment that Chairman Mao had prepared for the rightist reversal of verdicts.

Many comrades do not understand, and always wonder why Liu Bing wrote such a letter and asked Deng Xiaoping to forward it to Chairman Mao, and it was escalated to "the current struggle between the two lines"?

These comrades did not look at the problem from the perspective of the acute and severe class struggle situation at that time. The essence of the problem at that time was certainly not the problem

---

<sup>52</sup> It is also recommended to read Chairman Mao's comments on "Three Attacks on Zhujiazhuang" in "On Contradiction" – Trans.

<sup>53</sup> Mao Yuanxin was Mao Zedong's nephew. He reported to the Chairman his views about Deng Xiaoping's continuing opposition to the Cultural Revolution – Trans.



of a school in Tsinghua University, nor was it the problem of a letter from Liu Bing, but the problem of Deng Xiaoping's negation of the Cultural Revolution and the implementation of the line of counterattack against the Cultural Revolution. This was absolutely unacceptable, intolerable, and uncompromising to Chairman Mao. Moreover, in my opinion, Chairman Mao wanted Deng Xiaoping to fully play the role of a negative teacher, so that the people could more easily understand what capitalist-roaders and capitulationists are, why the Cultural Revolution was carried out, and why the Cultural Revolution should be defended.

Chairman Mao had a deep understanding of Deng Xiaoping. It can be said that "invite Deng Xiaoping out" and "overthrow Deng Xiaoping" were Chairman Mao's two-step strategic deployment of retreating to advance. Chairman Mao once again implemented the principle of "bombarding the headquarters" and insisted on his emphasis on "capturing the leader first", resolutely and directly pointing the spearhead of the struggle directly at Deng Xiaoping, the biggest capitalist roader in the party.

C. Chairman Mao, through leading the struggle to criticise Deng and beat back the Right deviationist wind of reversing correct verdicts, scientifically answered theoretically and practically that under socialist conditions, the struggle against revisionism and the struggle against the capitalist-roaders is mainly manifested in the struggle between adhering to the line of continuing the socialist revolution and adhering to the line of restoring capitalism, and the struggle between the proletarian headquarters and Marxist leaders and the bourgeois headquarters and revisionist leaders.

Let us study Chairman Mao's instructions again.

a. Chairman Mao clearly stated from the beginning of the struggle to criticise Deng and beat back the Right deviationist wind of reversing correct verdicts: "The issues involved in Tsinghua are not isolated, but a reflection of the current struggle between the two lines."

This clearly defines the struggle to criticise Deng and beat back the Right deviationist wind of reversing correct verdicts as a struggle between the two lines.

What is the theoretical and practical basis for Chairman Mao's statement?

It is on the issue of whether to adhere to "taking class struggle as the key link."

Chairman Mao raised the question in this way. "Is there class struggle in socialist society? What is the 'Three Directives as the key link'? Stability and unity do not mean no class struggle. Class struggle is the key link, and the rest are the details." Chairman Mao further analysed and said: "Stalin made a big mistake on this issue. Lenin was different. He said that small production continually engenders capitalism every day and every hour. Lenin said that we should build a bourgeois state without capitalists. In order to protect bourgeois right, we have built such a country ourselves, which is similar to the old society, divided into classes, with eight levels of wages, distribution according to work, equal exchange, and you have to pay money to buy rice, coal, oil, and vegetables. The eight levels of wages, no matter how few or how many people there are."

Chairman Mao reviewed the practical process of our socialist revolution and summarized it as follows: "In 1949, it was proposed that the main contradiction in the country was the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Thirteen years later, the issue of class struggle was raised again, and the situation began to improve. What was the Cultural Revolution for? It was class struggle. Liu Shaoqi talked about the theory of the dying out of classes, but he himself was not extinct. He wanted to protect his bunch of traitors and diehards. Lin Biao wanted to overthrow the proletariat and stage a coup, but has that been extinguished? Chairman Mao further analysed, "Why do some people not

see the contradictions in socialist society clearly? Doesn't the old bourgeoisie still exist? Isn't it obvious to everyone that there are a large number of petty bourgeoisie? Aren't there a large number of intellectuals who have not been reformed? Aren't the influence of small-scale production, corruption, and speculation everywhere? Isn't the anti-Party group of Liu, Lin, etc. terrifying? The problem is that they belong to the petty bourgeoisie and their thoughts can easily turn to the right. They represent the bourgeoisie, but they say that they can't see the class contradictions clearly. "

Here, there is a fundamental principle that we need to understand theoretically, which is: Why did Chairman Mao regard whether to adhere to "taking class struggle as the key link" as a line issue? What is the importance of this issue?

This is a theoretical issue that we seemed to understand for a long time, but in fact we have not really understood or figured out. Naturally, it is also a practical issue.

By carefully studying and researching all of Chairman Mao's discussions on the capitalist-roader problem, we can clearly see the internal connections of the Maoist theoretical system of continuing socialist revolution.

To deny "taking class struggle as the key link" is to deny the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, and to deny the theoretical basis for the need to continue revolution in socialist society. In socialist society, the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is an objective reality. To abandon "taking class struggle as the key link" is to abandon the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, which will inevitably lead to capitulation to the bourgeoisie and the inevitable path of capitalism. Chairman Mao used Deng Xiaoping as an example to profoundly reveal the universal law of class struggle. Chairman Mao said: "Deng Xiaoping proposed the 'Three Directives as the Key Link' without discussing it with the Politburo, nor did he consult with the State Council, nor did he report to me. He just said it. He is not a person who pays attention to class struggle, and he never mentioned this guideline. It is still 'white cat, black cat', no matter whether it is imperialism or Marxism." Chairman Mao made it very clear here that the result of "never mentioning this guideline" is to implement the "white cat, black cat" line, and the result is "no matter whether it is imperialism or Marxism", that is, a question of the road - the road of socialism or capitalism.

Over the years, we have participated in the struggle against revisionism, capitalist-roaders, and the bourgeoisie within the Party, and especially in the "serious exercise" of the Cultural Revolution. However, from the Cultural Revolution to the present, we have always been vaguely aware of the concept of capitalist-roaders, and especially have not been able to find a standard. This problem is right beside us, we come into contact with it every day, and feel it every day, but we have not been able to rise to a scientific understanding. It can be seen how difficult it is to correctly understand a theoretical issue, especially such an important theoretical issue.

If we understand these principles that Chairman Mao taught, we can see what revisionism is, what the capitalist road clique in the Party is, and what the representatives of the bourgeoisie are. It all comes down to one point: whether or not we adhere to "taking class struggle as the key link." Only by adhering to "taking class struggle as the key link" can we persist in continuing the socialist revolution and implement and formulate the proletarian revolutionary line of the proletariat's victory over the bourgeoisie and all other classes. If we abandon "taking class struggle as the key link", we will inevitably abandon the continuation of the socialist revolution, we will inevitably abandon the class struggle against the bourgeoisie and all exploiting classes, and we will inevitably use deceptive excuses such as "characteristics" as a cover to formulate and implement the revisionist line of restoring capitalism.

From Khrushchev to Deng Xiaoping to "Yizun"<sup>54</sup>, the biggest revisionist leaders formulated and implemented the revisionist line, which led to the restoration of capitalism. Hasn't this truth been repeatedly proved? This is not surprising or accidental. As Chairman Mao said, the line is a guideline, and the correctness of the ideological and political line determines everything. When the line changes, the nature of society will inevitably change. The so-called 'capitalist-roaders on the move' have thus emerged from a restored capitalist society.

Therefore, we must bear in mind that in socialism there exists a struggle between the two classes, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, between two roads and two social systems, and that there is a danger of the restoration of capitalism, and that this class struggle is centrally manifested in the struggle between the two lines, and that the central question of the struggle between the two lines centres around whether or not to adhere to the principle of 'class struggle as the key link'.

This is one of the most basic and central criteria. Whether it is Marxism-Leninism-Maoism or revisionism, there is no need to look at anything else, and there is no need to believe in such nonsense as 'special characteristics', and there is even less need to believe in it, the criterion is one, that is, to see whether or not it is adhering to the principle of 'class struggle as the key link'.

If we look at the "Yi Zun" with this criterion, we can characterise him without any mistake as the biggest capitalist roader in power in the whole Party and the whole country today, the biggest bourgeois representative, the biggest capitulationist who surrenders to imperialism, especially to US imperialism and Tsarist Russian imperialism. Thus, there is only one inescapable conclusion that has to be admitted: this Yi Zun is the biggest, most dangerous and most vicious class enemy that our proletariat and the broad masses of the working people are now facing.

Hasn't the fact that this person has been in power for more than a decade been clearly demonstrated again and again?

b. Why did Chairman Mao directly describe the phenomenon of capitalist-roaders as the bourgeoisie "within the Communist Party"? Aren't these revisionist leaders just individual phenomena?

This is no longer a purely theoretical question. The cruel class blows and class dictatorship after the counter-revolutionary coup in 1976 are the most powerful answers to this question in practice.

The biggest capitalist roaders in the party are nothing more than representatives of the privileged class that has already formed in the party - a special form of the bourgeoisie. The revisionist bourgeois line formulated and implemented by the capitalist roaders is nothing more than a concentrated expression of the interests and demands of this class. China's bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie was formed step by step under the rule of this line. The line has never been empty, abstract, or purely theoretical, but has a certain class basis and real class content. Therefore, formulating and implementing the revisionist bourgeois line is not an individual act, but a class act.

As far as the word "being in power" is concerned, whether it is party power, political power, or military power, it is not individual power, but class power, which embodies the dictatorship of the class. The basic principles of Marxism tell us that the class in which the power is held determines everything. The capitalist roaders are in power. Their being in power means that the power is in the hands of the representatives of the bourgeoisie who are taking the capitalist road, which also determines the respective class status of dictatorship and dictatorship in the class confrontation between the

---

<sup>54</sup> i.e. Xi Jinping- Trans.

proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Here, it is not the fate and status of an individual, but the fate and status of a class.

It is based on this basic theory of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism that Chairman Mao defined the ruling clique within the Party that is taking the capitalist road as the bourgeoisie "within the Communist Party". This is very scientific and completely in line with reality.

c. The theory of capitalist-roaders is the core theory of Chairman Mao's theory of continuing socialist revolution. If you don't understand the theory of capitalist-roaders, you can't really understand the theory of continuing socialist revolution. But, unfortunately, for a long time, even until today, we haven't really understood this theory completely. If you don't understand this theory, you will inevitably make the mistake of "overthrowing everything".

In the Cultural Revolution, such a problem actually existed all the time.

Earlier, when analysing why the two major factions of conservatives and rebels emerged in the early days of the Cultural Revolution, this issue has been discussed. The fact is that at that time, not only the masses were confused about this issue, but also the majority of cadres were confused about this issue. Whether it was the division into conservatives and rebels, or the implementation of the so-called "bourgeois reactionary line" by party committees at all levels, it was related to this (of course there were other reasons, which have been analysed above and will not be repeated here).

Here, we will focus on summarising historical lessons to further explore this issue.

At that time, everyone was confused, but now looking back, it is clearer. That is, the "Sixteen Articles" that guided the Cultural Revolution at that time did not clearly state these issues, especially because they did not stipulate corresponding specific policies. Under such circumstances, confusion in political understanding and political action is inevitable. This issue has been discussed before.

Here, we will do some analysis and research on why the focus of the movement was to rectify the capitalist roaders in the party, but it was not truly implemented.

The "Sixteen Articles" at that time stated that "the focus of this movement is to rectify those in power within the party who are taking the capitalist road." However, regarding what is a capitalist roader, the line issue was not highlighted, nor were relevant specific policies formulated.

In the fifth article, it was written as follows:

"V. Firmly implement the party's class line

"Who are our enemies? Who are our friends? This question is the primary issue of the revolution and the primary issue of the Cultural Revolution.

"The Party leadership must be good at discovering the left, developing and strengthening the left, and firmly relying on the revolutionary left. Only in this way can the most reactionary rightists be completely isolated in the movement, the middle faction be won over, the majority be united, and after the movement, more than 95% of the cadres and more than 95% of the masses be united.

"Concentrate efforts to attack a handful of extremely reactionary bourgeois rightists and counter-revolutionary revisionists, fully expose and criticize their crimes of opposing the Party, socialism, and Mao Zedong Thought, and isolate them to the greatest extent possible.

"The focus of this movement is to rectify those in power within the Party who are taking the capitalist road.

“Pay attention to strictly distinguishing the anti-Party and anti-socialist rightists from those who support the Party and socialism but have said some wrong things, done some wrong things, or written some bad articles and works.

“Pay attention to strictly distinguishing the bourgeois reactionary cliques and reactionary "authorities" from those who have general bourgeois academic ideas.”

Here, it is stipulated that "we must concentrate our forces to crack down on a handful of extremely reactionary bourgeois rightists and counter-revolutionary revisionists, fully expose and criticize their crimes against the Party, socialism, and Mao Zedong Thought, and isolate them to the greatest extent possible." It is also stipulated that "the focus of this movement will be to rectify those in power within the Party who are taking the capitalist road." However, the relationship between the two is not made clear; in particular, it is not made clear what "those in power within the Party who are taking the capitalist road" are.

It is precisely because these major political principles and policies that guide the movement were not explained clearly, and only a large number of "political labels" were listed.

In the end, the result of the implementation of these "political labels" was "overthrow everything" and brutal struggle.

Article 8 talks about the cadre issue:

"VIII. Cadre Issues Cadres can be roughly divided into the following four types:

- (1) Good.
- (2) Relatively good.
- (3) Those who have serious mistakes, but are not anti-party and anti-socialist rightists.
- (4) A small number of anti-party and anti-socialist rightists.

Under normal circumstances, the first two types of people (good and relatively good) are the majority. The anti-party and anti-socialist rightists must be fully exposed, fought, defeated, discredited, and their influence must be eliminated, and at the same time, a way out is given so that they can start a new life. "

The cadres are divided into four categories here, but it is worth noting that the focus of this movement is not mentioned, that is, the "capitalist roaders in power"; and there are no specific and clear policy provisions for the so-called "anti-party and anti-socialist rightists", and at that time, it felt that this was still a repetition of the anti-rightist struggle in 1957.

This not only led to a heated debate among the masses on whether a certain leading cadre belonged to the fourth category or should be classified as such, thus forming a confrontation between conservatives and rebels; but also the leading cadres at all levels would not consider themselves to be "anti-party and anti-socialist rightists". On the contrary, they would pick out "anti-party and anti-socialist rightists" from the masses, which formed the so-called "bourgeois reactionary line" at that time.

The "Sixteen Articles" were considered to be the programmatic document guiding the Cultural Revolution at that time, but this document did not play the role it should have played at that time. Today, when we study this document again, it is easy to understand that the emergence of such a problem is not accidental.

At that time, from inside the party to outside the party, generally speaking, everyone had a poor understanding of Chairman Mao's theory of capitalist roaders, and this theory has a process of continuous development, continuous improvement, and continuous maturity. At that time, we did not yet deeply understand that the essential problems and essential characteristics of the so-called "capitalist roaders" were mainly concentrated in the line issue. Today, this is a very simple issue. What road to take is always determined by what line to implement, which is what Chairman Mao emphasized: whether the ideological and political line is correct or not determines everything. Chairman Mao's big-character poster "Bombard the Headquarters" was written in this way. However, at that time, our understanding could not keep up with Chairman Mao, and even the "Sixteen Articles" did not fully reflect Chairman Mao's thoughts.

From the perspective of philosophical epistemology, we must not take the desire to obtain a true understanding as a simple matter; and it is not easy to improve our level of understanding and ability.

It is precisely because we did not understand and handle the most critical issue of rectifying the capitalist roaders in the party, so in the late period of the Cultural Revolution, when dealing with cadres, it was almost equivalent to changing from "overthrowing everything" to "liberating everything".

At that time, there was only one criterion for liberation: whether or not someone had a historical problem. Specifically, whether or not someone was a traitor or a spy. Whether or not someone was a capitalist-roader was excluded because no one had figured out what a capitalist-roader was. As mentioned earlier, the treatment of Liu and Deng was a typical reflection of this problem. Neither the overthrow of Liu nor the removal of Deng were based on the definition of capitalist-roaders. This problem was prevalent at the time, from the central government to the local governments. Its seriousness was that it was equivalent to cancelling Chairman Mao's theory of capitalist-roaders. Later facts further proved this point. As long as they did not have serious historical problems, were not traitors or spies, the "old comrades" became "proletarian revolutionaries", and no one was considered to be a person in power taking the capitalist road. This completely negated the core theory of Chairman Mao's theory of continuing socialist revolution - the theory of capitalist roaders.

This is a major theoretical and practical issue that needs to be corrected and the root cause corrected.

Criticizing Deng means criticising Deng's line. Criticising Deng's line means criticising Deng for wanting to take the capitalist road, criticising Deng as a representative of the bourgeoisie who has infiltrated the party, and criticising Deng as the greatest danger that will lead to the restoration of capitalism in China. In summary, this means: taking the struggle of lines as the key link, focusing on rectifying the biggest capitalist-roaders in the party who have formulated and implemented the revisionist line of restoring capitalism, that is, the biggest representatives of the bourgeoisie in the party.

This is a brilliant example that Chairman Mao set for the proletariat and the broad masses of working people in the last days of his life on how to oppose revisionism and capitalist restoration. History cannot be assumed.

If Chairman Mao had continued to follow his example after his death, the Communist Party of China would not have changed, and Chinese society would not have changed. However, the historical conditions at the time determined that not only did this "if" not occur, but the inevitable counter-revolutionary coup interrupted this possibility.

However, if we think further, the possible and the impossible as a pair of contradictions will transform. Impossible this time does not mean impossible next time. The struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is endless. Chairman Mao's example will surely be the banner of victory that the



Chinese Communists will hold high in the next great struggle against the rise of revisionism and the restoration of capitalism.

The reason why I spent so much space and combined with some historical facts I personally experienced to discuss the key issues of continuing the socialist revolution under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat is because I feel that this is the most important, most crucial, and most fundamental historical lesson left by the Cultural Revolution.

To summarise, in order to carry out the continued revolution under socialist conditions, the first thing to do is to solve the line problem; and to solve the line problem, we must solve the problem of the headquarters; to solve the problem of the headquarters is to solve the problem of political power, that is, to solve the line problem. These are all organically linked and unified. Therefore, it can be said that "bombarding the headquarters" is the general program for carrying out the continued socialist revolution under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the general program for focusing on rectifying the ruling clique that is taking the capitalist road, and the general program for driving the comprehensive class struggle throughout the country.

If we grasp this general program and, under the guidance of this general program, the proletarian headquarters of the Party leads the entire Party and the people of the whole country to launch a struggle against the biggest capitalist-roader in the whole Party and the whole country; at the same time, in conjunction with this struggle, we mobilize the masses, connect the realities of various localities and units, and use the appropriate method to correctly handle the two types of contradictions of different natures, thereby both solving the problems and carrying out a broad socialist education movement. If we do this, we may be able to avoid mistakes such as "overthrow everything" and "all-out civil war" and successfully complete the historical task of continuing the socialist revolution.

But why was this idea interfered with by the two mistakes of "overthrowing everything" and "all-out civil war" in its actual implementation?

Looking back on this issue, we can clearly see that the continued revolution under socialist conditions, like the socialist revolution to seize power, must adhere to the leadership of the Party, and the Party's specific leadership must be implemented in all levels and forms of the continued revolutionary struggle.

This leads to the following topic to be discussed in detail.

**(2) The socialist revolution must be carried out under the direct and concrete leadership of the Party, mainly by correctly handling the contradictions among the people.**

The obvious and direct reasons for the two mistakes of "overthrowing everything" and "all-out civil war" during the Cultural Revolution are easy for everyone to see. It is because there was a lack of direct and specific leadership by the Party, and it was carried out in the form of mass organizations - fighting teams. As a result, "chaos under heaven" was inevitable, and in "chaos under heaven", the two mistakes of "overthrowing everything" and "all-out civil war" were also inevitable.

Under the conditions of socialism, that is, under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, that is, under the conditions of the leadership of the Communist Party, should the socialist continued revolution, including the socialist continued revolution centred on opposing capitalist-roaders, be carried out in the form of "chaos under heaven to achieve great order under heaven"?

The "two mistakes" negated this from the opposite side.

The "two mistakes" themselves are chaos and disorder.



The proletarian revolution, whether it is the socialist revolution or the socialist continued revolution, must adhere to the leadership of the Communist Party. This is determined by the nature and advantages of the party. This is irreplaceable by any other political organization, including any mass organization. This is common sense and does not need to be explained too much here. The "two mistakes" that occurred during the Cultural Revolution once again proved this truth from the opposite side.

The reason why the socialist continued revolution can be carried out and the proletarian cultural revolution can be launched is that the leadership of the entire party is still in the hands of the proletarian headquarters, and the proletarian dictatorship is basically still in the hands of the proletarian headquarters.

Under such circumstances, it is entirely possible to realize the party's specific and direct leadership of the socialist continued revolution movement being carried out by organizations at all levels and various organizations through appropriate forms.

Sending party work groups is a common form.

The work groups in the early days of the Cultural Revolution made directional and line errors. That was not a mistake in the form of the work group itself, but a directional and line error of the bourgeois headquarters that sent and led the work group.

In the rural Four Cleanups Movement<sup>55</sup>, under the guidance of the "Twenty-three Articles" formulated under the leadership of Chairman Mao, the Party's work group did not make such a mistake. I participated in three phases of the "Four Cleanups" at that time. I experienced the "Four Cleanups" work under the guidance of the first ten "decisions", the second ten "regulations", and the third "Twenty-three Articles". In comparison, I deeply realized that whether the line, principles, and policies of the work group are correct or not is determined by the general policy formulated by the Party Central Committee. The work group is just a form of work, a form of work that implements the line, principles, and policies of the Party Central Committee. It is a very important and good form of work. This form has long been used in the international communist movement.

For those units with serious problems, especially those units with serious problems in the party organization, it is absolutely necessary to send party work groups to reflect the direct and specific leadership of the party.

Of course, the direct and specific leadership of the party can be reflected and created in various forms, and it is not necessary to be limited to the form of work groups. However, the fundamental principle and fundamental requirement is that there must be party leadership, and it cannot be replaced by any other political form or organizational form.

To carry out the continued revolution under socialist conditions, we must adhere to the leadership of the Party, including the direct and specific leadership of the Party. Only in this way can we have strict iron discipline, fully and accurately implement the policies issued by the Party Central Committee,

---

<sup>55</sup> The Socialist Education Movement was a broad propaganda campaign aimed at practically the whole population. It was ideologically based on the writings of Mao Zedong and thus initiated a novel type of general campaign in which altruism, courage, perseverance and confidence in the building of socialism were highlighted. The movement was initiated in 1962 and lasted until the beginning of the Cultural Revolution. It was also known as the Four Cleanups Movement, meaning that bourgeois influence had to be removed from politics, economy, organization, and ideology – Trans.

and avoid mistakes such as "overthrow everything" and "all-out civil war". This is a very valuable historical lesson left to us by the Cultural Revolution.

Central issues are resolved by the Central Committee, and local issues are resolved under the leadership of the Central Committee. For example, the 11th Plenary Session of the 8th Central Committee actually resolved the issue of the bourgeois headquarters of Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping. Even the Lin Biao group was resolved under the personal leadership of Chairman Mao. This was not resolved by the whole Party and the people of the whole country from bottom to top, and it was not resolved by "chaos in the world", "all-out civil war" or "overthrow everything".

The facts are simple, and the reason is also simple. The general party members and the general public at the grassroots level of the whole party and the whole country neither understand the situation nor have the power to solve the problems of the central government.

Of course, from the perspective of the political system and organizational system of the Communist Party itself, there have always been problems in the past, mainly manifested in the fact that the democratic system has not been handled well, which directly affects the understanding and supervision of the majority of party members and the masses on party organizations at all levels, up to the Party Central Committee. The so-called one-party dictatorship problem also comes from this. If the problem of democracy is not handled well, the result will inevitably lead to dictatorship. This tells us that in the process of leading the struggle against the capitalist-roaders, the party must not only solve the problem of the capitalist-roaders, but also solve the problems of the party's political system and the country's political system. The following is a special discussion.

With the direct and specific leadership of the Party, in leading and implementing the line, principles and policies of the socialist continuing revolution, there is still a problem of correctly handling the nature of contradictions and the methods of correctly handling struggles.

On this issue, the mistakes of "overthrowing everything" and "all-out civil war" are that they confuse the nature of contradictions and adopt the wrong methods to resolve contradictions.

The socialist continuing revolution is a class struggle that continues under socialist conditions. It is a class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie centred on the capitalist-roaders. This is the basic nature of the social contradictions we face, and it is also the basic nature of the socialist continuing revolution. On this issue, we must adhere to the viewpoints of class and class struggle, and the methods of class and class analysis. We must adhere to "taking class struggle as the key link."

The key issue is that in dealing with and resolving this class contradiction, we must not adopt the wrong approach of "overthrowing everything" or "all-out civil war", but should adopt the line, principles and policies set out for our party in Chairman Mao's book "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People" written in 1957. In Chairman Mao's words, "Correctly handling contradictions among the people is a general topic." ("The Situation in the Summer of 1957", Selected Works of Mao Zedong, Volume 5, page 459, People's Publishing House, 1977 edition.)

Judging from the historical lessons left by the many political struggles within and outside the Party after the founding of the People's Republic of China, especially the two mistakes of the Cultural Revolution of "overthrowing everything" and "all-out civil war", the problem lies mainly in the policy boundaries and handling methods for dividing the two types of contradictions of different nature: contradictions between ourselves and the enemy and contradictions among the people. To be more specific, the main problem lies in the characterization and handling of contradictions among the people as contradictions between ourselves and the enemy, and in the adoption of cruel methods of

struggle. This will inevitably lead to serious mistakes, including mistakes such as "overthrow everything" and "all-out civil war". The harm caused by such mistakes is seen by everyone, and some have experienced it personally. The negative consequences brought about in politics are even more far-reaching. The bourgeois reactionary line of suppressing the masses in the early days of the Cultural Revolution is a typical manifestation of such negative consequences. Moreover, it should be emphasized that such negative consequences have continued to affect us to this day, and have even become more serious and more intensified. In essence, the dictatorship of the proletariat has degenerated into the dictatorship over the proletariat.

This is a major theoretical and practical problem. The essence of this problem, the occurrence of this problem, first of all, lies in the understanding of the classes, class contradictions and class struggles that exist in socialist society. It is wrong not to recognize the existence of classes, class contradictions and class struggles, but it is also wrong to simply understand the existence of classes, class contradictions and class struggles as contradictions between enemies and ourselves and to deal with them as contradictions between enemies and ourselves. Class contradictions cannot be simply equated with contradictions between enemies and ourselves, and class struggle cannot be simply equated with struggles between enemies and ourselves. This is a new situation under socialist social conditions, in which classes, class contradictions, and class struggles are quite complex. This is a difficulty in understanding class issues under socialist social conditions, and it is also a difficulty in correctly distinguishing the boundaries between contradictions among the people and contradictions between ourselves and the enemy. If this issue is not clear in theory and practice, it will directly affect the understanding and implementation of socialist democracy, that is, it will directly affect the understanding and implementation of the dictatorship of the proletariat. From the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe to China, it is precisely around this issue that too many painful historical tragedies and historical lessons have been left.

The seriousness of this problem is also reflected in the fact that even now, many comrades who claim to be Maoists have not yet stepped out of the quagmire of mistakes they have fallen into on this issue. Their understanding of class struggle and the dictatorship of the proletariat is exactly the same as the fascist bourgeois dictatorship implemented by the revisionist rulers.

By learning Chairman Mao's teachings and summarising the lessons of history, we should have a new and improved understanding of this issue today.

In his speeches on the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People and other works, Chairman Mao spoke very clearly about the boundaries of the two types of contradictions of different natures.

Chairman Mao said: "Our country is a people's democratic dictatorship led by the working class and based on the worker-peasant alliance. What is the purpose of this dictatorship? The first function of the dictatorship is to suppress the reactionary classes and reactionaries within the country and the exploiters who resist the socialist revolution, and to suppress those who undermine socialist construction, that is, to resolve the contradictions between the enemy and ourselves within the country. For example, arresting certain counter-revolutionaries and sentencing them, denying the landlord class and bureaucratic bourgeoisie the right to vote and the right to freedom of speech for a period of time, all fall within the scope of the dictatorship. In order to maintain social order and the interests of the broad masses of the people, dictatorship must also be exercised over thieves, fraudsters, murderers and arsonists, gangster groups and all kinds of bad elements who seriously undermine social order. The second function of the dictatorship is to defend the country against subversive activities and possible aggression by external enemies. When such a situation arises, the

dictatorship takes on the task of resolving the contradictions between the enemy and ourselves externally." (Selected Works of Mao Zedong, Volume 5, page 366, People's Publishing House, 1977 edition)

Chairman Mao's statement is very clear. To put it in a nutshell, only those counter-revolutionaries who resist and undermine socialism, as well as members of the landlord class, the bureaucratic bourgeoisie and criminals, belong to the enemy contradiction and are the targets of the dictatorship of the people's democratic dictatorship (which is essentially the dictatorship of the proletariat).

However, the mistakes made in the anti-rightist struggle in 1957 and the mistake of "overthrowing everything" during the Cultural Revolution, as well as other similar mistakes made in handling political struggles within and outside the Party, tell us that the reason for such mistakes is that we did not correctly distinguish between contradictions between ourselves and the enemy and contradictions among the people, and we handled issues that should have been handled as contradictions among the people as contradictions between ourselves and the enemy. In the anti-rightist struggle in 1957, 550,000 "rightists" who were "anti-Party and anti-socialist" were identified and all handled as contradictions between ourselves and the enemy; during the Cultural Revolution, various "anti-Party and anti-socialist" hats were put on by means of "infinite exaggeration", leading to "overthrowing everything" and handling them all as contradictions between ourselves and the enemy.

This kind of mistake is not accidental. It involves the question of whether the understanding of classes, class contradictions, the situation of class struggle, its nature, and its solution under socialist conditions is correct, and whether the understanding of proletarian democracy and proletarian dictatorship is correct. If mistakes are made in theory and policy, they will inevitably lead to mistakes in practice. This kind of mistake cannot be simply described as "exaggerated". This is a serious political mistake, a major mistake that confuses two types of contradictions of different natures, violates the nature and principles of the proletarian dictatorship, abuses the name of the proletarian dictatorship, and ultimately brings extremely heavy tragedies. This mistake seriously discredited socialism and was an important reason why the masses followed the "colour revolution" later.

Why did such a mistake happen? It was the mistake in ideological understanding that led to the practical and political mistakes. It is worthwhile for us to seriously summarise the historical lessons contained in it today.

First, from the lessons of the anti-rightist struggle in 1957, a serious mistake occurred in the fight against the "rightists" at that time, that is, those who had opinions about the party's first-level party organisations were regarded as anti-party, and they might be labelled as "rightists" who were anti-party and anti-socialist.

Therefore, in the early days of the Cultural Revolution, when some students had opinions about the school party committee and wanted to rebel against the school party committee, they were considered to be "rightists" who had jumped out again, preparing for another "anti-rightist struggle" and fighting the "rightists" again. This widespread phenomenon, which occurred everywhere from Beijing, was not accidental. This led to Chairman Mao's famous comment on the People's Daily commentator's article "Hailing a Big-Character Poster at Peking University" on August 5, 1966: "We should not unconditionally accept the wrong leadership that endangers the revolution, but resolutely resist it." This was in response to the negative consequences of the Anti-Rightist Struggle in 1957. For quite a long time, this mistake directly affected China's political life and contributed to the one-party dictatorship.

Second, from the mistake of "overthrowing everything" during the Cultural Revolution, we can learn another lesson. That is, to overthrow a person, instead of looking at a person correctly and comprehensively, we mainly look for so-called anti-party and anti-socialist remarks. No matter where or under what circumstances these remarks were made, even including those written in diaries or private conversations between friends, we can seize on a single word and make it into evidence of anti-party, anti-socialist and anti-Mao Zedong Thought. With this, they will either be designated as anti-Party and anti-socialist capitalist-roaders or anti-Party and anti-socialist counter-revolutionaries, who will not only be brought down, but will even eventually be sentenced to death.

Thirdly, in connection with the above two mistakes, it is also because 'not many people in our party really understand Marxism-Leninism', and there is no real theoretical and practical solution to the question of how to correctly understand and correctly deal with the problems of class and democracy in socialist societies, and how to correctly understand and correctly deal with the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Even today, many people's ideas on this issue are still completely contrary to Marxist-Leninist-Maoist theory, which proves that the failure of all socialist countries in the past to deal with this issue was not accidental, but was due to various social reasons determined by historical conditions.

Under socialism, under the dictatorship of the proletariat, if socialist democracy and proletarian democracy are truly upheld, do citizens have the right to discuss politics? Is there any right to give advice to the leadership of the Communist Party? Is there any right to put forward one's ideas and opinions on the socialist political system? Do they even have the right to put forward their ideas and opinions on the socialist system? Can they make their own demands on the ruling regime?

At that time, limited by historical conditions, the Party's understanding of these issues was basically incorrect.

At that time, and even today, those famous "rightist remarks" that are still considered (such as the authoritative "Biography of Mao Zedong"): the criticism of the so-called "Party's World"<sup>56</sup>, the proposal of "Political Design Institute"<sup>57</sup>, the demand for "taking turns to be the boss", the label of "feudal

---

<sup>56</sup> The People's Daily, June 2, 1957, reprinted Chu Anping's speech "Putting Forward Some Suggestions to Chairman Mao and Premier Zhou", in which he said "...the relationship between the party and the masses has not been good in the past few years, and it has become an issue that urgently needs to be adjusted in China's political life. What is the crux of the matter? In my opinion, the key lies in the ideological issue of "the party in the world." I believe that the Party's leadership of the country does not mean that the country is owned by the Party; Everyone supported the party, but they did not forget that they were also the masters of the country." In 2023, Wang Dan, a leader of the students gathered at Tiananmen square in 1989, extended the "Party world" to "Xi Jinping world", stating "The so-called party-governed country no longer exists, the party no longer exists, and now it is the out-and-out Xi world." – Trans.

<sup>57</sup> The People's Daily, May 22, 1957, printed a Speech on the establishment of the "Political Design Institute" by Zhang Bojun, vice chairman of the China Democratic League. He said "As far as the friends I have met are concerned, their views are basically similar, and they all believe that the leadership of the Communist Party is indispensable and that the Party can lead scientifically politically. But, on the other hand, there is also a sense that there are shortcomings in this system, and that there are shortcomings in sectarianism, dogmatism and bureaucracy.... At present, there are many design institutes in the industrial sector, but there is no one in many political facilities. In my opinion, the CPPCC, the National People's Congress, the democratic parties, and the people's organizations should be the four political design institutes. The role of these design institutes should be given more play... When making a summary of a certain department, the democratic parties concerned can also be invited to participate, and this can also reduce the occurrence of a little subjectivism." At about the same time, the China Democratic League's Luo Longji proposed that the democratic parties and the CCP should jointly create a Political Rehabilitation Committee. Zhang and Luo were criticised as attempting to establish a separate organ of state power from the highest organ of state power and denounced as Rightists – Trans.

socialism", etc., these political opinions were considered "extreme rightist remarks" at the time, including the rightist remarks quoted in Chairman Mao's articles. In the end, these people were classified as "extreme rightists" and treated as enemy contradictions.

This raises a very serious theoretical and practical question, that is, under socialist conditions, as citizens, as the masses, do they have the right to express opinions on the political system of the country, whether the Communist Party can continue to lead, how to secure the ruling power, etc.?

I think the answer should be yes, and it is a basic and important content that must be included in socialist democracy and proletarian dictatorship.

At that time (and until now), the mistake of reversing right and wrong occurred on this issue. I think there are two historical lessons left.

One is that under the socialist conditions of proletarian dictatorship, how should the political system of a socialist country be established to ensure that the proletariat and the broad masses of the people truly enjoy socialist democracy and proletarian democracy? This issue was not resolved at that time.

Many of Chairman Mao's opinions at the time were instructive for the Anti-Rightist Struggle, but in the process of actual implementation, they went astray and led to serious mistakes.

Chairman Mao said in "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People": "In advocating freedom with leadership and democracy under centralized guidance, we in no way mean that coercive measures should be taken to settle ideological questions or questions involving the distinction between right and wrong among the people. All attempts to use administrative orders or coercive measures to settle ideological questions or questions of right and wrong are not only ineffective but harmful. We cannot abolish religion by administrative order or force people not to believe in it. We cannot compel people to give up idealism, any more than we can force them to embrace Marxism. The only way to settle questions of an ideological nature or controversial issues among the people is by the democratic method, the method of discussion, criticism, persuasion and education, and not by the method of coercion or repression." (Selected Works of Mao Zedong, Vol. 5, p. 368, People's Publishing House, 1977) He also said: " People may ask, since Marxism is accepted as the guiding ideology by the majority of the people in our country, can it be criticised? Certainly it can. Marxism is scientific truth and fears no criticism. If it did, and if it could be overthrown by criticism, it would be worthless. In fact, aren't the idealists criticising Marxism every day and in every way? And those who harbour bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideas and do not wish to change -- aren't they also criticising Marxism in every way? Marxists should not be afraid of criticism from any quarter. Quite the contrary, they need to temper and develop themselves and win new positions in the teeth of criticism and in the storm and stress of struggle. Fighting against wrong ideas is like being vaccinated -- a man develops greater immunity from disease as a result of vaccination. Plants raised in hothouses are unlikely to be hardy. Carrying out the policy of letting a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend will not weaken, but strengthen, the leading position of Marxism in the ideological field.

"What should our policy be towards non-Marxist ideas? As far as unmistakable counter-revolutionaries and saboteurs of the socialist cause are concerned, the matter is easy, we simply deprive them of their freedom of speech. But incorrect ideas among the people are quite a different matter. Will it do to ban such ideas and deny them any opportunity for expression? Certainly not. It is not only futile but very harmful to use crude methods in dealing with ideological questions among the people, with questions about man's mental world. You may ban the expression of wrong ideas, but the ideas will still be there. On the other hand, if correct ideas are pampered in hothouses and never exposed to the elements



and immunized against disease, they will not win out against erroneous ones. Therefore, it is only by employing the method of discussion, criticism and reasoning that we can really foster correct ideas and overcome wrong ones, and that we can really settle issues." (Ibid., p. 391.)

In terms of policy, Chairman Mao said in the article "*Wen Hui Bao's* Bourgeois Orientation Should Be Criticised": " Now to return to the term "bourgeois Rightists". Bourgeois Rightists are the bourgeois reactionaries mentioned above who oppose the Communist Party, the people and socialism; this definition is scientific and true to fact. Only a handful, they are to be found in the democratic parties, among intellectuals, capitalists and students and also in the Communist Party and Youth League, and they have surfaced in the present great storm. They are very small in number, but in the democratic parties, and particularly in certain of these parties, they carry weight and should not be taken lightly. This bunch have not only expressed themselves in words but also followed up with deeds; they are guilty, and the principle of "blame not the speaker" does not apply to them. They are not only speakers but doers. Are they to be punished by law? There seems to be no need for that at present. For the people's state is very secure and, moreover, many among them are prominent figures. They can be treated leniently, without punishment. In general, it is enough to call them "Rightists", not reactionaries. The only exceptions are those who refuse to correct their mistakes after repeated warnings and continue to engage in sabotage in violation of the criminal law; these will have to be punished. Learn from past mistakes to avoid future ones, cure the sickness to save the patient, transform negative factors into positive ones--these principles still apply to the Rightists. Then there are Rightists of another kind who have expressed themselves in words but have not followed up with deeds. Their views are similar to those of the Rightists mentioned above, but they have not engaged in disruptive activities. There should be a greater degree of leniency towards them. Erroneous views must be repudiated root and branch with no quarter given, but these individuals should be permitted to reserve their opinions. The various types of Rightists mentioned above are allowed their freedom of speech. For a great, secure nation, there is little harm in keeping a small number of such people around when their mistakes are known to the masses. It must be understood that Rightists are persons who teach us by negative example. In this sense, poisonous weeds can render service. They render service precisely because they are poisonous and because in the past people were harmed by the poison they spread." (Selected Works of Mao Zedong, Volume 5, pages 438-439. People's Publishing House, 1977 edition.)

I have quoted Chairman Mao's original text at a relatively long length here in order to help us better understand how to distinguish and deal with two types of contradictions of different natures under socialist conditions and how to not deviate from the principles of socialist democracy. On this issue, history has left us with rich content and valuable experience and lessons, both in theoretical understanding and in practical operation, which deserve our careful study and summary today, so that after the socialist revolution and the reconstruction of socialist society, we can make socialist democracy more correct and better.

Related to the question of how to correctly deal with the class question, the question of two different types of conflicts and the question of socialist democracy, another and more important problem was the lack of a clear and correct understanding of the fact that history was taking a turn for the worse at that time.

The reason why people at that time put forward some opinions, including very sharp ones, about the Party Conference fully reflected that the question of 'the Party changing into a revisionist and the country changing colour' had been put on the agenda historically, that is to say, the object of a new revolution, a revolution of a new nature, in short, the historical task of continuing the revolution in a new socialism, was put on the agenda.



However, at that time, there was a lack of new theories that were compatible with this new historical requirement. Therefore, there was no correct understanding of this historical turning point, including the mass movements that emerged in some socialist countries in Eastern Europe. Only one side of the story was discussed, but not the other, more important side: the party was degenerating and the masses were dissatisfied.

It is not that there is no correct understanding at all. Chairman Mao's understanding is relatively correct. The proposal to oppose bureaucracy and the rectification movement was made because we saw that the Communist Party itself was having problems. We also saw that some so-called "disturbance" phenomena in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe were also inseparable from the Communist Party itself having problems. Therefore, we must oppose bureaucracy and carry out the rectification movement. However, as everyone has seen, once people really stand up to raise opinions, and some opinions are very sharp and very unpleasant to hear, the Communist Party can no longer sit still and cannot allow it. It proposed that "things are changing", and the "change" from solving the problems of the Communist Party itself to solving the problems of opposition to the Communist Party was the so-called "anti-rightist struggle".

It can be seen that it is quite difficult for a person's or a party's understanding to be able to keep up with the changes and developments in the situation, especially with the major turns in the situation. This is a well-founded historical experience. Not only is today's understanding of the theory of continued socialist revolution the basis for this judgement; but at that time, only five years later, in 1962, Chairman Mao raised the issue at the Tenth Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee, in what he later called the 'reintroduction of the class struggle'. At that time, the 'reintroduction of the class struggle' already had the content of a brand-new theory of continued socialist revolution, and it was this theory of revolution that kept pace with the development of the situation and the historical requirements of the turnaround.

Fourthly, another important reason for the confusion between the two types of contradictions of a different nature is the incorrectness of the political system and the process of implementing the people's democratic dictatorship (essentially the dictatorship of the proletariat).

One is 'substituting the party for the law'. The power to qualify and deal with conflicts between the enemy and us is held by the party organisations. Originally, the power to characterise and deal with the contradictions between the enemy and us, as listed by Chairman Mao, should belong to the legal department, not to the party organisations, but, in the actual process of operation, it has all gone towards 'substituting the party for the law', which is in fact a party dictatorship, or one-party dictatorship, and in the end it will inevitably develop into a one-party dictatorship.

Another is the so-called "mass dictatorship". The term and practice of "mass dictatorship" is not in line with Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. It is either the dictatorship of the proletariat or the specific form of the dictatorship of the proletariat - the people's democratic dictatorship. This is a dictatorship with a specific class nature and cannot be replaced by "mass dictatorship". The masses are composed of different classes. Practice has proved that once the "mass dictatorship" is carried out, it will deviate from the class nature and policies and strategies of the dictatorship of the proletariat or the people's democratic dictatorship, and will make the mistakes of "overthrowing everything" and "all-out civil war"; and it will often adopt extremely cruel means of struggle, resulting in many catastrophic tragedies.

These historical lessons tell us that the continued revolution under socialist conditions must correctly and strictly distinguish and handle the two types of contradictions of different natures, and the general theme is the correct handling of contradictions among the people.

Contradictions under socialist conditions always have the nature and content of class and class struggle. However, because it is under the socialist conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, when dealing with these issues with the nature and content of class and class struggle, we must strictly draw a clear line between the two types of contradictions of different natures. Although a large number of contradictions have the nature of class and class struggle, they still belong to the contradictions among the people. They should be resolved in the form of correctly handling contradictions among the people, and the formula of "unity-criticism-unity" should be implemented.

The policy boundary between judging the contradiction between ourselves and the enemy and the contradiction between the people should be based on the law, as Chairman Mao emphasized. If it is a violation of the law and belongs to the contradiction between ourselves and the enemy, it should be resolved by the legal department; if it is a contradiction among the people, it can only be resolved within the framework of the socialist democratic political system.

The correct handling of internal contradictions among the people is not super-class; it is in the nature of class struggle, and in the nature of the dictatorship of the proletariat. But because they are internal contradictions among the people, they cannot be dealt with in the repressive way of dealing with enemy contradictions, but only in the way of 'unity-criticism-unity'. Criticism is also a form of struggle. Criticising the bourgeoisie is precisely a form of struggle against the bourgeoisie. But this is a particular form of struggle under particular historical conditions. Chairman Mao has made all these points clear, but the problem is that we have not learnt or understood enough, so today we have the task of re-learning.

Forgetting class struggle, not daring to persist in class struggle, not daring to persist in "taking class struggle as the key link" is a revisionist tendency. However, when dealing with the class struggle of contradictions among the people, the correct way of struggle must be adopted. Only by doing so, and only by doing so well, can we truly implement the principles of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, truly adapt to the special requirements of class struggle under socialist conditions, and truly meet the requirements of continuing the socialist revolution.

Fifth, historical experience and lessons also tell us that in carrying out the socialist continued revolution and the socialist education movement, we must implement the mass line, and we must mobilize the masses under the leadership of the Party to create a vigorous mass revolutionary movement.

Only in this way can we, firstly, solve the problem of the Party's revisionism and the problem of the capitalist-roaders; secondly, allow the broad masses of the people to be educated in the movement to "fight self, repudiate revisionism", transform their world outlook, improve their socialist political consciousness, and improve their understanding and grasp of the socialist revolutionary line; thirdly, on this basis, can we continuously advance the reform of the socialist political and economic systems and enable the socialist society to move step by step towards a communist society.

Chairman Mao often emphasized that bad things can be transformed into good things. The two mistakes made during the Cultural Revolution, "overthrow everything" and "all-out civil war", left us with painful lessons, but bad things can be transformed into good things. These painful lessons are no less valuable than positive historical experience. Only by mastering both positive and negative historical experiences and lessons can we have a more correct understanding of how to carry out the

socialist continued revolution and do more correctly and better in the future socialist continued revolution.

The advancement of history always requires a price. As long as the historical price becomes the ladder for the advancement of history, these prices will not be paid in vain. This is the historical significance of the historical price.

Due to the confusion of two types of contradictions of different natures, the two mistakes of "overthrowing everything" and "all-out civil war" appeared. The direct consequence of this was that the bourgeoisie within the party took advantage of it to launch a counter-revolutionary coup and conduct a counter-revolutionary counterattack, which led to the failure of the Cultural Revolution and almost all the victorious achievements of the Cultural Revolution were lost.

The fundamental reason for the failure of the Cultural Revolution is, of course, that the bourgeoisie within the Party has a broad social base inside and outside the Party and has considerable political power. This is a class struggle under socialist conditions. We can only understand it from the law of class struggle under socialist conditions. The "two mistakes" at most gave the bourgeoisie within the Party an excuse to deny the Cultural Revolution.

Despite this, as a serious proletarian party and as serious Communists, we do not avoid our mistakes because of this, but, as we are doing now, we must seriously learn lessons from our mistakes.

But at the same time, we must study and understand the historical lessons left to us by the counter-revolutionary coup from the law of class struggle under socialist conditions.

As a serious "exercise", the Cultural Revolution took a tortuous path and took a full ten years. Under the correct leadership of Chairman Mao, the focus was on rectifying the ruling clique that took the capitalist road - rectifying the largest capitalist-roaders in the whole party and the whole country, and eliminating the three bourgeois headquarters. However, after Chairman Mao's death, a counter-revolutionary coup took place in less than a month, which ultimately led to the failure of the Cultural Revolution.

In the face of this cruel and disastrous fact, it is not enough to just be indignant and denounce these traitors of the Communist Party who betrayed Chairman Mao and said all the good things and did all the bad things. The most important thing is to study and understand the historical laws and lessons contained in this major class struggle phenomenon.

### **(3) Historical lessons left by the counter-revolutionary coup.**

A simple fact that everyone has seen and cannot but admit is that the culprits who launched the counter-revolutionary coup and led to the direct failure of the Cultural Revolution were Hua Guofeng and Wang Dongxing, who occupied the leadership position of the Party Central Committee. Moreover, this counter-revolutionary coup was approved by the Politburo and therefore succeeded. Afterwards, the Politburo as a whole completely surrendered to the bourgeoisie within the Party without any resistance or struggle.

Of the four leaders of the Party Central Committee who were arrested, only Comrades Jiang Qing and Zhang Chunqiao were worthy of being proletarian revolutionaries who were loyal to Chairman Mao and his revolutionary line, while Yao Wenyuan was weak and Wang Hongwen betrayed and surrendered.

There is now a saying about the so-called "four heroes"<sup>58</sup>. This is completely wrong. If we cannot correctly understand Wang Hongwen's betrayal and surrender, and can tolerate it, it is equivalent to denying the criticism of traitors and the philosophy of traitors in the Cultural Revolution, and it is equivalent to denying that Communists must maintain the proletarian revolutionary integrity in the cruel class struggle. We cannot be so weak as to cover up the truth of history. We can only face these cruel historical facts and find historical lessons from historical facts.

It is very clear that the most profound historical lesson left to us is that although the three bourgeois headquarters were successively eliminated, the new proletarian headquarters was not well established, especially the main leaders of the new proletarian headquarters were not well selected. Instead, Hua Guofeng, a seemingly honest but actually dishonest speculator and Khrushchev-like representative of the bourgeoisie, was allowed to occupy the main leadership position, giving him the conditions to launch a counter-revolutionary coup.

Can this be explained only from the historical contingency?

No.

From Khrushchev to Gorbachev, to Yeltsin, weren't they all such people? From Liu Shaoqi to Lin Biao, to Deng Xiaoping, and even to "Yizun", weren't they all such people?

Hua Guofeng was just such a person. And he was not the only one who staged the coup. Didn't Wang Dongxing, Ye Jianying, Li Xiannian, and many others participate in the coup?

Chairman Mao added the following words to the May 16 Notice: "The representatives of the bourgeoisie who have infiltrated the Party, the government, the army and various cultural circles are a group of counter-revolutionary revisionists. Once the time is ripe, they will seize power and transform the dictatorship of the proletariat into the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Some of these people have been identified by us, while others have not. Some are being trusted by us and are being trained to be our successors, such as Khrushchev. They are now sleeping beside us. Party committees at all levels must pay full attention to this." As a result, the historical facts are indeed like this: "Some have been discovered by us, some have not been discovered yet, and some are being trusted by us and being cultivated as our successors, such as people like Khrushchev, who are now sleeping beside us." Hua Guofeng, who is "being trusted by us and being cultivated as our successor", is also "a person like Khrushchev" without exception, and, like Khrushchev, he launched a counter-revolutionary coup. It was precisely because this problem was not solved in the end that the Cultural Revolution failed.

Can we blame or complain about Chairman Mao for this?

No.

Practice has proved that under the current party political system, the method of selecting successors, including selecting successors from model workers and peasants, is unsuccessful.

---

<sup>58</sup> The "four heroes" is a literary expression that refers to four heroes from the Song Dynasty. As an historical and literary expression, it has a more elevated meaning than the English word "heroes" but has no other more direct expression than that in English. As an example of its contemporary use, an author on redchinacn.net said in 2017: "But facts and history are the wisest teachers. Despite the fact that the bureaucratic bourgeoisie is still in power and in control of the propaganda and public opinion, more and more people have come to realise that the Gang of Four are not counter-revolutionaries, that they are revolutionary fighters, and that they are called the 'Four Heroes.'" – Trans.

This has become a difficult problem facing the international communist movement, and it is a problem that concerns the survival of the Communist Party and a problem that the Communists must solve. I believe that to solve this problem, we must have new breakthroughs and new developments in our understanding.

The most important thing is to adhere to the methodology of historical materialism and use the viewpoint of historical materialism to find solutions to this practical problem facing the Communist Party.

If we put this opinion more specifically, the progress of all aspects of society will ultimately be reflected by the progress of the social system. Conversely, only when the social system progresses can the progress of all aspects of society be guaranteed. Further, all social problems are ultimately caused by the social system. Only when the social system progresses can all these problems be solved. This principle is also applicable to the problems we encounter here.

What the central leaders are like will determine the line. What the line is like will determine the road. What the road is like will determine the nature of society. It can be seen that for the Communist Party that wants to build socialism, the selection of central leaders is the most critical and important link.

Chairman Mao saw this very clearly. Chairman Mao's words were quoted earlier, saying that once the leader changes, everything will change. The deputy commander-in-chief's words were also quoted earlier, saying that "leadership is political power." Not only bigwigs see this, but ordinary people like us also see this. The selection of leaders determines the fate of the party and the country. It is really too important.

However, the Communists have not yet solved this problem and have not found a method to select successors that can meet historical requirements. The history of the two major parties, the Soviet Communist Party and the Chinese Communist Party, at least fully proves this point.

Let's not talk about the distant past. Lin Biao's coup failed, but Hua Guofeng's coup succeeded. Then, Hua Guofeng was taken down by Deng Xiaoping and replaced by Hu Yaobang's team. Hu Yaobang and Zhao Ziyang engaged in "liberalization" and were taken down by Deng Xiaoping again, replaced by Jiang Zemin. Deng Xiaoping ruled behind the scenes (his Southern Tour Speech was a confession), thoroughly implemented his revisionist line, and took great strides on the road to restoring capitalism. This has continued to this day, amending the constitution, destroying the political rule of two terms in office, returning to the lifelong system, and embarking on the road of imperial despotism. This period of regime change history was obviously achieved through coups.

This has almost become a common feature of political power changes in countries where the Communist Party is in power. The organizational principle of the Communist Party is democratic centralism. However, real life tells us that the Communist Party organizations at all levels, including the formation of the highest leadership of the Party Central Committee, have not truly implemented democratic centralism. Democratic elections have become a false form. This will not only lead to a trend of coups, but also to autocratic politics and autocratic rule. The ensuing nepotism, bribery, buying and selling of official positions, corruption, etc., are all inevitable. The overall result is that it has laid the social foundation for revisionism to come to power and capitalism to be restored.

It can be seen that the history of the ruling Communist Party has proved that it is the political system of the Communist Party that determines not only the problems of coups, autocratic politics and autocratic rule, but also that, under this system, it is impossible to solve the problem of the leadership team, including the problem of the central leadership team. It is therefore impossible to solve the

problem of the line, the problem of revisionism coming to power, and the problem of the restoration of capitalism.

The victory and ultimate failure of the Cultural Revolution, and even the fact that revisionism came to power and capitalism was restored, tell us that if we do not resolve the problem of the party's political system and the country's political system, and simply rely on launching a political revolution and overthrowing the capitalist-roaders, including the biggest capitalist-roaders within the party, we will still not be able to fundamentally resolve the problems of the creation and supervision of the party's leadership and the creation and supervision of the party's line; the problems of revisionism coming to power and capitalism being restored will still occur.

There is indeed a theoretical and practical problem here about how the organizational system and political system of the ruling Communist Party should be built.

There is a fundamental issue that has been ignored, which is: to whom should the highest and greatest power of the party belong?

In his famous book "Left-Wing' Communism: An Infantile Disorder", Lenin, while criticising the cognitive errors of the German "Left-wing" Communists, once taught us: "At least in modern civilized countries, classes are usually led by political parties; political parties are usually presided over by relatively stable groups composed of the most prestigious, influential, experienced people who are elected to the most important positions and are called leaders. This is all basic common sense. This is all simple and clear." ("Selected Works of Lenin", Volume 4, pages 197-198, People's Publishing House, 1972 edition). Lenin's opinions are certainly correct and authoritative. However, when we study Lenin's teachings, we should not forget that Lenin made such a statement in response to the cognitive errors of the German "left" communists at that time. This is very important for correctly understanding Lenin's opinions.

Based on the actual problems we face today, Lenin's teachings are still worth our serious study and understanding.

We must realise that the proletariat can only carry out class struggle through the leadership of the party, the Communist Party. Under the socialist conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, this principle cannot be deviated from, that is, the leadership of the Communist Party must be upheld. The leadership of the Communist Party and the ruling of the Communist Party do not mean the dictatorship of the Communist Party.

Instead, it is only through the leadership of the Communist Party and the ruling of the Communist Party that the dictatorship of the proletariat can be realised, or the people's democratic dictatorship can be realised under specific historical conditions.

Speaking of the Communist Party in power, let me touch upon a question. Some comrades do not agree with the term "ruling party" and do not think that there should be a "ruling party". Not to mention that all revolutionary mentors admit that this is an inevitable historical phenomenon. The problem is that, as Lenin said, as long as classes exist and class struggles exist, political parties, as the political embodiment and political representatives of classes, will inevitably exist. Just as Lenin said, when people participate in class struggles and political struggles, they do not participate as individuals, but as classes. Political parties participate in class struggles and political struggles as the political embodiment and political representatives of classes. Participating in various forms of struggle for power, including elections, will naturally result in the phenomenon of a ruling party. "Party ruling" and "ruling party" are both in reference to this actual historical phenomenon. This is not a political system



that is necessarily required under the Constitution, but it is a political phenomenon that is bound to appear under the Constitution. Therefore, denying the historical inevitability of the existence of a ruling party is a subjective imagination that is divorced from reality.

As the political representative of the proletariat and the vanguard of the proletariat, the Communist Party must have a Marxist leadership team to fulfill its class responsibilities, and this leadership team can formulate a proletarian revolutionary line that conforms to the objective laws of reality. This is what Lenin said: "Political parties are usually led by a relatively stable group of people who are the most prestigious, influential, experienced, and elected to the most important positions and are called leaders."

Lenin actually put forward two conditions for "leaders": one is that leaders are usually "the most prestigious, influential, and experienced" people; the other is that leaders are "elected to the most important positions."

Lenin's opinion is a scientific summary of the political phenomenon of "leaders". It is correct, important, and practical, and therefore feasible.

Although we attach great importance to the training and selection of successors to the proletarian revolutionary cause and have put forward five conditions for successors to the proletarian revolutionary cause<sup>59</sup>, the central leadership team finally formed in the late Cultural Revolution did not meet the requirements of the proletarian dictatorship and the socialist continued revolution, nor did it meet Lenin's high but practical requirement of "the most prestigious, influential, and experienced".

The weakness and capitulation of this leadership team in the face of the counter-revolutionary coup has irrefutably proved this point. This is not surprising. At least one of Lenin's requirements was not met: they were not "composed of people who were elected to the most important positions and called leaders."

---

<sup>59</sup> In the final section of the July 1964 polemic *On Khrushchov's Phoney Communism and its Historical Lessons for the World*, Mao Zedong inserted the following:

What are the requirements for worthy successors to the revolutionary cause of the proletariat?

They must be genuine Marxist-Leninists and not revisionists like Khrushchov wearing the cloak of Marxism-Leninism.

They must be revolutionaries who whole-heartedly serve the majority of the people of China and the whole world, and must not be like Khrushchov who serves both the interests of a handful of members of the privileged bourgeois stratum in his own country and those of foreign imperialism and reaction.

They must be proletarian statesmen capable of uniting and working together with the overwhelming majority. Not only must they unite with those who agree with them, they must also be good at uniting with those who disagree and even with those who formerly opposed them and have since been proven wrong. But they must especially watch out for careerists and conspirators like Khrushchov and prevent such bad elements from usurping the leadership of the Party and government at any level.

They must be models in applying the Party's democratic centralism, must master the method of leadership based on the principle of "from the masses, to the masses", and must cultivate a democratic style and be good at listening to the masses. They must not be despotic like Khrushchov and violate the Party's democratic centralism, make surprise attacks on comrades or act arbitrarily and dictatorially.

They must be modest and prudent and guard against arrogance and impetuosity; they must be imbued with the spirit of self-criticism and have the courage to correct mistakes and shortcomings in their work. They must not cover up their errors like Khrushchov, and claim all the credit for themselves and shift all the blame on others.

Successors to the revolutionary cause of the proletariat come forward in mass struggles and are tempered in the great storms of revolution. It is essential to test and know cadres and choose and train successors in the long course of mass struggle. – Trans.

This proves that it is unsuccessful and incorrect to try to solve the problem of successors and form a proletarian command-leadership team through selection or appointment by superiors, without Lenin's teachings. It is neither in line with the principles of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism nor in line with the principles of socialist democracy.

Lenin's "election" is very clear, very principled, and very important. That is to say, the leadership team must be elected through a legal and procedural election of the whole party congress; and the "most prestigious, most influential, and most experienced" leadership group is the result of this "election".

We are not unaware of Lenin's teachings. This is what our "Party Constitution" says in the chapter "Party Organisation System". Although the "Party Constitution" has been revised many times, the chapter "Party Organisation System" has always been roughly written in this way. First, it emphasises that party organizations at all levels are elected; second, it emphasises that "the highest leading body of the party is the National Congress of the Party and the Central Committee it produces."

However, we have precisely discarded elections in the practical implementation of the Party Constitution. It can be said that elections are belittled or even denied in terms of understanding and theory. This is an important manifestation of the fact that 'not many people in our Party really understand Marx and Lenin', and it is also an important manifestation of the fact that our Party does not adhere to Marx and Lenin.

This is not a small issue, but a major issue of political principle. It is also a major problem common to all Communist Parties in socialist countries and an important reason for the "party becoming revisionist and the country changing colour."

Historical facts tell us that if we do not implement and enforce the principle of democratic centralism, it will be impossible to elect a leadership team that is "a relatively stable group of people who are the most prestigious, influential, experienced, and elected to the most important positions and are called leaders." Without such a leadership team, there will be no headquarters that meets the requirements of the Communist Party. Without such a headquarters, it will be impossible to formulate a proletarian revolutionary line that conforms to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, including a line for the continued socialist revolution that conforms to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. The greatest danger is that it will degenerate into a revisionist headquarters or a bourgeois headquarters.

The more serious problem is that without the institutional guarantee of democratic centralism within the Party, it will be impossible to prevent anti-Party, counter-revolutionary coups, it will be impossible to prevent revisionism from coming to power, it will be impossible to prevent the revisionist line from becoming the dominant political line. The final result can only be the restoration of capitalism.

From the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe" to China's revisionism, aren't the historical facts we see the same? Aren't these historical facts serious enough?

This should be the most painful lesson left by the failure of the Cultural Revolution.

Facing this fact, not daring to admit it, deceiving oneself, or even swell one's face to make it look good is not the correct attitude that Marxists-Leninists-Maoists should take.

What we should face and answer is how to solve this problem?

From the perspective of cognition and theory, we must have a correct understanding of what a party, its headquarters, its line, and even its life ultimately rely on to ensure it.

We can only rely on all party members, not others. The "organisational system" in the "Constitution of the Communist Party of China" is actually formulated according to this principle and is the embodiment of this principle. The organisational line is the guarantee of the political line. The "organisational system" in the "Party Constitution" is the guarantee of the party's political line. In the final analysis, it is also the guarantee of the party's nature, the party's life, and whether the party will degenerate.

The most fundamental, basic and most important "organisational system" in the "Party Constitution" is that the national and all-level congresses of party members are the highest and most authoritative leading organs of the party. The fact that the leading organs of the Party at all levels are elected by the party congresses is an organisational and institutional guarantee for the implementation of this article.

If the party's organisational system is upheld, then the highest leaders and leadership groups of the party, as well as leaders of party organisations at all levels, can only be elected, and cannot be "selected," "chosen," or even "designated," nor can they be the work of the organisational department alone. However, from the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe to China, almost all ruling Communist parties have violated the provisions of the organisational system of the Party Constitution and mistakenly adopted various methods of selection and even designation that are divorced from the election of party member congresses and focus on implementing the leadership's intentions. This method, when taken to the extreme, develops into a means of coup d'état.

There is no guarantee that the Party leaders and groups of leaders thus produced, as well as the Party leadership at all levels, will be able to reflect the demands of the Party congresses at all levels, and especially the National Congress of the Party, for the Party's line and the nature of the Party. The fate of the Party is completely divorced from the Party Congress, which is the only one capable of reflecting the will and demands of the whole Party.

This fact tells us that the present organisational system of the Communist Party is even more backward than that of a bourgeois party under the conditions of a bourgeois democratic republic, and manifests itself in a kind of historical regression towards the feudal system of imperial absolutism.

This is a serious error of principle, a trampling on the Party's democratic centralism and on the democratic system stipulated in the Party's constitution, and a bridge to the transformation into a fascist party and a fascist bourgeois dictatorship, as pointed out sharply by Chairman Mao

Hua Guofeng's counter-revolutionary coup d'état is the best proof of the seriousness of this error of principle, and the fact that "Yi Zun"<sup>60</sup> dared and was able to move gradually towards imperial authoritarianism is even better proof of the seriousness of this error of principle.

Theoretically, in the final analysis, this still involves the class nature of a political party, whether it can only be truly reflected through the party's democratic system. In particular, the Communist Party, as the vanguard of the proletariat, can only truly reflect the will and demands of the entire party and all its members through a democratic system, thereby reflecting the class nature of the party as the vanguard of the proletariat.

The importance of democratic centralism shown here is not accidental, for the true meaning of democratic centralism lies in the fact that power is to be held in the hands of the masses of the people, and for the Communist Party, it is that power is to be held in the hands of the majority of party members. The so-called mass line is the line of democratic centralism.

---

<sup>60</sup> Xi Jinping- Trans.

For a political party, especially the Communist Party, if it wants to ensure the establishment of a leadership team that truly meets the nature, purpose, and program requirements of the Communist Party; if it wants to ensure the formulation of a line that meets the nature, purpose, and program requirements of the party, it can only be solved through the party's democratic centralism organisational system.

The problems that our party encountered in the formation of the leadership team, including the problems that the Soviet and Eastern European parties encountered in this issue, were all due to violating the principles of the democratic system stipulated in the "Party Constitution" and were all due to the issue of whether to follow the democratic line.

People will naturally raise a question: since the "organisational system" of democratic centralism is written into the Party Constitution, but in the end it is just a piece of paper and is not implemented at all, in this case, how can this problem be solved?

This can only show that the party's organisational system and political system still have defects and loopholes. In order to solve this problem, the party's organisational system and political system must be reformed.

This is the historical lesson left by the failure of the Cultural Revolution due to a coup in the Party. This is a more profound revolution than simply "overthrowing", a more profound form of class struggle, and a more profound implementation of "taking class struggle as the key link". Only when this revolution is done well can the Party's leadership, the formulation and implementation of the Party's line be firmly in the hands of all Communist Party members, and only then can the strength of the whole Party be used to prevent the Party from becoming revisionist and thus prevent the country from changing colour. Therefore, we will study and discuss this issue below.

#### **(4) The Party's organisational system must be reformed.**

The Party's organisational system is prescribed and established by the Party Constitution. Therefore, the reform of the Party's organisational system is in line with the revision of the Party Constitution.

In view of the painful historical fact that revisionism came to power and restored capitalism, the new Party Constitution must summarize the historical lessons left by this painful historical fact. In theory, not only should we summarize the correct positive experience, but also the correct negative historical lessons (for example, the lessons of the "October Six Coup" must be written into the Party Constitution to prevent future troubles); and in practice, we must find the correct solution.

The Party Congress is the highest authority of the Party and the highest leading body of the Party. New requirements should be put forward for its duties. For example, the Party Congress must fulfill an important and basic duty, which is to lead all Party members to regularly discuss and evaluate whether the line currently implemented by the Party is correct or wrong, whether it is Marxist-Leninist-Maoist or revisionist; and, through a vote of all Party members, make a final and authoritative evaluation of whether the line currently implemented by the Party is wrong or Marxist-Leninist-Maoist or revisionist. If the majority of Party members believe that the line currently implemented by the Party is revisionist, then the current leading body of the Party must immediately accept the dismissal, and immediately re-elect the leading body of the Party through the Party Congress and re-formulate the Party's line.

The basis for such considerations still comes from Chairman Mao's teachings. First, the line is a guideline, and the line determines and reflects the nature of the party. Whether to adhere to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism or not, whether to change or not, mainly depends on the line. Second, the final power to judge the nature of the party's line is placed in the hands of all party members; and based

on the judgment of whether the line is correct or not, the right to elect and dismiss the party's highest leading body is also placed in the hands of all party members.

This is actually based on summarising the experience and lessons of the Cultural Revolution, and implementing and guaranteeing the theory of "taking class struggle as the key link", line struggle as the key link, and opposing capitalist-roaders as the focus, that is, the theory of continuing socialist revolution, from the party's organisational system and political system.

Whether a party will become revisionist or not, the problem lies in the party's highest leading body, but the root cause is that the entire party has lost control and supervision over the party's highest leading body. Therefore, this problem must be solved from the party's organisational system.

The main manifestation of one-party dictatorship is the dictatorship of the Party's leading organs at all levels, from top to bottom, and in particular the dictatorship of the Party's leading cadres at all levels, right down to the Party's leaders. The Party's leading organs at all levels, the Party's leading cadres, and the Party's leaders are out of control and not under the supervision of the entire Party and its members, so that they have developed to the point where they are above the entire Party and its members. The key to reforming the Party's organisational and political systems is to put the Party's leading organs at all levels, its leading cadres and its leaders back under the control and supervision of the Party as a whole and of all its members. This requires new revisions and additions to the chapter on "Rights and Obligations of Party Members" in the Party Constitution, and corresponding provisions on the rights and obligations of Party members to achieve this requirement. For example: Party members must understand Chairman Mao's theory of continuing socialist revolution, understand the basic line of continuing socialist revolution under the guidance of this theory, and have the determination to dare to fight to defend this theory and this line. This includes that party members must fully realize that every party member has the right and obligation to supervise whether the party's leading bodies at all levels, especially the party's central leading bodies, adhere to and implement Chairman Mao's theory and line of continuing socialist revolution. In order to prevent this requirement from becoming empty talk, there should be corresponding institutional measures. For example, party member conferences should be held regularly, and party leading bodies at all levels, including the party's central leading bodies, should regularly report their work to party members and accept comments from party members, including criticism and fierce criticism; and this should be linked to the party's recall system. Learn from the past wrong practices of arbitrarily depriving party members of their democratic rights and personal freedom, and even arresting and imprisoning them on charges of "anti-party" and "anti-party group". The new "Party Constitution" must clearly state that the rights of party members are guaranteed, and it must also state that the highest punishment for party members within the party is expulsion from the party. If a party member violates the law, it should be handled by the legal organs, and it should not be confused with the party's organisational discipline.

Every party member has the sacred and inviolable right and obligation to prevent "the party from becoming revisionist and the country from changing colour". The new "Party Constitution" must absolutely guarantee this right and obligation from the party's organisational system.

From the perspective of historical lessons, the central link of the party's organisational construction is still how to prevent the central government from becoming revisionist, especially how to prevent the revisionist leaders from launching a coup and usurping power.

Lenin had this problem in mind and in his later years set up the Supervisory Committee at the Central Committee to prevent what seemed to him to be the most dangerous split in the Party. Chairman

Mao's launching of the Cultural Revolution and the formation of a new Central leadership on the basis of the Cultural Revolution were also based on the same consideration. However, as we can all see, both in the USSR and in China, coups d'état took place in the end, with the revisionist leaders coming to power, pursuing the revisionist line and restoring capitalism.

It can be seen that this is a problem that has not yet been solved, and it is not an easy problem to solve.

As with any problem, the first thing to do is to have a correct understanding of the problem, a correct theory and a correct way of thinking. On the contrary, I am afraid that this is where the mistakes were made in the past because the problem was not solved.

The lessons of history tell us that coups d'état and the rise to power of revisionism occurred because there was no effective democratic mechanism within the Party, and the Party Central Committee and the main leaders of the Party Central Committee were above the whole Party and completely out of the control and supervision of all Party members.

As we all know, the original meaning of democracy is that the people are the masters of their own house, and in connection with this, the most thorough form is direct democracy. With the development of society, especially with the development of science and technology, the possibility of practising direct democracy is growing, and the Party must find a way out in this regard.

The most important aspect of the embodiment of direct democracy is the right of all Party members to vote, to make decisions, to supervise and to recall. Whether through the Party Congress or the Party Congress, the Party elects, from the bottom up, the Party's leadership at all levels up to the leadership of the Party Central Committee; it formulates the Party's lines, guidelines and policies; and there is also a corresponding organisational system to ensure that the Party's members have the right to supervise and dismiss the leaders of the Party's organisations at all levels, in particular the leaders of the Party Central Committee.

The organisational system now actually in force is the exact opposite of this. Under this organisational system, all members of the Party are completely deprived of their right to vote, to make decisions, to supervise and to be dismissed; instead, it is the leading organs of the Party at all levels, through the organisational departments, that appoint leaders at all levels of the Party, and even the Central Committee of the Party is formed in this way; the formulation of routes, policies and guidelines is also shaped in this way; and the right of dismissal is held directly in the hands of the organisational departments. This organisational system, no matter what form it takes, is essentially the same, an authoritarian system divorced from the principle of democracy.

This is totally incompatible with the organisational principles of the Marxist Communist Party. It is not even as good as the democratic system of a bourgeois party. It is an even more retrogressive, and therefore even more reactionary, organisational system with a strong feudal character. This provides opportunities and possibilities for revisionist groups to stage counter-revolutionary coups to usurp the party and seize power.

Therefore, the power of the party congresses and party deputies must be absolutely guaranteed in the organisational system.

Based on such considerations, should not the Party's leading organs at all levels elected by the Party Congress, or the Party's Delegates' Congress, consider electing a number of committees with parallel powers that can check and balance each other. For example, should there not be both working committees and supervisory committees, as well as committees for finalising lines and policies, and so



on? The working committee is responsible for implementing the Party's line and policies. The Supervisory Committee is responsible for supervising the correct implementation of the Party's line and policies by the Working Committee. It also has the right to convene a Party member meeting or a Party congress, which reflects the supervisory power of the Supervisory Committee, which comes from the Party member meeting and the Party congress. The Line and Policy Committee is responsible for reviewing the Party's line and policies. These committees certainly need to have leaders, but first, they must be elected; second, there must be term limits; third, rotation can also be considered.

Regardless of the leadership position at any level, the term system is adopted. No more than two terms.

The right of recall must also be implemented through a certain organisational system. As Lenin said: "The right of recall is the real right of supervision. In all revolutionary periods in history, all amendments to the Constitution have been permeated with such a basic spirit: the demand for the right of recall. The Soviets were established by the workers themselves, and they established them with revolutionary perseverance and creative spirit. Only in this way can it be guaranteed that the Soviets work completely for the interests of the masses. Every peasant can elect representatives to participate in the Soviets and can also recall them. This is where the Soviets' true popular nature lies." (Lenin: "Report on the Right of Recall at the All-Russian Central Executive Committee Meeting", "Collected Works of Lenin", Volume 26, pp. 316-317.) Lenin's reasoning is of course also applicable to inner-party democracy.

Among these, the formation and supervision of the highest authority of the whole party and the formation and supervision of the party's line should be the most critical link, a step of decisive significance, and the general outline for solving the party's organisational system. If we grasp this general outline, it is possible to lead the entire party's organisational system to be correctly solved.

The soul of the Communist Party's organisational system is democracy. The foundation and implementation of democratic centralism come from democracy. The democratic system and the democratic centralism are synonymous. The democratic system itself contains centralisation, which is the original intention and significance of the democratic system. Understanding this principle is crucial to correctly understand the democratic system, especially the democratic centralism. If there is a wrong understanding of the democratic system and the democratic centralism, the most prominent manifestation is that democracy and centralisation are separated, which ultimately leads to the unification of centralisation and autocracy.

This is where the theory of one-party dictatorship fails. The Communist Party's organisational system must implement the principle of democratic centralism, but how to ensure the implementation of democratic centralism, rather than just empty talk as it has always been in the past, is a question we need to study seriously today.

As long as we use the thought method of historical materialism to think deeply, we will realise that political parties are the product of social development, they do not exist in isolation, and the level of development of the party is unified with the level of development of society. This is what we often see, whether there is a democratic system within the party is unified with whether there is a democratic system outside the party, that is, in the whole society. From this, we can get a regular understanding: if we want to truly and thoroughly solve the problem of the democratic system within the party, we must solve the problem of the democratic system in the whole society at the same time.

This is what everyone has seen. In order to solve the problem of one-party dictatorship, not only the party's organizational system must be reformed in accordance with the principle of democratic centralism, but also the entire country's political system must be reformed in accordance with the

principle of democratic centralism. This is an important significance of political system reform and the historical basis for putting political system reform on the agenda.

Next, we will discuss this issue.

#### **4. We must re-learn and study the political system of the proletarian dictatorship country**

Let's study this issue from the problems we actually face.

Why is it that "it is easy for people like Lin Biao to establish a capitalist system if they come to power"? Moreover, what about the worst kind of capitalism, which is the fascist bourgeois dictatorship? In December 1974, Chairman Mao asked the whole party and the people of the whole country, "Why did Lenin say that there should be a dictatorship over the bourgeoisie?"

This question must be clarified. If this question is not clarified, it will become revisionism. The whole country must know it." From then on, a movement to seriously study the theory of proletarian dictatorship was launched throughout the country.

This was a very important, timely and great theoretical study movement for the whole party and the people of the whole country to correctly understand the existence of classes and class struggle in socialist society, the possibility of revisionism coming to power and the danger and inevitability of capitalist restoration. Chairman Mao, with his ardent feelings for us working people, was afraid that we would "suffer twice and be punished twice" after he left, so he decided to hand over the theoretical weapon of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism for the continued socialist revolution to us so that we can use it to protect ourselves and liberate ourselves in the cruel class struggle that may occur in the future. We are all beneficiaries of this theoretical study movement. Therefore, it is possible for us to persist in the struggle against revisionism to this day.

We should be deeply grateful to Chairman Mao.

We should also realise that this is a great creation of Chairman Mao and we have the responsibility to inherit this great creation.

Chairman Mao spent nearly a year in the south at that time, conducting research and theoretical thinking, spending more than 100 days in Changsha alone. Inheriting Marx and Lenin's theoretical ideas on the necessity of continued revolution in socialist society and combining them with the realities of our country in all aspects of economy, politics, class and society, and especially summing up the experience and lessons of the Cultural Revolution, Chairman Mao, in the last two years of his life, further put forward a series of important theoretical views on class and class struggle in socialist society, further completing and systematising the Maoist theory of continued revolution in socialist society. History has already verified that these new contributions and developments made by Chairman Mao to the theory of continued socialist revolution are in line with reality and entirely correct.

##### **(i) Why is it easy for 'Lin Biao and his kind to come to power and set up a capitalist system' and why will they set up the worst capitalist system?**

Taking into account Chairman Mao's relevant discussions, we can understand why Chairman Mao said 'it would be easy' and why he said 'the worst' ('Hitler is worse than de Gaulle').

Because there is a potentially large majority of class forces and political forces within the Communist Party that do not understand Marxism-Leninism, only understand privileged interests, and represent the bourgeoisie. Once the revisionist leaders and capitalist-roaders steal the leadership of the party and the country, that is, steal the political power, the so-called "power holders" who hold the leadership at all levels, that is, the political power at all levels, will become the dominant class force that "easily" implements the revisionist line and restores capitalism.

Especially because many people had been attacked and even "overthrown" during the Cultural Revolution, it is natural and inevitable that they would now counterattack the proletariat and socialism with ten times more hatred and a hundred times more madness, and naturally and inevitably wantonly restore capitalism. Moreover, they must first deny and overthrow Chairman Mao with hatred. The infamous 4,000-person conference and the subsequent "resolution"<sup>61</sup> are representative works of this emotional outburst. This proved with their actual actions that they were acting as a class - the bourgeoisie, and proved that Chairman Mao's statement that they were the bourgeoisie within the party was not an injustice to them, nor was it an exaggeration, but rather a statement of the truth that was completely in line with reality.

At the same time, the limitations of our socialist system are also at work. In his 'theoretical instructions', Chairman Mao highlighted some of the inevitable limitations of our economic system. At a meeting with the Prime Minister of Denmark, Paul Hartling, on 20 October 1974, Chairman Mao said: 'All in all, China is a socialist country. Before liberation it was more or less like capitalism. There is still an eight-tier wage system, distribution according to labour and exchange of money, which are not much different from the old society. The difference is that the system of ownership has changed.' On December 26, Chairman Mao invited Premier Zhou to Changsha for a long private talk. In addition to the issue of convening the Fourth National People's Congress and its personnel arrangements, another aspect of the discussion was theoretical issues. Chairman Mao said: "Our country is now implementing a commodity system, and the wage system is also unequal, with an eight-level wage system, etc. This can only be restricted under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Therefore, if Lin Biao and his kind come to power, it will be easy to establish a capitalist system. Therefore, you should read more books on Marxism-Leninism." (The above quotations are all from the People's Daily on February 22, 1975) Chairman Mao's remarks were called "Important Instructions on the Theoretical Issues of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat" at the time.

It is precisely because Chairman Mao saw that our economic system still inevitably had these limitations, and these limitations in Chairman Mao's view were "not much different from the old society. The only difference is that the ownership system has changed." "Therefore, if Lin Biao and his ilk came to power, it would be easy to establish a capitalist system."

The fact that capitalism was restored later tells us that, as far as state-owned enterprises are concerned, it was "very easy" to transform from a socialist state-owned economy to a bureaucratic monopoly capitalist economy without undergoing fundamental changes in form. In the sense of capitalist restoration, "the only difference is that the ownership system has changed" happened again.

Chairman Mao also said: "Lenin said, 'Small production is constantly, daily, spontaneously and in large numbers producing capitalism and the bourgeoisie.'" History has also proved that Lenin's idea emphasized by Chairman Mao was completely correct. Later, the "household contract responsibility system"<sup>62</sup> was used to destroy the rural collective ownership economy, which was actually to use the

---

<sup>61</sup> In September 1980, the Political Bureau of the CPC Central Committee decided to organise the discussion of the draft historical resolution ("Resolution on Several Issues in the Party's History Since the Founding of the People's Republic of China") among 4,000 senior cadres of the whole party. The discussion took over a month and was fundamental to Deng Xiaoping's attacks on Chairman Mao's legacy – Trans.

<sup>62</sup> The household contract responsibility system essentially dismantled collective farming by making individual farmers into independent production units. Farmers contract the collective basic means of production (mainly land) for self-management, and pay various fees due to the state and the collective, and the rest of the products or income belong to the contracting households. This system was first implemented briefly in Shandong and other places in 1962, but was vigorously promoted only after Deng Xiaoping seized power following Mao's death. Deng alleged that it arose from initiatives taken by the peasants of Xiaogang Village, but

spontaneous capitalist tendency of small production represented by Xiaogang Village to negate the direction of socialist development. And this process of restoring the capitalist system was also "very easy" to complete, which also made Chairman Mao accurate. He even said it as early as 1962 when he firmly resisted and resolutely opposed Chen Yun's proposal, supported by leaders such as Liu Shaoqi, Deng Xiaoping, and Deng Zihui, to abandon collective ownership and divide the land to work individually.

Chairman Mao has repeatedly stressed that China is a country with small production and a vast sea of petty bourgeoisie. Such national conditions are difficulties that cannot be avoided in building socialism. It is not accidental that the Xiaogang Village Road can emerge and work throughout the country. Looking at the fact that most of the corrupt officials caught now come from poor peasant families, it is easier to understand that Lenin and Chairman Mao repeatedly stressed that the spontaneous capitalist tendency of small production will pose a very dangerous threat to socialism, which is completely in line with reality. Regarding this historical phenomenon that did not happen by chance, I once wrote an article entitled "Peasant's Children Become the Reserve Army of the Bourgeoisie".

Chairman Mao also pointed out that "capitalist and bourgeois phenomena are emerging" and that "this situation also exists among a part of the working class and a part of the party members. Among the proletariat and among the staff of government agencies, bourgeois lifestyles are emerging." This is also a truth verified by history.

There is no doubt that these are the social reasons and social foundations for "making it easy to establish a capitalist system." The rampant corruption among the bureaucratic class not only proves that Chairman Mao's foresight is correct, but that the situation was also far more serious, terrible, and ugly than Chairman Mao estimated.

This is a fact that everyone has seen. Not only is it "very easy" to restore capitalism, but the capitalist society that is restored is also the "worst" capitalist society under the dictatorship of the fascist bourgeoisie.

Chairman Mao, based on the fact that revisionism occurred in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe and China's national and party conditions, accurately predicted that if revisionism came to power and restored capitalism, politically speaking, it would inevitably lead to the dictatorship of the fascist bourgeoisie. In Chairman Mao's view, this capitalist society under the dictatorship of the fascist bourgeoisie is worse than the capitalist society under the bourgeois democratic republic, so he used the figurative statement "Hitler is worse than de Gaulle".

Why does a socialist country become a capitalist society under the dictatorship of the fascist bourgeoisie once it becomes revisionist? What is the internal reason for this transformation?

Chairman Mao said "Hitler is worse than de Gaulle" after careful consideration. He had thought about this issue and talked about it repeatedly. Some people who were close to Chairman Mao and heard Chairman Mao talk about this issue have memories that can be used as reference. Because there is no official record of the text, it is not easy to discuss the issue here as the basis of Chairman Mao's thoughts. We can only rely on officially published reliable documents. One fact is clear: Chairman Mao has always been concerned about the principle of democratic centralism that must be implemented in the political life of the party and the country. In 1962, the "Seven Thousand People Conference"

---

it had long been his plan for dismantling the People's Communes and the spread of capitalism in the countryside – Trans.

focused on this issue.<sup>63</sup> During the Cultural Revolution, when inspecting the country, the reasons why some cadres were criticized were also explained by the cadres' lack of democracy towards the masses and their love of scolding people at every turn. When Chairman Mao led several scholars to read the Soviet Union's "Political Economics Textbook", he also emphasized that the most important and fundamental right of the people is the right to manage the country, and even advocated that when the people are dissatisfied, they can practice "great democracy". Chairman Mao clearly stated in his Speech at the Second Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee of the Communist Party of China in 1956: "The great democracy launched by the proletariat is to deal with class enemies." "Great democracy can also be used to deal with bureaucrats. As I said just now, there will be revolutions ten thousand years from now, and it will still be possible to carry out great democracy at that time. If some people are tired of living and engage in bureaucracy, and never say a good word to the masses but only curse them, and do not solve the problems of the masses, then they must be overthrown. Now, this danger exists. If we are separated from the masses and do not solve the problems of the masses, the peasants will beat their carrying poles, the workers will take to the streets to demonstrate, and the students will cause trouble. Whenever such things happen, the first thing to do is to say that they are good things. This is how I see it." (Selected Works of Mao Zedong, Volume 5, pp. 324-325) The reason why Chairman Mao repeatedly and extensively talked about this issue is because bureaucracy and undemocracy exist in the actual political life of our party and country.

It is precisely because of this problem that Chairman Mao saw that if "the party becomes revisionist, and the country changes colour", then the revisionist party will inevitably establish a fascist bourgeois dictatorship; and if the country changes colour, it will inevitably become a bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalist society that is worse than the bourgeois democratic republic capitalist society. Chairman Mao used this theory to deeply criticise the social nature of the Soviet party and state after they became revisionist, which has been proven by the history of the transformation of the Soviet revisionists and Eastern European countries; and China's transformation after more than 40 years of restoration of capitalism is another supplementary verification of Chairman Mao's theory.

Today, we have raised the severity of this problem to the level of "one-party dictatorship" or even "one-party autocracy", which is a bridge that will inevitably transform revisionism into fascist bourgeois dictatorship after it comes to power.

Lenin saw and emphasized that the inherent weaknesses brought about by the backward national conditions determined that it was very difficult to carry out the socialist revolution to the end, and especially saw that the shortcomings and lags in the political system would bring great danger to the socialist cause. In his later years, he even issued such a warning: "If we do not carry out a systematic and tenacious struggle to improve the state organs, we will certainly perish before the foundation of socialism is established." (Lenin: "Outline of a Book on Grain Tax", "Collected Works of Lenin", Volume 32, Page 311.) Lenin and Chairman Mao were completely consistent in their concerns about the danger of socialism failing. In his "Instructions on the Socialist Education Movement," Chairman Mao used almost the same language as Lenin to explain from China's social foundation how serious the problem would be if capitalism were to be restored, and thus issued a heavy warning to us: "Comrades, please

---

<sup>63</sup> The enlarged Central Work Conference was held in Beijing from January 11 to February 7, 1962. More than 7,000 people attended the meeting, including responsible cadres from various central departments, central bureaus, party committees of all provinces, municipalities, and autonomous regions, as well as prefectural and county party committees, important industrial and mining enterprises, and military units. The main purpose of this congress was to sum up experience, unify understanding, and strengthen democratic centralism within the party, so as to further correct the mistakes made in the work since the Great Leap Forward and implement the principle of readjusting the national economy -Trans.



think about this, what a dangerous situation this is." Unfortunately, we lack such a profound sense of history. We basically do not understand the warnings issued by the two revolutionary mentors and the profound historical laws contained in these warnings, and we are basically in a state of blindness.

The fact of capitalist restoration has verified the foresight of Lenin and Chairman Mao. We can therefore more deeply understand that the so-called "worst" is not just a problem of fascist bourgeois dictatorship, but under the strong control of fascist bourgeois dictatorship, the entire society, from top to bottom, has all gone backwards and corrupted, not to mention the bourgeois materialism, even all the dregs and garbage left by the imperial despotism for thousands of years have been revived in various ways, corroding people's souls and polluting everything in society. Just as people often say now: "We returned to the pre-Liberation era overnight", and it is even worse than before Liberation.

Now, such facts can be seen everywhere in China. It shows people a backward, reactionary, and "worst" bureaucratic, autocratic, and monopolistic capitalist society with extremely ignorant and ugly performances. It is ridiculous and sad that the "Yi Zun"<sup>64</sup> who knows nothing about Chinese traditional culture has recently been on a whim and is clamouring for such regression and restoration with his own ignorance and fearlessness. He also wants to link it with Marxism and show off that this is the so-called "second combination" of "Marxism and Chinese traditional culture" and a major feature of "socialism with Chinese characteristics." This is pure bullshit.

All revolutionary mentors have repeatedly stressed that Marxism must always be combined with reality, and that "reality" always includes historical traditions. The correct understanding of "combination" should be that under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, starting from the reality of practical things, including the historical traditions contained in the reality of practical things, the existing society should be transformed through revolutionary movements, and in accordance with the direction and requirements of historical development, the new social system should defeat the old social system, including the new advanced ideology and culture defeating the old and backward ideology and culture. This is the correct understanding of "combination" in Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

The combination with traditional culture is by no means an uncritical and selective patchwork. There are two kinds of 'combination': a revolutionary and critical combination, and a restorative and retrogressive combination. The union of "Yi Zun" is precisely a union of restoration and regression. The reason is that the 'combination' of "Yi Zun" is all about Confucianism and its ideology and culture, which have been hindering the advancement of Chinese history, and which have been criticised and fought against by advanced Chinese since the May Fourth Movement, and which have been in the service of imperialism and authoritarianism. We have already seen several such historical farces, and now, in the 21st century, "Yi Zun" has gone so far as to renovate the 'combination' of 'Marx and Confucius'. "Yi Zun" really knows how to play jokes with history, and he is playing the 'worst' and lamest jokes of all.

Understanding Chairman Mao's profound thought that 'Hitler is worse than de Gaulle' is an important part of understanding the Maoist theory of continued socialist revolution. The 'worst' is not only the phenomenon, but also the substance. What is happening in China now can only be explained by 'the worst'. It is only through this understanding of the serious harm that the rise to power of revisionism and the restoration of capitalism have brought to our country and society that we can understand more deeply and accurately that 'the worst of capitalism' is a realistic theoretical understanding, and that it is the theoretical as well as the practical basis for the need to carry out a socialist re-revolution.

---

<sup>64</sup> i.e. Xi Jinping – Trans.

We cannot but acknowledge the greatness of Lenin and Chairman Mao. In a backward country, once revisionism comes to power and capitalism is restored, it is not only 'easy', but also 'the worst', and as a result, the people of our country are tossed around to the point where they can hardly live on. Moreover, because of the backwardness of the country, it is 'not easy' to launch a socialist revolution. Chairman Mao overestimated the people he led, educated, and loved; and apart from reminiscing and lamenting, they failed to fulfil Chairman Mao's repeated exhortation to revolt! As I write this, what else can I say but to feel ashamed?

**(ii) The 'change in the party' is the leading cause of the 'national colour change'.**

If we further explore the historical reasons that led to the 'easy' restoration of a 'worst' capitalist society, we can see more deeply that the main responsibility for this metamorphosis lies with the ruling Communist Party.

The so-called representatives of the bourgeoisie, revisionist leaders, and capitalist-roaders all come from the Communist Party; the newly born bourgeoisie in power comes from the Communist Party; the revisionist line that guides the restoration of capitalism comes from the Communist Party; the so-called "Lin Biao and others coming to power" and the revisionists coming to power are caused by the Communist Party; the so-called "leadership is political power" means that the leadership of the Communist Party is political power, and naturally it also comes from the Communist Party; as the saying goes: "When the party becomes revisionist, the country changes colour", this can be regarded as a simple and clear theoretical summary, which means: the country changes colour because the party becomes revisionist, which bluntly says that the problem lies with the Communist Party.

This is how the historical facts unfolded. From Khrushchev to Deng Xiaoping, the problem of capitalist-roaders usurping the party and seizing power occurred within the Communist Party, so there was "the party becoming revisionist" and then "the country changing colour".

If we ask further, why is it inevitable that the problem of "very easy" to establish a capitalist system, and the worst capitalist system, will arise when the Communist Party, which "leads everything", has problems?

Undoubtedly, this is a cruel historical fact that we have experienced from the Soviet Union to China. Not daring to face and admit this historical fact is a manifestation of political weakness. The historical issue left now is how to correctly understand this issue.

Combined with the historical phenomenon that it is "very easy" for people like Lin Biao to come to power and restore the capitalist system, which we talked about above, there are at least two major historical reasons, which we can see very clearly.

One is the problem of the ruling Communist Party itself. It would be "very easy" for a revisionist leader like Lin Biao to come to power and "very easy" for the party to quickly turn into a revisionist party. Moreover, the party itself has neither the ability to resist a revisionist leader like Lin Biao coming to power nor the ability to resist the party's rapid transformation into a revisionist party. Therefore, it is inevitable that "it will be easy to establish a capitalist system."

This is true from the Soviet Party to the Eastern European Parties to the Chinese Party. Even with Chairman Mao and his theory of continuing the socialist revolution, and even with the Cultural Revolution, the Chinese Communist Party could not be stopped from becoming revisionist, and could not be stopped from restoring capitalism in China, and even from the worst kind of fascist bourgeois dictatorship, bureaucratic autocracy and monopoly capitalism. All these reactionary and perverse

actions were carried out "very easily" and smoothly. It seems incredible. However, this is inevitable, that is, it is a law, but we have not yet been able to correctly and fully recognise this law.

If we look at the problem from the perspective of the whole society and the masses, then, whether the masses like it or not, they have no right to supervise the ruling party, let alone the right to choose the social system, because there is no political system or political structure that protects the people's democratic rights and is compatible with the dictatorship of the proletariat. Power is concentrated in the hands of the ruling Communist Party, a one-party dictatorship, and as long as the leadership of the Communist Party is in control, it is equivalent to controlling the state power, and it can use the tools of dictatorship to "easily" forcibly restore everything in the capitalist system.

Under this system, the masses are called "bums" and "low-end population", which is an accurate description of the actual political situation and class relations, not because the people who say this are so bad. However, it is precisely this political situation and class relations that determine that the masses cannot resist the restoration of capitalism. This is the historical law that if "the party changes to revisionism", it will inevitably lead to "the country changes colour".

**(iii) It is necessary to further understand the historical reasons why the party's change of course will bring about the country's change of colour.**

Historical facts tell us that such a generalisation can be made:

In terms of the Communist Party itself, the failure to solve the problem of the Party's becoming revisionist, and the failure to solve the problem of how the Party can resist becoming revisionist, is linked to the failure to solve the Party's own political system.

From the perspective of the state, the political system of the proletarian dictatorship that should be coordinated with the state system of the proletarian dictatorship has not been properly resolved. The political system of the proletarian dictatorship has not only failed to play the role of consolidating the proletarian dictatorship and preventing the revisionist party from usurping the proletarian dictatorship regime, but has instead transformed the political system of the proletarian dictatorship into a political system in which the party and the state are one, and the proletarian dictatorship has been transformed into a one-party dictatorship and a one-party dictatorship of the revisionist party that has become revisionist and practices fascist bourgeois dictatorship. The party is above the state and the people, and the party replaces the government and the state. Instead of the people authorising the party and supervising the party, it has degenerated into the party's dictatorship over the people. Lin Biao's statement that 'leadership is power' is a theoretical encapsulation of the fact that this runs counter to the dictatorship of the proletariat.

It can be seen that, whether we look at it from the point of view of the Communist Party's own degeneration or from the point of view of the Communist Party's degeneration inevitably leading to the country's discolouration, the shortcomings of the political system, the political system that runs counter to the Marxist theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat, are a major cause with regularity.

If we look at the problem from the perspective of the Marxist theory of social formation, the substance of the problem and its seriousness may be more likely to attract our attention.

The social form indicates the historical level reached by a society. If socialism is superior to capitalism, it must be manifested in the social form. However, as we all see and admit, the problems in the political system of socialist countries that lead to "the party becoming revisionist and the country changing colour" are not only not the social form required by Marxist scientific socialism, but are even more backward than the social form of bourgeois democratic republics. In this case, not only can the

superiority of socialist society not be reflected, but there is also the danger that socialism will inevitably degenerate into capitalism, and the worst type of capitalism.

Lenin saw and foresaw the existence and danger of this problem, and the seriousness of the bureaucracy within the Party. He tried to prevent the Party from splitting and, in particular, from degenerating by establishing a supervisory body at the Central Committee. He wanted to protect the stability of the dictatorship of the proletariat by innovating and building the political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Although Stalin did not further inherit and develop Lenin's theory that classes and class struggle still exist in socialist society, from the "political report" he made at the last party congress before his death, he had already seen the severity and danger of bureaucracy in the party. However, he did not analyse the root causes of these problems from the point of view of the Party's political system and the country's political system, and still insisted on the 'one-party dictatorship' and 'one-party dictatorship' which he had once criticised and denied, but which has now actually taken place, and which inevitably led to revisionism. As a result, the tragedy of revisionism coming to power and the socialist state degenerating into a bureaucratic dictatorship and privileged state inevitably occurred.

Chairman Mao encountered the same difficulties. From "On New Democracy" to "On the Coalition Government" and "On the People's Democratic Dictatorship"; from the "Cave Pair"<sup>65</sup> in Yan'an to the "'54 Constitution"<sup>66</sup> after the victory of the revolution, the establishment of the National People's Congress and the CPPCC system, and the implementation of the multi-party "long-term coexistence and mutual supervision" system; from the "Poor and Lower-Middle Peasants Committee" in the rural "Four Cleanups Movement" to the Cultural Revolution Movement, when the broad revolutionary masses could freely organize various forms of "combat teams" to participate in political struggles, and the establishment of the "three-in-one" revolutionary committee on the basis of the great unity of the proletarian revolutionaries and the seizure of power from the capitalist-roaders; from "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People" in 1957 to "Speech at the Conference of 7,000 Cadres" in 1962, as well as a large number of speeches and instructions on how the most fundamental right of the people is the right to manage the country, the need to constantly improve the relationship between the Party and the people, and opposition to Party members and cadres being officials and masters, etc., all of these are aimed at answering how to realise the dictatorship of the proletariat, how to establish a new form of political system that meets the requirements of the dictatorship of the proletariat, so as to prevent "the Party from changing to a revisionist nature and the country from changing its colour", and to ensure the transition from an incomplete socialist society to a complete socialist society and then to a communist society (this is a theory proposed and repeatedly emphasised by Lenin).

All of this is actually Mao Zedong Thought's exploration of the theory and practice of the political system of the proletarian dictatorship or the people's democratic dictatorship under socialist conditions. However, with the death of Chairman Mao, this exploration was interrupted. The political

---

<sup>65</sup> The "cave pair" refers to a conversation about democratic China between Mao Zedong and Huang Yanpei in the cave living room of Mao Zedong's residence in Yan'an in July 1945. Asked by Huang Yanpei how to change the law of the dynastic cycle, according to which a dynasty existed until it lost the mandate of Heaven and was replaced by a new dynasty, Mao Zedong said, "We have found a new way, and we can jump out of this cyclical law. This new path is democracy. Only by letting the people supervise the government will the government dare not relax. Only when everyone stands up and is responsible will there be no 'death' of the new regime" – Trans.

<sup>66</sup> The 1954 Constitution of the People's Republic of China, referred to as the '54 Constitution, is the first constitution of the People's Republic of China. It was adopted at the first session of the First National People's Congress on September 20, 1954 - Trans.

system reform proposed later can also be said to be an inevitable reflection of this historical requirement in people's cognition in a certain sense. However, under the rule of revisionism, it is inevitable to establish a fascist bourgeois dictatorship. Therefore, not only did the political system reform not take place afterwards, but it also regressed step by step. Today, it has even openly restored the ancient "one-man rule" imperial autocratic political system.

**(iv) The core of the political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat is proletarian democracy.**

Lenin once profoundly pointed out a basic principle of Marxism: the dictatorship of the proletariat and proletarian democracy are synonymous.

This is very correct and is also very important for us to correctly understand the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The reason is very clear. The so-called proletarian democracy means that the proletariat and the broad masses of working people are the masters of the country, which is of course the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is correct to say "synonymous".

Some of our comrades often have insufficient understanding of the significance of proletarian democracy.

They often fail to see that the form of the democratic system and the essence of the democratic system are unified. For example, the Constitution stipulates that citizens have the right to "freedom of speech". From the perspective of the system, this seems to be just to ensure that citizens have the right to freedom of speech, as if the significance of the democratic system is only this; in fact, this is not the case. The essence of this democratic right reflects the dictatorship of the proletariat. In other words, whether the proletariat and the broad masses of working people have freedom of speech actually reflects whether there is a dictatorship of the proletariat.

We must clarify this point in theory. We must never underestimate proletarian democracy. It is the same mistake to underestimate proletarian democracy and deny the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Chairman Mao repeatedly stressed that the most fundamental right of the working people is the right to manage the country. This idea is completely consistent with Lenin's idea. The working people directly manage the country, which is both the implementation of proletarian democracy and the implementation of proletarian dictatorship. It can be seen that the essence of the political system of proletarian dictatorship is to ensure the implementation of proletarian democracy, and the core is to implement proletarian democracy. This is synonymous and unified with the need to ensure the implementation of proletarian dictatorship.

The implementation of proletarian democracy requires systems and institutions, which is nothing more than to implement and guarantee the implementation of proletarian democracy, that is, to implement and guarantee the implementation of proletarian dictatorship. This is the inevitable requirement and inevitable relationship of the unity of the political system and the essence of the state system.

Many people do not understand the importance of the democratic system. They always say, "The system is dead, but people are alive." They always criticise the so-called "system omnipotence theory" in an exaggerated way. In fact, no one says that the system is omnipotent, but they simply do not understand and naturally do not attach importance to the role of the system. In their superficial

understanding, they always think that the system is useless because people can destroy the system, and as a result, they slide into the "system is useless theory."

We have never denied, and we attach great importance to the fact that the fate of the democratic system is consistent with the level of people's understanding and grasp of the democratic system. This is a fact that must be seen in adhering to the viewpoint of historical materialism.

However, it is precisely from the perspective of historical materialism, from the conditions of the times, and especially from the conditions and level of the people's creation of history, that the kind of democratic system to be established will still play an important role in this day and age. For example, East and West Germany in the past and North and South Korea in the present, including mainland China and Taiwan, are one people and one country, but there are two different social systems, which the people have accepted without being able to arbitrarily 'live' and change the existing system. . This shows that the system can play a relatively stable role in regulating people's real life. For example, since the independence of the United States, it has established a bourgeois democratic republic system. There has been no coup d'état for more than 200 years, no Hitler phenomenon, and the bourgeois democratic system has not been destroyed. Obviously this is not accidental. For another example, a more realistic and sharper example is the reality we face ourselves. It is obviously a fascist dictatorship system that does not conform to the principles of socialism. All rights of the people have been completely deprived. However, this has not changed because "people are alive". On the contrary, most people obey this system, and a few people are willing to act as thugs of this system. Even small urban management dares to do whatever they want. This is the most thorough denial of "systems are dead, people are alive". Human society is a society of huge groups. In order for society to function normally, there must be systems. I often cite the traffic rules of "go when the light is green, stop when the light is red, and wait when the light is yellow". Some people may not follow traffic rules, but this does not mean that "traffic rules are dead, people are alive" and therefore traffic rules are unnecessary. The same is true for the need for social systems. Therefore, the role of systems cannot be underestimated, let alone denied. Systems are the concrete manifestation of content and substance.

The state system of proletarian dictatorship is the essence, which needs the guarantee of the political system of proletarian dictatorship. Moreover, the positive and negative experiences and lessons left by the successful and failed practices of the socialist revolution have proved that the construction of the political system of the socialist society is a very important historical issue that is directly related to the fate of the proletarian dictatorship and must be seriously resolved.

Not only political relations need to be guaranteed by political systems; economic relations also need to be guaranteed by economic systems. We often say that we must uphold socialist public ownership, which means we must uphold the socialist economic system of public ownership of the means of production. No one would say that because "systems are dead, people are alive", there is no need for the socialist public ownership system. Even when talking about socialist revolution, it is always emphasised that after the socialist revolution, after seizing power, a socialist social system must be established. No one would say that because "systems are dead, people are alive", there is no need to establish the system of socialist society. The socialist constitution is the highest law of the essence of socialism, that is, the highest and greatest system. The system is nothing more than the legal form of certain class relations, including political, economic, ideological and cultural relations. Without the corresponding system, it is impossible to establish and guarantee the existence and operation of the corresponding class relations, including political, economic, ideological and cultural relations.

Historical experience and lessons tell us that it is not accidental that the emergence of "one-party dictatorship" and "one-party despotism" in socialist countries, which eventually led to the rise of



revisionism and "easy" to establish the "worst" capitalist system, is not accidental. An important and even fundamental reason for this is that there are defects and drawbacks in the construction of the country's political system and political structure that are inconsistent with the Marxist scientific socialist theory and the requirements of the proletarian dictatorship and proletarian democracy.

Some defects and drawbacks can even be said to be more backward than the political principles and forms created by the Paris Commune more than a hundred years ago, or even more backward than the political principles and forms of the bourgeois democratic republic; these defects and drawbacks are not the political system that the dictatorship of the proletariat should have, but the political system of bourgeois autocracy with feudal characteristics, and its inevitable result is revisionism, the restoration of capitalism, and the worst capitalist restoration of the fascist bourgeois dictatorship. This lesson is painful. Because this lesson means that the working people have to "suffer twice and be punished twice"<sup>67</sup>. This is how history actually came to pass in a painful way.

**(v) Follow historical materialism and look for historical inevitability and regularity.**

Why have we come to this point? And, why have almost all socialist countries come to this point?

In terms of the underlying social foundations, it is still important to adhere to Lenin's view that the difficulties encountered in building the institutions of a socialist society from a country with a relatively backward foundation are naturally very great.

Because the old social formations that were overthrown were backward, and this meant that not only the economy was backward, but also politics, ideology and culture, and in particular the condition of the people, including the working masses, and even the party members, were backward, and this could not provide the historical conditions needed for the construction of a more complete socialist social system.

Chairman Mao has been criticizing the existence of the "three, six, nine" hierarchical system<sup>68</sup> and the corresponding hierarchical concept in our party and country since the 1950s; however, Chairman Mao was unable to solve this problem. Because China's national conditions determine that, first, there is great resistance in the party, and people are proud of their own achievements and reward according to their merits. The old ideas such as "conquer the country and rule the country" have a wide influence; second, under the condition that "there are not many people in our party who really understand Marxism-Leninism", it is quite difficult to establish a political system of proletarian dictatorship that

---

<sup>67</sup> The original Chinese expression was a little difficult for me to understand, but I found this comment on a Chinese website from September 2017: "Suffering twice and being punished twice" is what we, the post-60s generation, often wrote in our essays when we were in school. The background at that time was to criticize Lin Biao and Confucius, and later it was to fight back against the rightist trend of reversing verdicts and criticize the capitalist-roaders, all of which were about class struggle. The general meaning of the whole sentence is: If their conspiracy to restore the old order succeeds, we, the poor and lower-middle peasants (or the working class), will suffer twice and be punished twice. These two times of suffering and two crimes refer to the old society, which means that if we follow their line, the working class and peasant class will return to the dark old society and be treated like slaves. We were born in the new society and have no idea what the old society was like, how deep the suffering was, and what kind of punishment we suffered? Today, when we talk about "suffering twice and being punished twice", we feel that this sentence at that time was quite effective and reasonable. Isn't it the case now? Thirty years in the east, thirty years in the west, the workers and peasants who have been liberated are now oppressed again – Trans.

<sup>68</sup> The original Chinese wording comes from the famous 18th Century novel *A Dream of Red Mansions*, and means that there are many ranks and categories, and there are various differences between people – Trans.

conforms to Marxism-Leninism. The reason is simple. If you don't understand it, you won't do it. Therefore, "walking into the wrong room" is completely understandable.

Here again, historical necessity plays a decisive role, and the necessity lies in the backwardness of the national situation which Lenin emphasised. Even today we are still confronted with such difficulties, and one has only to look at the confusion in our understanding of the form of the dictatorship of the proletariat not to recognise this reality. Issues that would not even be a problem in the developed capitalist countries are a problem for us in understanding the political system of socialist society. Moreover, the arguments are made in a righteous manner, confident not only that the truth is at hand, but also that the defence of Marxism is a determined class struggle against bourgeois ideas. This is a crying historical irony. These people actually misunderstand feudal imperial despotism as the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is still one historical stage behind the bourgeois idea of democracy.

However, this is a living reality, a reality that contains profound historical inevitability. In the following, we will give a few examples to make some serious criticisms in good faith against some misunderstandings and prejudices.

This issue is a historical subject that has been practised and studied from Marx and Engels, through Lenin and Stalin, to Chairman Mao. From Marxism, through Leninism, to Maoism, in order to answer this historical question, they have all made serious theoretical and practical discussions, among which the ideological and theoretical wealth left behind by Maoism is particularly rich. I have written a book entitled 'The Theory of Socialism with Chinese Characteristics', which is a study of the inevitability and regularity of the emergence of 'capitalism with Chinese characteristics' in China on the basis of the basic theories of Maoism.

#### **(vi) Criticise several common misunderstandings and prejudices.**

Over a long period of time, even up to the present time, we have not learnt enough about the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist theories on the construction of the proletarian state apparatus, let alone studied them seriously and in depth; on the contrary, misunderstandings and misinterpretations have occurred from time to time, and under these circumstances we naturally have not been able to carry on the invaluable theoretical heritage left behind by our revolutionary mentors in a good way.

For a long time, some people have had serious prejudices against bourgeois democratic republics.

We often only remember what the revolutionary mentor taught: "The most democratic bourgeois republic has always been and cannot be anything but a machine for capital to suppress workers, a tool of capitalist regime, and a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The bourgeois democratic republic promises and declares that power belongs to the majority, but as long as private ownership of land and other means of production exists, it cannot realize this power." (Lenin: *The Third International and Its Place in History* (April 15, 1919), *Selected Works of Lenin, Volume 3*, page 814, People's Publishing House, 1972 edition.) This is of course completely correct and is also a Marxist principle that we must keep in mind.

However, if we forget or reject other teachings of the revolutionary mentors, then our understanding will turn from correct to wrong.

This is mainly manifested in the lack of correct understanding of the historical status and historical value of the bourgeois democratic republic, and the failure to see the reference significance of the bourgeois democratic republic for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Engels once said, and Lenin reiterated in *The State and Revolution*: the bourgeois democratic republic is even a special form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. In his letter to Paul Lafargue, Engels also clearly stated: "For the proletariat, the difference between the republic and the monarchy is only that the republic is a ready-made (emphasis added by Engels) political form for the future rule of the proletariat. Your advantage over us is that you already have it; while we need to spend 24 hours to establish it. However, like any other form of government, the republic depends on its content. When it is still a form of bourgeois rule, it is as hostile to us as any monarchy (leaving aside the form of hostility). Therefore, it is an unfounded fantasy to regard it as an essentially socialist form, or to entrust it with the socialist mission when it is still controlled by the bourgeoisie." (Collected Works of Marx and Engels, Volume 39, Pages 209-210.) This is a letter written by Engels on March 6, 1894. It is the very mature thought of this revolutionary mentor in his later years, and is completely consistent with the thought in "Critique of the Draft Program of the Social Democratic Labor Party in 1891" written in 1891.

There are two points that deserve our special attention today. The bourgeois democratic republic, even the most developed bourgeois democratic republic, is a form of political rule of the bourgeoisie, not of the proletariat, in terms of its content and class essence. This is a basic principle. Generally speaking, Maoist comrades are clear about this. It is completely correct and necessary to adhere to this principle.

However, the fact that the republic is a "ready-made political form for ruling" that the proletariat can use is often ignored by some comrades, and even denied and rejected by many comrades.

The "government form" that Engels talked about is actually the political system that we often talk about now, that is, the form of government. It should be noted that this was the opinion of the revolutionary mentor 20 years after the Paris Commune. This is quite important. This certainly does not mean denying the great significance of the Paris Commune as a form of proletarian dictatorship; however, it must be seen that even under the condition of adhering to the principles of the Paris Commune, the democratic republic is still a form of government that the proletarian dictatorship can inherit, use and develop, that is, a form of government.

This point has very important practical significance today.

We only need to look at the revisionist rulers, who always deny that the bourgeois democratic republic as a form of government still has its practical value and is still a "ready-made" political system that can be used by the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is enough to make us clearly realise that the teachings of the revolutionary mentors are not outdated.

The reason is very simple. The political system of a democratic republic is completely opposite to the autocratic political system of the revisionist party's "one-party dictatorship". They are not at the same level or stage of historical development. The autocratic political system is a whole historical stage behind the democratic republic. From a historical perspective, this is an outdated and reactionary political system. And it is precisely on this issue that we can see that the autocratic rule of "one person in power" is combined and unified with the traditional Chinese imperial despotism. The so-called "two combinations" (the combination of Marxism and the reality of the Chinese revolution, and the combination of Marxism and traditional Chinese culture) that have been widely publicised in the name of Marxism recently are nothing more than a fig leaf for this outdated and reactionary political system that reflects historical regression.

It is precisely because of our limitations in knowledge and our failure to keep up with the teachings of our revolutionary mentors that we have not seriously studied the political system of the bourgeois democratic republic for a long time, let alone the fact that we can critically inherit this "ready-made"

political system as our revolutionary mentors said. We have only "correctly" repeated that bourgeois democracy is all hypocritical democracy; however, we have not faced up to the fact that bourgeois democracy has found a political system that ensures that the entire bourgeoisie can obtain democracy and thus has the function of consolidating the bourgeois dictatorship, and we have not studied it. Not only have we concealed the fact that the "one-party dictatorship" that has gradually formed here will "very easily" degenerate into a fascist bourgeois dictatorship, but we have also conveyed a wrong message to people: it seems that only the "one-party dictatorship" is the political system of the proletarian dictatorship without hypocritical bourgeois democracy.

This is a mistake that cannot be underestimated. Chairman Mao has repeatedly pointed out the mistakes of the so-called "enlargement of class struggle" in socialist countries, especially its cruel form of struggle, saying that such problems would not occur in the bourgeois democratic republics of Europe and the United States. When denouncing the revisionists who would establish a fascist bourgeois dictatorship when they came to power, he said more vividly that "Hitler was worse than de Gaulle", which actually meant that the fascist bourgeois dictatorship was worse than the bourgeois democratic republic.

The example of the United States mentioned above is actually far more than just the United States. The role played by the political system of many bourgeois democratic republics in Switzerland and Northern Europe in more effectively implementing the bourgeois dictatorship is worthy of our full attention when considering the political system of the proletarian dictatorship. We should learn from their useful experience, including learning from the negative side about their inevitable limitations as a part of the bourgeois dictatorship.

The despotic and dictatorial rulers oppose the democratic republic, thinking that by labelling it as "bourgeois", they can turn fallacies into truth. However, they forget that the teachings of the revolutionary mentors of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism are there, which will make us clear-headed and not fall for their tricks. Even some of the comrades we criticise here may fall for their tricks for a while and not understand them. After relearning the teachings of the revolutionary mentors and after serious and necessary self-criticism, they will gradually awaken and return to the teachings of the revolutionary mentors.

In the face of the arduous task of socialist re-revolution, it is of great practical and guiding significance for us to understand and comprehend the theory and strategy of the revolutionary mentors on the proletariat's struggle for a bourgeois democratic republic.

For one thing, it is an unavoidable initial step towards the realisation of socialist re-revolution, a step in the political struggle to put Chairman Mao's theory of socialist re-revolution into real revolutionary practice; it is a step in the struggle of the proletariat and the mass of the working class and of all the other classes and strata opposed to dictatorship to form the broadest possible united front against the rule of the characteristic fascists; it is a step in the political struggle that is far more revolutionary than the economic struggle and can lead and command the economic struggle. Now is the time for the Chinese Maoists, who are loyal to Chairman Mao, to put this struggle on the agenda of the socialist re-revolution without delay.

Another thing is that when the socialist revolution wins victory, a new socialist society is rebuilt, and the political system of the proletarian dictatorship is constructed, in order to avoid the problem of revisionism coming to power and capitalist restoration, critically inheriting and absorbing all valuable "ready-made" aspects of the democratic republic form of government is of positive significance and absolutely necessary for consolidating the proletarian dictatorship and the socialist social system.

As Lenin said and hoped, let us, the proletarian revolutionaries - Maoists, become advanced fighters who lead the proletariat and the broad masses of the revolutionary people to fight for democracy, consolidate democracy, and safeguard democracy in different historical stages and periods of seizing and consolidating power!

For the sake of communication, we would like to discuss some specific issues of the political system of the democratic republic in combination with the new theories and new developments of Maoism. Because the actual problem is that we not only do not pay enough attention to and study the political system of the bourgeois democratic republic, but more importantly and seriously, we also do not pay enough attention to and study Chairman Mao's theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship.

Chairman Mao made a great deal of important innovations in theory and practice in his important works such as *On New Democracy* and *On Coalition Government*, and in the practice of the new democratic revolution and socialist revolution under his leadership, regarding the state system and political system of the people's democratic dictatorship. In fact, Chairman Mao had already answered some of the questions that we are now arguing over and over again, both in theory and in practice. Unfortunately, we have not learned enough. Moreover, the minds of some comrades are full of prejudices, and they are fierce prejudices. Prejudice is further from the truth than ignorance, and fierce prejudice is twice as far from the truth as ignorance.

We must also see that these radical but erroneous opinions are exactly the same as the arguments of the revisionist fascist party rulers, and are actually helping them - the bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie - to speak and help them - the bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie - to maintain their fascist bourgeois dictatorship. The revisionist rulers have repeatedly criticised the bourgeois democratic republic, and put forward the so-called "five no's" - "no multi-party rotation in power, no diversification of guiding ideology, no separation of powers and bicameralism, no federalism, no privatisation" and the so-called "seven no's" - no "universal values, freedom of the press, civil society, civil rights, the party's historical mistakes, the privileged bourgeoisie, and judicial independence."

What some of our comrades have said is exactly the same as the revisionist fallacies that deny the dictatorship of the proletariat and proletarian democracy. How come those who oppose revisionism and those who promote revisionism sing the same tune and reach the same conclusion? Are there similarities in ideology and theory, and in class standpoint? It is worth serious study and reflection. Moreover, it is precisely these erroneous opinions that have helped the revisionist rulers, split the proletarian revolutionary ranks, and interfered with the proletariat's launching of the socialist re-revolution.

For a long time, when we wanted to launch a struggle for democracy, they interfered; when we wanted to defend the various democratic rights granted to citizens by the Constitution, to fight for freedom of speech and freedom to form a political party, they also interfered. They were actually playing the role of "Song Jiang" who was attached to the revisionist rulers, and their spearheads were naturally always directed at "Fang La".

They not only advocated the theory of "saving the party and saving the country", but also actually engaged in the activities of "saving the party and saving the country". They were truly worthy of the name of "saving the party and saving the country".

This is an important reason why the proletarian revolutionaries have never been able to unify their line and strategy and gradually launch a socialist re-revolution. This is a serious interference with the

general direction of the socialist re-revolution and a reflection of the class struggle in the ideological and theoretical fields within the Maoist ranks.

Let us combine several specific examples to do some serious research and discussion.

### **Example 1:**

Under the socialist conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, is it allowed to form parties freely or to have multiple parties?

In the view of some comrades, the dictatorship of the proletariat can only implement "one-party rule" or "one-party dictatorship". Anyone who thinks that free party formation and the existence of multiple parties should be allowed is adhering to the bourgeois view and wants to replace the dictatorship of the proletariat with bourgeois democracy.

The principle they talk about and insist on is very simple and "very pure", that is: the fundamental interests of the proletariat are the same, so only one Communist Party can represent the fundamental interests of the proletariat.

What a simple, simplistic, metaphysical and unrealistic idea this is.

Real life tells us that the proletariat, as a class, can and should analyse its internal structure. For example, there is often a distinction between advanced and backward, and between left, centre, and right. That is what Chairman Mao said: Wherever there are people, there are left, centre, and right. In this case, if we simply say that only one Communist Party can represent the interests of the proletariat, then the next question is, among the different groups of people in this class, which part of the Communist Party can represent the interests of the proletariat in a concentrated manner? How is this right obtained and recognised? A further question is, do those people who cannot represent the overall interests of the proletariat have the right to form a party, including organising a Communist Party, and participate in the management of the state power of the proletarian dictatorship?

Further, in socialist society, whether under the historical conditions of the initial people's democratic dictatorship or under the historical conditions of the development of the dictatorship of the proletariat, there is not a monolithic existence of the proletariat, there are also 'a large number of non-proletarian labouring strata', a class, whether it is a 'coalition government' (as in China) or a 'workers' and peasants' government' (as in Russia), it is the form of state that the dictatorship of the proletariat is bound to take on the basis of such class relations. The expression 'the people are the masters of their own house' is a popular but accurate expression of such a form of state and government, and the people is a multi-class concept.

Lenin had a very clear and very important argument about the historical position and historical role of the proletariat in the process of implementing the dictatorship of the proletariat and the form of the dictatorship of the proletariat: "The dictatorship of the proletariat is a special form of class alliance between the vanguard of the working people - the proletariat and the large non-proletarian working strata (petty bourgeoisie, small owners, peasants, intellectuals, etc.) or with the majority of them. It is an alliance against capital, an alliance formed to completely overthrow capital, to completely suppress the resistance of the bourgeoisie and to completely crush its attempts at restoration, and an alliance formed to finally establish and consolidate socialism." (Lenin: "Preface to the Publication of "On Deceiving the People with the Slogan of Freedom and Equality", "Collected Works of Lenin", Volume 29, pp. 343-344.) Similarly, Chairman Mao also said in his famous article "On the People's Democratic Dictatorship": "What are the people? In China, at the present stage, they are the working class, the peasant class, the urban petty bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie. Under the leadership of the



working class and the Communist Party, these classes unite to form their own country, elect their own government, and exercise dictatorship and autocracy over the running dogs of imperialism, namely the landlord class and the bureaucratic bourgeoisie, as well as the Kuomintang reactionaries and their accomplices who represent these classes, oppress these people, and only allow them to behave themselves and not to speak or act recklessly. If they speak or act recklessly, they will be immediately banned and punished. For the people, a democratic system is implemented, and the people have the freedom of speech, assembly, association, etc. The right to vote is given only to the people, not to the reactionaries. The combination of these two aspects, democracy among the people and dictatorship over the reactionaries, is the people's democratic dictatorship. " (Selected Works of Mao Zedong, Vol. 4, Unified Edition, p. 1412)

The principles that Lenin and Chairman Mao talked about here are scientific expositions of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship. They both embody the idea that the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship "both give full play to democracy, that is, to enable all the people to participate truly equally and universally in all state affairs and in the handling of all the complex problems of eliminating capitalism." Lenin: "Reply to P. Kievsky (Yu. Pyatakov)" (August-September 1916), "Collected Works of Lenin", Vol. 23, p. 14.) including "forming their own state and electing their own government" and "having freedom of speech, assembly, association, etc." Based on these principles that Lenin and Chairman Mao talked about, how can it be understood that the masses do not have the right to freely form a party? How can it be understood that "there can only be one Communist Party that represents the fundamental interests of the proletariat"?

Chairman Mao also emphasized the freedom of "association" here. Some people nitpick and say that association is not equal to forming a party. Let me give you an example of Chairman Mao's explanation of "association". On the afternoon of December 28, 1964, a working meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China was held in the Hebei Hall of the Great Hall of the People to discuss the "Minutes of the Meeting" ("Some Issues Currently Raised in the Rural Socialist Education Movement", commonly known as the "Twenty-three Articles"). Chairman Mao said: "There is a book called "The Constitution of the People's Republic of China". Chapter 3, Article 85, says that "Citizens of the People's Republic of China are equal before the law", and then Article 87 says that "Citizens of the People's Republic of China have freedom of speech, publication, assembly, association, procession and demonstration." For example, are we considered citizens of the People's Republic of China? If so, do we have freedom of speech? Are we allowed to say a few words? Is there freedom of publication? Now the Ministry of Culture only allows those people to have freedom of publication. I think this publishing agency needs to be rectified, as many are in the hands of bad people. Freedom of assembly, for example, isn't this what we are holding in the Hebei Hall? That's called an assembly, right? It doesn't count, right? There is also association. Now we want to form an association, which is to get rid of those who are too serious about the "four unclears" and to form a Communist Party. We need to rectify the branches, the grassroots party committees, and the party committees at all levels. This is called association. Parades and demonstrations, didn't we hold a parade and demonstration in Tiananmen Square a few days ago? That was against the invasion of Congo by US imperialism. I have always been in favor of holding demonstrations against our bureaucrats." This is the record of the Chronicle of Mao Zedong. It is reliable. There is also a "note" saying that Chairman Mao asked for the "Documents of the Eighth National Congress of the Communist Party of China" (including the "Constitution of the Communist Party of China" and the "Constitution of the People's Republic of China") to bring to the meeting before the meeting, and read the relevant articles of the Party Constitution and the Constitution in public when he spoke. As we all know, Chairman Mao had differences with Liu Shaoyi and Deng Xiaoping at the time. They did not want Chairman Mao to attend the meeting or to speak,

so Chairman Mao brought the Constitution and the Party Constitution, and of course he was angry when he spoke these words. We quote this passage here mainly to explain that the "freedom of association" written in the Constitution includes the right of "citizens" to freely form a party, which Chairman Mao particularly emphasized here. We can naturally not believe or listen to our words, but we should not ignore the truth that Chairman Mao spoke in such a serious class struggle and political struggle with such a serious attitude.

The crux and essence of the disagreement on this issue is not about the wording or the understanding of "freedom of association", but about the understanding of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the people's democratic dictatorship, or what is commonly referred to as the people being the masters of the country.

The crux and essence of the issue is whether the working people, as the masters of the socialist country, have the right to directly participate in the management of the state power through organizing political parties, and directly participate in the supervision, investigation, and even removal of the rulers of the state power.

Revolutionary mentors have repeatedly emphasized that "the party is a tool of the proletarian dictatorship" (rather than saying the other way around as some people say: "the proletarian dictatorship is a tool of the party"). (Stalin: "On the Foundations of Leninism" (April-May 1924), "The Complete Works of Stalin", Volume 6, pages 156-157; "Selected Works of Stalin", Volume 1, pages 267-268.) The proletariat and the broad masses of working people are the masters of the proletarian dictatorship state. As the masters of the state, how can it be said that they have no right to organize and use the tool of the proletarian dictatorship - the party, to realize the management, supervision and protection of the proletarian dictatorship state?

Therefore, this is actually still a question of upholding the proletarian dictatorship or negating the proletarian dictatorship.

Since the dictatorship of the proletariat is the class dictatorship of the proletariat (Marx always emphasized the concept of "class dictatorship"), how can the members of this class not even have the right to form a political party in order to participate in the dictatorship and participate in the management of the state? Is it true that this class dictatorship can only be the right of some people, while others do not have this right? Isn't this a complete negation of the dictatorship of the proletariat? Isn't this what the revisionist rulers from the Soviet Union to China did? Isn't this how the dictatorship of the fascist bourgeoisie came into being?

This is a very simple Marxist principle, and it should be said that this is the fundamental difference between the dictatorship of the proletariat and the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. As long as we connect it with reality, with the fascist bourgeois dictatorship of the Chinese revisionist party in the form of "one-party dictatorship" and with all the brutal means of bureaucratic autocracy and monopoly capitalist society protected under this autocratic system, we can easily see the class roots of the differences on this issue and the essence of class struggle.

Comrades who insist on "one-party dictatorship" should seriously consider which class their class stand is on the side of? Which class does their erroneous theory benefit?

Chairman Mao has a very clear statement in "On the Ten Major Relationships": "Is it better to have one party or several parties? Now it seems that it is probably better to have several parties. Not only was it so in the past, but it can also be so in the future, that is, long-term coexistence and mutual

supervision." (Mao Zedong: "On the Ten Major Relationships", "Selected Works of Mao Zedong", Volume 5, page 278, People's Publishing House, 1977 edition.)

Chairman Mao went on to explain: "In our country, many democratic parties, mainly composed of national bourgeoisie and its intellectuals, which were formed in the struggle against Japan and Chiang Kai-shek, still exist. In this respect, we are different from the Soviet Union. We consciously keep the democratic parties, give them the opportunity to express their opinions, and adopt a policy of unity and struggle with them. We must unite with all democratic personages who give us advice in good faith. We should continue to mobilize the enthusiasm of patriotic Kuomintang military and political personnel such as Wei Lihuang and Weng Wenhao. Even those who scold us, such as Long Yun, Liang Shuming, Peng Yihu, etc., we should support them and let them scold us. If the scolding is unreasonable, we will refute it, and if the scolding is reasonable, we will accept it. This is more beneficial to the Party, the people, and socialism." (Ibid., pp. 278-279)

This is actually Chairman Mao's explanation of the "long-term coexistence and mutual supervision" of the Chinese Communist Party and democratic parties. In Chairman Mao's view, doing so is "more beneficial to the party, the people, and socialism." Chairman Mao's reasoning tells us that multi-party "long-term coexistence and mutual supervision" is not bourgeois democracy, but a people's democratic dictatorship that is "more beneficial to the party, the people, and socialism," and is essentially a form of government that is the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Bourgeois democratic parties can exist and participate in state management, so why can't the working people organize political parties in order to directly participate in state management? Since it is a people's democratic dictatorship, how can the people's political right to freely form a party be deprived?

Looking around the world, except for a few countries that are still practicing autocratic dictatorship, the vast majority of countries, including relatively backward African countries, have implemented a democratic political system of free party formation and multi-party coexistence. However, in our country, which is facing fascist autocratic rule and brutally trampling on the "freedom of association" stipulated in the Constitution, some comrades who claim to adhere to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and the dictatorship of the proletariat have been waving big hats and aggressively opposing freedom of association and freedom to form political parties, and loudly believing in the autocratic system of "one-party dictatorship". How ignorant, stupid, ridiculous and sad this is!

In the final analysis, comrades who hold this view still do not know how important proletarian democracy is to the proletarian dictatorship. They do not know that without proletarian democracy, the proletarian dictatorship cannot exist. They neither understand the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist theory of proletarian dictatorship nor take seriously the historical lessons of "the party changed to its revisionist system and the country changed its colour" in the former socialist countries. They are more based on the narrow patriarchal perspective of small producers and petty bourgeoisie, and are deeply influenced by the long-standing imperial autocratic tradition in China. They not only cannot correctly understand the scientific meaning of proletarian dictatorship, but also absurdly use autocracy to understand and define the meaning of proletarian dictatorship. Their attitude of not recognizing the mistake of "overthrowing everything" during the Cultural Revolution, and even their attitude of affirmation and praise, is enough to prove this point. Some people are right to express fear about this, which is completely understandable.

This is not accidental, it is determined by historical conditions. Looking back at the history of socialist countries, we will find that this is a problem that is quite difficult to solve. Because as Chairman Mao said, there are not many people in our party who really understand Marxism-Leninism, so. The theory

of the political system of the proletarian dictatorship of the revolutionary mentors of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism has not been understood and mastered; another is that when facing fierce class struggles with bourgeois enemies, including armed struggles, we have to understand and deal with some practices adopted when consolidating the proletarian dictatorship and defending the socialist regime. Simply applying dogmatically to the new historical conditions where the proletarian dictatorship has been relatively consolidated and the socialist society has been relatively stable will inevitably lead to mistakes, and the vested interests generated from this will continue to deepen and develop this mistake.

History is always developing and changing, and the history of socialist society is also always developing and changing. We often say that theory must be combined with practice and must meet the requirements of practice. The practice mentioned here refers to the reality we face, not the practice that has passed. Practice is developing, and theory must develop with it. If we are separated from the reality of practice and just stick to the existing theory, we will slide into the error of dogmatism. This is an important epistemological reason for the gradual deviation from "the leadership of the Communist Party" and the gradual transformation into "one-party dictatorship". Just look at the fact that there are so many comrades today who have a positive attitude towards "one-party dictatorship", and you can imagine that in the socialist practice of more than 100 years, it is completely understandable to go astray and move towards self-negation.

Therefore, it is very reasonable for Chairman Mao to emphasise the importance of ideological methods. In terms of ideological methods, these comrades can only think about problems metaphysically and mechanically, like a primary school student who can only memorise concepts by rote. It is very difficult to discuss any issue with a comrade who has such ideological methods in his head. They adopted such an attitude and ideological method to deal with the teachings of revolutionary mentors Lenin and Stalin criticising "one-party dictatorship" and "party dictatorship". As a result, their understanding of the opinions of the revolutionary mentors is exactly the opposite of the original intention of the revolutionary mentors, although they do not oppose the revolutionary mentors subjectively.

This is a typical theoretical and practical problem with great educational significance. For this reason, we will take the trouble to quote Lenin and especially Stalin's teachings in more detail below, which may be of some benefit to comrades who adhere to the idea of "one-party dictatorship".

They often quote a passage from Lenin's debate to defend the rationality and necessity of "one-party dictatorship". Lenin said: "When we are reproached with having established a dictatorship of one party and, as you have heard, a united socialist front is proposed, we say, "Yes, it is a dictatorship of one party! This is what we stand for and we shall not shift from that position because it is the party that has won, in the course of decades, the position of vanguard of the entire factory and industrial proletariat. This party had won that position even before the revolution of 1905. It is the party that was at the head of the workers in 1905 and which since then—even at the time of the reaction after 1905 when the working-class movement was rehabilitated with such difficulty under the Stolypin Duma—merged with the working class and it alone could lead that class to a profound, fundamental change in the old society." (Lenin: "Speech at the All-Russian Congress of Workers in Education and Socialist Culture", July 31, 1919, "Collected Works of Lenin", Volume 29, pp. 489-490.)

After quoting the first half of Lenin's words, some comrades concluded: "Lenin directly affirmed that 'it is to uphold the one-party dictatorship'! This is an important content of Leninism! That is, the Communist Party monopolises the state!"

What a simple and arbitrary conclusion. Lenin clearly started from the leadership role of the Bolshevik Party in 1905. At that time, they had not yet seized power, so how could they draw the conclusion that "the Communist Party monopolised the state"? The second half of this passage is very clear, referring to the Bolshevik Party's insistence on combining with the working class and winning the position of the vanguard of the entire factory proletariat and industrial proletariat, so in the end they concluded that "only this party can lead the working class to profoundly and fundamentally change the old society." What Lenin emphasized here was that only the Bolshevik Party had won the leading position of the proletariat in the socialist revolution with its correct line and correct struggle strategy. Isn't this very clear? Moreover, it is also very clear that this passage does not touch on the relationship between the Bolshevik Party and the political power of the proletarian dictatorship.

It is completely wrong to impose the so-called "Communist Party monopolies the state" on Lenin. Lenin clearly wrote in "On the Tasks of the Third International": "The dictatorship of the proletariat is the power of a class. This class must control the entire new state machinery, defeat the bourgeoisie, and neutralize the entire petty bourgeoisie, peasants, petty bourgeoisie and intellectuals." (Volume 29 of "Collected Works of Lenin", page 467.) In "Salute to the Workers of Hungary", he also said: "It is necessary to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat and establish a class power. This class must be organized and disciplined, and use all the achievements of bourgeois culture, science and technology to exert the power of concentration, understand the psychology of all workers, and have prestige in front of the scattered, less developed and politically unstable workers in rural areas or small production. Only in this way can the proletariat lead the peasants and all petty bourgeoisie forward." Then he said: "To abolish classes, a period of class dictatorship is necessary, a period of dictatorship of the oppressed class." "Only such an oppressed class is capable of abolishing all classes with its dictatorship." (Volume 29 of "Collected Works of Lenin", pages 352-353.) In "Speech at the Third All-Russian Congress of Water Transport Workers", it was emphasized more clearly: "The working class governs as a class, so when it establishes the Soviet regime, it controls this regime as a class." (Volume 30 of "Collected Works of Lenin", page 396.) These statements all emphasise that the dictatorship of the proletariat is the class dictatorship of the proletariat, not the "monopoly of the state by the Communist Party." Moreover, Lenin once gave a classic and concise definition of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin said: "The dictatorship of the proletariat may be a very profound Latin word, but in fact it means the Soviet power that allows workers to control the state organs." (Lenin: The Seventh All-Russian Congress of Soviets (December 5-9, 1919), "Collected Works of Lenin", Volume 30, pages 198-199.) Lenin clearly emphasised that "the Soviet power of the state organs controlled by workers", and the word "workers" here obviously refers to the working class. It is based on such a correct understanding that Lenin even emphasised that "if the party does not trust the working class and does not allow workers to take important positions, such a party should be overthrown." (Lenin: The Tenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks), "Collected Works of Lenin", Volume 32, Page 194.) These very serious statements of Lenin are all complete denials of the "one-party dictatorship" statement.

As mentioned above, in Lenin's view, in the process of implementing the dictatorship of the proletariat, the historical position, historical role and form of the dictatorship of the proletariat are to establish a class alliance led by the proletariat. This is a very important idea that Lenin repeatedly mentioned. We repeat Lenin's opinion: "The dictatorship of the proletariat is a special form of class alliance between the vanguard of the working people - the proletariat and the large number of non-proletarian working strata (petty bourgeoisie, small owners, peasants, intellectuals, etc.) or with the majority of them. It is an anti-capital alliance, an alliance established to completely overthrow capital, to completely suppress the resistance of the bourgeoisie and to completely crush its restoration attempt, and an alliance established to ultimately build and consolidate socialism." (Lenin: "Preface to the Publication

of "On Deceiving the People with the Slogan of Freedom and Equality", "Collected Works of Lenin", Volume 29, pages 343-344.) The truth that Lenin talked about here is not only of strict theoretical significance, but also of practical significance. It is an important development of the Marxist theory of proletarian dictatorship. Moreover, everyone will think that Lenin's discussion of the "special form of class alliance" implemented by the proletarian dictatorship is completely consistent with Chairman Mao's ideas of "people's democratic dictatorship" and "coalition government".

It was based on such principles and strategies of the dictatorship of the proletariat that Lenin led the Bolshevik Party to set an example for us in dealing with the relationship with the Social Revolutionary Party. In his book "Left-Wing" Communism, an Infantile Disorder', Lenin reviewed this history. Lenin wrote: "At the time of the October Revolution, we signed an informal but very important (and very successful) political alliance with the petty-bourgeois peasants. We accepted the land program of the Social Revolutionary Party in its entirety without making any changes, that is, we made an undoubted compromise to prove to the peasants that we did not want to suppress them with a majority vote, but were willing to reach an agreement with them. At the same time, we proposed to the "Left Socialist Revolutionaries" (and soon realised) a formal political alliance and invited them to participate in the government; but after the conclusion of the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty, they broke this alliance and even launched an armed uprising against us in July 1918, and later carried out an armed struggle against us. "In the "Resolution of the Central Committee of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party (Bolsheviks) on the Question of Opposition within the Central Committee" drafted by Lenin, it was specifically stated: "The Central Committee confirms that the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets has not excluded anyone, and even at present it is very willing to allow those who have withdrawn from the Soviets to return and is willing to recognise their union within the Soviet framework. Therefore, it is a complete lie to say that the Bolsheviks seem unwilling to share power with anyone." ("Collected Works of Lenin", Volume 26, page 259.) Then in the Manifesto of the Central Committee of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party (Bolsheviks), it was denounced: "Bourgeois sleazy writers and those who are intimidated by the bourgeoisie accuse us of being unwilling to make concessions, unwilling to reconcile, and unwilling to share power with other parties. Comrades, this is all lies! We have invited and are still inviting the Left Socialist Revolutionaries to share power with us. If they refuse our invitation, it is not our fault." "We uphold the principle of Soviet power, that is, the principle of power in the hands of the majority at the last Congress of Soviets; we agreed, and still agree, to share power with a minority in the Soviets, provided that this minority obeys the majority faithfully and sincerely and carries out the program of gradual, unwavering steps toward socialism approved by the Second National Congress of Soviets." (Collected Works of Lenin, Vol. 26, pp. 286-287)

Lenin's theory and practice of the Soviets, that is, the dictatorship of the proletariat, can be implemented in a united way, and Chairman Mao's strategy and practice towards the eight democratic parties can be said to have similarities in purpose. Both are based on historical reality and correctly and flexibly handle the specific form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is a clear and profound criticism of the so-called "Communist Party monopolisation of the state."

Moreover, in Lenin's view, not only should multiple Soviet parties be allowed to exist and to form a coalition government, but Lenin also had important theoretical opinions on the replacement of the ruling party, which are still very correct today. Lenin wrote: "In Russia, the Soviet power has been won, so the government can be transferred from one Soviet party to another without any revolution, only through the resolution of the Soviet and the re-election of Soviet representatives. At the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets, the Bolshevik Party won the majority. Therefore, only the government organised by this party is the Soviet government." (Lenin: Manifesto of the Central Committee of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party (Bolsheviks) - To All Party Members and All Working Classes of



Russia, Collected Works of Lenin, Vol. 26, p. 283.) Lenin also had clear opinions on the duration of the ruling party's rule. "Now, after the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets, until the Third Congress is held, or until the Soviets are re-elected, or until the Central Executive Committee organises a new government, the Bolshevik government is the only recognised Soviet government." (Ibid., p. 284.)

Lenin also emphasized that the right of recall is of special importance in the Soviet political system. Lenin said: "The people were told that the Soviet is a plenipotentiary organ: they believed it and acted upon that belief. The process of democratisation must be carried forward and the right of recall introduced. The right of recall should be given to the Soviets, as the best embodiment of the idea of state power, of coercion. The transfer of power from one party to another may then take place peacefully, by mere re-election." (Lenin: "Report on the Right of Recall at the All-Russian Central Executive Committee Meeting", "Collected Works of Lenin", Volume 26, page 318.)

These very important opinions of Lenin are of guiding significance for the political system of our future socialist society.

Of course, historical facts tell us that once the proletariat seizes power and establishes the dictatorship of the proletariat, it will be difficult to fully implement Lenin's opinions on the construction of the political system due to the limitations of historical conditions. In the face of complex and acute class struggles, we must not only adhere to the leadership of the Communist Party, but also rely mainly on the Communist Party members to actually control the management of the country. This is an inevitable historical process constrained by historical conditions. Lenin explained why this historical phenomenon occurred in his report on the Party Program. Lenin said: "Only when all residents participate in management can the struggle against bureaucracy be carried out thoroughly and bureaucracy be completely defeated. This is not only impossible in a bourgeois republic, but the law itself also prevents it from doing so. The best bourgeois republic, no matter how democratic it is, has countless legal obstacles that prevent the working people from participating in management. We have completely removed these obstacles, but to this day we have not yet reached the point where the working people can take part in administration, because besides laws, there must be a culture, and you cannot make them subject to any law. Because of this low culture, although the Soviets are in theory an organ for administration through the working people, in reality they are an organ for administration through the advanced sections of the proletariat for the working people, and not through the working people.

"Here we have before us a task which can be solved only by long-term education. At present this task is extremely difficult for us, as I have repeatedly pointed out, because there are still very few workers in charge of management. We must obtain support. Judging from various signs, this reserve force is growing in the country. There is no doubt about the strong desire for knowledge among the working people and the great educational achievements that are often achieved through social education. Although these achievements are not the results of any school education, they are indeed very huge. All signs indicate that in the near future we will certainly gain a huge reserve force to replace those overworked elements of the small advanced stratum of the proletariat. However, at present our situation in this regard is extremely difficult. The bureaucracy has been overthrown, the exploiters have been eliminated. But the cultural level has not yet risen, so the bureaucracy has taken over the original position. To squeeze them out, it is only by organising the proletariat and the peasantry on a much larger scale than before, and at the same time actually implementing various measures to absorb the workers into management. You all know these measures implemented by each People's Commissariat, so I will not go into details." (Selected Works of Lenin, Volume 3, pp. 788-789)

Lenin's thought is very clear. The highest requirement of the dictatorship of the proletariat is to implement direct management of the state by the entire people. However, due to the limitations of historical conditions, it is not possible to do this for the time being. But this is exactly the problem that the dictatorship of the proletariat must solve, the work to be done, and the process to be completed as soon as possible. Here we see once again how consistent Lenin's ideas are with Chairman Mao's ideas. During the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, according to Chairman Mao's theoretical ideas and political strategies, in the construction of the new regime, from local to central, a large number of representatives of the workers and peasants were absorbed to directly participate in the management of the state. Isn't this the implementation of Lenin's theoretical ideas?

The direct participation of the working people of the working class and peasantry in state management is the only correct way to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The deeper significance is that this is also the only correct way to achieve the withering away of the state and the realization of communism. Lenin has made this point very clear in his book "The State and Revolution". Lenin said: "When all members of society, or at least the vast majority of them, have learned to manage the state themselves, have mastered this cause themselves, and have "adjusted" supervision over a very small number of capitalists, gentlemen who want to retain the bad habits of capitalism, and workers who have been deeply corrupted by capitalism, the need for any management begins to disappear. The more complete democracy is, the closer it is to becoming redundant. The more democratic the state composed of armed workers, which is "no longer a state in the original sense", the faster any state will begin to wither away.

"Because when everyone has learned to manage, and actually manages social production by themselves, does their own calculations and exercises supervision over parasites, masters, swindlers and other "protectors of capitalist traditions", attempts to evade this national calculation and supervision will inevitably be difficult to achieve, and will inevitably only be extremely rare exceptions, and may also be punished very quickly and severely (because armed workers are pragmatic, unlike intellectuals who are hard-pressed to get away with it; they may not allow others to joke with them casually), so people will quickly change from having to obey the simple basic rules of all human public life to being accustomed to obeying them.

"At that time, the door to the transition from the first stage of communist society to its higher stage will be open, and the state will completely wither away." (Lenin: "The State and Revolution", Selected Works of Lenin, Volume 3, pp. 258-259.) Of course, the actual historical fact is that it is quite difficult to uphold the dictatorship of the proletariat and it is a long historical process. However, the most fundamental significance of the dictatorship of the proletariat mentioned by Lenin here is completely correct. The dictatorship of the proletariat, that is, the proletarian state, will eventually wither away; the entire purpose of the existence of the dictatorship of the proletariat is to achieve the transition to communist society for the elimination of classes and its own withering away. If you do not deeply understand this point, you will not understand the significance of the existence of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

These comrades also bring Stalin into the picture in defence of 'one-party rule'. They do not even know that it was Stalin who specifically criticised Zinoviev's erroneous idea of 'one-party dictatorship'. They quote Stalin's statement that 'our soviets and other mass organisations do not decide any important political or organisational question without instructions from the Party'. -This fact should be considered the highest expression of the leading role of the Party.' This quote is from Stalin's book 'On Several Problems of Leninism'. They then conclude from this quote that 'Stalin pointed out that the vanguard

of the working class would not only monopolise the state, but would take full control of it! That is, the organs of the Soviet state, without instructions from the Party, will not and cannot decide any of the important political and organisational questions!'

Stalin's words reflected the actual situation of the Soviet regime at that time. Lenin also said the same thing repeatedly, referring to the actual situation of the Soviet regime implementing the dictatorship of the proletariat at that time. Stalin's words were nothing more than a repetition of Lenin's words in "'Left-Wing Communism': An Infantile Disorder". Lenin's words were: "No state organ in our republic may solve any major political or organizational problems without the instructions of the Party Central Committee." However, Lenin clearly stated before this passage: "The mutual relations between leaders, parties, classes, and the masses, as well as the relationship between the dictatorship of the proletariat and the proletarian party to the trade unions, are now concretely manifested in our country as follows. The dictatorship is implemented by the proletariat organized in the Soviets and led by the Communist Party of the Bolsheviks." (Lenin: "'Left-Wing Communism': An Infantile Disorder" (April-May 1920), Selected Works of Lenin, Volume 4, p. 203.) It can be seen that, firstly, Lenin is talking about the form in which the dictatorship of the 'proletariat under the leadership of the Bolshevik Communist Party' is realised, the leadership; and secondly, and more importantly, Lenin is talking about the 'concrete manifestations in our country at the present time'. Lenin's reasoning, quoted above, as to why this 'concrete manifestation in our country at the present time' has occurred, is a perfectly correct explanation of this phenomenon, and it is by no means theoretically possible to generalise the basis on which the dictatorship of the proletariat is to be implemented in the form of a 'one-party dictatorship'. This is in no way a theoretical justification for the dictatorship of the proletariat to be a 'one-party dictatorship'.

If you look at Stalin's statement, you can see that the interpretation of the comrade who quoted it is completely contrary to Stalin's original intention.

It seems that the question of 'one-party dictatorship' was also debated within the Soviet Party, and Stalin's opponent was Zinoviev. Stalin's criticism of Zinoviev's erroneous views is not only not outdated, but also of great practical significance today; in particular, it is of help to some comrades in the Maoist camp in their erroneous understanding of 'one-party dictatorship'. Therefore, I am quoting here the more complete original text of Stalin's discourse on this issue. I ask the reader to bear with me; it is far better and more convincing to listen to Stalin than to me.

"The highest expression of the leading role of the Party, here, in the Soviet Union, in the land of the dictatorship of the proletariat, for example, is the fact that not a single important political or organisational question is decided by our Soviet and other mass organisations without guiding directives from the Party. *In this sense* it could be said that the dictatorship of the proletariat is, *in essence*, the "dictatorship" of its vanguard, the "dictatorship" of its Party, as the main guiding force of the proletariat. Here is what Lenin said on this subject at the Second Congress of the Comintern<sup>12</sup>:

'Tanner says that he stands for the dictatorship of the proletariat, but the dictatorship of the proletariat is not conceived quite in the same way as we conceive it. He says that by the dictatorship of the proletariat we mean, *in essence*, the dictatorship of its organised and class-conscious minority.

'And, as a matter of fact, in the era of capitalism, when the masses of the workers are continuously subjected to exploitation and cannot develop their human potentialities, the most characteristic feature of working-class political parties is that they can embrace only a minority of their class. A political party can comprise only a minority of the class, in the same

way as the really class-conscious workers in every capitalist society constitute only a minority of all the workers. That is why we must admit that only this class-conscious minority can guide the broad masses of the workers and lead them. And if Comrade Tanner says that he is opposed to parties, but at the same time is in favour of the minority consisting of the best organised and most revolutionary workers showing the way to the whole of the proletariat, then I say that there is really no difference between us' (see Vol. XXV, p. 347).

"But this, however, must not be understood in the sense that a *sign of equality* can be put between the dictatorship of the proletariat and the leading role of the Party (the "dictatorship" of the Party), that the former can be *identified* with the latter, that the latter can be substituted for the former. Sorin, for example, says that "*the dictatorship of the proletariat is the dictatorship of our Party.*" This thesis, as you see, identifies the "dictatorship of the Party" with the dictatorship of the proletariat. Can we regard this identification as correct and yet remain on the ground of Leninism? No, we cannot. And for the following reasons:

"*Firstly.* In the passage from his speech, at the Second Congress of the Comintern quoted above, Lenin does not by any means identify the leading role of the Party with the dictatorship of the proletariat. He merely says that "only this class-conscious minority (i.e., the Party—*J. St.*) can guide the broad masses of the workers and lead them," that it is *precisely in this sense* that "by the dictatorship of the proletariat we mean, *in essence*\*\*", the dictatorship of its organised and class-conscious minority."

"To say "in essence" does not mean "wholly." We often say that the national question is, in essence, a peasant question. And this is quite true. But this does not mean that the national question is covered by the peasant question, that the peasant question is equal in scope to the national question, that the peasant question and the national question are identical. There is no need to prove that the national question is wider and richer in its scope than the peasant question. The same must be said by analogy as regards the leading role of the Party and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Although the Party carries out the dictatorship of the proletariat, and in this sense the dictatorship of the proletariat is, *in essence*, the "dictatorship" of its Party, this does not mean that the "dictatorship of the Party" (its leading role) is *identical* with the dictatorship of the proletariat, that the former is equal in scope to the latter. There is no need to prove that the dictatorship of the proletariat is wider and richer in its scope than the leading role of the Party. The Party carries out the dictatorship of the proletariat, but it carries out the dictatorship of the *proletariat*, and not any other kind of dictatorship. Whoever identifies the leading role of the Party with the dictatorship of the proletariat substitutes "dictatorship" of the Party for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"*Secondly.* Not a single important decision is arrived at by the mass organisations of the proletariat without guiding directives from the Party. That is perfectly true. But does that mean that the dictatorship of the proletariat *consists entirely* of the guiding directives given by the Party? Does that mean that, in view of this, the guiding directives of the Party can be identified with the dictatorship of the proletariat? Of course not. The dictatorship of the proletariat consists of the guiding directives of the Party plus the carrying out of these directives by the mass organisations of the proletariat, plus their fulfilment by the population. Here, as you see, we have to deal with a whole series of transitions and intermediary steps which are by no means unimportant elements of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Hence, between the guiding directives of the Party and their fulfilment lie the will and actions of those who are led, the will and actions of the class, its willingness (or unwillingness) to support such directives, its ability (or inability) to carry out these directives, its ability (or inability) to carry them out in strict accordance with the demands of the situation. It scarcely needs proof that the Party, having taken the leadership into its hands, cannot but reckon with the will, the condition, the level of political consciousness of those who are led, cannot leave out of account the will, the condition,

and level of political consciousness of its class. Therefore, whoever identifies the leading role of the Party with the dictatorship of the proletariat substitutes the directives given by the Party for the will and actions of the class.

*“Thirdly.* “The dictatorship of the proletariat,” says Lenin, “is the class struggle of the proletariat, which has won victory and has seized political power” (see Vol. XXIV, p. 311). How can this *class* struggle find expression? It may find expression in a series of armed actions by the proletariat against the sorties of the overthrown bourgeoisie, or against the intervention of the foreign bourgeoisie. It may find expression in civil war, if the power of the proletariat has not yet been consolidated. It may find expression, after power has already been consolidated, in the extensive organisational and constructive work of the proletariat, with the enlistment of the broad masses in this work. In all these cases, the acting force is the proletariat as *a class*. It has never happened that the Party, the Party alone, has undertaken all these actions with only its own forces, without the support of the class. Usually it only directs these actions, and it can direct them only to the extent that it has the support of the class. For the Party cannot cover, cannot replace the class. For, despite all its important leading role, the Party still remains *a part* of the class. Therefore, whoever identifies the leading role of the Party with the dictatorship of the proletariat substitutes the Party for the class.

*“Fourthly.* The Party exercises the dictatorship of the proletariat. “The Party is the direct governing vanguard of the proletariat; it is the leader” (*Lenin*).<sup>13</sup> In this sense the Party *takes* power, the Party *governs the country*. But this must not be understood in the sense that the Party exercises the dictatorship of the proletariat separately from the state power, without the state power; that the Party governs the country separately from the Soviets, not through the Soviets. This does not mean that the Party can be identified with the Soviets, with the state power. The Party is the core of this power, but it is not and cannot be identified with the state power.

“As the ruling Party,” says Lenin, “we could not but merge the Soviet ‘top leadership’ with the Party ‘top leadership’—in our country they are merged and will remain so” (see Vol. XXVI, p. 208). This is quite true. But by this Lenin by no means wants to imply that our Soviet institutions as a whole, for instance our army, our transport, our economic institutions, etc., are Party institutions, that the Party can replace the Soviets and their ramifications, that the Party can be identified with the state power. Lenin repeatedly said that “the system of Soviets is the dictatorship of the proletariat,” and that “the Soviet power is the dictatorship of the proletariat” (see Vol. XXIV, pp. 15, 14); but he never said that the Party is the state power, that the Soviets and the Party are one and the same thing. The Party, with a membership of several hundred thousand, guides the Soviets and their central and local ramifications, which embrace tens of millions of people, both Party and non-Party, but it cannot and should not supplant them. That is why Lenin says that “the dictatorship is exercised by the proletariat organised in the Soviets, the proletariat led by the Communist Party of Bolsheviks”; that “all the work of the Party is carried on *through* the Soviets, which embrace the labouring masses irrespective of occupation” (see Vol. XXV, pp. 192, 193); and that the dictatorship “has to be exercised . . . *through* the Soviet apparatus” (see Vol. XXV1, p. 64). Therefore, whoever identifies the leading role of the Party with the dictatorship of the proletariat substitutes the Party for the Soviets, i.e., for the state power.

*“Fifthly.* The concept of dictatorship of the proletariat is a state concept. The dictatorship of the proletariat necessarily includes the concept of force. There is no dictatorship without the use of force, if dictatorship is to be understood in the strict sense of the word. Lenin defines the dictatorship of the proletariat as “power based directly on the *use of force*” (see Vol. XIX, p. 315). Hence, to talk about dictatorship of the Party in *relation to the proletarian class*, and to identify it with the dictatorship of the proletariat, is tantamount to saying that in relation to its class the Party must be not only a guide, not only a leader and teacher, but also a sort of dictator employing force against it, which, of course,

is quite incorrect. Therefore, whoever identifies “dictatorship of the Party” with the dictatorship of the proletariat tacitly proceeds from the assumption that the prestige of the Party can be built up on force employed against the working class, which is absurd and quite incompatible with Leninism. The prestige of the Party is sustained by the confidence of the working class. And the confidence of the working class is gained not by force—force only kills it—but by the Party’s correct theory, by the Party’s correct policy, by the Party’s devotion to the working class, by its connection with the masses of the working class, by its readiness and ability to *convince* the masses of the correctness of its slogans.

“What, then, follows from all this?

“From this it follows that:

“1) Lenin uses the word *dictatorship* of the Party not in the strict sense of the word (“power based on the use of force”), but in the figurative sense, in the sense of its undivided leadership.

“2) Whoever identifies the leadership of the Party with the *dictatorship* of the proletariat distorts Lenin, wrongly attributing to the Party the function of employing force against the working class as a whole.

“3) Whoever attributes to the Party the function, which it does not possess, of employing force against the working class as a whole, violates the elementary requirements of correct mutual relations between the vanguard and the class, between the Party and the proletariat.” Stalin: “Concerning Questions of Leninism” (January 25, 1926), “Collected Works of Stalin”, Volume 8, pp. 36-42).

Stalin argued from the above five aspects that the so-called “one-party dictatorship” or “party dictatorship” is wrong, which is convincing and scientific. In this book, Stalin also further examined and discussed Lenin’s relevant teachings, which is also worth our serious study.

“In Lenin’s numerous works I have been able to note only five cases in which he touches, in passing, on the question of the dictatorship of the Party.

“The first case is in his controversy with the Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks, where he says:

“When we are reproached with the dictatorship of one party, and when, as you have heard, a proposal is made to establish a united socialist front, we reply: ‘Yes, the dictatorship of one party! We stand by it, and cannot depart from it, for it is that Party which, in the course of decades, has won the position of vanguard of the whole factory and industrial proletariat’” (see Vol. XXIV, p. 423).

“The second case is in his “Letter to the Workers and Peasants in Connection with the Victory over Kolchak,” in which he says:

“Some people (especially the Mensheviks and the Socialist Revolutionaries—all of them, even the ‘Lefts’ among them) are trying to scare the peasants with the bogey of the ‘dictatorship of one party,’ the Party of Bolsheviks, Communists.

“The peasants have learned from the instance of Kolchak not to be afraid of this bogey.

“Either the dictatorship (i.e., iron rule) of the landlords and capitalists, or the dictatorship of the working class” (see Vol. XXIV, p. 436).

“The third case is Lenin’s speech at the Second Congress of the Comintern in his controversy with Tanner. I have quoted it above.\*



“The fourth case is a few lines in the pamphlet *“Left-Wing” Communism, an Infantile Disorder*. The passages in question have already been quoted above.\*

“And the fifth case is in his draft outline of the dictatorship of the proletariat, published in the *Lenin Miscellany*, Volume III, where there is a sub-heading “Dictatorship of One Party” (see *Lenin Miscellany*, Vol. III, p. 497).

“It should be noted that in two out of the five cases, the last and the second, Lenin puts the words “dictatorship of one party” in quotation marks, thus clearly emphasising the inexact, figurative sense of this formula.

“It should also be noted that in every one of these cases, by the “dictatorship of the Party” Lenin meant dictatorship (“iron rule”) over the “landlords and capitalists,” and not over the working class, contrary to the slanderous fabrications of Kautsky and Co.

‘It is characteristic that in *none* of his works, major or secondary, in which Lenin discusses or merely alludes to the dictatorship of the proletariat and the role of the Party in the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat, is there any hint whatever that “the dictatorship of the proletariat is the dictatorship of our Party.” On the contrary, every page, every line of these works cries out against such a formula (see *The State and Revolution*, *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, *“Left-Wing” Communism, an Infantile Disorder*, etc.).

“Even more characteristic is the fact that in the theses of the Second Congress of the Comintern<sup>16</sup> on the role of a political party, which were drawn up under the direct guidance of Lenin, and to which Lenin repeatedly referred in his speeches as a model of the correct formulation of the role and tasks of the Party, we find *not one word*, literally *not one word*, about dictatorship of the Party.

“What does all this indicate?

“It indicates that:

a) Lenin did not regard the formula “dictatorship of the Party” as irreproachable and exact, for which reason it is very rarely used in Lenin’s works, and is sometimes put in quotation marks;

b) on the few occasions that Lenin was obliged, in controversy with opponents, to speak of the dictatorship of the Party, he usually referred to the “dictatorship of *one* party,” i.e., to the fact that our Party holds power *alone*, that it *does not share* power with other parties. Moreover, he always made it clear that the dictatorship of the Party *in relation to the working class* meant the leadership of the Party, its leading role;

c) in all those cases in which Lenin thought it necessary to give a scientific definition of the role of the Party in the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat, he spoke *exclusively* of the leading role of the Party in relation to the working class (and there are thousands of such cases);

d) that is why it never “occurred” to Lenin to include the formula “dictatorship of the Party” in the fundamental resolution on the role of the Party—I have in mind the resolution adopted at the Second Congress of the Comintern;

e) the comrades who identify, or try to identify, the “dictatorship” of the Party and, therefore, the “dictatorship of the leaders” with the dictatorship of the proletariat are wrong from the point of view of Leninism, and are politically short-sighted, for they thereby violate the conditions for correct mutual relations between the vanguard and the class.

“This is apart from the fact that the formula “dictatorship of the Party,” when taken without the above-mentioned reservations, can give rise to quite a number of dangers and political set-backs in our practical work. This formula, taken without reservations, says, as it were:

a) *to the non-Party masses*: don’t dare to contradict, don’t dare to argue, for the Party can do everything, for we have the dictatorship of the Party;

b) *to the Party cadres*: act more boldly, tighten the screw, there is no need to heed what the non-Party masses say, we have the dictatorship of the Party;

c) *to the top leadership of the Party*: you may indulge in the luxury of a certain amount of complacency, you may even become conceited, for we have the dictatorship of the Party, and, “consequently,” the dictatorship of the leaders.

“It is opportune to call attention to these dangers precisely at the present moment, in a period when the political activity of the masses is rising, when the readiness of the Party to heed the voice of the masses is of particular value to us, when attention to the requirements of the masses is a fundamental precept of our Party, when it is incumbent upon the Party to display particular caution and particular flexibility in its policy, when the danger of becoming conceited is one of the most serious dangers confronting the Party in its task of correctly leading the masses.” (Stalin: Concerning Questions of Leninism (January 25, 1926), The Complete Works of Stalin, Vol. 8, pp. 55-59.)

Stalin's profound criticism of "one-party dictatorship" or "party dictatorship" here not only shows that this theory is wrong, but especially in connection with the historical tragedy of the rise of revisionism and the restoration of capitalism from the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe to China, these teachings left by Stalin not only have extremely high theoretical significance, but also have extremely high practical significance, and are worthy of our serious study.

Back then, Stalin directly criticized Zinoviev by name. In his article “On the Social Democratic Tendency in Our Party Again”, he wrote:

“Proceeding from the correct proposition that the Party is the principal directing force in the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat, Zinoviev arrives at the absolutely incorrect conclusion that the *dictatorship of the proletariat is the dictatorship of the Party*. In other words, Zinoviev identifies dictatorship of the Party with the dictatorship of the proletariat.

“But what does identifying dictatorship of the Party with the dictatorship of the proletariat mean?

“It means, firstly, placing the sign of equality between class and party, between the whole and a part of the whole, which is absurd and preposterous. Lenin never identified, and never could have identified, party and class. Between the Party and the class there is a whole series of non-Party mass organisations of the proletariat, and behind them stands the whole mass of the proletarian class. To ignore the role and importance of these non-Party mass organisations, and still more the whole mass of the working class, and to think that the Party can replace the non-Party mass organisations of the proletariat and the proletarian mass as a whole, means divorcing the Party from the masses, carrying bureaucratisation of the Party to an extreme point, converting the Party into an infallible force, and implanting "Nechayevism," "Arakcheyevism" in the Party.

“It goes without saying that Lenin has nothing in common with such a "theory" of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

“It means, secondly, understanding dictatorship of the Party not in a figurative sense, not in the sense of the Party's leadership of the working class, which is the way Comrade Lenin understood it, but in

the strict meaning of the word "dictatorship," that is, in the sense of the Party replacing leadership of the working class by the *use of force* against it. For what is dictatorship in the strict meaning of the word? Dictatorship, in the strict meaning of the word, is power based on the use of force; for without the element of force there is no dictatorship, understood in its strict meaning. Can the Party be a power based on the use of force in relation to its class, in relation to the majority of the working class? Obviously not. Otherwise, it would be a dictatorship not over the bourgeoisie, but over the working class.

"The Party is the teacher, the guide, the leader of its class and not a power based on the use of force in relation to the majority of the working class. Otherwise, there would be no point in talking about the method of persuasion as the proletarian party's principal method of work in the ranks of the working class. Otherwise, there would be no point in saying that the Party must convince the broad proletarian masses of the correctness of its policy, and that only when it performs this task can the Party consider itself a real mass party capable of leading the proletariat into battle. Otherwise, the Party would have to replace the method of persuasion by the method of ordering and threatening the proletariat, which is absurd and absolutely incompatible with the Marxist conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"That is the kind of nonsense to which Zinoviev's "theory" leads, the theory which identifies dictatorship (leadership) of the Party with the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"It goes without saying that Lenin has nothing in common with this "theory."

"It was against this nonsense that I objected when I opposed Zinoviev in my article "Concerning Questions of Leninism." (The Complete Works of Stalin, Vol. 9, pp. 72-73).

There are more quotations and they are longer, but in my opinion, they are necessary. Because the teachings of Lenin and Stalin are very convincing and can easily clarify the misunderstandings on this issue, which is much better than our own arguments.

My learning experience is: "One-party dictatorship" or "party dictatorship" is a fundamentally wrong term, which does not come from Marxist theory, but from the attacks of the enemies of the proletarian dictatorship on the Communist Party that leads the proletarian dictatorship.

The relationship between the Communist Party and the dictatorship of the proletariat can only be a leadership relationship, and this leadership relationship is based on the correctness of the party's line, principles, and policies, not on coercion, let alone dictatorship. As Lenin said: "The dictatorship of the proletariat is the leadership of the proletariat over policies." (Lenin: "On the Grain Tax" (April 21, 1921) "Collected Works of Lenin", Volume 32, page 332; "Selected Works of Lenin" Volume 4, page 515.)

The theoretical expositions of the two revolutionary mentors, as well as their specific practices in practice, including their alliance with the Left Socialist Revolutionaries to participate in the government, tell us that the dictatorship of the proletariat under the leadership of the Communist Party can or should be manifested in the form of an alliance between the Communist Party and other non-communist progressive revolutionary organizations of the proletariat or other working people to jointly realize the dictatorship of the proletariat. This makes us think that Chairman Mao further developed the theoretical ideas of Lenin and Stalin and created the Chinese model of a "coalition government" in the form of a "political consultative conference". The essence of a "coalition government" is a special form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. By extension, the existence of multiple parties and multiple mass organizations is not only permitted under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, but also a way for the Communist Party to better and more closely

connect with the broad masses of the people and to better and more extensively establish a solid class foundation for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In particular, Stalin's criticism of "one-party dictatorship" or "party dictatorship" is almost equivalent to saying that if "one-party dictatorship" occurs, it will inevitably bring about a privileged class and revisionism. Although Stalin did not use the words we often use today, his scientific foresight of the problems that will occur essentially reveals the danger of the emergence of a privileged class and revisionism. Stalin's "On the Foundations of Leninism" and "Concerning Questions of Leninism" are quite well written. Stalin deserved to be the revolutionary mentor of the proletariat all over the world at that time. We must not be influenced by the imperialist reactionaries and revisionists and underestimate and misjudge Comrade Stalin's level.

Related to this question is the question of correctly understanding the relationship between violence and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Some comrades quoted Lenin's words: "Dictatorship is a regime that relies directly on violence and is not bound by any law." "The dictatorship of the proletariat is a regime that is obtained and maintained by using violence against the bourgeoisie, and is not bound by any law." Then the following explanation is derived: "That is to say, if the working class wants to realize its ideals, it must eliminate classes, and the only way to eliminate classes is to rely on the working class's political power, that is, violence, to carry out a comprehensive transformation of society! The dictatorship of the proletariat is a revolutionary process. It is not bound by any law and has revolutionary dictatorship power that is not bound by law!" "That is to say, the Communist Party, the vanguard of the working class, is above the state. It is not bound by the state constitution. The state is only a tool of the Communist Party's dictatorship. That is, the working class controls the state in its entirety through the vanguard and uses state violence to comprehensively transform society."

Lenin's exposition is undoubtedly completely correct, but this comrade's understanding and extension of Lenin's exposition is completely wrong and completely violates Lenin's scientific and comprehensive exposition of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Let us see what Lenin said:

"But the essence of proletarian dictatorship is not in force alone, or even mainly in force. Its chief feature is the organisation and discipline of the advanced contingent of the working people, of their vanguard; of their sole leader, the proletariat, whose object is to build socialism, abolish the division of society into classes, make all members of society working people, and remove the basis for all exploitation of man by man. This object cannot be achieved at one stroke. It requires a fairly long period of transition from capitalism to socialism, because the reorganisation of production is a difficult matter, because radical changes in all spheres of life need time, and because the enormous force of habit of running things in a petty-bourgeois and bourgeois way can only be overcome by a long and stubborn struggle. That is why Marx spoke of an entire period of the dictatorship of the proletariat as the period of transition from capitalism to socialism." (Lenin, "Greetings to the Hungarian Workers" (May 27, 1919), *Collected Works of Lenin*, Vol. 29, p. 351.)

"I have repeatedly pointed out, for example, in my speech at the Petrograd Soviet of Workers, Soldiers and Peasants' Deputies on March 12, that the dictatorship of the proletariat is not merely violence against the exploiters, nor even primarily violence. The economic basis of this revolutionary violence, its vitality and the guarantee of its victory, is that the proletariat represents and realises a higher social organisation of labour than that of capitalism. Therein lies the essence. Herein lies the source of the power of communism and the guarantee of its complete victory." (Lenin: *The Great Initiative*, *Collected Works of Lenin*, Vol. 29, p. 381; *Selected Works of Lenin*, Vol. 4, p. 9.)

Lenin also emphasized that "the dictatorship of the proletariat means the suppression of the bourgeoisie, that is, of the minority of the population, and at the same time it fully develops democracy, that is, it enables all the masses of the population to participate truly equally and universally in all state affairs and in the handling of all the complex problems of the abolition of capitalism." (Lenin: "Reply to P. Kievsky (Y. Pyatakov), (August-September 1916), "Collected Works of Lenin", Vol. 23, p. 14.)

Stalin also had a statement that was completely consistent with Lenin. He said: "Some comrades have concluded that the concept of proletarian dictatorship is limited to the concept of violence. This is incorrect. The dictatorship of the proletariat is not only violence, but also the leadership of the non-proletarian working masses and the construction of a socialist economy that is higher than the capitalist economy and has a higher labour productivity than the capitalist economy. The dictatorship of the proletariat is: (1) Unrestricted violence against capitalists and landlords, (2) proletarian leadership over the peasants, and (3) socialist construction of society as a whole. If any of these three aspects of dictatorship is excluded, there is the danger of distorting the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Only by combining all three aspects can we obtain a complete concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat. (Stalin: "Questions and Answers" (June 9, 1925), "Collected Works of Stalin", Vol. 7, p. 155).

The revolutionary mentor's discussion of the scientific meaning of the proletarian dictatorship is very comprehensive, very accurate, and very easy to understand. In contrast, the statements that some comrades have derived are very obviously wrong and very harmful.

Putting the Communist Party above the state of the proletarian dictatorship, saying: "The Communist Party, the vanguard of the working class, is above the state, it is not bound by the state constitution, and the state is only a tool of the Communist Party's dictatorship." This is a very absurd statement and a serious distortion of the relationship between the Communist Party and the proletarian dictatorship.

Lenin clearly pointed out: "Soviet power was not established by decree or party resolution, because it is above parties, and is the outcome of revolutionary experience, the experience of millions of men: " (Lenin: "Extraordinary All-Russian Congress of Railway Employees", "Collected Works of Lenin", Volume 26, page 467.) The Soviet "is above all parties", which is the criterion for the relationship between the dictatorship of the proletariat and the Communist Party.

Stalin also has a scientific statement, which is almost equivalent to a direct criticism of the above erroneous statement. Stalin said: "The party is the tool of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The party is the highest form of proletarian organisation. The party is the main leadership basis within the proletariat and in all its organisations. However, it does not follow from this that the party can be regarded as an end in itself, as the supreme force. The party is not only the highest form of class unity of the proletariat, but also a tool for the proletariat to win political power (when the proletariat has not yet won the dictatorship) and to consolidate and expand the dictatorship (when the proletariat has already won the dictatorship)." (Stalin: On the Foundations of Leninism, (April-May 1924), "Collected Works of Stalin", Volume 6, pp. 156-157). Stalin's statement is completely correct. "The Party is a tool of the dictatorship of the proletariat", not as this comrade said the other way around, "the dictatorship of the proletariat is a tool of the Party", which is superior to the dictatorship of the proletariat. This statement is not only completely wrong in theory, but also fatally harmful in practice. It will lead to the Communist Party degenerating into a revisionist party, a fascist party, and a privileged class, and the dictatorship of the proletariat degenerating into the dictatorship of the fascist bourgeoisie. From the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe to China, the historical facts of the rise of revisionism and the restoration of capitalism have fully proved this point, right?

There is a serious ideological confusion among Maoists around "one-party dictatorship" and some related theoretical issues, and it has not been resolved to this day. Therefore, I have used a large amount of space here and quoted a lot of Lenin and Stalin's teachings, in order to help our comrades correctly understand the very important and very realistic issues of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the relationship between the Communist Party and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

It is worth studying that these comrades are also reading Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and quoting quotations from Marxism-Leninism-Maoism at every turn. However, why do they understand not the correct ideas of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, but the bourgeois or petty-bourgeois erroneous ideas that distort Marxism-Leninism-Maoism? What lessons does this leave us?

One is that these comrades do not have a profound and correct understanding of the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. They have not seriously understood, let alone mastered, a theory such as the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is the soul of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. As a result, they can only speak nonsense based on their own understanding and knowledge.

Another thing is that these comrades are not serious about the theories of the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist revolutionary mentors. This is mainly manifested in that they only read a few quotations, but did not seriously and systematically study the theoretical thoughts of the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist revolutionary mentors, and did not work hard; they did not correctly understand some of the words said and written by the revolutionary mentors based on the specific historical background at that time, and did not synthesize all the revolutionary mentors' discussions on relevant issues. They only made dogmatic interpretations of a few quotations and added very casual and irresponsible elaborations, which inevitably led to the mistakes of taking them out of context and distorting the original meaning.

In connection with this point, these comrades have forgotten that when understanding and applying the teachings of the revolutionary mentors, they must be combined with the realistic social conditions we face today. This not only involves the question of whether the teachings of the revolutionary mentors can be correctly understood, but also involves the question of how to correctly treat and correctly apply the guiding role of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. If Marxism-Leninism-Maoism is treated with a dogmatic attitude and method, it will be impossible to proceed from reality and flexibly and correctly apply Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, and it will be impossible to have new creations and new developments in Marxism-Leninism-Maoism under new and specific practical conditions. In the history of our party, the mistakes made by leftist dogmatism and Chairman Mao's creative search for the path of China's new democratic revolution are the best examples of how to correctly treat the teachings of revolutionary mentors. Today, facing the cruel reality of revisionism coming to power and the restoration of capitalism from the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe to China, the negative role played by "one-party dictatorship" and one-party autocracy is a major historical issue that Communists must proceed from reality and conduct theoretical summaries. How can we go the opposite way and still defend "one-party dictatorship"?

The most fundamental one is that the class standpoint of these comrades is limited. Simply put, they have not yet transformed from the class standpoint of small producers, small intellectuals, and petty bourgeoisie who are entangled in China's traditional feudal culture to the class standpoint of the proletariat. Therefore, it is impossible for them to deeply understand and grasp the theory of Marxist-Leninist-Maoist communist revolution. The narrow, feudal, patriarchal mind of small producers, small intellectuals, and the petty bourgeoisie and the mind of the proletariat to liberate all mankind are not only different in class standpoint, but also in historical level. Such comrades, without a profound self-transformation and self-revolution, will find it difficult to become a true communist, and naturally will



not be able to correctly understand Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, but will often misinterpret Marxism-Leninism-Maoism with their own narrow vision.

This is probably the class root of the frequent disagreements between the revolutionaries and the dogmatic extreme leftists in the Maoists.

If we do not solve these problems of subjective cognition, and do not seriously study and listen to the teachings of the revolutionary mentors, we will not get any positive results even if we continue to argue endlessly.

**Example 2:**

On the issue of proletarian constitutionalism.

This is also a serious disagreement, and the debate has not been resolved so far.

Chairman Mao said it very clearly: "What is constitutionalism? It is democratic politics." The basic requirement of a democratic republic is democracy. Of course, this kind of democracy is class-based, and it depends on which class controls the democratic republic. As a form of government, the democratic republic has found constitutionalism in order to realise the requirements of democracy. This is a manifestation of the value and guarantee of a democratic republic.

As the name implies, constitutionalism is politics under the guidance and regulation of the Constitution. The Constitution is the fundamental law that guides and regulates democracy. The proletarian constitution embodies the fundamental interests and fundamental demands of the proletariat and the broad masses of the working people. Only by guiding and regulating politics with such a constitution can we realise true proletarian democracy, that is, realise the dictatorship of the proletariat, and ensure the realisation of the fundamental interests and fundamental demands of the proletariat and the broad masses of the working people. This is the essence of proletarian constitutionalism. It is under such a proletarian constitutional system that the true socialism belonging to the proletariat and the broad masses of the people can be protected from changing colour.

Therefore, emphasising the adherence to proletarian constitutionalism is unified with emphasising the adherence to proletarian democracy, the dictatorship of the proletariat, and socialism. As Lenin said, they are essentially synonymous.

In June 2011, I published "On the Consistency of the Proletarian Dictatorship and the Proletarian Constitutionalism", trying to use the theoretical ideas expressed by Chairman Mao in his speech "The Constitutionalism of New Democracy" to explain the theoretical basis and practical significance of proposing proletarian constitutionalism. Today, it seems to be generally correct and in line with the correct understanding of Mao Zedong Thought, so I quote a few paragraphs here.

"This issue is worth raising and discussing, not only because a few '50 cents'<sup>69</sup> and 'thugs' have repeatedly created confusion on this important issue, but more importantly, this issue is very important both in theory and in practice for opposing the revisionist line and for the future

---

<sup>69</sup> "Fifty cents" refers to a person who is employed and guided by administrative organs, universities, and websites in Chinese mainland, and publishes comments in favour of the Chinese government or relevant departments on various websites, discussion boards, etc. on a full-time or part-time basis. They usually act as ordinary netizens, posting content in support of the Chinese government (or relevant departments), besieging online voices critical of the government, or adopting other online communication tactics in an attempt to influence, guide, and create online public opinion. The term stems from netizens' speculation that these people claim to be paid fifty cents for every comment – Trans.

construction of the proletarian dictatorship and the proletarian state apparatus. Perhaps, precisely because of this importance, the online accomplices who are attached to the revisionist rulers are keen to create confusion on this issue."

"Listen to what Chairman Mao said. Chairman Mao delivered a famous speech entitled "New Democratic Constitutionalism" at the founding meeting of the Yan'an Constitutional Promotion Association on February 20, 1940. Chairman Mao clearly said: "What is constitutional government? It is democratic government. I agree with what our old Comrade Wu has just said. What kind of democratic government do we need today? New-democratic government, the constitutional government of New Democracy. Not the old, outmoded, European-American type of so-called democracy which is bourgeois dictatorship, nor as yet the Soviet type of democracy which is the dictatorship of the proletariat."

"Chairman Mao's words are very clear. There is not only bourgeois constitutionalism, but also proletarian constitutionalism. According to China's situation, there is also new democratic constitutionalism. This is not a problem at all in theory."

"According to Chairman Mao's opinion, which is also the opinion of Marx and Lenin, proletarian constitutionalism is proletarian democratic politics. I have thought about it initially. The dictatorship of the proletariat, proletarian democracy, proletarian constitutionalism, and proletarian state are essentially the same thing. Just as Lenin said, the dictatorship of the proletariat and proletarian democracy can be said to be synonyms. These can all be said to be synonyms. The difference is only that the concepts are defined from different observation angles. The essence is the same, unified, and consistent. According to the historical characteristics of our country, we are a people's democratic dictatorship, and therefore a people's democratic state. The people's democratic constitutionalism and people's democratic politics also mean the same thing, and the essence is still the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"Why do I say this? The so-called proletarian constitutionalism is nothing more than the proletarian dictatorship under the guidance of the proletarian constitution. The proletarian dictatorship must have laws and regulations. Otherwise, how can we implement the dictatorship of the class? Without rules and regulations, wouldn't it be a mess? So we need a fundamental law to guide us. This is a very easy-to-understand principle. Once someone makes a mess, a problem that is not a problem becomes a problem. This is the harm caused by the swindlers. I think that if I make a thorough reckoning, the Maoist comrades will immediately understand. It can be said that proletarian constitutionalism is the form in which the proletarian dictatorship is implemented. Naturally, it is also a proletarian state under the guidance of the proletarian constitution, and it is also democracy under the guidance of the proletarian constitution. Aren't these unified? Yes, they are unified and very clear. Those comrades who have been deceived should read Marxism-Leninism-Maoism seriously. "

"We are now emphasizing proletarian constitutionalism, or people's democratic constitutionalism, or socialist constitutionalism. This is not aimless, nor is it a purely theoretical discussion. Instead, it is highly targeted and militant. This is to oppose revisionism.

"A fundamental characteristic of revisionist rule is autocracy. Autocracy brings privileges and also maintains privileges. It is the lifeblood of the privileged class that practices revisionism. The reason why Chairman Mao denounced the revisionism as the most reactionary fascist bourgeois rule was because he saw this characteristic of autocracy. The reactionary nature of autocracy is self-evident. Marx and Engels criticized the situation in Germany, and Lenin criticized the situation in Russia. They pointed out that this is a feudal, backward, and reactionary political form, and that it is something that

must be fought against first. This reactionary political form is unified with the reactionary and autocratic rule of the bourgeoisie. Without removing this reactionary political shackle, the proletariat cannot launch its own class struggle. The principles taught by the mentors are consistent, and we must seriously understand and truly grasp them.

“The lessons from reality are clear. As long as the autocracy is not broken, the proletariat and the broad masses of working people cannot act as a class, and there is no condition for the proletarian revolutionary movement to unfold. Not only is it impossible to resort to political struggle, but even the desire to solve some practical problems is extremely weak. The right of the Western working class to express their opinions, under the conditions of bourgeois democracy, takes various forms, and strikes are an effective method that is often used; however, under the reactionary rule of revisionism, all rights are completely deprived. Therefore, in terms of the form of rule, revisionist rule is more backward, more reactionary, and more corrupt.

“Under such circumstances, the constitution is meaningless, and the people's democratic rights confirmed and protected by the constitution, such as the rights of speech, assembly, association, publishing, and demonstration, cannot be implemented.

“This means that the proletarian constitutional government no longer exists, and this means that the proletarian dictatorship no longer exists. The proletarian dictatorship has become inevitable and unavoidable. It can be seen that defending the proletarian constitutional government is defending the proletarian dictatorship.”

“Precisely because upholding the dictatorship of the proletariat means upholding class struggle and continuing the revolution, the revolutionary significance of upholding proletarian constitutionalism is very clear. It is not only not a bourgeois viewpoint, but also a revolutionary viewpoint against the bourgeoisie.

“The reason is very simple. The dictatorship of the proletariat needs a form, and the fundamental form is the proletarian constitutional government. Yes, the dictatorship of the proletariat requires violence, but it is the proletarian constitutional government that is the legal system established in the form of the highest authority and the highest law that guarantees that violence can be firmly controlled by the proletariat and the working people. If someone asks why the significance of socialist constitutional government is so overestimated, I don't need to explain or debate. You just need to face reality and you should be able to answer it yourself. It is precisely because there is no socialist proletarian constitutionalism that the constitution is nothing but a dead letter, and the dictatorship has turned its guns around. The problem is not that constitutionalism is unimportant, but that it has not been truly implemented. We cannot abandon constitutionalism just because it has not been truly implemented and has not played its due role. On the contrary, what we need to fight for is to realize it and implement it. This struggle is essentially a struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat. As long as you recognise the significance of the dictatorship of the proletariat, you will inevitably understand the significance of the proletarian constitutionalism.”

“The political system must be reformed. Just like the economic system reform, there is a question of direction and line. To carry out socialist political system reform, I think the core issue is to implement the socialist proletarian constitutional government or the people's democratic constitutional government. This is a theme and a guideline. If we grasp this theme and this guideline, we will grasp the concrete implementation of the proletarian dictatorship and the concrete steps of class struggle and continued revolution.”

These statements made more than a decade ago are not only still correct today, but also have great practical significance. This problem has not been completely solved so far, and comrades still have not reached a unified understanding based on correct thinking.

We should still use the old method used above, relying on the authority of revolutionary mentors and their teachings to help us understand the significance of proletarian constitution and constitutionalism.

When the first Russian Soviet Constitution was produced in 1918, the second year after the victory of the October Revolution, Lenin once gave a high evaluation: "The Soviet Constitution, like the Soviets, was produced in the period of revolutionary struggle. It is the first constitution to declare that state power belongs to the working people and deprives the exploiting class, the enemies of the builders of the new life, of all rights. This is the important difference between it and the constitutions of other countries, and it is also the guarantee of victory over capital." ("Speech at the Mass Meeting of the Khamovniki District", July 26, 1918, "Collected Works of Lenin", Volume 27, page 520.) And he added: "What kind of organisation was the Soviet last October? It had just been created, and we could not give it a real and definite status, but now we have a Soviet Constitution. We know that this Soviet Constitution, ratified in July, was not invented by some committee, was not invented by lawyers, and was not copied from some other constitution. There is no such constitution as ours in the world. It records the experience of the struggle and organisation of the proletarian masses against the exploiters at home and throughout the world. We have rich experience in struggle. (Applause) These experiences clearly prove to us that organized workers have established Soviet power without bureaucracy, without a standing army, without the actual privileges enjoyed by the bourgeoisie, and have laid the foundations of new construction in the factories." (Lenin: "The Sixth Extraordinary All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Workers', Peasants', Cossacks and Red Army Deputies", "Collected Works of Lenin", Volume 28, page 129.) In "A Letter to the American Workers", Lenin also said: "The old bourgeois-democratic constitution enshrined formal equality and the right to assembly, while our proletarian and peasant Soviet constitution has abandoned the hypocritical words of formal equality. When the bourgeois republicans overthrew the monarchy, they did not care about the formal equality of the monarchists and republicans. When it comes to the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, only traitors and idiots will strive for formal equal rights for the bourgeoisie. "Freedom of assembly" is worthless to the workers and peasants if all the good houses are occupied by the bourgeoisie. Our Soviets have taken all the good houses in the cities and villages from the rich and handed them over to the workers and peasants for their assembly and association. This is the freedom of assembly for our working people! This is the meaning and content of our Soviet Constitution, our Socialist Constitution." (Collected Works of Lenin, Vol. 28, p. 55.)

Lenin's teachings explained the significance and content of the proletarian constitution and the socialist constitution in a very specific and clear way. Lenin told us that the emergence of the proletarian constitution and the socialist constitution established and affirmed the historical status of the dictatorship of the proletariat in terms of fundamental law, and that all the contents of this constitution fully embodied the dictatorship of the proletariat and demonstrated the consistency between the proletarian constitution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Chairman Mao's understanding of the importance of the constitution is completely consistent with Lenin's ideas. After the basic victory of the War to Resist U.S. Aggression and Aid Korea, Chairman Mao immediately took a group of people to Hangzhou to draft the Constitution of the People's Republic of China. After a long period of serious work, a draft was written. The draft was widely discussed by more than 500 people in Beijing and more than 8,000 people across the country, and more than 5,900 opinions were collected, and finally the draft was finalized. Chairman Mao gave a speech on the draft constitution of the People's Republic of China at the 30th meeting of the Central People's Government

Committee. The speech introduced the process of the draft, especially the content and significance of the Constitution of the People's Republic of China.

Chairman Mao emphasised: "Why do all of you and the majority of activists support this draft constitution? Why do you think it is good? There are two main reasons: one is that it summarises experience, and the other is that it combines principle and flexibility.

"First, this draft constitution summarises historical experience, especially the experience of revolution and construction in the past five years. It summarises the experience of the people's revolution led by the proletariat against imperialism, feudalism, and bureaucratic capitalism, and summarises the experience of social reform, economic construction, cultural construction, and government work in recent years."

"Our draft constitution mainly summarises our country's revolutionary experience and construction experience. At the same time, it is also a combination of domestic experience and international experience. Our constitution belongs to the socialist constitutional type."

"Our constitution is a new socialist type, different from the bourgeois type. Our constitution is much more advanced than their constitution during the revolutionary period. We are superior to them."

"Second, our draft constitution combines principle and flexibility. There are basically two principles: democratic principle and socialist principle. Our democracy is not bourgeois democracy, but people's democracy, that is, people's democratic dictatorship led by the proletariat and based on the worker-peasant alliance. The principle of people's democracy runs through our entire constitution. The other is the socialist principle. Our country now has socialism. The constitution stipulates that we must complete socialist transformation and realise the socialist industrialization of the country. This is principle. To implement the socialist principle, does it mean that socialism will be implemented in everything across the country in one day? This is very revolutionary in form, but it lacks flexibility, so it will not work, will be opposed, and will fail. Therefore, things that cannot be done at the moment must be allowed to be done step by step. "

"This draft constitution is supported by everyone and is good because of two things: one is that it correctly and appropriately summarizes experience, and the other is that it correctly and appropriately combines principle and flexibility."

"This draft constitution is completely feasible and must be implemented. Of course, today it is only a draft. In a few months, it will be passed by the National People's Congress and become a formal constitution. Today we are preparing to implement it. After it is passed, every citizen of the country must implement it, especially state agency staff must take the lead in implementation, and first of all, everyone present here must implement it. Failure to implement it is a violation of the constitution."

"After our draft constitution is published, it will be unanimously supported by the people of the whole country and will enhance the enthusiasm of the people of the whole country. A group must have a constitution, and a country must also have a constitution. The constitution is a general constitution and a fundamental law. By using the form of a fundamental law such as the constitution to fix the principles of people's democracy and socialism, the people of the whole country will have a clear track and feel that there is a clear, definite and correct path to follow, which will enhance the enthusiasm of the people of the whole country." (Selected Works of Mao Zedong, Volume 5, pages 127-129)

The significance of the constitution as described by Chairman Mao is completely consistent with that as described by Lenin. Chairman Mao used popular language and combined it with China's reality to unify the two principles of implementing the constitution and realising people's democracy and taking

the socialist road, making it easier for us to understand how important the proletarian constitution and the socialist constitution are for building and consolidating the socialist society of the people's democratic dictatorship.

This is the essential feature of the proletarian constitutional government under the guidance of the proletarian constitution that the revolutionary mentor taught us.

In short, the dictatorship of the proletariat needs a specific form, and the proletarian constitutional government is the most important, fundamental and important specific form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Adhering to the proletarian constitutional government and adhering to the proletarian dictatorship have the same significance, both of which are for the purpose of adhering to people's democracy and adhering to the socialist path. From this, it can be seen that adhering to the proletarian constitutional government has the significance of opposing revisionism and the restoration of capitalism. It can be said that only by adhering to the proletarian constitutional government can it be possible to adhere to the people's democratic dictatorship (essentially the dictatorship of the proletariat) and adhere to the socialist path.

It is these principles that tell us that the theory of new democratic constitutionalism (people's democratic constitutionalism) and the theory of socialist constitutionalism (proletarian constitutionalism) are important contents of Mao Zedong's theory of continuing revolution.

By the way, the so-called speech of Chairman Mao on the Constitution in Beidaihe that is now circulating on the Internet is completely opposite to the speech officially released in Volume 5 of Selected Works of Mao Zedong, which is quoted here, in terms of its content that despises and denies the Constitution. It is obviously a forgery. It is estimated that it was written by someone who denies the theory of proletarian constitutionalism. It is very wrong and bad to do so.

### **Example 3:**

On the issue of nationalisation of the army. Is this a problem? Of course not. Not only is it not a problem, but it should not be a question for discussion. What is particularly ironic is that in the ranks of the so-called Maoists, this non-problem is still being discussed.

The army is the army of the state, the main component of the state apparatus, and the pillar on which the state apparatus depends. Without the army, as well as the police, public security, procuratorial and judicial organs and other tools of dictatorship, there would be no state apparatus. This is the basic theory of Marxism on the state apparatus, and a scientific summary of historical facts since the emergence of the state. "Nationalisation of the army" is nothing more than a correct expression of this historical fact.

Under the condition that the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established, it is necessary to adhere to the basic Marxist theory on the state. The era we are in is the era of imperialism, the era of the proletariat carrying out socialist revolution. The country that has seized power and established the dictatorship of the proletariat must also have an army and must be able to control the army. The army is the pillar and tool of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It consolidates the country of the dictatorship of the proletariat internally and defends the country of the dictatorship of the proletariat externally, realising the unity of the state and the army, that is, the unity of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the army.

The principle of the Paris Commune was to abolish the standing army and replace it with the arming of the whole people. The "all people are soldiers" of Chairman Mao's era embodied the principle of the Paris Commune and was one of the important ideological contents of Maoism. All people are



soldiers is the highest and most thorough form of the proletarian dictatorship. The working people, with the proletariat as the main body, are the army, the state, and the most powerful proletarian dictatorship, reflecting the complete unity of the proletarian dictatorship, the state, and the people. The people are the army and the state. When we talk about the nationalisation of the army, this is the most thorough nationalisation of the army.

Under the conditions that the proletarian dictatorship and the proletarian state have been established, it is completely wrong to emphasise "the party commands the gun" and implement the party's command of the gun, to put the party above the state, above the National People's Congress, that is, above the people, to turn the army of the proletarian state into the party's army and directly command the army. This is completely contrary to the Marxist theory of the state and the principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The "turmoil" in 1989 verified this error. This is a naked warlord road of replacing the state with the party and the army with the party, which is an important reason that will inevitably lead to the fascist bourgeois dictatorship. Chairman Mao's repeated criticism of the revisionist leaders as big party bosses and big warlords includes this criticism.

"The Party commands the gun" is a very important political principle formulated by Chairman Mao in the process of leading the new democratic revolution and in the process of the Chinese Communist Party leading the Chinese People's Liberation Army in the armed seizure of power.

It is an important content of Mao Zedong's theory of new democratic revolution and an important condition for ensuring the victory of armed struggle and the victory of the new democratic revolution. All truths are conditional. In "Problems of War and Strategy" written by Chairman Mao in 1938, he gave a scientific explanation of the historical conditions for the emergence and application of the political principle of "the Party commands the gun".

Chairman Mao discussed the great differences between the historical conditions faced by the Chinese revolution and those faced by capitalist countries, and then concluded: "All this shows the difference between China and capitalist countries. In China, the main form of struggle is war, and the main form of organisation is the army. Everything else, such as mass organisations and mass struggles, is very important, indispensable, and cannot be ignored, but it is all for the sake of war." Chairman Mao reiterated Stalin's statement: "In China it is armed revolution against armed counter-revolution. This is one of the characteristics of the Chinese revolution and one of its advantages." He believed that "this conclusion is completely correct". Chairman Mao then pointed out: "Foreign bourgeois parties do not need to directly control a part of the army. China is different. Due to feudal division, landlords or bourgeois groups or parties, whoever has guns has power, and whoever has more guns has greater power. The proletarian party in such an environment should see the core of the problem. Communist Party members do not fight for personal military power (they must not fight, and never learn from Zhang Guotao) but they must fight for the military power of the party and the people. Every party member should understand this truth, 'Political power comes from the barrel of a gun'."

Based on the truth that the Party must control the barrel of the gun (that is, the army), Chairman Mao further continued: "Our principle is that the Party commands the gun, and never allow the gun to command the Party." (Selected Works of Mao Zedong, Volume 2, pages 508-512.)

This is part of Chairman Mao's speech at the Sixth Plenary Session of the Sixth Central Committee of the Party. His discussion of the characteristics of the Chinese revolution is very comprehensive, very insightful, and very profound. I have only excerpted a few key points here. Comrades are better off reading the original work.

Chairman Mao's discussion tells us that under the specific historical conditions of China, the Chinese Communist Party must take the path of encircling the cities from the countryside to lead the new democratic revolution. To achieve this, there must be a people's army created and led by the Party. Second, it tells us that this army under the leadership of the Party must adhere to the principle of the Party commanding the gun, and never allow the gun to command the Party.

The two principles mentioned by Chairman Mao are unified and are based on the reality of the Chinese revolution. The path of the Chinese revolution is the path of armed struggle with revolutionary armed forces against counter-revolutionary armed forces. To follow this path, we need an army under the leadership of the Party, and this army must implement the principle that the Party commands the gun, not the gun commands the Party.

Chairman Mao's exposition clearly tells us that the principle of "the Party commands the gun, not the gun commands the Party" is a principle that must be implemented under the historical conditions of seizing power in the process of the New Democratic Revolution. It is aimed at the warlord style that was separated from the command of the Party at that time. He also emphasised that "Communists do not fight for personal military power" by taking Zhang Guotao as an example. The army is not a personal property and cannot be separated from the command of the Party.

We cannot talk about the party commanding the gun without considering the historical conditions at that time. Without specific historical conditions, truth may turn to its opposite and become a fallacy.

The question we are studying today is how to deal with the relationship between the party, the army and the country under the historical conditions of having seized power and established the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Fortunately, Chairman Mao also had a clear opinion on this issue. This is what Chairman Mao said about this issue in "On the Coalition Government" in 1945.

Chairman Mao expounded it this way: "'The army belongs to the state'. This is absolutely correct. There is no army in the world that does not belong to the state. But what state? A feudal fascist dictatorship of the big landlords, big bankers and big compradors, or a new democratic state of the masses of the people? China should only establish a new democratic state and, on this basis, a new democratic coalition government; all Chinese troops should belong to this state and this government, so as to safeguard the freedom of the people and effectively oppose foreign invaders. When a new democratic coalition government emerges in China, the troops in China's liberated areas will be immediately handed over to it. But all the Kuomintang troops must also be handed over to it at the same time."

The 1954 Constitution, drafted under the personal leadership of Chairman Mao, embodies this spirit. Article 20 states: "The armed forces of the People's Republic belong to the people. Their mission is to safeguard the achievements of the people's revolution and national construction and to safeguard the sovereignty, territorial integrity and security of the country." Article 42 states: "The President of the People's Republic of China commands the armed forces of the whole country and serves as Chairman of the National Defence Commission."

The view that "the Party commands the gun" was not written in, but that the President of the country elected by the National People's Congress commands the gun, that is, the state commands the gun. The view that "the Party commands the gun" was written into the later revisions of the Constitution, and it became that the Central Military Commission (Chairman) of the Party commands the armed forces of the whole country, and the Party commands the gun on behalf of the state. This is

inconsistent with the Marxist theory of the proletarian dictatorship state, and it is also inconsistent with Chairman Mao's thoughts. It is completely wrong.

The "Party commanded the gun" to suppress the masses during the "storm" was the inevitable result of this theoretical and practical error. Even the "October 6<sup>th</sup> Coup" in 1976 had the same result.

This is by no means limited to the question of the affiliation and nature of the army. In fact, it involves the question of all the tools of state dictatorship, such as the "public security, procuratorial and judicial organs". Originally, these forms of violence should be controlled by the state as tools of the dictatorship of the proletarian state. The state of the proletarian dictatorship is the people's state, a state controlled by the people; all the tools of dictatorship are controlled by the state, which is actually controlled by the people. If this is done, how can the problem of implementing fascist bourgeois dictatorship over the people arise? It is precisely because the current system is the opposite, the party commands the gun, the party commands the "public security, procuratorial and judicial organs", and the party commands all the tools of dictatorship. As a result, once the party becomes revisionist and degenerates into a bourgeois party, these tools of dictatorship will inevitably degenerate into violent tools of implementing fascist bourgeois dictatorship over the working people. Moreover, I want to boldly emphasise that the Chinese People's Liberation Army, the people's army under the leadership of the Communist Party of China with Chairman Mao as its leader, no longer exists. The fundamental nature of this army has degenerated and has degenerated into a reactionary and counter-revolutionary tool of violence. Not only did the suppression of the "turmoil" bring shame to the Chinese People's Liberation Army, but the armed police that was established afterwards were also directly established to suppress possible resistance from the broad masses of working people. The essence of the current public security, procuratorate, and courts has also undergone the same degeneration. It has become a "new normal" for revolutionary comrades who defend Maoism and Chairman Mao to be "jailed." Against this historical background. The slogan of "smashing the public security, procuratorate, and courts" that Chairman Mao once supported during the Cultural Revolution now has the correct revolutionary significance again.

In understanding the violent tools of fascist bourgeois dictatorship, we should not blur our understanding of its class essence just because its name has not been changed and its plaque has not been removed. We must firmly adhere to the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist theory of the state and stand firmly on the revolutionary stand of the proletariat.

Chairman Mao said that Hitler was worse than Charles de Gaulle. Now, Deng Xiaoping and others are worse than Chiang Ching-kuo<sup>70</sup>. Moreover, we must see that the transformation from the dictatorship of the proletariat to the dictatorship of the fascist bourgeoisie was not accidental. The distortion of "the party commands the gun" is one of the reasons. Chairman Mao foresaw this possibility. He saw the historical fact that the Soviet revisionist party implemented the dictatorship of the fascist bourgeoisie, and also saw that there was a Khrushchev hidden in the Chinese party. He summed up the lessons left by this historical fact in a timely manner and put forward the problem of both "big party cliques" and "big warlords". The Lin Biao group was such a danger, and Chairman Mao was determined to get rid of the Lin Biao group, also based on this danger. Therefore, Chairman Mao's saying "Hitler is worse than Charles de Gaulle" has many rich and profound contents. We often only have a simple understanding, but we don't really understand it.

---

<sup>70</sup> Chiang Ching-kuo (April 27, 1910 - January 13, 1988), was the eldest son of Chiang Kai-shek. After Chiang Kai-shek's death, on 5 April 1975, Chiang Ching-kuo was elected chairman of the Central Committee of the Chinese Kuomintang and chairman of the Central Standing Committee, and in 1978 was inaugurated as "president" of Taiwan – Trans.

This question actually also contains the regular pattern of what Chairman Mao said was "very easy". Under the autocratic system of one-party dictatorship, the revisionist party that usurped the power of the party and the government emphasised the need to implement "the party commanding the gun". Its purpose is to change the nature of the army and turn the army into a violent tool to maintain the restoration of capitalism and suppress the socialist revolution. It is in such a process of the class nature of the state machine that we have repeatedly seen that it is under the suppression of the "gun barrel" that obeys the "party commanding the gun" that "stability overrides everything" is achieved, thus "very easily" and smoothly realising the restoration of capitalism.

It can be seen that the debate on "the party commanding the gun" is by no means an empty theoretical debate, but a debate with very realistic practical significance. We Maoist comrades must not be confused.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is the state machine for the proletariat and the broad masses of the working people to suppress the resistance of the bourgeoisie and all other exploiting classes, and the army is the main component of this state machine. The people's armed forces of the Paris Commune replaced the standing army; the Red Army of the Russian Soviet regime; the Red Army, the Eighth Route Army, the New Fourth Army, the Chinese People's Liberation Army, the militia, and the people's army of the Chinese revolution all reflect that the dictatorship of the proletariat needs a tool of violence belonging to the proletariat - the army, the army of the proletariat, and the army of the working people. This is the class nature and class affiliation of this armed force. The dictatorship of the proletariat and the proletarian army are unified. Only the dictatorship of the proletariat can command the proletarian army through a specific form, not any political party, including the Communist Party. A genuine Marxist-Leninist-Maoist Communist Party can and should lead the dictatorship of the proletariat; under such historical conditions, the leadership of the genuine Marxist-Leninist-Maoist Communist Party over the proletarian army can and must be manifested through the form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. However, even under such circumstances, the genuine Marxist-Leninist-Maoist Communist Party cannot bypass the dictatorship of the proletariat to exercise direct leadership and direct command over the proletarian army.

The people's army belongs to the people. The people's army loves the people. The people's army serves the people. The people's army obeys the command of the people. The people here, of course, refer to the proletariat and the broad masses of working people. The people here, of course, want to express their will and realise their demands through the people's political power. This is the inseparable and flesh-and-blood relationship between the people and the people's army.

#### **Example 4**

Creating a "coalition government" in the form of a people's democratic dictatorship is an important part of Mao Zedong's theory of new democratic revolution, that is, the theory of people's democratic socialist revolution. It is another new contribution and development to Marxism.

The workers of Paris created the first form of proletarian dictatorship, the "Paris Commune" (the members of the Commune belonged to different political factions) - called the "working class government" by Marx; the October Revolution led by Lenin created a new form of proletarian dictatorship, the "Workers' and Peasants' Government" (at Lenin's insistence, it shared power with the Left Socialist Revolutionaries) - the "Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Soviets"; Chairman Mao created a new form of people's democratic dictatorship which is essentially the dictatorship of the proletariat - the "coalition government" of various revolutionary classes under the leadership of the proletariat

(including the "Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference" composed of a Communist Party and eight progressive bourgeois democratic parties).

Mao Zedong's theory of people's democratic dictatorship and its form of "coalition government" is a major breakthrough in the Marxist theory of proletarian dictatorship. Its main significance lies in the fact that the principle of proletarian dictatorship must be combined with the specific reality of each country, and in the treatment of the state system and political system, changes and adjustments can be made in accordance with the specific historical conditions and in line with the actual situation. For example, the "CPPCC" is a major creation of the state system and political system for realizing the people's democratic dictatorship.

The principles of the "January Revolution" of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, that is, the principle of the proletarian revolutionaries implementing a great alliance to seize power from the small handful of capitalist roaders in power and establishing a "revolutionary committee" combining three elements in one, are also a new breakthrough and new development in the construction of the state and political system through the continued socialist revolution under the personal leadership of Chairman Mao and under the new historical conditions of socialist society.

The proletarian revolutionaries implemented a great alliance, which showed that the proletarian revolutionaries might not be one faction, but several factions. However, as long as they were proletarian revolutionaries, they should implement a great alliance. The proletarian revolutionaries at that time were still mass organisations, political associations at a lower level than political parties. But it was a political organisation after all. Chairman Mao supported its existence, and even supported that it should implement a great alliance and participate in the seizure of power. This is also of great enlightenment significance for us to correctly understand how to deal with the issue of political parties under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The proletarian revolutionaries should implement a great alliance, seize power from the capitalist-roaders, and establish a new temporary political power body - the Revolutionary Committee. It can be said that this is the highest form of continuing the revolution under socialist conditions, and this highest form was carried out smoothly and finally completed successfully under the personal guidance and support of Chairman Mao, and under the personal leadership and approval of the Party Central Committee. This has extremely profound and realistic enlightenment significance for how we should carry out the socialist re-revolution today, what path the socialist re-revolution should take, what goals it should achieve, and what historical tasks it should complete. It can be said that the "Revolutionary Committee" established after seizing power from the capitalist-roaders is an upgraded version of the socialist coalition government under socialist conditions, surpassing and exceeding the "coalition government" during the democratic revolution.

This is of historical significance. At that time, as Chairman Mao said, this was only a partial improvement of the proletarian dictatorship, and the current historical task is to overthrow the bourgeois dictatorship and rebuild the proletarian dictatorship. It is necessary to negate the negation again, and build a new type of socialist coalition government of the great alliance of proletarian revolutionaries (proletarian parties) in the form of a higher state system and political system, in the sense of truly embodying the dictatorship of the proletariat.

This is a major theoretical and practical issue in the historical task of socialist re-revolution that we face.

History has infinitely rich and infinitely wonderful content and forms. Let us create it in the future socialist re-revolution.

In short, Chairman Mao's theory on the "coalition government" and the theory of the great coalition of proletarian revolutionaries to seize power contains very rich content. In the past and now, we have not studied it enough, let alone a deep understanding, and often even misinterpreted it. For example, the examples given above are actually included in Chairman Mao's theory on how to deal with the "coalition government", and the ideas of some of our comrades are contrary to Chairman Mao's thoughts.

We still need to study Marxism-Leninism-Maoism seriously. Facing the arduous historical task of socialist re-revolution, we must make progress.

The theory of the people's democratic dictatorship, including the theory of its state and political system, is the theory of building people's democratic socialism (in a broad sense), that is, the theory of carrying out the continued revolution under the conditions of people's democratic socialism; this theory has the significance of the general program of the Maoist socialist continuing revolution.

The general principle is clear and the whole is clear. By taking the people's democratic dictatorship as the general principle and commanding the overall content of all aspects of the socialist continued revolution, we can steadily and step by step push forward the historical task of building (broadly defined) people's democratic socialism. This has very important guiding theoretical and practical significance not only for the historical tasks we face at home, but also for the communist movement around the world.

When studying and researching Mao Zedong's theory of socialist continued revolution, we must not ignore the important issue of how to build the state and political system of this socialist society. I have written small books such as "On Semi-Socialism" and "On People's Democracy" on this issue, which can be used as a reference for comrades who are interested in this issue.

Until now, it should be said that our understanding of the political system of socialist society is often limited to blindness.

People will fall into blindness, and Communists are no exception. Fake Communists are not worth mentioning. Even the real and loyal Communists have not really solved the following questions in theory and practice: why socialism has generally failed, how to avoid revisionism coming to power, capitalism being restored, and failure again if socialism is to be rebuilt, how to carry out the socialist revolution, and what kind of socialist society should be built? The examples cited above are proof of this. Therefore, we must continue to move forward on the basis of inheriting the theoretical legacy of the socialist continuing revolution left to us by Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, especially Maoism. As Lenin taught us: "We never regard Marx's theory as something immutable and inviolable; on the contrary, we firmly believe that it only lays the foundation for a science, and if socialists do not want to lag behind real life, they should advance this science in all aspects." (Lenin: "Our Program", "Selected Works of Lenin", Volume 1, page 203, People's Publishing House, 1972 edition.)

This is a difficult historical task in theory and practice. The examples cited above fully illustrate that if one really understands Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, especially Maoism, these are issues that should not be a problem; moreover, from Marx, through Lenin, to Chairman Mao, especially Chairman Mao, there are clear opinions. However, some of our comrades are unwilling to listen, unable to learn, and, moreover, they stick to their own views, always thinking that the principles in their hands are the truth - in fact, they take fallacies as truth. Under such circumstances, it is even more impossible to propose new breakthroughs, new advancements, and new developments in the theory and practice of Mao Zedong's theory of continuing socialist revolution.



This is by no means accidental, but a necessity imposed on us by the conditions of the times.

As Chairman Mao has repeatedly and profoundly pointed out, our country is a country with a vast petty bourgeoisie and a strong feudal cultural tradition with imperial autocracy as its core. This is the profound social basis for all class phenomena, political phenomena, ideological and cultural phenomena in our country, and to a certain extent, it is of decisive significance.

This is a very serious but also very practical problem. Thinking about socialist issues from the standpoint and level of the feudal or small peasant and small producer petty bourgeoisie has actually resulted in not even reaching the level of bourgeois thought. How can we talk about the theory of continuing the socialist revolution, the theory of building socialism (in a broad sense), the theory of proletarian dictatorship and proletarian democracy?

I only read and memorised a few words and phrases of Marx, Lenin and Mao, but when I applied them to myself, they were inevitably distorted, deformed and even distorted. No matter what I think subjectively, the narrow mind and vision inevitably brought about by the petty selfish worldview and outlook on life of small producers cannot be compared with the mind, vision and theory of proletarian communism.

For example, in the understanding of the issue of "freedom", the bourgeoisie talks about "individuality and freedom" that transcends classes, which is actually the individuality and freedom of the bourgeoisie. The proletariat talks about implementing the communist revolution, overcoming the alienation that inevitably occurs under the conditions of private ownership, and achieving a communist society - the free development of each person is the premise of the development of the entire society. This is the most scientific, thorough and humane view of freedom. However, small producers only know patriarchy and do not know what freedom is. Therefore, Marx once said incisively that French small farmers are the natural foundation of Napoleon's despotism. This statement is also a key to understanding the social history of ancient China and modern society. Such examples and such problems often appear in our understanding of the theory of continued socialist revolution of Maoism.

Don't forget what Engels said in "Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy". A person's motives are not what they think they are, but what they think they are is not their real motives. A person's real motives are often hidden behind their own motives. The socialist theory of "Marxism-Leninism-Maoism" understood from the standpoint and worldview of the petty bourgeoisie is actually the "socialist" theory of the petty bourgeoisie. Like revisionism, this is bound to be a distortion of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, especially Maoism. Regarding this intentional or unintentional distortion of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, we sometimes think that if Chairman Mao were still alive, he would say the same thing as Marx: If you are "Maoists", I have no choice but to declare that I am not a "Maoist"!

This is a difficult problem in learning, studying and understanding Mao Zedong's theory of continuing socialist revolution. It is this practical difficulty that determines that we are facing a very contradictory situation.

On the one hand, almost everyone recognises that in order to prevent revisionism from coming to power and capitalism from being restored again in the future, a very important and critical issue is to solve the problem of truly realising the dictatorship of the proletariat (including the people's democratic dictatorship). The fundamental manifestation of the failure of socialism and the restoration of capitalism is the fundamental change in class relations: in the past, the working people were the masters of the country, but now the new bourgeoisie is the masters of the country. There is a simple fact that everyone can see very clearly, that is, "satellites go up, and red flags fall down." This image is a very accurate summary, which means that the economy has been developed, but socialism has failed.

The reason why socialism encountered setbacks was not because economic construction could not be carried out, but because political construction did not keep up, which was particularly manifested in the fact that the ruling Communist Party did not solve the problem of its own revisionism. Once this party became revisionist, and there was no political system that could protect the masses from rising up against revisionism and the restoration of capitalism, a new bourgeoisie would inevitably emerge, and class relations would change, from the working people being the masters of the country to the new bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie being the masters of the country. Moreover, it was manifested as a "very easy" process, a process of "very easily" embarking on the dictatorship of the fascist bourgeoisie, thus effectively protecting the restoration of capitalism.

This is a cruel fact that everyone has personally experienced and gradually recognized. Therefore, everyone also deeply feels that we should study the historical lessons and find ways to solve the problem. This is already a consensus among everyone and is also the research work that everyone is working hard on.

However, on the other hand, after a period of discussion, everyone has seen that there are really many answers to how to solve this problem, and not only are there many differences, but there are also more sharp contradictions. This makes everyone realize that if we want to correctly solve this problem, it is quite difficult from the perspective of the Communists themselves.

One difficulty is in theory.

In principle, this does not seem to be a problem. The dictatorship of the proletariat is the dictatorship of the proletariat. The working people are the masters of the state, which means that the working people are the masters of the state machinery. Furthermore, as Lenin emphasized, the dictatorship of the proletariat and proletarian democracy can be said to be synonymous. The dictatorship of the proletariat must be unified with proletarian democracy to be the real dictatorship of the proletariat. In other words, without proletarian democracy, there is no dictatorship of the proletariat. The proletarian democratic system is a form, a tool, and a guarantee for the realisation of proletarian democracy and proletarian dictatorship. The so-called political system of proletarian dictatorship is actually the political system of proletarian democracy. Are these principles truly understood and accepted by everyone? I think this is still a problem. The bigger and more prominent problem is how these principles should be combined with reality and turned into practical, concrete and feasible systems and measures. This has not been solved in theory and practice. The actual situation is that once it comes to specific issues, everyone's understanding is different, which will lead to fundamental differences and long-term unresolved disputes. Aren't the specific examples mentioned above clear evidence of this serious problem?

The essential characteristics of socialist society are the dictatorship of the proletariat (including the people's democratic dictatorship), proletarian democracy (including people's democracy), and in layman's terms, the working people are the masters of the country, and the working people manage the country through democratic means. These are unified and all mean the same thing. The reason is very simple, clear, and accurate. Without the working people being the masters of the country, what kind of socialism is there? However, whether it is the dictatorship of the proletariat, proletarian democracy, or the working people being the masters of the country, it needs to be reflected and guaranteed through the political system. This is what we often call the issue of the political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat. When we talk about the political construction of the dictatorship of the proletariat, we are mainly referring to the construction of the political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

It can be inferred from this that if we want to correctly and effectively solve the problem of the dictatorship of the proletariat in order to carry out the socialist revolution, the ultimate goal and the realisation of the final results must still be to correctly and effectively solve the problem of the political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

However, some of our comrades often have some misunderstandings on this issue, separating the dictatorship of the proletariat from the political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and only emphasizing the strengthening of the construction of the dictatorship of the proletariat, but not the strengthening of the construction of the political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat. They understand the dictatorship of the proletariat as only violence, as overthrowing, and solving the problem of people (capitalist roaders); while ignoring the significance of the construction of the political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat, ignoring the need to rely on the reform and construction of the political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat to eradicate the soil for the degeneration of cadres and the party, and to create an environment in which, once the cadres and the party degenerate, the majority of party members and the broad masses of working people can dismiss the degenerates and the degenerate party, and replace the degenerates and the degenerate party, so as to truly and firmly realise the dictatorship of the proletariat and firmly realise the working people as masters of the country.

It can be said that not understanding the importance of the political system of the proletarian dictatorship is actually not understanding the fundamental significance of the proletarian dictatorship.

Let's see what Chairman Mao said. Chairman Mao once said in "On New Democracy": "The issue of the state system has been a topic of discussion for decades since the end of the Qing Dynasty, but it has not been clarified. The state system only refers to one issue, that is, the status of various social classes in the country." "The so-called "political system" issue refers to the form of the political power structure, which refers to the form in which a certain social class organises the political power organs that oppose the enemy and protect itself. Without a proper form of political power organs, it cannot represent the country. China can now adopt a system of the National People's Congress, the Provincial People's Congress, the County People's Congress, the District People's Congress and even the Township People's Congress, and the government is elected by the congresses at all levels. However, a truly universal and equal electoral system without distinction of gender, belief, property, education, etc. must be implemented in order to suit the status of the various revolutionary classes in the state, to express the will of the people and to direct the revolutionary struggle, and to suit the spirit of New Democracy. This system is democratic centralism. Only a government under democratic centralism can give full play to the will of all revolutionary people and to oppose the enemies of the revolution with the greatest force. The spirit of "not being acquired by a few for private gain" must be reflected in the composition of the government and the army. Without a truly democratic system, this goal cannot be achieved. This is called the incompatibility of the political system and the state system. The state system is the joint dictatorship of the revolutionary classes. The political system is democratic centralism. This is the politics of New Democracy, this is the republic of New Democracy, this is the republic of the Anti-Japanese United Front, this is the republic of the new Three Principles of the People with the three major policies, and this is the Republic of China worthy of the name." ("On New Democracy", Volume 2 of "Selected Works of Mao Zedong", pages 637-638.)

Although what Chairman Mao is talking about here is the principle of the state system and political system of the people's democratic dictatorship, it is consistent with the principle of the state system and political system of the proletarian dictatorship. The state system must be unified with the political system, that is, the essence of dictatorship must be unified with the form of democracy. Chairman

Mao's opinions are completely consistent with Lenin's opinions, and as a general principle, they are also acceptable to everyone.

However, the historical lessons of revisionism coming to power and the restoration of capitalism have taught us that there are still a series of issues that have not been clarified in theory and not handled well in practice regarding the specific form of the proletarian dictatorship. The most concentrated, main and biggest problem is that the National People's Congress, as the highest organ of state power, has not been correctly solved in theory and practice from the perspective of the establishment and operation of the political system, from its formation to the scope of its exercise of power, to the mechanism of power operation, to the supervision of power, to the checks and balances of power. This is mainly reflected in the relationship between the Party's leadership and the National People's Congress as the highest organ of power, where the Party is actually above the National People's Congress. In the end, it inevitably led to the National People's Congress being hollowed out and becoming a mere formality, losing the significance of the National People's Congress as embodying people's democracy as Chairman Mao said. Without democracy and without centralisation based on democracy, there was only the party replacing the government, the party replacing the country, and the party ruling over everything. Moreover, in the end, it was the party's top leader who had the final say, and it was inevitable that it would move towards autocracy step by step. Therefore, it was inevitable that the significance of the dictatorship of the proletariat would be lost. The rise of revisionism and the restoration of capitalism became a historical inevitability.

However, the question of the form of government of the proletarian dictatorship, the People's Congress, has not been clarified in theory, and there is no correct solution to the proletarian dictatorship under the proletarian democratic system in practice.

Now, under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, we need to make new breakthroughs and new developments in theory on the form of government of socialist countries, that is, the dictatorship of the proletariat or the people's democratic dictatorship. This is an important task that must be completed after studying Mao Zedong Thought.

Another difficulty lies in practice.

The most critical issue is probably the understanding of the laws of development of contemporary society.

As mentioned earlier, the same Korea can have two completely different social systems. The same China can also have two completely different social systems. In Germany, too, two different social systems coexisted at the same time. The existence of this historical phenomenon is not accidental. The question of what historical reasons led to the establishment of a social system is one that deserves serious analysis and research. When it comes to the relationship between people and systems. I am afraid that such a problem also exists. At what level of human development can a system be established and implemented? Or what kind of system can be established and implemented on the basis of what kind of human level? What kind of relationship exists between the establishment of a system and the people, including the masses, politicians, leaders, and so on? These are all questions that must be studied.

It is undoubtedly correct for comrades to pay attention to the form of the proletarian dictatorship. It is normal to have serious and heated discussions and express various different opinions. Many opinions are also very good. However, I now think that in order to truly correctly and scientifically solve the problem of the form of the proletarian dictatorship, some basic principles must be clarified and corrected. The outline commands the purpose, and the big principle commands the small principle.

Only by first clarifying and correcting the outline and the big principle can we clarify and correct the purpose and the small principle under the command of the outline and the big principle.

First, we must correctly solve the unity of the proletarian dictatorship and the state system of the proletarian dictatorship.

The fundamental nature of the state system of a socialist country under the dictatorship of the proletariat is the dictatorship of the proletariat, or the people's democratic dictatorship under specific historical conditions. This state system can be described in a popular phrase that everyone is accustomed to using: "The people are the masters of the country", or "the working people are the masters of the country". The "country" here refers to the country and the state machinery. The people are the masters of the country and the state machinery, and the people control the country and the state machinery. This is the original meaning of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and it is also the original meaning of the commonly said "the people are the masters of the country". Any political system that deviates from this original meaning will inevitably deviate from the dictatorship of the proletariat. Only the political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat that is compatible with and unified with the original meaning of this state system can guarantee the realisation of the dictatorship of the proletariat, or the people's democratic dictatorship, and the realisation of "the people are the masters of the country." In simple terms, the political system we want is a political system that guarantees the realisation of the working people being the masters of the country. The political system serves the state system, is the embodiment of the state system, and is the political form of the state system. This is the most fundamental and main requirement for the political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

When we consider the construction of the political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat today, we must be guided by this most fundamental and most important principle. Whether it is called a commune, a Soviet, or a people's congress; whether it is a political party, a social group, or any form of association; whether it is the army, the public security, the procuratorate, the courts, and other dictatorship tools, in short, the entire state apparatus of the dictatorship of the proletariat must be controlled by the proletariat and the broad masses of the working people through the political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat; only by doing this can we truly and fully reflect that the working people are the masters of the country. In the scientific language of Marxism, this is the real dictatorship of the proletariat, or the people's democratic dictatorship whose essence is the dictatorship of the proletariat under specific historical conditions.

Second, the form of the proletarian dictatorship must be determined by the people who are the masters of the country.

This is the only correct way to solve the problem that the form of the proletarian dictatorship must meet the requirements of the proletarian dictatorship.

In the past, the forms of the dictatorship of the exploiting class were formulated by a small number of exploiting class rulers. This was determined by the nature of their state system. Only through certain exploiting class political procedures can the forms of the dictatorship that meet the requirements of the exploiting class dictatorship be formulated to meet the needs of the exploiting class dictatorship.

There is a fundamental difference between the dictatorship of the proletariat and the dictatorship of the exploiting class in the past. This is common sense that everyone knows. The way the dictatorship of the proletariat deals with the form of government of the dictatorship of the proletariat is also fundamentally different from the way the exploiting class dealt with the form of government of the dictatorship of the exploiting class in the past. This is mainly: the dictatorship of the proletariat deals

with the form of government of the dictatorship of the proletariat by relying on the proletariat and the broad masses of the working people.

The forms of government of the dictatorship of the proletariat, such as the Paris Commune, the Soviets, the People's Congress, etc., were all created by the masses in the process of the proletarian revolution.

This is not surprising. It is determined by the class nature of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat was achieved through the arduous and great socialist revolution carried out by the proletariat and the broad masses of the people. With the dictatorship of the proletariat, it is natural for the proletariat and the broad masses of the working people to realise their own political status, including the creation of a political system that conforms to historical conditions and is historically possible to guarantee and consolidate the political status of the proletariat and the broad masses of the working people as masters of their own affairs.

This is the fundamental law of the proletariat in carrying out the cause of socialist revolution and socialist construction (in a broad sense), and it is a fundamental principle of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism that Communists must adhere to. The cause of socialist revolution and construction (in a broad sense) of the proletariat has always been the cause of the proletariat and the broad masses of the people. This is the fundamental guarantee for the victory of the proletariat's socialist revolution and construction, and it is also the fundamental guarantee for the ultimate victory of communism from socialist society through continued revolution.

Respecting this law and adhering to this principle is the most critical point for establishing the proletarian political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat. If this law and principle are violated, and the work of establishing the proletarian political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat is regarded as a matter of "elite politics" and a "top-level design" must be carried out, the result will inevitably be to replace Marxism-Leninism-Maoism with revisionism, and finally the proletarian political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat will be tampered with into the authoritarian political system of the fascist bourgeois dictatorship.

This is not a random statement. We are still experiencing this fact.

Third, the establishment of the political system of proletarian dictatorship requires ideological emancipation.

After the socialist revolution led by the proletariat, the proletarian dictatorship will be rebuilt, and at the same time, the political system of the proletarian dictatorship will also be rebuilt.

This is a negation of negation, and it should and must be a leap.

Revisionism came to power, capitalism was restored, and the political system of bourgeois dictatorship negated the political system of proletarian dictatorship. After the proletariat's socialist re-revolution, the political system of bourgeois dictatorship will be negated again, and the political system of proletarian dictatorship will be rebuilt again. However, the reconstruction of the political system of proletarian dictatorship is not a simple repetition of the proletarian dictatorship that was established in the past, but it is a process of negation of negation, and it is inevitable to rebuild the political system of proletarian dictatorship at a new height and a new level. This requires a great liberation and breakthrough in ideological understanding and theory.

We can give some examples:



Example 1: It was under the past political system that a privileged class emerged, which led to the rise of revisionism, the restoration of capitalism, and the restoration of the worst capitalism of the fascist bourgeois dictatorship.

It was under such a political system that all political rights of the vast majority of party members and the vast majority of revolutionary people were completely deprived. As Chairman Mao said above, "Hitler is worse than de Gaulle", a big gangster group was in power. Today, we have experienced it personally.

It is this crude and cruel fascist bourgeois dictatorship that makes it inevitable that the vast majority of party members and the vast majority of the people will encounter considerable difficulties when they want to launch a socialist revolution and rebuild a socialist society. This is also the painful experience we have experienced personally today.

To rebuild the political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat, it is necessary to address this lesson of history and find the right political system capable of solving this problem. This is a difficult historical task. Lenin and Chairman Mao both faced this historical task and tried to solve this historical problem, and there were some very bold and ground-breaking ideas and practices. The Chairman advocated the inclusion of the 'freedom to strike', the 'speaking freely, airing views freely, writing big-character posters and engaging in big debates', and advocated the inclusion of the so-called 'Four Bigs' in the Constitution. He also advocated the right of the masses to oppose the capitalist-roaders by means of 'great democracy'. The so-called "great democracy", as Chairman Mao emphasized, can include forms such as street demonstrations, that is, launching mass revolutionary movements, that is, rebellion, and even seizing power. However, despite this, the problem of revisionism coming to power and capitalism being restored finally occurred. It can be seen that the difficulty of solving this problem is quite large. Without a major breakthrough in theory and thought, it is difficult to solve this historical problem.

Example 2: The essence of the dictatorship of the proletariat is that the proletariat and the broad masses of working people hold political power, that is, the right to govern.

The core and most fundamental point of the political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat is that this point must be reflected. In a socialist country with the dictatorship of the proletariat, we should see that the people have the greatest power and are truly the masters of the country. That is, whether directly or indirectly, it must be reflected that the people are in power; it cannot be a minority, including a party composed of a minority.

It is based on this fundamental principle of socialism that the "Constitution" formulated under the leadership of Chairman Mao states that the National People's Congress and its Standing Committee are the highest organs of power in the country. The political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat should be the institutional guarantee for the implementation of this principle.

However, as we have seen, the National People's Congress has never been shown to be the highest organ of power in the country's political life. Not to mention the highest, even the lowest level of power has not been shown. "The Party Committee waves its hands, the National People's Congress raises its hands, and the CPPCC claps its hands" is a vivid summary of the actual power mechanism.

This is certainly not a true socialist proletarian dictatorship, but a one-party dictatorship that actually exists above the National People's Congress.

Why does this problem arise? As everyone recognizes, it is because there is no real political system that implements the dictatorship of the proletariat and is unified with the dictatorship of the proletariat; everyone also recognizes that the political system that is actually implemented is the one-

party dictatorship. It is based on this consensus that political system reform was proposed. The core of the reform is to change the one-party dictatorship back to the dictatorship of the proletariat, including the people's democratic dictatorship, that is, to return the real and substantial power of governance to the hands of the working people.

Whether from the perspective of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism theory or from the previous socialist practice, this is a practical problem and a political system problem that cannot be clearer.

Under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, whether it is the people, composed of the proletariat and the broad masses of the working people, who are the masters of the country, or the political parties composed of a minority of people, who are the masters of the country, is a matter of right and wrong, which must be clarified in theory and correct in practice. Only under this premise can the political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat be correctly solved and the political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat be realised to play the institutional role of ensuring that the people are the masters of the country.

Example 3: The political system of the proletarian dictatorship must not only reflect the ruling power of the proletariat and the broad masses of working people, but also reflect the supervisory power, including the power of recall, which is organically and dialectically unified, coexisting and constrained with this ruling power. Lenin particularly emphasised that without the right of recall, the right of election and the right of supervision are not thorough.

In order to maintain their own fascist bourgeois dictatorship, the revisionist rulers often shout to criticize the "bourgeois separation of powers", but the essence of this criticism is to deny the supervisory power of the proletariat and the broad masses of working people, and the result is to uphold and strengthen the "one-party dictatorship", that is, to uphold and strengthen the fascist bourgeois dictatorship.

Under historical conditions that have not yet reached what Lenin called "direct management of the state by all working people," any political system that does not have supervisory power, including the power to recall, can lead to fascist dictatorship. This is a problem that cannot be solved by self-consciousness, ideological education, or various forms of anti-corruption campaigns. The only effective solution is to have both the power to rule and the power of supervision, including the power to recall, in parallel.

The bourgeois separation of powers, including the "Five Powers Constitution" developed by Dr. Sun Yat-sen from the "separation of powers" in Europe and the United States, are all political systems formed based on this historical law. However, they all belong to the bourgeoisie's supervisory power, including the right to recall, and belong to a minority of people. The political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat is a fundamental negation of the class nature of this bourgeois "separation of powers". The political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat embodies the guarantee that the proletariat and the broad masses of working people can truly exercise their supervisory power, including the right to recall, so as to achieve the complete unity of the proletariat and the broad masses of working people's ruling power and supervisory power, including the right to recall, and truly realise "the people are the masters of the country."

The Paris Commune was a great revolutionary practice that attempted to do so. The principles of state political system construction left by the Paris Commune have not become obsolete to this day. However, society is developing and history is advancing. Under new historical conditions, we must not only inherit the principles of the Paris Commune, but also develop them. This is a new requirement raised by the positive and negative historical experience and lessons of reality. To truly achieve this,

both in theory and in practice, we need to make major breakthroughs and innovations in the construction of the political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Example 4: All government departments of the country must maintain relative independence. This is not a question of three powers or five powers. As long as the institutions can operate relatively independently, they should maintain their relative independence under the National People's Congress.

On this issue, it is indeed unnecessary to copy the bourgeois separation of powers, but rather to create a system of power sharing, checks and balances that is compatible with the proletarian dictatorship, and ultimately subject to the supervision and management of the National People's Congress.

Example 5: Along with the political system reform of the proletarian dictatorship, a very important task is to revise the Constitution and reconsider the basic principles that the Constitution must contain.

The Constitution is a concentrated expression of the will of the proletariat and the broad masses of working people. Therefore, it is the fundamental law that the proletarian dictatorship must implement without any deviation. How the Constitution is written is not a small matter, but a very important matter involving the fate of the proletarian dictatorship.

The lessons are heavy. For one thing, the Constitution has not been able to establish its lofty position as the so-called fundamental law. The fact that the National People's Congress (NPC) is in a state of limbo is consistent with the Constitution being in a state of limbo. Secondly, the principles expressed in the Constitution are problematic. It is not accidental that 'the leadership of the Communist Party' was removed from the 'Constitution of 82', for this point alone contains the summing up of historical experience and is correct. Misinterpreting 'leadership of the Communist Party' to mean that the leadership of the Communist Party is superior to the Constitution, and misinterpreting 'leadership of the Communist Party' to mean that it is eternal, is a common mistake. This is how the question of 'whether the Party or the law is greater' arose, and this is how the question of 'one-party dictatorship' arose.

The Constitution must reflect the demands of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The principles of the Constitution are the principles of the political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The fate of the Constitution is completely and absolutely synchronised with the fate of the political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and thus with the fate of the dictatorship of the proletariat. As long as the Constitution is trampled upon, the dictatorship of the proletariat will certainly be trampled upon, and history has fully proved this.

This is the importance of the Constitution. The Constitution is the legal embodiment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The meaning of the word "fundamental" in "fundamental law" lies here.

The above examples are enough to show that if we want to truly solve the problem of the political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat that is unified with the dictatorship of the proletariat, it is impossible to complete this historical task without further study and understanding of the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist doctrine on the dictatorship of the proletariat and without major breakthroughs in ideological theory.

Opposing and preventing revisionism is the historical task left to us by Chairman Mao. It is also the historical task of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the historical task of continuing the socialist revolution. Creating a form of political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat that can adapt to this historical task and achieve the goal of preventing revisionism from coming to power and

preventing the restoration of capitalism is a historical task that contemporary Communists must undertake and must accomplish.

The reason why I have devoted a large amount of space to discussing this issue and have quoted many of the revolutionary mentors' teachings is that I want our comrades to better understand and comprehend the revolutionary mentors' theories on the political system of socialist society so that they can seriously think about which aspects of our actual actions are consistent with the revolutionary mentors' teachings and which aspects are inconsistent with the revolutionary mentors' teachings. It is precisely in comparison with the revolutionary mentors' teachings that I have criticised several erroneous viewpoints and erroneous ideas that still exist today and still interfere with our socialist revolutionary movement.

Moreover, and more importantly, practice has answered the question of the importance of improving the political system in socialist countries from both positive and negative aspects. Lenin said: "This point is not proved by any theoretical analysis, but by practice. I think practice is better than any theoretical debate in the world." (Lenin: The Fourth Congress of the Communist International, Collected Works of Lenin, Vol. 33, p. 382.) On this issue, as Lenin said, "Practice is better than any theoretical debate in the world." A practical problem that exists now, and also a practical reason for the endless debate, is that some comrades do not respect practice, do not seriously use Marxism-Leninism-Maoism to study practice, but stick to the prejudices in their own minds.

The essential characteristic of socialism is the dictatorship of the proletariat, including the people's democratic dictatorship, which is usually referred to as the people being the masters of the country. Only the dictatorship of the proletariat can guarantee the implementation of socialist public ownership and the basic requirements of socialism in all aspects, otherwise socialism will only become an empty slogan and will degenerate. However, some comrades do not have a correct understanding of this issue, and especially do not understand that the significance and importance of the proletarian political system under socialist conditions lies in that it is the form of the socialist dictatorship of the proletariat. There is no content without form, and content and form are always unified. Only through the form of the proletarian political system can the content of the proletarian dictatorship, that is, the state system of the proletarian dictatorship, be truly and thoroughly realised.

It is in this sense that we can say that the political system of the proletarian dictatorship determines the fate of the proletarian dictatorship.

From this, we can further realise that if the central task of the socialist continued revolution is to strengthen the proletarian dictatorship, then in order to achieve this, we must simultaneously strengthen the continuous revolution and reform of the political system of the proletarian dictatorship. The meanings of the two are the same and unified. The political system of the proletarian dictatorship is the guarantee for the realisation of the proletarian dictatorship. In this sense, it can be said that without the political system of the proletarian dictatorship, there will be no proletarian dictatorship. Therefore, the political achievements of the socialist continued revolution "taking class struggle as the key link" must ultimately be implemented and realised through the continuous improvement of the political system of the proletarian dictatorship. It can be seen that the continuous revolution and reform of the political system of the proletarian dictatorship is also synchronised with the socialist continued revolution "taking class struggle as the key link", and is of equal importance. It is an important and inseparable part of the general program of the socialist continued revolution.

In general, taking class struggle as the key link, taking the dictatorship of the proletariat as the key link, and taking the political system of the proletariat as the key link are essentially unified and have the

same significance for the continued socialist revolution. They all deal with the class struggle issues in the socialist historical stage.

As the old saying goes, this is an understanding that must be "raised to the top", and the significance of the construction of the political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the continued socialist revolution must not be underestimated.

This is a historical process that is synchronised with class struggle and the dictatorship of the proletariat. This historical process fully reflects that the theory of the continued socialist revolution is nothing more than a theory of dealing with class struggle in the historical stage of socialism. This is a historical process of continuous revolution and reform, and a historical process that is synchronised with the level of development of the continued socialist revolution. Only through the continuous revolution and reform of the socialist political system can the dictatorship of the proletariat be continuously strengthened and consolidated, continuously developed and improved, and gradually reached a level where all the people can directly manage the country, creating reliable historical conditions for the ultimate realisation of the demise of the state. Only under such historical conditions can we achieve, as the revolutionary mentor said, "cut off the tumour of the state" or "send the state to the museum of history", thus entering a free and happy communist society where all mankind is liberated without private property, classes or the state.

This principle, this truth, was clearly pointed out by the great revolutionary mentor Lenin more than 100 years ago: "The abolition of state power is the goal of all socialists, led by Marx. Without achieving this goal, true democracy, that is, true equality and freedom, cannot be achieved. Only Soviet or proletarian democracy can actually achieve this goal, because it attracts the mass organisations of workers to regularly participate in state management and prepares for the complete withering of the state." (Lenin: The First Congress of the Communist International, Complete Works of Lenin, Vol. 28, p. 443.)

It is no exaggeration to say that Lenin's teachings are a red flag that guides us to carry out socialist revolution, continue revolution and ultimately realise the great ideal of communism!

## VI. The Maoist Theory of Socialist Re-Revolution

The theory of socialist re-revolution is the third important theory of Mao Zedong's theory of socialist revolution.

The core theory of Mao Zedong's socialist society is that socialist society is a relatively long historical stage, in which there is a struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, a struggle between the socialist road and the capitalist road, and the danger of capitalist restoration.

This is a completely scientific and practical Marxist-Leninist-Maoist theory. The theory of socialist continuation revolution is based on this theory; similarly, the theory of socialist re-revolution is also based on this theory.

This theory has withstood the test of social practice.

The cruel facts of the rise of revisionism and the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, especially in China, have proved that this theory is not an empty talk of "the wolf is coming", but an irrefutable truth.

The previous section has discussed Mao Zedong's theory on the danger, possibility and reality of capitalist restoration, and this has also been verified by the cruel facts of capitalist restoration.

It is precisely because Chairman Mao profoundly foresaw the danger and possibility of capitalist restoration that he further proposed the theory of socialist re-revolution on the basis of the theory of socialist continued revolution - the theory of carrying out socialist revolution again under the historical conditions of revisionism coming to power, socialism failing, and capitalist restoration.

We now attach more importance to the study and research of Mao Zedong's theory of socialist continued revolution, but we have not studied and researched Mao Zedong's theory of socialist re-revolution very much.

I am also one of them, so here I can only talk about some superficial learning experience.

### **1. Socialist re-revolution is the only way to defeat capitalist restoration**

This is a question related to whether the understanding of the current situation and tasks is correct.

To answer this question correctly, we must first have a correct understanding of the fundamental nature of the society we are facing. What kind of society are we facing? What is the essence of this society we are facing?

Although Chairman Mao did not see today's Chinese society, he did scientifically foresee that if things were not done well, today's Chinese society would emerge. Chairman Mao emphasized more than once that the coming to power of revisionism was the coming to power of the bourgeoisie, which would restore capitalism and establish a fascist bourgeois dictatorship. Chairman Mao said "Hitler was worse than de Gaulle" to illustrate that this capitalist society under the fascist bourgeois dictatorship was worse than the capitalist society under the general bourgeois democratic regime in the West. The "worst capitalist society" that everyone usually refers to now is derived from Chairman Mao's opinion, and the general idea is correct.

Chairman Mao's predictions were not alarmist. We were not able to keep up with Chairman Mao's understanding at the time, and we did not expect that things would be so serious and dangerous. Some foreign party leaders were naturally even more so. Kim Il-sung, for example, immediately asked



Chairman Mao in a skeptical tone after hearing Chairman Mao's question: Can it be so serious? However, history has proved that Chairman Mao was right. Chairman Mao's predictions were absolutely verified by the cruel facts of China's capitalist restoration. What we are facing now and have to accept is not such a bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalist society that practices fascist bourgeois dictatorship? Moreover, it is indeed the worst capitalist society!

This fact tells us that China is no longer a socialist society with classes and class struggle, but a class society. A full-fledged class society with class exploitation and class oppression reappearing. This is a fundamental change in the nature of society. We must face this fact and understand the situation and tasks we face from the law of class struggle in class society.

This is the most basic starting point that determines whether we can correctly understand our historical tasks and the line, principles and policies for carrying out the revolution.

Chairman Mao's understanding of this issue is very sharp, very profound and very pointed, whereas today, although we are already living in the midst of suffering, we are still unable to keep up with Chairman Mao in terms of ideological understanding. More than being unable to catch up, we can simply say that we are a million miles away from each other! We neither dare to face up to the cruel reality, nor do we dare to understand it correctly, nor do we dare, as Chairman Mao expects us to do, to raise his banner, to rise up in revolt, to overthrow the revisionist party and the fascist bourgeois dictatorship, and to re-establish a scientific socialist society belonging to the proletariat and the masses of the working people.

For more than 40 years! The revisionist ruling party has been so rampant in restoring capitalism in China, so rampant in counterattacking socialism, and so cruelly exploiting and oppressing the Chinese working class and the broad masses of the working people. However, because our thinking cannot keep up with Chairman Mao's thinking, we have been so weak and vulnerable that even a large-scale struggle of resistance has not occurred so far. We are so sorry to Chairman Mao and have failed to live up to Chairman Mao's expectations. It is our weakness that has led to the rampant, vicious, and unscrupulous nature of the revisionist ruling party, and it has been able to gain power for a while and for a long time. This is a cruel historical fact that should not have happened but did happen!

This cruel historical fact tells us that without Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, the working people will become ignorant and unenlightened, and will only be a suffering class that is oppressed, exploited and bullied by the ruling exploiting class.

However, in the face of such cruel class struggle facts, some people have come up with a different idea and raised the banner of "saving the party and protecting the country", "only fighting against corrupt officials but not against the emperor", and advocating to place hope on the revisionist party, especially the leaders of the revisionist party.

What a wrong view!

Although these comrades sincerely claim to be Maoists who believe in Chairman Mao, such views are actually completely contrary to Chairman Mao's thoughts and turn a deaf ear to Chairman Mao's repeated warnings.

The essence of "the party becomes revisionist and the country changes colour" is "the party and the country will perish." The two are unified and have the same meaning.

We must see that once the leadership of a Communist Party is usurped by revisionist leaders, that is, as Chairman Mao repeatedly warned us, "there is revisionism in the Central Committee", and the

revisionist line occupies a dominant position, in this case, as Chairman Mao also warned us, this party will inevitably degenerate into a revisionist party, a bourgeois party, and a fascist bourgeois party, the worst bourgeois party. We call it a revisionist party only in terms of its particular form of disguise. Our struggle against this kind of revisionist party is no longer at all a question of a struggle within the Communist Party against revisionist thinking and revisionist lines, because the Communist Party, which adheres to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, has been usurped by revisionist leaders, which determines that a fundamental metamorphosis of the entire nature of the Party has inevitably taken place, which means that a truly proletarian Communist Party has already died out! The state apparatus in the hands of such a party is no longer a state apparatus for the dictatorship of the proletariat in the hands of the proletariat and the mass of the working people, but a state apparatus for the dictatorship of the fascist bourgeoisie in the hands of the bureaucratic dictatorship of the monopoly bourgeoisie, which means that the original state which really belonged to the proletariat and the mass of the working people has also died!

It is precisely because the proletariat and the broad masses of working people are in such a situation of "the party and the country being destroyed" that they have inevitably and inevitably transformed from the former status of the masters of the country to the oppressed and exploited "low-end population" and "little people" class who have a hard time living under the heavy pressure of the "new three mountains".

We must adhere to this very important and very thorough theoretical view of Mao Zedong's socialist re-revolution, which is the foundation and basis of Mao Zedong's socialist re-revolution theory.

Don't think that a revisionist party that holds up the banner of Marxism, hangs the sign of socialism, and calls itself the Communist Party is not a bourgeois party, and is better than a bourgeois party; on the contrary, a revisionist party is not only a bourgeois party, but also, as Chairman Mao emphasized, a fascist bourgeois party, that is, the most backward, the most reactionary, and the worst bourgeois party. Therefore, just as Marxism never talks about "saving" a bourgeois party, we cannot "save" a revisionist party. Marxism-Leninism-Maoism has always only talked about overthrowing the bourgeois party and seizing power from the bourgeois party; similarly, we can only overthrow the revisionist party that has degenerated into a fascist bourgeois party and seize power from this worst bourgeois party.

Chairman Mao had clear instructions on this issue. Around 1965, when talking with Kim Il Sung, Ho Chi Minh and other leaders of fraternal parties about the possibility of revisionism in China and the possibility of the Chinese Communist Party becoming a revisionist party, Chairman Mao clearly told them that if such a thing happened, they should unite with all the revolutionary and genuine Communist parties in the world to overthrow the Chinese Communist Party. In 1974, Chairman Mao asked Deng Xiaoping to make a special statement in his speech at the UN General Assembly: "China is not a superpower, nor will she ever seek to be one... If one day China should change her colour and turn into a superpower, if she too should play the tyrant in the world, and everywhere subject others to her bullying, aggression and exploitation, the people of the world should identify her as social-imperialism, expose it, oppose it and work together with the Chinese people to overthrow it." (By the way, there is an erroneous rumour that this paragraph was added by Deng Xiaoping. On the contrary, the UN General Assembly speech was not drafted by Deng Xiaoping, and this paragraph was written based on Chairman Mao's existing speech.) Therefore, proposing "saving the party" now is completely contrary to Chairman Mao's teachings and the class analysis viewpoint of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. It is wrong in theory and harmful in practice. It can only create illusions for comrades and interfere with and undermine the development of the socialist re-revolutionary movement.

As for some comrades who insist on the "save the party and protect the country" theory, they emphasise that "there are healthy forces within the party" and they can rely on them to "save the party and protect the country". This is also an incorrect and untenable wrong view.

According to Marxist theory, for the proletariat to launch a socialist revolution, it has never emphasised relying on the "healthy forces" in the bourgeois parties. If there are "healthy forces" in the bourgeois parties, then what is the purpose of the proletarian party? Then why launch the proletarian socialist revolution? The bourgeois parties exist to engage in capitalism and bourgeois dictatorship. How can there be "healthy forces" within the bourgeois parties that want to engage in socialism and proletarian dictatorship? This is self-evident.

The situation of the revisionist party is naturally more complicated. The revisionist party evolved from the Communist Party. As far as the situation of the majority of party members is concerned, it is different from that of ordinary bourgeois parties and requires specific analysis.

When the Soviet Party became a revisionist party under the rule of Khrushchev's revisionist line, Chairman Mao wrote a special paragraph in the "Nine Commentaries" criticizing Khrushchev, emphasizing that the majority of cadres and members of the Soviet Party were still good and still wanted to make revolution. Chairman Mao said this because, firstly, the Soviet Party had just become revisionist, so it was in line with reality; secondly, there was also a problem of revolutionary strategy, which was to concentrate efforts to criticise and attack the revisionist leaders headed by Khrushchev, and to win over and unite the majority of cadres and members to rise up against revisionism. However, historical facts ultimately tell us that the majority of cadres and members of the Soviet Party were not able to solve the problem of the Soviet Party becoming revisionist and even collapsing.

This historical lesson is worth pondering.

There are two points that can be seen more clearly.

First, the nature of the Soviet Party was determined by the revisionist line of Khrushchev, who was in a dominant position. It was this line that determined that the Soviet Party had degenerated into a revisionist, bourgeois party that practiced fascist bourgeois dictatorship. The embourgeoisification of the Soviet Party determined the embourgeoisification of Soviet society.

Secondly, although it can be said that the majority of cadres and members of the Party in the USSR were good and wanted to make a revolution, these cadres and members of the Party did not hold the leadership of the Party at all levels, nor had they been educated in the theory of continued socialist revolution against the rise to power of revisionism and against the restoration of capitalism, and thus could not coalesce to form a revolutionary force to wage an intra-Party struggle and to overthrow the rule of Khrushchev's revisionist clique. Instead, it was not by chance that they did nothing, allowing the revisionist line to be successfully pursued for several decades, transforming the USSR from a socialist country into a bureaucratic, authoritarian and privileged society, and finally collapsing completely in the 'colour revolution'.

This is a true historical fact that has already taken place, and we must respect it and make a comprehensive and serious analysis of it in order to arrive at a scientific and correct understanding of the complexity of things.

The situation of the Chinese Party is again significantly different from that of the Soviet Party. This is mainly due to the fact that Chairman Mao left the Chinese Party and the Chinese people with the theory of continued socialist revolution and re-revolution; and that he led the Chinese Party and the Chinese people to carry out a proletarian cultural revolution - essentially a proletarian political

revolution - focusing on opposing the capitalist factions and opposing the rise to power of revisionism and the restoration of capitalism.

It is this historical condition that determines that in China, both inside and outside the Party, there is a group of genuine communists who really insist on taking the road of socialism and Chairman Mao's line of socialist revolution. Insofar as this fact is concerned, it is not wrong to say that 'there are healthy forces within the Party'. Moreover, there is such a so-called 'healthy force' (an unscientific term that should be used to refer to Communists who adhere to the socialist revolution) not only within the Party but also outside the Party.

But does this constitute a basis for the 'theory of saving the Party and preserving the country'?

No, it does not.

There are a few points that can be seen more clearly.

Firstly, as far as this 'healthy force' within the Party is concerned, whether it is the old comrades who are still alive, some Marxist experts in the theoretical field, or some Party cadres and comrades, who are generally no longer in leading positions and are mostly in a state of retirement, in general, the force is still very weak. The limitations of the struggles waged, both in terms of their thoroughness and of their scale, as well as the effect they had, were all very obvious, and were quickly and easily suppressed by the fascist bourgeois dictatorship, which was naturally insufficient to shake the rule of revisionism.

Secondly, after more than four decades of capitalist restoration under Deng Xiaoping's line, China is already a bureaucratic authoritarian monopoly capitalist society. This society is the creation of the metamorphosed CCP, and the existence of such a society inevitably determines the fundamental nature and overall outlook of the CCP. Simply put, the Party is inevitably becoming more and more nakedly bourgeois, and the cadres of the Party, especially the senior cadres, are even more inevitably bourgeois, with the group of senior and big officials essentially constituting the basic constituents and class base of the bureaucratic authoritarian monopoly bourgeoisie, whose corruption and bribery can easily amount to hundreds of millions of dollars, which is an inevitable manifestation of the economic status and economic interests of this class. How can there be the so-called 'healthy forces' in this class?

If we look at the issue from an international perspective, under the rule of opportunism and revisionism, some former communist and workers' parties have always become more and more bourgeois with the development of time, and in the end, there is no difference between them and ordinary bourgeois political parties. This is a general fact with regularity. Like the German Social Democratic Party, once a party of the working class guided by Marxism, which is now a completely bourgeois party, even worse than other bourgeois parties; the present situation of the Chinese Communist Party has not and cannot escape from this law.

Under these circumstances, to talk abstractly about 'the existence of a healthy force within the Party' without reference to the facts and to think that this force can 'save the Party' is, of course, totally wrong, a subjective fabrication without reference to the facts, and for the revolutionary masses it can only be a kind of deception.

Despite this, there are indeed comrades in the party who believe in Chairman Mao and Chairman Mao's thoughts, especially the majority of ordinary party members. Because Chairman Mao's influence is long-term and will exist from generation to generation, both inside and outside the party. This is very valuable. However, this fact is only of revolutionary significance from the perspective of launching a socialist revolution in the future, that is, from the perspective of denying the "save the party and protect the country theory" and not "save the party" but "overthrow the party."

The term "save the party" is wrong, and the term "protect the country" is also wrong.

The premise for correctly understanding this issue is to adhere to a basic Marxist view that the state is a machine of class oppression. As long as you have carefully studied Engels's "The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State", especially Lenin's "State and Revolution" and "On the State", you can overcome the confused views on the state issue and have a clear, correct and scientific understanding.

The Marxist theory of communism is a very thorough theory of human liberation. The state has not always existed. The state is a historical thing, a historical process from birth to development to final extinction. The state is a thing that only came into being when private ownership and classes appeared in human society along with the development of productivity. From the moment it appeared, the state was a tool for class rule in the hands of a very small number of people who were exploiting and oppressing classes. The bourgeois state machine of capitalist society is the final and highest form of the exploiting class state machine. With the further development of social productivity, it is inevitable to break through the capitalist production relations and move towards a communist society without private ownership, classes, oppression and exploitation. Once the historical conditions for realising this social change are in place, the conscious working class and the broad masses of working people will adapt to the requirements of further development put forward by human society, carry forward the great spirit of historical initiative, and with the tremendous enthusiasm of "one day equals twenty years", under the guidance of the red flag of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, launch the socialist and communist revolution, eliminate capitalism, eliminate private ownership, eliminate class oppression and class exploitation, and create a communist society without private ownership, without classes, and in which the state also disappears.

This is the scientific theory on the question of the State revealed by Marxism. According to this theory, to regard the state as a sacred eternal superclass thing, or as the existence of vast lands and living human beings, is not in accordance with the reality of the historical development of mankind, and is totally wrong and anti-Marxist theory of communism. Only all the exploiting classes would abstract from the actual existence of the class content of the state to sanctify it, to actually superimpose and sanctify their class rule. The proletariat and the masses of working people cannot be deceived or taken in by this.

Therefore, when we talk about patriotism, when we talk about 'protecting the country' or 'not protecting the country', we must not forget one premise, that is, which class of people is in control of the state machinery of this country.

Now, the reality we are facing is very clear: the dictatorship of the proletariat has ceased to exist and has been replaced by the dictatorship of the fascist bourgeoisie; the socialist State has ceased to exist and has been replaced by the bureaucratic dictatorship of monopoly capitalism. Under such social conditions, 'the party has changed and the country has changed its colour', and the working people, the former masters of the country, have been subverted into an oppressed and exploited class under the dictatorship of the fascist bourgeoisie, and have been contemptuously called the 'low-end population', and "bums". If this fact is respected and if we start from this fact, how can the proletariat and the working people in general 'love' this 'country' which belongs to the bureaucratic dictatorship of the monopolistic bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the fascist bourgeoisie? How can they 'protect' this 'country' which belongs to the bureaucratic dictatorship and monopoly bourgeoisie and is under the dictatorship of the fascist bourgeoisie?

You can whimsically try to 'protect' this 'country', but this 'country' will not forget its own duty to protect you. From the smallest city policeman, auxiliary police officer, gatekeeper, to the largest public

prosecutor, law enforcement officer, and even the army, which one, which kind of violent tool of the state apparatus is not directed at the general working people? Especially for those rebels and revolutionaries who dare to oppose revisionism and the restoration of capitalism, they are arrested and sentenced to heavy penalties. As for mobilising the army and marching into the capital to suppress the masses of the people, it is unprecedented. Even Chiang Kai-shek and the Beiyang warlords had not yet dared to go this far. This has not only written a shameful chapter in the history of the People's Liberation Army, which was once much loved by the people, but, more importantly, it has signalled a change in the fundamental nature of the 'guns' under the command of the revisionist Party. A revolutionary army has been transformed into a counter-revolutionary army. This is a harsh statement, and probably not easy to accept, but it is true. Let's not forget that Chairman Mao once accused the revisionist leaders controlling the army of being 'big warlords', or that he said 'Hitler is worse than de Gaulle'. Now it seems that Deng Xiaoping and other revisionist leaders are not only 'big party warlords', but also 'big warlords', actually worse than de Gaulle and Chiang Kai-shek.

In the face of such brutal facts, they still claim to "protect" this "country". This is a class dislocation and a wrong class standpoint. Aren't the sufferings endured by the proletariat and the broad masses of working people heavy enough? How can a so-called Maoist betray Chairman Mao's teachings and create the illusion of "saving the party and protecting the country" for the working people? Can't it make people suspect that such people are probably going to follow the path of Song Jiang and accept the amnesty of the ruling class? Not only do they surrender themselves, but they also deceive Maoist comrades who believe in Chairman Mao's thoughts to play the tragic role of being betrayed and slaughtered like Li Kui and the Ruan brothers.<sup>71</sup> It is not wrong to say that they are capitulationists. Moreover, we must also see that the capitulationists are accomplices of the capitalist-roads.

Earlier, we studied and researched Chairman Mao's comments on "Water Margin" from the perspective that the capitalist-roads are the focus of the socialist continued revolution. The capitulationists are the capitalist-roads, and the capitalist-roads are the capitulationists. Here, we can change the perspective and put forward such an understanding that the "rescue faction" is the capitulation faction - the capitulation faction that surrenders to the capitalist-roads and the bourgeoisie. "Song Jiang surrendered and went to fight Fang La." The "rescue faction" did not deviate from this rule. Their attack on the revolutionaries is just as Lu Xun said: they also want to "fight other bandits for the country - bandits who do not 'act on behalf of heaven'. In the end, they are slaves."

Look at the scary labels that the "Save the Party and Protect the Country" group put on the revolutionaries, such as "Temple Demolition and Wall Pushing Group", "Leading the Way Party"<sup>72</sup>,

---

<sup>71</sup> Li Kui and the Ruan brothers are characters in the novel "Water Margin". They are all betrayed and killed as a result of betrayal after the Liangshan rebels are recruited by the imperial court. Li Kui is outspoken and unwilling to accept the restrictions of serving under the court. Because of his rebellious nature, he becomes a target for those in power who want to eliminate potential threats to their control. Eventually, he is framed and executed under orders from corrupt officials who fear his loyalty to his fellow rebels over the imperial court. The Ruan brothers are targeted by officials who see them as threats to the stability of the regime. These corrupt officials plot to weaken and eliminate the remaining Liangshan members, and the Ruan brothers are killed under these schemes – Trans.

<sup>72</sup> These are both terms that have been applied by the "Protect the Nation" faction to those whom they accuse of working for the imperialists by pushing ultra-left views. They accuse the ultra-left of instigating the masses of the left to cooperate with the ultra-right forces to metaphorically tear down walls and temples, and to bring about a situation in China in which the "left" and the right converge and bring in external forces to govern China together. The "Leading the Way" party was originally applied to those Chinese who led the way for the Eight Nation imperialist Army that invaded China at the time of the Boxer Rebellion. The term was revived in 2010, when the United States and South Korea repeatedly claimed to conduct military exercises in the Yellow Sea, and when the American aircraft carrier was about to enter the Yellow Sea, some people on the Internet



"Fifth Column" and so on. Aren't they following the path of Song Jiang again, accepting the amnesty, and eager to "fight Fang La" in order to show their loyalty to the fascist bourgeois dictatorship rulers? I was once honoured to be listed as the head of the "Leading Party" and have personal experience.

The essence of "protecting the country" is to protect the "emperor", to protect the "Yi Zun", to "protect" the "country" of the bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie, and to "protect" the "country" of the fascist bourgeois dictatorship.

To put it more thoroughly, the "save the party and protect the country" trend of thought is a kind of slave trend and capitulation trend that is willing to be a vassal of the bureaucratic autocracy and monopoly bourgeoisie. It is a reactionary trend of thought specifically targeting the theory of socialist re-revolution of Maoism.

From the perspective of class struggle, the problem can only be raised in this way. This kind of raising is in line with reality, and it is not wrong to them at all, but reveals their essence.

The "save the party and protect the country" trend of thought is unified with bourgeois patriotism and bourgeois nationalism, and completely violates the internationalism and communist theoretical principles of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

Marxism is a theory of internationalism, not nationalism. Since its birth, Marxism has issued the great call of "Workers of the world, unite" in the Communist Manifesto; the immortal "Internationale" sings the strongest voice of proletarian internationalism in the era. Internationalism has always been a red flag held high by the proletariat of the world in the united struggle!

The Marxist theory of communism is a theory that insists that all mankind, not just a certain nation, should be liberated. In a letter to the "Red Guards of Tsinghua University Affiliated Middle School" in 1966, Chairman Mao particularly emphasised the Marxist idea of liberating all mankind. Marx and Engels repeatedly emphasised from their youth that a nation that oppresses other nations will not be liberated. They warned the proletariat to completely draw a line between itself and bourgeois nationalism.

Leninism inherited and developed the internationalist thought of Marxism. Leninism's theory of imperialism, using the Marxist class analysis method, revealed that imperialism, as a stage of monopoly capitalism, must launch wars in the struggle for interests and hegemony, and put forward the famous proposition that "imperialism is war". Based on such historical background and historical conditions, Leninism proposed that the revolutionary strategy of the proletariat should be to transform the imperialist war into a civil war, that is, to use the social crisis caused by the imperialist war to launch a socialist revolution. Under the leadership of Lenin, the internationalism of "proletarians of the world unite" was used as a weapon against the "defence of the country" thought that was rampant in the workers' parties at that time. The resolute struggle against the revisionist bourgeois nationalist thought led to the development of the revolutionary situation in Europe and the victory of the great October Revolution.

Chairman Mao inherited and developed Leninism. Based on Lenin's theory of imperialism, he not only upheld the slogans "Workers of the world, unite!" and "Workers of the world and oppressed nations, unite!", but also put forward the Maoist theory and strategy of the proletarian struggle of the "theory of the three worlds". The theory and strategy of the "theory of the three worlds" is the theoretical strategy of the proletariat to launch an international struggle against imperialism headed by U.S.

---

claimed that if the US military invaded China, they would lead the way for the US military. It followed that the term then came to be applied to the so-called ultra-left – Trans.

imperialism and reactionaries in various countries, the theoretical strategy of the proletariat to support the proletariat of the world in carrying out socialist revolution, and the theoretical strategy of the proletariat to support the proletariat of the world in uniting with the oppressed people and oppressed nations to fight for national independence and national liberation.

This theoretical strategy is a further development of the general line of the international communist movement at this stage as expressed by our party in 1963 in the "Proposal on the General Line of the International Communist Movement".

Under the historical conditions at that time, the Communist Party of China led by Chairman Mao proposed: "Proletarians of the world unite, proletarians of the world unite with the oppressed peoples and oppressed nations, oppose imperialism and reactionaries of all countries, strive for world peace, national liberation, people's democracy and socialism, consolidate and strengthen the socialist camp, gradually realise the complete victory of the proletarian world revolution, and build a new world without imperialism, capitalism and exploitation. In our view, this is the general line of the international communist movement at this stage."

It is very clear that under the changed new historical conditions, the theoretical strategy of "the theory of the three worlds" proposed by Chairman Mao has the significance of a new general line of the international communist movement.

This is a line with the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie as the general outline. It firmly supports the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie in developed capitalist countries for a socialist future; it also firmly supports the class struggle for a people's democratic socialist future in the form of national and democratic revolutions in Asia, Africa and Latin America. In this great struggle, socialist China under the leadership of the Communist Party of China has played the role of the mainstay and "rear area" of all these revolutionary struggles; Maoism is a red flag guiding all these revolutionary struggles, providing all these revolutionary struggles with valuable practical and effective theories and lines, and Chairman Mao is the helmsman who guides this great struggle and is respected by revolutionary parties and revolutionary people in various countries.

Like Marxism and Leninism, Maoism is essentially internationalist, not nationalist. There is nothing difficult to understand about this. Marxism-Leninism-Maoism was created to realise communism, the great ideal of national integration, the disappearance of the state, and the liberation of all mankind. The proletariat is the leading class of this great struggle. Just as the bourgeoisie is international, the proletariat is also international. The communist struggle led by the proletariat is naturally and inevitably internationalist, and the ideological theory guiding this struggle is naturally and inevitably unified with the purpose of this struggle.

It is precisely because of the adherence to this Marxist-Leninist-Maoist principle of internationalism that, under the leadership of Chairman Mao, the Communist Party of China has never defined its goal as "realising the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation," a narrow bourgeois nationalist erroneous slogan, but rather as striving to achieve communism for the liberation of all mankind throughout the world. This has been clearly written in the Party Constitution since the founding of the Communist Party of China, and only traitors would betray this principle.

It is precisely based on this principle that, after seizing power and establishing the socialist People's Republic of China with a proletarian dictatorship under the leadership of the Communist Party of China, the Communist Party of China not only adhered to the line of taking class struggle as the key link in the country and did not stop the revolution but continued the revolution; at the same time, it did not forget to adhere to the line of taking class struggle as the key link in the international arena, did not

forget to fulfill its internationalist obligations and actively supported the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie in various capitalist countries; in particular, it firmly and vigorously supported the class struggle against imperialism and colonialism and for national independence and national liberation in the vast areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and contributed its internationalist obligations to the great success that these struggles finally achieved and shocked the world, which basically ended the rule of imperialism in the colonies and the people of Asia, Africa and Latin America finally won the great victory of national independence and national liberation.

When representatives of revolutionary parties and people from various countries who visited China expressed their gratitude to the Communist Party of China and the Chinese people, Chairman Mao and Premier Zhou always said modestly and realistically that it was you who stood at the front line and fought bravely with your blood and sacrifice that won us time and opportunities to build our own country peacefully. We should thank you. All we did was to fulfill our internationalist obligations.

This is the theory and practice of Mao Zedong's internationalism, and it is also the theory and practice of Mao Zedong's internationalism practiced by tens of millions of true Chinese Communists. It was in this historical background that the great communist fighter Comrade Lei Feng said: We must not forget that there are still two-thirds of class brothers in the world who are still oppressed and exploited. This is the strongest voice of the times issued by the proletarian internationalist mind under the correct and great leadership of Chairman Mao.

The narrow patriotism and narrow nationalism of the bourgeoisie are completely opposite to the communist theory of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, and are an inevitable reflection of the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie on national and national issues.

If we look at the issue from the point of view of worldview and methodology, the fundamental difference between Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and opportunism and revisionism on this issue still occurs mainly over whether or not to adhere to the class struggle point of view and the method of class analysis.

The theory of communism is, in the final analysis, the theory of the class of the proletariat and the mass of the working people striving for emancipation, not the theory of nationalism. From the first day of the publication of the Communist Manifesto, the banner raised by the Communists was: Proletarians of the world, unite! Half a century later, under the new historical conditions, the Comintern, under the leadership of Lenin, raised a new red flag, 'Proletarians and oppressed peoples of the world, unite!'

It is precisely based on the class analysis of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism that the wars caused by the struggle between imperialism, including social imperialism, can only be understood as the internal struggle of the monopoly bourgeoisie. Therefore, the proletariat cannot take the position and strategy of choosing sides, and cannot propose and promote a so-called "defensivism" line like the revisionists, but should adopt the proletarian line and strategy proposed by Leninism to transform imperialist war into socialist revolution. The victory of the October Revolution and the Chinese Revolution both have such significance.

It is also based on the class analysis of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism that proletarian patriotism can and should be put forward as a strategy of proletarian revolution only in the following two situations.

One is to defend the proletarian regime that has been born. For example, Russia, under the leadership of Lenin, fought against the invasion of 14 countries organized by imperialism and defended the Russian Soviet Socialist Republic. This is a war to defend the proletarian regime and the proletarian

state, and of course it is a war with the nature of proletarian patriotism. In the War to Resist U.S. Aggression and Aid Korea, the "defending the country" in the slogan of "defending the home and the country" put forward by our party also has such a nature. The War to Resist U.S. Aggression and Aid Korea has both the significance of proletarian internationalism and the significance of proletarian patriotism. The two are unified.

However, we must realise that, in the final analysis, these struggles are still class struggles, the highest form of class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie for power - war. In such a war, whether the proletariat takes a patriotic stance depends on the nature of the regime and the state. Only in order to defend the proletarian regime and the proletarian state do we have reason and must put forward proletarian patriotism.

Another is that when a weak and backward colonial or semi-colonial country suffers armed aggression from imperialism and launches a war against it, the banner of patriotism it raises is just, progressive, and revolutionary. This patriotism is not only national patriotism, but, in the final analysis, it is also the class struggle of the oppressed peoples and nations against imperialism, which is monopoly capitalism. In particular, when this is a war of anti-aggression waged under the leadership of a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist Communist Party, it has the nature and significance of the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie. For example, the Anti-Japanese War, which the Chinese Communist Party participated in and led, had such proletarian patriotic significance. The essence of this patriotism was the class struggle of the Chinese proletariat and the broad masses of the working people against the Japanese monopoly bourgeoisie. This class struggle was actually a step in China's new democratic revolution, that is, the proletarian people's democratic revolution; it laid the foundation for the victory of the next step, the new democratic revolution, that is, the victory of the people's democratic socialist revolution.

The actual situation that China is facing now has nothing to do with these two historical backgrounds. What we are facing is the struggle between imperialism, including social imperialism. This is a struggle between the monopoly bourgeoisie. This kind of war will not bring any benefits except disasters to the proletariat and the broad masses of working people. The nature of this imperialist war determines that the proletariat and the broad masses of working people have no reason to participate in this war, let alone choose sides. If they are deceived and foolishly obey the revisionist "defence" line to participate in the war, they can only serve as war victims of the monopoly bourgeoisie - cannon fodder.

Imperialist wars are, of course, waged in the form of states. To correctly understand the nature of imperialist wars, we must have a correct understanding of which class controls the state at that time and what class nature the state has. The proponents of the "save the party and protect the country" theory, the bourgeois nationalists, have fallen into the quagmire of revisionism precisely on this crucial issue.

Recently, on various issues involving the Taiwan Strait, Russia and Ukraine, many people have fallen into the quagmire of bourgeois patriotism and national chauvinism. For a time, it can be said that bourgeois patriotism and national chauvinism are rampant. Some so-called "big names" have played the role of waving flags and shouting. They are both fans of Putin and fans of Xi. They are passionate about sharing weal and woe with the "country" with characteristics and the Russian Empire. Not only have they presented letters of praise and support to "Emperor Putin", but they are also eager to draw their swords and ride on horses, rush to the battlefield, and swear to be cannon fodder for the "country" of imperialism and social imperialism. Watching their performance, one can't help but think of the old saying: You must have taken the wrong medicine. How ridiculous and pathetic! It's a bit like the new version of Ah Q. Don't they think about whether they "deserve to be named Zhao"? To put it

in the scientific language of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, they have forgotten the class nature of the Russian and Chinese state apparatuses, and have also forgotten their own class standpoints. As a result, they can only stand on the standpoint of the class enemy under the deception of bourgeois patriotism and national chauvinism!

There is a representative of the "rescue faction" who has a great influence in making videos online. He is such a typical example. He never used class struggle and line struggle as the main line to oppose the emperor and attack the headquarters. He is just good at seizing some specific people and specific events, relying on demagoguery to attract attention. On the surface, it seems that he is fighting against the restoration of capitalism, but in fact, he has played a role in shifting the general direction of the struggle. In essence, he is "saving" the bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie, "saving" the revisionist line, and especially "saving" the emperor. Recently, in a video of his talking about the Russo-Ukrainian War, he brazenly claimed that he was "standing on the standpoint of the People's Republic of China" and that he understood and treated the Russo-Ukrainian War and supported Tsarist imperialism from the attitude of "maximizing China's national interests."

Isn't this too absurd? If such a gentleman still calls himself a "Maoist", it is really an insult to Maoism. Such a video only provides us with a very convincing negative teaching material.

First, it clearly shows that the "rescue faction" stands on the same class position as the bureaucratic monopoly bourgeoisie and the state apparatus of the bureaucratic monopoly bourgeoisie.

Second, it clearly states that the "rescue faction" considers the issue from the perspective of "maximizing national interests" of the bureaucratic monopoly bourgeoisie.

Third, it clearly states that the "rescue faction" chose to stand on the side of Russian imperialism and Chinese social imperialism in this aggressive war, which was fundamentally caused by the struggle for imperialist interests and hegemony and was first launched by Russian imperialism.

Fourth, it also clearly states that in the face of the disaster brought to the people by such a cruel war, the video maker actually adopted an inhumane so-called "black humour" attitude, which completely exposed that the "rescue faction" had completely betrayed the position of the proletariat and the broad masses of the people, and regarded the bloody war launched by imperialism as a favourable tool to obtain "maximising national interests."

The good thing about this video is that it clearly exposes the class standpoint and class nature of the "rescue faction". As a negative teaching material, it is very educational for Maoists. It once again clearly tells us that the so-called "rescue faction" is actually a revisionist capitulationist faction that has infiltrated the ranks of Maoists.

We must have a clear understanding of this and cannot let them interfere with the general direction of our socialist re-revolution. We must firmly believe that Chairman Mao pointed out that only launching a socialist re-revolution is the only way to defeat the restoration of capitalism.

This is the same as "Only socialism can save China". Only a socialist re-revolution can save China!

## **2. The struggle for political freedom and democracy is an important step in launching a socialist re-revolution.**

If, in the process of launching the socialist revolution to seize power, the proletariat is faced with the historical limitations of the autocratic system determined by specific historical conditions, then, whether based on the teachings of the revolutionary mentors, or based on the historical experience

provided by the history of the international communist movement, and especially on our own personal experience gained in the struggles of recent decades, we have deeply realized that in order to obtain a stage for class struggle for the socialist revolution, and in order to enable the proletariat and the broad masses of working people to participate in the class struggle and political struggle as a self-conscious class, as a historical law and an indispensable step of the socialist revolution, we must first launch a struggle against autocracy and for political freedom and democracy, even though this political freedom and democracy do not go beyond the scope of bourgeois democracy.

From Marx and Engels to Lenin and Chairman Mao, they have repeatedly taught the proletariat that in the presence of autocratic rule, the struggle for bourgeois democracy and a bourgeois democratic republic is an important and indispensable revolutionary strategy and historical step in the proletariat's struggle for power.

This truth is also applicable to the socialist revolution.

In the struggles of the past one or two decades, we have repeatedly called for launching a struggle for democracy as an important step and an important strategy for carrying out the socialist re-revolution of the proletariat under the difficult conditions of the fascist bourgeois despotism, striving to open a gap in the chains of the fascist bourgeois despotism that tightly bound the proletariat and the broad masses of the people, so that the proletariat and the broad masses of the people can gradually gain a stage for launching class struggle; and we have repeatedly warned our comrades that this is a revolutionary theory and revolutionary strategy that the revolutionary mentors have repeatedly emphasised under the historical conditions of the existence of despotism.

However, as mentioned before, some comrades always misunderstand this theoretical viewpoint. Some comrades even criticise it from the standpoint of extreme left dogma, saying that "this is an idea of striving for bourgeois constitutional democracy", "these people are Westernisers", "Nordic democratic socialists"; they emphasise that "since it is under the conditions of bourgeois dictatorship, it is impossible to strive for the democracy needed by the proletariat, because the bourgeoisie will not give any democracy to the proletariat and the broad masses of the people."

From a dogmatic way of thinking, this statement seems to be in line with the class nature of the bourgeois dictatorship and seems to make sense. Indeed, under the conditions of the bourgeois dictatorship, there can be no real and thorough proletarian democracy. There is no doubt about this. However, it is not enough to just see this principle. If you treat this principle rigidly, you will go wrong.

In fact, this is a simple metaphysical mistake. It is not in line with the teachings of the revolutionary mentors, nor with the stage-by-stage nature of the historical tasks of the proletarian revolution determined by the conditions of historical development, including that the political form of the bourgeois dictatorship has a historical process of development from a low level to a high level, and the bourgeois democratic republic is the highest political form of the bourgeois dictatorship.

The reason for this mistake is that, in terms of their thinking, they do not understand and cannot use Marxist historicism to look at problems, and do not know that the bourgeois political system should be seen as a historical process of development from low to high, just like any other thing. In practice, they ignore that the bourgeois political system, as a historical thing and historical process, has different forms of political systems and corresponding different levels of development. For example, the political system of fascist autocracy with strong feudal characteristics is a relatively low-level form of bourgeois dictatorship, while the political system of bourgeois democratic republic is a relatively high-level form of bourgeois dictatorship. It is precisely because of this difference that Engels said in his famous "Critique of the Draft Program of the Social Democratic Party of 1891" that "a democratic republic is



even a special form of proletarian dictatorship."<sup>73</sup> Chairman Mao said "Hitler is worse than de Gaulle", meaning that the fascist autocracy represented by Hitler is worse than the bourgeois democratic republic represented by de Gaulle.

It is because they are looking at the issue from a rigid perspective that, in their view, it is pointless to propose to wage a struggle for democracy in the face of the fascist bourgeois dictatorship.

In order to rectify this confusion of thought, in the Minutes of the Luoyang Conference (February 2015) and the Minutes of the Shaoshan Conference (December 2015), which I drafted for the Maoist Comrades' Conference, this issue was addressed in a targeted manner. These observations still do not seem outdated today, and I quote a few passages from them.

In the Minutes of the Luoyang Conference, it is written as follows: "These recent historical experiences tell us that the most powerful means to achieve socialist re-revolution is the revolutionary movement of the masses. This is incomparable to any other means of reform. As Engels said in his later years in the famous Introduction to the "Class Struggles in France, 1848-1850", revolution is undoubtedly the 'most authoritative means' of historical progress and historical change. Moreover, Engels also specifically made a point of urging that active attack is better than the defensive street fighting used in 1848.

"Chinese Maoist communists want to take this revolutionary route and only this revolutionary route. We have to launch a revolutionary movement of the people's masses to put an end to bourgeois rule, which is politically characterised by revisionism, to achieve a socialist re-revolution and to re-establish the scientific socialist society of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

"Taking this revolutionary route involves breaking through the fascist dictatorship of revisionism. Revisionism still claims to follow the 'Constitution of the People's Republic of China' (albeit modified by them). This gives us the possibility of legitimate struggle. We are the ones who demand the implementation of all the democratic rights granted to the people under Article 35 of the Constitution. We are fighting the fascist dictatorship of the revisionist bourgeoisie with socialist democratic demands. We may only get limited bourgeois democracy, but it is better than fascist dictatorship for the working class of workers, peasants and labourers, for organising themselves, for propaganda and mobilising the masses.

"From a long-term perspective, our highest demand for democracy is for the working people to be the masters of their own house, and this can only be achieved ultimately after the people's socialist re-revolutionary movement has been set in motion and power has been attained. This is an inevitable and mutually unifying historical step in our struggle for socialist re-revolution and for democracy, and it is also the fundamental significance and purpose of our struggle for democracy. As long as power is

---

<sup>73</sup> The paragraph in which this is said reads: "If one thing is certain it is that our party and the working class can only come to power under the form of a democratic republic. This is even the specific form for the dictatorship of the proletariat, as the Great French Revolution has already shown. It would be inconceivable for our best people to become ministers under an emperor, as Miquel. It would seem that from a legal point of view it is inadvisable to include the demand for a republic directly in the programme, although this was possible even under Louis Phillippe in France, and is now in Italy. But the fact that in Germany it is not permitted to advance even a republican party programme openly, proves how totally mistaken is the belief that a republic, and not only a republic, but also communist society, can be established in a cosy, peaceful way." The distinction between "of a democratic republic" and "for a democratic republic" may have been lost in translations between languages - Trans.

in our hands and the people are the masters of their own house, this is not only the victory of the socialist re-revolution, but also a new starting point for the continuation of the socialist revolution.

“The struggle for democracy is the starting point of the current struggle. This is a difficult task. We must unite all forces that can be united. As long as they are forces that oppose fascist dictatorship, we can unite, but we must not forget our class independence, our line, purpose and direction.

“To follow this revolutionary line, we must focus our work on propaganda and mobilising the masses. Theory is the spiritual soul of revolution, and the masses are the material force of revolution. Only by combining the two and arming the masses with Marxism-Leninism-Maoism can we launch a socialist re-revolutionary movement. This is where all our work ends. To this end, we Maoist communists must go deep into the masses of workers and peasants, be students of the masses, achieve unity with the masses, participate in all revolutionary practical activities of the masses, and gradually transform the theory of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism into the ideological weapon of the masses in revolutionary practical activities.

“To follow this revolutionary line, we must also study hard and thoroughly understand Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. Comrades unanimously agreed that in carrying out this struggle against the bureaucratic monopoly bourgeoisie with revisionism as its political characteristic, we still have many unresolved theoretical issues; we have many blind spots on what kind of scientific socialist society to build in the future that can relatively resist the emergence of revisionism and the restoration of capitalism. This requires us to study and understand again under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, which is quite difficult. It seems ironic that the Communist Party members do not understand Marxism-Leninism, but it is also a fact. This is even an important reason for the occurrence of revisionism and the restoration of capitalism. Comrades must maintain a clear understanding of this issue and treat it seriously. If it is said that the correctness of the ideological and political line determines everything, then the premise for achieving this is that we must master Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. The higher the red flag of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism is raised, the more certain the victory of the socialist revolution will be.

“Study hard, mobilize the masses, and strive for democracy. These are the three tasks that we Maoist communists must now grasp.

“The general program is the socialist revolution.

“The general line is: with the proletariat as the leader (through the Communist Party), based on the worker-peasant alliance, unite all progressive forces that can be united, launch a socialist re-revolution against the reactionary rule of the bureaucratic monopoly bourgeoisie with revisionism as its political characteristics, retake the power usurped by them, and strive to rebuild the scientific socialism of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism in China-the first stage of communism. ”

These opinions are still correct today, and still have very practical significance.

In the "Shaoshan Conference Minutes", more discussions were made on the erroneous thoughts that denied the significance of the struggle for democracy, which are also quoted as follows:

"The meeting once again emphasized that the "Luoyang Conference" proposed to break through autocracy and strive for democracy, which is in line with the teachings of the revolutionary mentors of Marxism-Leninism and Maoism, and is also in line with the reality of China's socialist re-revolution.

“From the perspective of historical materialism, this is an indispensable historical step for the advancement of Chinese history. There is currently a great debate in theory about this issue. Therefore, we need to give our answer to this question.

“The essential requirement of socialism is the dictatorship of the proletariat, or the people's democratic dictatorship, a special form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. In layman's terms, it means that the people are the masters of the country.

“The reason is obvious. Politics is the commander. Politics commands the economy. Compared with the economy, politics must take the first place. Only the existence of the dictatorship of the proletariat can guarantee the existence of socialist public ownership and the existence of socialist ideology and culture. Once the dictatorship of the proletariat is lost, even if there is a form of public ownership, the essence will be transformed. This has been proven by the history of the bureaucratic monopoly capitalist economy and the restoration of capitalism from the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe to China.

“As Lenin said, the dictatorship of the proletariat and proletarian democracy are synonymous. Without the dictatorship of the proletariat, there can be no proletarian democracy, and likewise, without proletarian democracy, there can be no dictatorship of the proletariat. It is in this sense that, so long as the inevitability and necessity of the dictatorship of the proletariat is recognised, the inevitability and necessity of proletarian democracy must be recognised. This brings out the importance of proletarian democracy.

“Democratic politics is the ultimate destination of the form of the State and the highest form of the State system. Lenin stated: ‘Democracy is a form of state, a state form. It is therefore, like any state, an organised and systematic use of violence against people, which is on the one hand. But on the other hand, democracy means the formal recognition of the equality of all citizens, of the equal power of all to determine the system of the state and to administer it.’ (Lenin's Selected Works, Volume III, People's Publishing House, 1972 edition, p. 257.) Whether in essence or in form, socialist democracy is a more progressive and advanced democracy than capitalist democracy. Socialist countries must institutionally and practically guarantee that the masses enjoy more extensive, more direct and more real democratic rights than the masses in all capitalist countries, especially the right to manage the country. As Lenin said, Soviet democracy “is the real equal and real universal participation of all residents in all state affairs.” This is the essence of socialist countries and proletarian dictatorship. Chairman Mao not only emphasized in his conversation with Huang Yanpei in Yan'an that democracy must be implemented among the people, allowing the people to supervise the government and let everyone take responsibility, so that the government will not perish with the people. Moreover, after the founding of the People's Republic of China, this issue was raised many times, emphasising that the most fundamental right of the masses is the right to manage the country. In the last ten years of the Cultural Revolution, he encouraged and supported the masses to boldly create and put into practice how to realise the direct management of the country by the masses.

“The painful history of socialist revisionism and the failure of socialism has once again put the issue of proletarian democracy on the agenda urgently. Historical lessons tell us that proletarian democracy is the guarantee of socialism. Once proletarian democracy is lost, the failure of socialism is inevitable.

“Of course, we cannot ignore the fact that the realisation of democracy is a historical process. This is especially true for an ancient and civilised country that has experienced a long-term imperial autocratic society based on landlordism. The historical tradition of imperial autocracy has corroded the entire Chinese social body and bound everything in Chinese society, including the souls of the Chinese people.

Under such circumstances, breaking through autocracy and moving towards democracy is difficult and requires constant struggle and revolution.

“The greater difficulty is that we are facing the fascist bourgeois dictatorship and the historical task of socialist re-revolution. As far as socialist re-revolution is concerned, without democracy, there will be no class movement of the proletariat and the broad masses of working people. Only by breaking through the autocracy and in the form of democracy, even in the form of bourgeois democracy, can the proletariat and the broad masses of working people act in unity with a unified class will, can they participate in the political struggle as a whole class, and can there be class struggle and political struggle in the strict sense. This puts the historical task of breaking through the autocracy and striving for democracy in front of us more urgently. The revolutionary mentor Lenin pointed out that economic struggle is not yet a class struggle, or in other words, it is ‘only the embryo of class struggle’. Only the struggle for democracy and the struggle for political freedom are class struggles in the strict sense. ”

These opinions in the "Minutes" are obviously correct. We must never underestimate the significance of the political struggle for democracy. Engels pointed out from his early years that without democracy, there would be no workers' movement. In his later years, he emphasized: "If there is anything that is beyond doubt, it is that our party and the working class can only rule under the political form of a democratic republic." (Engels: "Critique of the Draft Program of the Social Democratic Party of 1891" (June 18-29, 1891), "Collected Works of Marx and Engels", Volume 22, page 274.) He further explained the reasoning behind this, saying: "Marx and I, for forty years, repeated ad nauseam that for us the democratic republic is the only, political form in which the struggle between the working class and the capitalist class can first be universalised and then culminate in the decisive victory of the proletariat." (Engels: "Reply to the Honourable Giovanni Bovio", "Collected Works of Marx and Engels", Vol. 22, p. 327.) In the very important Introduction to Marx's *The Class Struggles in France, 1848-1850*, written in 1895, the last year of Engels' life, it was also reiterated that "The Communist Manifesto has long declared that the struggle for universal suffrage and democracy is one of the primary tasks of the militant proletariat." (Collected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. 22, p. 602.) Unfortunately, even if we repeat these teachings of our revolutionary mentors ten thousand times, those "very revolutionary" comrades always turn a deaf ear to them.

Lenin upheld and defended this revolutionary principle and strategy of Marxism. In the party program drafted for the Russian Social Democratic Party, he wrote: "The struggle of the Russian working class for its own liberation is a political struggle, and its primary task is to win political freedom." (Lenin: "The Social Democratic Party's Program and Its Explanation", "Collected Works of Lenin", Volume 2, page 70.) Based on this view, Lenin drafted 9 "primary demands" for the Social Democratic Party to fight for political freedom and democratic rights. This includes the right to vote and democratic rights such as freedom of assembly, association, strike, publication, and belief. Lenin emphasised, "The struggle of the working class is a political struggle. What does this mean? That is, the working class cannot fight for its own liberation without fighting for influence over state affairs, state management, and the issuance of laws." (Ibid., p. 89.) In the article "The Tasks of Russian Social Democrats", it is also said: "It is impossible to fight victoriously for the cause of the workers without fighting for political freedom and democratising the political and social system of Russia." (Volume 2 of "Collected Works of Lenin", p. 285.)

It is precisely from the stage-by-stage nature of the historical tasks of the proletarian revolution, which is determined by the stage-by-stage nature of historical development, that the importance and necessity of striving for democracy under the conditions of bourgeois dictatorship are explained. Lenin argued this truth in this way: "For the proletarians, the struggle for political freedom and a democratic republic in bourgeois society is only one of the necessary stages in the social-revolutionary struggle to

overthrow the bourgeois order. Strictly distinguishing between essentially different stages and calmly exploring the conditions under which these stages arise does not mean that the ultimate goal is shelved or that the pace is deliberately slowed down. On the contrary, it is precisely in order to speed up the pace and achieve the ultimate goal as quickly and safely as possible that we must understand the class relations in modern society." (Lenin: "Autocracy and the Proletariat", "Collected Works of Lenin", Volume 8, page 6.)

It is based on such Marxist theories and strategies that Lenin emphasized: "Only the proletariat can become the advanced fighter for political freedom and democracy" and "Only the proletariat can thoroughly realize the democratisation of the political and social systems, because the implementation of such democratisation will make the workers the masters of this system." Therefore, Lenin emphasized that "prominently promoting the working class as an advanced fighter for democracy will strengthen the democratic movement and the struggle for political freedom." (Ibid., p. 289.)

These ideas are consistent with those in the Communist Manifesto. Lenin discussed the significance of fighting for political freedom and democracy based on the actual situation in Russia. Lenin was writing the party's program, which must have been extremely rigorous. This reflects that the struggle for democracy is a means and step to "realise socialism" and reflects the "combination of socialist struggle and democratic struggle."

The strategy of the Communists was at least determined by the national conditions of Russia at that time. Lenin said: "The Russian Social Democrats have never forgotten the political conditions of Russia, never dreamed of the possibility of establishing a workers' party in Russia, and never separated the task of striving for socialism from the task of striving for political freedom." Lenin's teachings have extremely practical guiding significance for us to understand whether we should strive for democracy in the face of fascist dictatorship.

The significance of economic struggle cannot be overestimated, and the significance of the political struggle for democracy cannot be underestimated. Lenin expounded on this important thought in the important article "Our Program".

"We have stated that the essence of this programme is to organise the class struggle of the proletariat and to lead this struggle, the ultimate aim of which is the conquest of political power by the proletariat and the establishment of a socialist society. The class struggle of the proletariat comprises the economic struggle (struggle against individual capitalists or against individual groups of capitalists for the improvement of the workers' condition) and the political struggle (struggle against the government for the broadening of the people's rights, i.e., for democracy, and for the broadening of the political power of the proletariat). Some Russian Social-Democrats (among them apparently those who direct *Rabochaya Mysl*) regard the economic struggle as incomparably the more important and almost go so far as to relegate the political struggle to the more or less distant future. This standpoint is utterly false. All Social-Democrats are agreed that it is necessary to organise the economic struggle of the working class... Every economic struggle necessarily becomes a political struggle, and Social-Democracy must indissolubly combine the one with the other into a *single class struggle of the proletariat*. The first and chief aim of such a struggle must be the conquest of political rights, *the conquest of political liberty*... The Russian working class is able to wage its economic and political struggle alone, even if no other class comes to its aid. But in the political struggle the workers do not stand alone. The people's complete lack of rights and the savage lawlessness of the bashi-bazouk officials rouse the indignation of all honest educated people who cannot reconcile themselves to the persecution of free thought and free speech; they rouse the indignation of the persecuted Poles, Finns, Jews, and Russian religious sects; they rouse the indignation of the small merchants, manufacturers,

and peasants, who can nowhere find protection from the persecution of officials and police. All these groups of the population are incapable, separately, of carrying on a persistent political struggle. But when the working class raises the banner of this struggle, it will receive support from all sides. Russian Social-Democracy will place itself at the head of all fighters for the rights of the people, of all fighters for democracy, and it will prove invincible!" (Selected Works of Lenin, Volume 1, pp. 204-205.)

Lenin explained the necessity and possibility of democracy and a democratic republic very thoroughly.

Of course, Lenin was talking about the bourgeois democratic revolution in Russia, and what we are doing now is a socialist re-revolution. We cannot mechanically apply Lenin's ideas. The revolutionary tasks we are facing now are different from those Lenin faced back then. It is wrong not to see this essential difference.

However, it is also wrong not to see a common point between the two, that is, both are facing autocratic rule, although Lenin faced the tsarist feudal autocracy and we face the revisionist fascist autocracy.

The autocratic system is a backward and reactionary political system. We will not analyse in detail why China now has such a reactionary and backward political system. Everyone knows that the existence of such an autocratic system in China is not accidental. It is related to our current national conditions and our history. We only emphasise here that no matter what the reason is, the result is that China has an autocratic system. This system is a backward and reactionary political system, which is the political characteristic and political key of revisionist rule. It is precisely because of this backwardness, reactionary nature, and seriousness that Chairman Mao said, "Hitler is worse than de Gaulle," that is, fascist autocracy is worse than democratic republic, although both are bourgeois political systems and political rule. It is precisely from the perspective of historical comparison and the perspective of the historical development process that in the struggle against revisionism and the socialist re-revolution, the historical task of opposing autocratic rule, striving for political freedom, and striving for democracy has been mentioned in an important position. We must fully recognise the importance of striving for political freedom and democracy in realising the socialist re-revolution today.

We certainly will not forget that in today's China, the struggle for democracy is no longer the historical task of the bourgeois democratic revolution, but the historical task of the socialist re-revolution. Don't forget that the exact meaning of the concept of democratic revolution refers to the bourgeois democratic revolution. Obviously, we cannot understand the historical task of the socialist re-revolution against autocracy and for democracy that we are currently carrying out in this way. The reason is very simple. China is now a bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalist society. Such a social nature determines that the revolution to be carried out can only be a socialist revolution. Adding the word "again" only emphasises that it is a "second" socialist revolution.

The Marxist view of historical materialism is also the Marxist view of historicism. The two are unified and consistent. This is true for first making a democratic revolution and then a socialist revolution; it is also true for breaking through the fascist autocratic system and launching and carrying out a socialist revolution. Respecting the order of historical development, from low to high, from easy to difficult, is the most reasonable historical step that is most conducive to mobilising the broadest classes and the broadest masses and forming the broadest united front. These principles have been repeatedly explained by the revolutionary mentors.

Some comrades emphasise that our struggle for democracy is nothing but a struggle for bourgeois democracy, and that under the conditions of bourgeois dictatorship, it is nothing but an illusion to



want to win democracy. The accusation that we are wrong is that we are creating illusions, or even helping the rulers to paralyse the proletariat and the broad masses of working people.

This is a simplistic thinking that is divorced from facts. If the methods of bourgeois political rule are the same, then where is the difference between "Hitler" and "De Gaulle"? This is closing one's eyes to reality. According to this view, all political struggles for political freedom and democratic rights are meaningless, and the result is that such political struggles are not carried out in practice. This is the problem we are facing now.

Revolutionary mentors have always attached importance to the diversity of political ruling methods. Marx and Engels paid great attention to the different political ruling characteristics of different European and American countries, and therefore pointed out that the political tasks faced by the workers' parties in these countries were different. For example, when talking about Germany, they emphasised the backwardness and reactionary nature of its autocratic system and stressed the need to break through this reactionary "shell". When talking about the political systems of Britain, France, the United States, Switzerland and other countries, they acknowledged that the democratic republics in these countries were relatively developed. This is a scientific attitude that respects facts. It is based on this fact that Lenin also said, "The people of other European countries have long fought for political freedom. Only in Turkey and Russia are the people still political slaves of the Sultan government and the Tsarist autocracy." "Tsarist autocracy is official autocracy. Tsarist autocracy is the people's serf-like obedience to officials, especially to the police. Tsarist autocracy is police autocracy." (Lenin, "To the Rural Poor", Selected Works of Lenin, Volume 1, pp. 393, 395) Isn't this the political situation we are facing today? As a political system and political form, autocracy has the same basic characteristics.

In his debates with opportunist factions such as the Economists and the Liquidators, Lenin repeatedly explained that it was impossible to achieve the unity of the proletariat and enable the proletariat to wage class struggle as a class without political freedom and democracy. Including his explanation of Engels's words "the democratic republic is even a special form of the dictatorship of the proletariat", which was repeatedly quoted by his comrades, Lenin also emphasized that the democratic republic provided the proletariat with the possibility and stage to engage in class struggle and was a "shortcut" to the struggle for power. Moreover, Lenin also emphasized the significance of the proletarian revolution in the struggle for democracy by the proletariat, especially the strike struggle, which is a form of struggle unique to the proletariat. This is not only not limited to the constraints of bourgeois democracy, but also a struggle against the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. This is just as Chairman Mao said in his speech at the Second Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee of the Communist Party of China on November 15, 1956: "The great democracy launched by the proletariat is to deal with class enemies. Democracy is a method. It depends on who it is used on and what it is used for. We love great democracy. What we love is great democracy under the leadership of the proletariat. We mobilised the masses to fight against Chiang Kai-shek, and fought for more than 20 years, and defeated him; in the land reform movement, the peasant masses rose up to fight against the landlord class, and they won land after three years of struggle. That was all great democracy. The "Three Antis" was to fight those staff members who were corrupted by the bourgeoisie, and the "Five Antis" was to fight against the bourgeoisie, and they fought hard. Those were all vigorous mass movements, and they were all great democracy." (Selected Works of Mao Zedong), Volume 5, pages 323-324.) The principles that Chairman Mao talked about are consistent with those of Engels and Lenin. Once there is a form of democracy, even if it is a form of bourgeois democracy, the proletariat can develop into great proletarian democracy through this form of democracy, that is, the proletarian mass movement, that is, the proletarian revolution. This is the reason why we regard the bourgeois democratic form as a "shortcut" to launching the proletarian socialist revolution. These principles are worth our in-depth

thinking in light of historical reality, especially the reality of the present. We must never use dogmatic thinking to tailor the rich, complex and vivid real life.

Now, our comrades have repeatedly lamented that we lack an organised and united struggle, and have called for great unity and solidarity. This is a correct view based on facts. However, comrades should not forget that it is the actual fascist bourgeois dictatorship that restricts our unity. Not to mention unity, let alone forming a party, even if the revolutionary masses spontaneously organise themselves and carry out activities to commemorate Chairman Mao, they will be restricted or even suppressed. The reason why we have the weakness of lack of unity is precisely caused by the autocratic system. This is just as Lenin said: "To unite, we must have the right to establish various alliances, we must have freedom of association, and we must have political freedom. Political freedom cannot immediately free the working people from poverty, but it can give workers a weapon to fight poverty. To fight poverty, there is no and cannot be any other way except for the workers themselves to unite. Without political freedom, millions of people will not be able to unite." (Ibid., p. 396) Therefore, it is impossible to solve this problem by simply calling for unity and solidarity without first overthrowing the authoritarian system that hinders unity and solidarity. Only by resolutely fighting against the authoritarian system for political freedom and freedom of association, only by organising a party of one's own class to direct unified class actions, only by running one's own official newspaper and website to convey the theories and strategies of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism to every class brother, and achieving true ideological unity... Only in this way can the unity and solidarity of the proletariat and the broad masses of working people be achieved, and not just empty talk.

This is how the Russian Revolution led by Lenin came about. It is the best and most practical example for us to carry out the socialist revolution today.

Lenin once said: "As long as the Russian people win political freedom, the cause of the united working class, the cause of socialism, will advance extremely rapidly, even faster than the cause of the German workers." (Ibid., p. 401) "The Russian Social Democrats must first fight for political freedom. Only with freedom can they unite all Russian workers broadly and openly to fight for a new and beautiful socialist social system." (Selected Works of Lenin, Vol. 1, p. 332) "There is no other way to socialism except through democracy and political freedom." (Ibid., p. 641) The Russian Revolution verified Lenin's scientific foresight. Today, if the Chinese people have won political freedom, then what difficulties will there be in launching a socialist revolution and once again becoming the vanguard of the international communist movement?

It must be recognised that the struggle of the proletariat for democracy cannot rely on gifts or begging, but only on struggle, even bloody struggle. This is a class struggle and political struggle in the true sense. It is this struggle that can push the proletarian revolution forward and upward. The highest form of this struggle is for the proletariat and the broad masses of the people to take action and use all possible means, including violent means, to seize power and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. It can be said that the highest significance and highest form of the struggle for proletarian democracy is to realise the dictatorship of the proletariat. Moreover, after the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, it also has the significance and form of consolidating and protecting the dictatorship of the proletariat and preventing the emergence of privileges and revisionism.

In the course of leading the Russian Revolution, Lenin accumulated a vast amount of rich revolutionary experience, including experience in the struggle for democracy. He made many relevant expositions, which were very practical and thorough. They have all been tested by the practice of the Russian Revolution and are very reliable, worthy of our serious re-study.

There are serious differences among Maoists about whether we should strive for democracy under the conditions of fascist bourgeois dictatorship, and whether we can strive for democracy. Therefore, I quote more of the revolutionary mentors here in order to get to the bottom of the matter, to truly understand and comprehend this issue, and then put it into revolutionary practice. Unfortunately, I cannot quote more here. Judging from the feedback I received after the draft for soliciting opinions was published online, some comrades who do not like to read Marxist-Leninist-Maoist books have become impatient with just a few quotations like now. Chairman Mao repeatedly taught us to read and study seriously and to understand Marxism-Leninism. However, many of our comrades, although they love and respect Chairman Mao, do not listen to Chairman Mao's teachings and do not like to read. They think that as long as they know a few quotations, they have already mastered Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. In fact, they are more likely to attack Marxism-Leninism-Maoism based on their own limited feelings (caused by various conditions). This is an inevitable and important reason why these comrades have gone astray in theory.

Based on the above-mentioned reasons, we must fully understand that striving for democracy is a historical task that we cannot avoid, and we must do it step by step and in a down-to-earth manner.

At present, we should use Article 35 of the Constitution of the People's Republic of China as a weapon to strive for the minimum democratic rights.

Chairman Mao personally led the formulation of the first Constitution of New China. Chairman Mao used Marxist-Leninist theory and combined it with the country's social reality to have a clear and profound scientific discussion on the issue of democracy. Chairman Mao proposed that in our country's constitution, we must adhere to two basic principles, namely the principle of democracy and the principle of socialism. Our democracy is not bourgeois democracy, but people's democracy, which is the people's democratic dictatorship led by the proletariat and based on the alliance of workers and peasants. The principle of people's democracy runs through our entire constitution. The other is the principle of socialism, that is, to complete socialist transformation and realise the socialist industrialisation of the country. Chairman Mao advocated that among the people, there can be neither no freedom nor discipline, neither no democracy nor centralisation. This unity of democracy and centralisation, and the unity of freedom and discipline, is our democratic centralism. Under this system, the people enjoy extensive democracy and freedom; at the same time, they must restrain themselves with socialist discipline. (Mao Zedong: "On the Draft Constitution of the People's Republic of China" (June 14, 1954), "Selected Works of Mao Zedong", Volume 5, pages 127 and 128.) The democratic thought embodied in the "'54 Constitution" formulated under the leadership of Chairman Mao is still the democratic thought we must uphold today.

The '54 Constitution, including the Constitution that was revised many times afterwards, and even the current Constitution that was revised by the revisionist rulers, all clearly state the democratic rights that the citizens of the People's Republic of China should enjoy. Article 35 of the current Constitution clearly states: "Citizens of the People's Republic of China have freedom of speech, publication, assembly, association, procession and demonstration."

Our struggle for democracy can start with the demand for the effective implementation of Article 35 of the Constitution. We must fight against all so-called "regulations" and "laws" that violate Article 35 of the Constitution and undermine the implementation of Article 35 of the Constitution. For example, the Constitution clearly stipulates that citizens have the freedom to march and demonstrate, but under the fascist dictatorship, no citizen's application for a march and demonstration has been approved so far. This is a typical example of using the so-called "Law of the People's Republic of China on Assembly, Procession and Demonstration" by fascism to oppose and undermine the implementation of the

relevant provisions of Article 35 of the Constitution. This is a typical manifestation of the deception of revisionism. We must expose this deception. We must do the opposite, "use their own spear to attack their own shield", and use the relevant provisions of Article 35 of the Constitution on democratic rights to oppose the fascist dictatorship that actually tramples on Article 35 of the Constitution and carry out legal struggle.

Based on this struggle strategy, we can take striving to implement Article 35 of the Constitution as our immediate step in the struggle for democracy. We must do it in earnest, dare to fight hard battles, and not just fire blanks. Many of our other struggles, including the struggle for rights and economic struggles, can and must be combined with this political struggle.

Obviously, this opinion is nothing more than using the teachings of the revolutionary mentors and historical experience to refute the incorrect ideas and statements of those comrades who do not understand the importance of striving for democracy and can only make unlimited exaggerations and label others. Now it seems that this opinion has important and strong practical significance, is in line with reality, and therefore is in line with the requirements of the socialist re-revolution.

It is precisely based on the struggle for democracy as an important part of launching the socialist re-revolution that I drafted the following appeal in July 2016.

#### **Strive to implement Articles 35 and 37 of the Constitution**

The Constitution of the People's Republic of China clearly stipulates that the People's Republic of China is a socialist state under the people's democratic dictatorship led by the working class and based on the worker-peasant alliance.

According to the Constitution, if it is worthy of the name, this country should be a people's democratic country, or a country where the people are the masters of the country, or a country where the people's democratic dictatorship and the dictatorship of the proletariat should be the country.

The statements are different, but the essence is the same. It reflects a simple and fundamental truth: without the power (rights) of the people, without democracy, there will be nothing for the people, and there will be no socialism.

To achieve this, certain historical conditions are required; whether this is achieved or not, there are certain historical standards.

The socialist constitution is such a historical condition and historical standard. This has been repeatedly proven by the theory and practice of the success and failure of socialism.

In 1949, when the People's Republic of China was just being established, the Communist Party of China and various democratic parties immediately consulted and formulated the "Common Program of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference" under the leadership of Chairman Mao, which served as a temporary constitution. In 1954, the First Session of the First National People's Congress formally adopted the "Constitution of the People's Republic of China" formulated under the personal leadership of Chairman Mao. This is a political event of great historical significance. The Constitution of the People's Republic of China "in the form of the fundamental law of the state, confirms the heroic struggle of the Chinese people over the past 100 years to oppose internal and external enemies, strive for national independence and the freedom and happiness of the people, and confirms the historical changes in which the Communist Party of China led the Chinese people to win the victory of the new democratic

revolution and the Chinese people took control of state power." ("Xi Jinping's Speech at the Conference of All Circles in the Capital to Commemorate the 30th Anniversary of the Promulgation and Implementation of the Current Constitution")

It is this constitution that protects the socialist nature of our country and also embodies the socialist nature of our country. The constitution is called the supreme law and the fundamental law.

Historical experience, especially historical lessons, tell us that the fate of this constitution is the fate of the People's Republic of China, the fate of people's democracy, the fate of the people, and even the fate of the Communist Party of China.

The most fundamental point is that if the constitution is trampled upon, it means that the power (rights) of the people is trampled upon, people's democracy is trampled upon, and the people's right to be masters of their own country is trampled upon, which will inevitably lead to the trampling of socialism. The socialist history from the Soviet Union to China, especially the cruel and painful historical lessons that have occurred repeatedly, have repeatedly proved this point.

We have not yet completely solved this major historical issue. We are still facing the reality that the constitution is often trampled upon and the power (rights) of the people is often trampled upon. If this reality does not change, there will be no socialism.

Socialism is the fundamental interest of our people and our lifeblood. The socialist constitution is the concentrated embodiment of socialism in the form of the highest law. If we want to defend socialism, our lifeblood, we must defend the socialist constitution.

It is based on this simple, clear and important truth that we, the people, have formed a front to defend the constitution in response to the fact that the constitution has been violated and the people's power (rights) have been trampled upon. Starting from reality, we first defend Articles 35 and 37 of the current constitution on the rights of the people.

Article 35 stipulates that **citizens of the People's Republic of China have freedom of speech, publication, assembly, association, procession and demonstration.**

Article 37 stipulates that the personal freedom of citizens of the People's Republic of China shall not be violated. **No citizen shall be arrested without the approval or decision of the People's Procuratorate or the People's Court and the execution by the public security organs.**

**It is prohibited to illegally detain or illegally deprive or restrict the personal freedom of citizens by other means, and it is prohibited to illegally search the body of citizens.**

Have these provisions of the Constitution been truly and completely implemented? As long as we respect the facts, the answer can only be no. For example, as we all know, there is no freedom to create websites and magazines, no freedom of association, and even the most basic personal freedom is not guaranteed.

Once the people lose these rights, things will go in the opposite direction step by step. As we have seen, autocracy has occurred, privilege has occurred, corruption has occurred, and finally, bureaucratic monopoly capitalism or crony capitalism has occurred, and socialism has degenerated.

Facts have repeatedly proved that without the power and rights of the people, without the supervision and management of the people, the so-called "the party changes and the country changes colour" is a historical inevitability.

Therefore, whether considering the issue from the perspective of the interests of the people or from the perspective of the fate and future of the party and the country, defending the Constitution and defending the democratic power (rights) of the people are historical inevitability and historical needs that meet the requirements of socialism and promote historical progress. This is the historical basis for us to fight for the practical implementation of Articles 35 and 37 of the Constitution.

Based on the unfortunate reality that unconstitutional acts often occur, we have to specifically state that our proposal to implement Articles 35 and 37 of the Constitution is in line with the consistent instructions of the Communist Party of China and is a practical action to defend the Constitution and promote its implementation.

In order to set the record straight, let us review the relevant instructions of President Xi Jinping.

Regarding the supremacy and great significance of the Constitution, President Xi Jinping said, **'The Constitution is the fundamental law of the country; adherence to the rule of the country according to the law must first be adhered to in ruling the country according to the Constitution, and adherence to ruling in accordance with the law must first be adhered to in ruling in accordance with the Constitution.'** (Xi Jinping's Speech at a Meeting of Various Sectors in the Capital to Commemorate the 30th Anniversary of the Publication and Enforcement of the Existing Constitution) **'The Constitution is the fundamental law of the country, the general charter for the rule of the country and the security of the state, and it has the highest legal status, legal authority, and legal effect, and it is of a fundamental, overall, stable, and long-term nature.'** (Ibid.) **'To defend the dignity of the Constitution is to defend the dignity of the common will of the Party and the people.'** (Ibid.) **"Whether the authority of the rule of law can be established depends first and foremost on whether the Constitution has authority. It is necessary to take the promotion and establishment of the authority of the Constitution as a major matter in the overall promotion of the rule of law, and to make real efforts in the implementation and supervision of the Constitution."** ('Xi Jinping's Note on the Decision of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China on Several Major Issues Concerning Comprehensively Promoting the Rule of Law')

President Xi Jinping put it this way: **'The Party leads the people in enacting the Constitution and the law, the Party leads the people in implementing the Constitution and the law, and the Party itself must operate within the bounds of the Constitution and the law, which is the manifestation of the Party's leading power. The Party and the law, Party leadership and the rule of law are highly unified. It is in the uncompromising implementation of the constitution-centred rule of the country and rule in accordance with the constitution that we base ourselves on the Constitution of the People's Republic of China. Any organisation or individual must operate within the scope of the Constitution and the law, and any citizen, social organisation and state organ must take the Constitution and the law as their code of conduct, and exercise their rights or powers and perform their duties or responsibilities in accordance with the Constitution and the law.'** (Speech at the Seminar for Leading Cadres at the Provincial and Ministerial Levels on Studying and Implementing the Spirit of the Fourth Plenary Session of the 18th Central Committee of the Communist Party of China to Comprehensively Promote the Rule of Law)



Regarding the necessity and significance of promoting the implementation of the Constitution, President Xi Jinping said, **"The life of the Constitution lies in its implementation, and the authority of the Constitution also lies in its implementation. The full implementation of the Constitution is the primary task and fundamental work in building a socialist state governed by the rule of law."** (Xi Jinping's Speech at a Meeting of Various Sectors in the Capital to Commemorate the 30th Anniversary of the Publication and Enforcement of the Existing Constitution)

Regarding the need to uphold the Constitution and fight against all unconstitutional acts, President Xi Jinping said, **'Leading cadres should firmly establish the basic concepts of the rule of law, such as the supremacy of the Constitution and the law, equality before the law, and the rule of law by law, and stand up to and resolutely fight against all kinds of behaviour that endangers the rule of law, undermines the rule of law, and tramples on the rule of law.'** (Speech at the Seminar for Leading Cadres at the Provincial and Ministerial Levels to Study and Implement the Spirit of the Fourth Plenary Session of the 18th Central Committee on Comprehensively Promoting the Rule of Law)

Regarding the necessity and correctness of our struggle to defend Articles 35 and 37 of the Constitution, President Xi Jinping said, **'The fundamental rights and duties of citizens are the core content of the Constitution, and the Constitution is the fundamental guarantee for every citizen to enjoy their rights and fulfil their duties.'** (Xi Jinping's Speech at a Meeting of Various Sectors in the Capital to Commemorate the 30th Anniversary of the Publication and Enforcement of the Existing Constitution) **'People's rights and freedoms cannot be guaranteed if the Constitution is disregarded, weakened or even undermined.'** (Ibid.) **'We must guarantee, in accordance with the law, that all citizens enjoy a wide range of rights, and that their personal rights, property rights, basic political rights, and other rights are not infringed upon.'** (Ibid.)

President Xi Jinping's speeches are completely correct, and we fully agree and support them.

Unfortunately, these speeches have not been truly implemented so far. We clearly see that in order to truly implement these correct opinions, we must rely on our people to rise up and fight. Now, we will start with the simplest and most basic defence of citizens' rights and strive to promote the practical implementation of Articles 35 and 37 of the Constitution.

Based on such a purpose and objective, we hope that our activities can be understood, supported and helped by leaders at all levels of the Party, and that there will be no suppression, let alone repression.

People's democracy is the essence and embodiment of socialism. The practical implementation of Articles 35 and 37 of the Constitution is the basic condition and basic guarantee for the implementation of people's democracy.

A country that does not allow people to speak freely, publish freely, assemble freely, associate freely, and march and demonstrate freely will definitely not be a socialist country. Therefore, our efforts have the significance of upholding socialism.

Historical experience tells us that the power (rights) of the people cannot be obtained by grace, but only by struggle. The fate of the people and the fate of the Constitution are ultimately determined by the people themselves.

We solemnly call on all citizens to take action and strive for the thorough, complete and true implementation of Articles 35 and 37 of the Constitution!

China People's Democratic Front July 22, 2016

Now, this "appeal" is still not outdated and can still serve as a program for our struggle for democracy.

The reason why I have repeatedly quoted the teachings of the revolutionary mentors and some of our historical documents to illustrate the importance and practical significance of the struggle for democracy is because until now we have not really put the struggle for democracy on the agenda and carried it out seriously. If this problem is not solved, we will not even have the freedom to speak in the virtual space, let alone carry out actual material struggles. If this continues, then the socialist re-revolution will only become an empty talk and will be far away.

The theoretical and strategic errors of the comrades mentioned above have brought great negative consequences for a long time and have seriously interfered with our launching of the socialist re-revolution. It seems that it is not easy to solve them because these comrades insist on their own views. The fact that the differences have lasted for such a long time also fully proves this point.

Therefore, whether from the perspective of studying Mao Zedong Thought's theory of socialist continued revolution or from the practice of the socialist re-revolution we are currently carrying out, we have to tirelessly and repeatedly publicise the revolutionary principle that we must strive for political freedom and democracy.

### **3. Adhere to the internationalism of Maoism and remove the interference of bourgeois patriotism and national chauvinism in launching the socialist re-revolution.**

On the issue of the Russo-Ukrainian war, many people in the country have been influenced by bourgeois patriotism and national chauvinism. They lack a correct class analysis of Putin, Russia, of "Yi Zun" and the "characteristic country". They have completely deviated from the internationalism of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and the proletarian standpoint and viewpoint of "proletarians of the world, unite!" and have become ideological captives of the narrow nationalism of the bourgeoisie. If things go wrong, they may even become ignorant cannon fodder of the narrow nationalism of the bourgeoisie.

This erroneous trend of thought has seriously interfered with the development of the socialist revolutionary struggle and diverted the general direction of the struggle. It is actually a disguised "theory of saving the party and protecting the country" and needs some criticism. Only through criticism and by eliminating the influence of bourgeois patriotism and national chauvinism can we help everyone have a correct understanding of the internationalism of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. Only then can we understand the basic theories and basic principles of Mao Zedong's internationalist diplomatic line, which is also an important part of Mao Zedong's theory of continuing socialist revolution. Therefore, after repeated consideration, I will combine my existing articles on the Russian-Ukrainian war as a special topic to talk about it.

Last August (2022), I wrote a long article of more than 70,000 words entitled "Adhere to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and Correctly Understand the Russo-Ukrainian War". In the article, I once targeted the "Putin fans" and "Xi fans" who were fanatical about bourgeois patriotism and narrow nationalism. Based on the basic theories of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, especially Lenin's "Imperialism Theory" and Chairman Mao's "Three Worlds Theory", combined with the historical facts of the Russo-Ukrainian War, I made a relatively comprehensive class analysis of the capitulationist diplomacy of Russia, especially

Putin, US imperialism, NATO, and the Chinese government. Now it seems that the discussion is not outdated, so I can borrow this article here to do some work to set things right.

Under the first topic, "We must have a correct understanding of Putin", I finally put three hats on Putin as a conclusion: "Putin is a traitor to the Communist Party who betrayed the cause of communism; he is a representative of the worst capitalist society that is practicing fascist bourgeois dictatorship; he is a new tsar with a head full of Great Russian chauvinism and a contemporary version of fascist Nazism." Is it right to put these three hats? History is constantly verifying that it is right now.

Under the second topic, "We must have a correct understanding of the struggle against hegemony", in the subheading "We must correctly understand the class nature and class content of the struggle against hegemony", I once made the following statement: "The struggle against the hegemony of US imperialism (including the hegemony of the former Soviet revisionist social imperialism) was once a new issue raised by the contemporary international communist movement.

"From the most basic and fundamental point of view, the basic theory and strategy of the struggle against the hegemony of US imperialism are Lenin's "Imperialism" and Chairman Mao's "Three Worlds Theory" based on Lenin's theory of imperialism. The "Three Worlds Theory" is an important part of Maoism proposed by Chairman Mao. It is a major contribution made by Chairman Mao to the development of Marxism and to the international communist movement in the world.

"Today, we must be guided by Marxism-Leninism-Maoism when studying, understanding and applying the theories and strategies against the hegemony of US imperialism.

"I have the following learning experience.

"1. The most basic and important question is, what kind of struggle is the anti-hegemony struggle? What is the nature of the anti-hegemony struggle?

"To answer this question correctly, we must adhere to the viewpoint and method of class analysis of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

"There are hegemonisms of different historical contents and class natures in different historical periods, but there is one thing in common. In the final analysis, hegemony is essentially a specific form of class oppression and class exploitation.

"It is this essence that determines that any struggle against hegemony, no matter how it is manifested in form, can only be a class struggle in essence.

"We should follow this basic law to understand the contemporary struggle against the hegemony of US imperialism.

"The class nature and class essence of contemporary U.S. imperialist hegemony are very clear. A large number of economic, political, ideological and cultural facts, as well as military aggression facts, tell us that U.S. imperialist hegemony has always been the hegemony of the U.S. monopoly bourgeoisie. To paraphrase Lenin, hegemony is imperialism. Under the new historical conditions of contemporary global monopoly capitalist economic integration, this is an inevitable manifestation of the "counter-revolutionary global strategy of U.S. imperialism" (see "Proposal on the General Line of the International Communist Movement" hereinafter referred to as "Proposal").

"It is precisely under this specific form of class oppression and class exploitation that the contemporary class struggle against U.S. imperialist hegemony can only be the class struggle of the proletariat and the broad masses of working people in the world against the U.S. monopoly bourgeoisie. This is the

specific class content of the contemporary opposition to U.S. imperialist hegemony, and it is also the specific nature of the class struggle against U.S. imperialist hegemony.

“This is the theoretical principle and theoretical basis for us to correctly understand the contemporary issue of opposing U.S. imperialist hegemony. Any ideas and statements that deviate from this theoretical principle are deviations from Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and will inevitably fall into error and absurdity.

“Second, precisely because the struggle against the hegemony of U.S. imperialism is the class struggle of the proletariat of the whole world against the U.S. monopoly bourgeoisie, this class struggle can only be launched under the leadership of the proletariat (through the Communist Party). There is no second possibility. No other class or party can undertake such a major and arduous class task and historical task.

“Third, since the class struggle against the hegemony of the U.S. monopoly bourgeoisie on a global scale is the class struggle of the proletariat against the monopoly bourgeoisie, it is of course also a component of the international communist movement (socialist movement) of the proletariat of the whole world, and a special form of the socialist revolution of the proletariat of the whole world. Its direction, its demands, and its future can only be to strive for the victory of the socialist revolution on a global scale.

“Our understanding mainly comes from the theory and practice of the Communist Party of China under the leadership of Chairman Mao in opposing the hegemony of the U.S. monopoly bourgeoisie.”

After the test of the history of the Russo-Ukrainian war in the past two years, it is now seen that these opinions are still correct.

The reason why some people in China have fallen into the quagmire of narrow nationalism is mainly because they have abandoned the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist viewpoints on class and class struggle and the method of class analysis, and are therefore unable to correctly and scientifically understand the class content and class nature of the anti-hegemonic struggle. They have simply and mistakenly confused the struggle between imperialism and the anti-hegemonic struggle, and have actually taken the stand of Russian and Chinese social imperialism and become defenders of the foreign policy of Russian and Chinese social imperialism. Whether it is the fanatical applause for Xi Jinping or Putin, it is an extreme manifestation of this error and ignorance. They have completely deviated from Lenin's teachings: "Now we see with our own eyes that all imperialisms are the same. All imperialisms consistently lie that they are waging a war of liberation." Isn't this statement of Lenin very accurate when used in Putin's excuse for launching a war? (Lenin: "Speech at the Warsaw Revolutionary Corps Soldiers' Conference", "Collected Works of Lenin", Volume 28, Page 21.)

It is precisely in response to such erroneous thoughts that I have made a sharp criticism of the shameful and embarrassing eclectic performance of Chinese social imperialism in the Russo-Ukrainian war in this article.

Under the general title of "We must have a correct understanding of 'diplomacy with Chinese characteristics'", three questions are written. The first question is "We must have a correct understanding of the class nature of 'diplomacy with Chinese characteristics'".

It is written: "If we want to have a correct understanding of 'diplomacy with Chinese characteristics', we still have to rely on class analysis of 'diplomacy with Chinese characteristics', so as to have a correct understanding of the class nature of this diplomacy. In other words, we must first understand "whose" and which class's diplomacy is 'diplomacy with Chinese characteristics'?"

Maybe you will think this is a strange question, a non-issue. Isn't "Chinese-style diplomacy" still our "China" and "Chinese people's diplomacy"?

No. This view is a simple and superficial view on national issues, and it is a misunderstanding that often occurs."

Then, I gave a simple answer and comment on this question:

"China is already a bureaucratic, autocratic, monopolistic capitalist society. Against this historical background, the so-called "socialist diplomacy with Chinese characteristics" is nothing more than the diplomacy of China's bureaucratic, autocratic, monopolistic capitalism. It is no longer the communist, internationalist diplomacy of the proletariat and the broad masses of working people under the leadership of the Communist Party of China, as it was in the era of Chairman Mao.

These are two fundamentally different and fundamentally opposing national diplomacy of a proletarian and bourgeois nature. If we do not adhere to the basic theories and basic viewpoints of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism on national issues, including national diplomacy, we will make mistakes in ideology and politics, put forward some wrong and absurd ideas and viewpoints, and do some wrong and absurd things.

The fact we have seen is that some people have indeed become captives of the great power chauvinism of the monopoly bourgeoisie. They not only accept but also follow the shouting of "My country is so great", "great power diplomacy", "powerful country diplomacy", "wolf warrior diplomacy", and all kinds of arrogant clamour of great power chauvinism. The root of this mistake is that they completely do not understand the class nature of the "country" mentioned here, do not understand whose country this "country" is, and whose diplomacy this "country" is?

This is a foolish and wrong misplaced thinking. Moreover, it is not in line with reality. Those timid abstentions are neither powerful nor great, and they are not like "wolf warriors". Those few big words and empty words said internally are at most a show of righteousness, and the main purpose is to deceive the people at home. Unfortunately, aren't some young people really fooled now? The recent Taiwan Strait crisis brought about by Pelosi's visit to Taiwan has frightened "Yi Zun" who likes to give instructions every day and dare not even fart. Isn't this another vivid negative education lesson for these kind young people?

Marxism tells us that the "country" has never belonged to all the people. Khrushchev promoted "the whole people's state and the whole people's party", which was his ignorance and deception. It is completely understandable that billionaires who became rich overnight through exploitation and illegal means would brag about these things; how can workers under the heavy pressure of the new three mountains also follow the rich to make trouble? Don't forget that this "country" is drinking your blood, and no matter how "strong" it is, it has no share for you. At most, it deceives you to work for them and be cannon fodder under the banner of a "strong country". How can we not distinguish between these major issues and these fundamental principles?

The current trend of great power chauvinism is a betrayal of Chairman Mao's idea of "not seeking hegemony"!

The second topic is "The essential characteristic of 'diplomacy with Chinese characteristics' is capitulationism". Under this topic, I talked about the following:

“‘Diplomacy with Chinese characteristics’ is the diplomacy of the Chinese bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie. The fundamental revisionist characteristics it carries determine that it is also a kind of “worst” bourgeois diplomacy as emphasized by Chairman Mao - capitulationist diplomacy.

“Revisionism is capitulationism, the doctrine of capitulation to the bourgeoisie. The ‘characteristics’ of ‘socialism with Chinese characteristics’ are betrayal of socialism and capitulation to capitalism. The ‘characteristics’ diplomacy of the Chinese bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie in the form of revisionism, that is, the essential characteristics of ‘diplomacy with Chinese characteristics’, can only be capitulationism. ”

“Diplomacy is the continuation of domestic affairs. Just as ‘taking class struggle as the key link’ was abandoned internally, ‘taking class struggle as the key link’ was also abandoned externally.”

“In sync with this internal policy of promoting Deng Xiaoping’s revisionist line and restoring capitalism, a capitulationist diplomatic line of promoting Deng Xiaoping’s revisionist line and capitulating to capitalism was inevitably produced externally.

“The revisionist "diplomacy with Chinese characteristics" line completely betrays the general line of the international communist movement implemented by the Chinese Communist Party under the leadership of Chairman Mao.

“Unlike the basic analysis and basic viewpoints of the "General Line" on the characteristics of the times, the basic analysis and basic viewpoints of the "diplomacy with Chinese characteristics" line on the characteristics of the times are what Deng Xiaoping said: "Peace and development" is the theme of the contemporary world.

“This is a complete betrayal of Lenin's "Imperialism" and Chairman Mao's "Three Worlds" theory.

“The fundamental disagreement here is actually a question of whether to adhere to ‘class struggle as the key link.’

“Marxism-Leninism-Maoism says that our era is the era of imperialism and proletarian socialist revolution. This is of course the theoretical viewpoint of "taking class struggle as the key link", which is the theoretical viewpoint that requires class struggle to be carried out. The revisionist rulers say that "peace and development" are the themes of the contemporary world, which is of course to cancel the theoretical viewpoint of "taking class struggle as the key link" and to negate the theoretical viewpoint that class struggle must be carried out.

“It is not surprising that such a fundamental disagreement has occurred. To represent the interests of the proletariat and the broad masses of the people, one must adhere to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, speak out against imperialism, and speak out about the proletarian socialist revolution. To represent the interests of the bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie, one must naturally betray Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, and will not oppose imperialism, let alone speak out about the proletarian socialist revolution; instead, one must only talk about "peace and development" according to the needs of the monopoly bourgeoisie, "not talking about socialism or capitalism", but only about "building a community with a shared future for mankind". The result can only be that the so-called "peace" is nothing more than the "peace" of oppression and exploitation of the proletariat and the broad masses of working people, and the so-called "development" is nothing more than the "development" of monopoly capitalism that brings excess profits to the monopoly bourgeoisie.

“In the discourse system of "Chinese-style diplomacy", there is no longer the general line of the international communist movement of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, no longer the basic theoretical



concepts of Marxism such as imperialism, monopoly capitalism, proletariat, bourgeoisie, etc.; let alone the basic creed of communists such as proletarian revolution, socialist revolution, elimination of capitalism, and realisation of communism.

“We can no longer hear the sonorous and powerful voice of Chairman Mao: People of the world unite to defeat the American aggressors and all their running dogs!

“What we hear is a bunch of capitulation, selling out the country, worshipping foreigners, fawning on the imperialists, and first of all the American imperialists, which shames the Chinese people: The Sino-US relationship is a ‘strategic partnership’, a ‘strategic cooperation relationship’, or even a ‘husband-wife relationship’.

“When the US financial crisis occurred, the Chinese Premier announced: ‘Saving the US is saving China’. China and the US should ‘move towards each other’ and ‘cooperate for mutual benefit’. ‘There are a thousand reasons to improve Sino-US relations, and not a single reason to ruin Sino-US relations’.

“This kind of nonsense makes people angry when they hear it, and it is shameful to quote it, but it is the living ‘characteristic’ of the ‘Chinese-style diplomacy’.

“The "underlying colour" of this "characteristic" is the bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalism with Chinese "characteristics". It is the economic interests of China's bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalism and its dependence on the monopoly capitalist economy of the United States and other countries that will inevitably lead to this "diplomacy with Chinese characteristics" that bows down to the feet of the global leader of monopoly capitalism, the United States. There are a thousand reasons, but in the final analysis, it all comes down to this one reason.

“Economy determines politics. Class interests determine political diplomacy. The root cause of the "China-US" monster that emerged under the "Chinese-style diplomacy" lies in the integration of the monopoly capitalist economies of China and the United States and the dependency of the bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalism with Chinese characteristics contained in this monopoly capitalist economic integration.

“It seems that this is a law of betraying socialism and engaging in the "worst capitalism", and is the economic root of the capitulationism of the "Chinese-style diplomacy".

“The occurrence of the "Sino-US trade war" proves from another perspective that the economic integration of Sino-US monopoly capitalism has contradictions and struggles, which is completely in line with the basic law revealed by Lenin that the nature of imperialism is determined by the inevitable struggle and even war. However, in this contradiction and struggle, because of its dependence, especially the "characteristics" of the revisionist line, Chinese monopoly capitalism is always afraid of "decoupling" from the US monopoly capitalist economy and is always in a passive and weak position; in diplomacy, it manifests itself as capitulationism.

“The servility displayed by Mr. Liu He<sup>74</sup>, the Vice Premier of the State Council of China and the special envoy of the General Secretary, in the Oval Office of the President of the United States and in front of President Trump is a shameful portrayal of the capitulationism of "Chinese-style diplomacy".

---

<sup>74</sup> At the height of the US-imposed trade war on China, in February 2019, a delegation led by Vice Premier Liu He, a special envoy of President Xi Jinping, met with President Trump and US officials and reached agreement on issues such as protecting intellectual property rights, market access, and reducing the U.S. trade deficit with China by nearly \$400 billion by promising the U.S. to buy an additional \$1.2 trillion in products, including U.S.

"It is precisely based on the Chinese bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalism's demand to integrate into the global integration of the monopoly capitalist economy that the self-important General Secretary proposed the absurd and erroneous "Chinese-style diplomacy" program of "building a community with a shared future for mankind".

"This is of course a program of the monopoly bourgeoisie, which is nothing more than hoping to build a "community of shared destiny" for the global monopoly bourgeoisie.

"This program completely betrays the great ideal of the Communists to eliminate capitalism, realise communism, and thus achieve the complete liberation of mankind. In the face of the capitalist mode of production, class oppression and class exploitation, and the blood and tears of suffering under the polarisation of the rich and the poor everywhere in the world, it is said that the program of "Chinese-style diplomacy" is to "build a community of shared destiny for mankind" on such a social basis. Is there any more shameless betrayal and more abominable deception than this?

"This program is also a complete betrayal of Lenin's "Imperialism" and Chairman Mao's "Three Worlds Theory". The nature of imperialism is competition, and imperialism determined by this competition is war. On the basis of today's social foundation where imperialism dominates the world, how can it be possible to "build a community with a shared future for mankind"? Even the "community with a shared future" of monopoly capitalism is impossible to establish. Trump's "America First" and the United States' hegemony all over the world, including in Europe where many developed capitalist countries exist, can only build a competitive and unequal capitalist community.

"This is probably also the general secretary's dream, the general secretary's illusory dream - the world dream of a 'community of human destiny'."

Under this topic, I also mentioned that social-imperialism began to export capital and exploit developing countries in the third world. Due to space limitations, I did not expand on it, but just summarised it:

"It should be added that this capitulation to international monopoly capitalism has another characteristic, which is the social-imperialist nature of using capital export as a means of exploitation of developing countries. This is the inevitable development of China's nature of monopoly capitalism, that is, imperialism. "

The third topic is, "The capitulationism of 'Chinese-style diplomacy' in the Russo-Ukrainian war."

Under this topic, the following opinions are mainly written: "Why did this war happen? What is the nature of this war? 'Chinese-style diplomacy' only has a revisionist capitulationist attitude, but no scientific analysis of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

"It seems that this war has nothing to do with monopoly capitalism, imperialism, the struggle for interests and hegemony of imperialism, and the scientific conclusion that 'imperialism is war'. As Communists, they originally had the sharpest ideological weapon, the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist theory of imperialism. However, the revisionist "diplomacy with Chinese characteristics" had long since thrown away this knife. Faced with the Russo-Ukrainian war, which could have been a place where socialist diplomacy could have been fully demonstrated, "diplomacy with Chinese characteristics" criticized neither Russia nor the United States, and avoided talking about Ukraine, NATO, and all aspects and essential causes of the war. As a result, it made itself very passive and despicable.

---

soybeans, crude oil and liquefied natural gas. There was also an exchange rate agreement under which China would honour its commitment not to allow the renminbi to depreciate - Trans.

“By doing so, the “diplomacy with Chinese characteristics” completely betrays the Communist Party’s Marxist-Leninist-Maoist proletarian stand, viewpoint and strategy on the issue of war. This is both a betrayal of the proletariat and a capitulation to the bourgeoisie. Its “characteristics” are nothing more than using the weakness, compromise, ambiguity and unclear statements that are unique to revisionism to cover up the actual capitulation to the imperialist war of aggression and war for hegemony.”

"Chinese-style diplomacy" clearly knows and has repeatedly said that all countries should abide by international rules and respect each country's national sovereignty and territorial integrity. However, facing the fact that Russia has openly launched a war of aggression and undermined Ukraine's national sovereignty and territorial integrity, it dares not characterise the Russian-Ukrainian war as a war of Russian aggression against Ukraine. "

"The wrong policy of "Chinese-style diplomacy" on Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine is not accidental and deserves some analysis.

“First, the revisionist ruling group cannot correctly understand the nature of the Russian state and the countermeasures that should be taken.

“Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine is determined by the current nature of Russia's state. In other words, as a monopoly capitalist imperialist country, launching a war of aggression is determined by its nature and is a normal state that conforms to the law.

“However, this is to understand the problem from the perspective of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, and the Chinese revisionist ruling group, which has betrayed Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, cannot understand the problem in this way.

“On the contrary, the revisionist ruling group has no correct understanding of the restoration of capitalism in Russia, and it is even more impossible for them to have any class hatred towards Putin, who actively participated in the collapse of the Soviet Union, restored capitalism in Russia, and became the representative of the Russian monopoly bourgeoisie. There is a saying in the Cultural Revolution that goes, "No matter how close you are, you will be divided by the line." They are all birds of a feather who betrayed the proletariat and the broad masses of working people, betrayed Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, betrayed communism, restored capitalism, and are the worst bureaucratic autocracy and monopoly capitalism.

“This is the fundamental reason why the current leaders of China and Russia have always wanted to establish a "strategic partnership." The common class foundation and the common line of restoring capitalism have linked them inseparably.

“In fact, China's revisionist rulers have long had serious problems in their handling of Sino-Russian relations, but this time, they were particularly prominent in the issue of Russia's invasion of Ukraine.

“The one who performed the worst and exposed the most was the revisionist leader, the General Secretary, who was "Ding Yu Yi Zun."<sup>75</sup>

“According to the public information notice issued by the Russian Embassy in China: on 24 February, the Russian war of aggression against Ukraine started. The very next day, 25 February, Putin

---

<sup>75</sup> “Ding Yu Yi Zun” is the complete four-character Chinese idiom, from the Western Han Dynasty Sima Qian's "Historical Records" and originally meant to unify the world in the Central Plains and jointly establish an emperor, and now refers to Xi Jinping, his doctrine, thought, system, etc. as the only authoritative standard in any field. It is often abbreviated, as it has been in this text, to just “Yi Zun” – Trans.

immediately spoke to Xi Jinping on the phone. Putin informed Xi Jinping 'in detail about the reasons for the decision to recognise the Donetsk and Luhansk People's Republics and to carry out special military operations aimed at protecting civilians from genocide, as well as to ensure the demilitarisation and de-Nazification of the Ukrainian state.' And 'Xi emphasised respect for the actions taken by the Russian leadership in the current crisis situation'. 'The two sides assessed the current international situation in general terms and reaffirmed their readiness to further close coordination and mutual support in the United Nations and other multilateral platforms'. The use of 'unlawful sanctions' to 'achieve the self-interested goals of individual countries' must not be allowed. In view of this, the two leaders stressed the importance of strengthening bilateral practical cooperation, taking into account the outcome of their talks in Beijing on 4 February.

"If this information publicly released by the Russian Embassy in China is false, the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs should come out and clarify it, and the fact that it has not done so so far proves that the information is basically credible.

"This information fully proves that China's revisionist ruling group, just as they do not have the most correct understanding of the class nature of American imperialism, also do not have the most correct understanding of the class nature of Russian imperialism. They have completely deviated from Lenin's teachings on how the proletariat should treat imperialist wars, and actually supported and "respected" Putin's war of aggression against Ukraine. This has gone far beyond ordinary capitulationism to imperialism, and is actively trying to tie together the internal and foreign affairs of China and Russian imperialism, including the war of aggression launched abroad. It can be seen how "bad" the "diplomacy with Chinese characteristics" has become under the rule of the revisionist line! "

"Second, the demands of China's bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalism on Russia's economic interests determine that the 'Chinese-style diplomacy' must adopt a foreign policy towards Russia, including the policy on the Russo-Ukrainian war, which must be to shield and instigate, and to advance and retreat together."

"Now, China's monopoly capitalism has huge economic interests and economic needs in Russia. As far as energy is concerned, oil and natural gas are an important and significant demand of China's monopoly capitalism. In order to protect its own economic interests and economic needs, there are no principles to be adhered to in politics, including in diplomacy. Not to mention adhering to the principles of proletarian internationalism, even the norms of international relations that can be recognised by the general bourgeoisie can be ignored.

"In the minds of the revisionist ruling group represented by Deng Xiaoping, economic interests are the only hard truth, and socialist principles are nothing but empty words. The so-called "development is the only hard truth" and "hiding one's capabilities and biding one's time" are all expressions of this kind of thinking. Guided by such an ideological and political line, how could "diplomacy with Chinese characteristics" dare to offend Russia and Putin? It is precisely for this reason that the attitude of the General Secretary during the phone call with Putin, which was called "respect", was actually support for Putin's invasion of Ukraine."

"Third, the 'worst' strategy of 'Chinese-style diplomacy' in the Russo-Ukrainian war is nothing but the inevitable diplomatic manifestation of the 'worst' capitalism practiced by the revisionist ruling group, which once again proves that Chairman Mao's use of the term 'worst' is indeed a profound insight.

"Chairman Mao said that revisionism has "three fears": one is Marxism-Leninism, the second is imperialism, and the third is the revolutionary people. "Diplomacy with Chinese characteristics" fully demonstrated these "three fears" in dealing with the Russo-Ukrainian war, proving once again that

what Chairman Mao said is a regular truth. "Diplomacy with Chinese characteristics" with these "three fears" cannot be the so-called "wolf warrior diplomacy" attacked by the enemy. Not to mention the countless abstentions in the past, just looking at how weak and passive it was in dealing with the Russo-Ukrainian war this time; the speeches of the spokespersons of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs are always so ambiguous. The revolutionary style of the proletariat has always been clear-cut, but revisionism has "three fears" and it is impossible to do this. As Lenin criticised Bukharin, compromise is always "on the one hand, on the other hand", ambiguous."

"Chairman Mao taught us that compromise is revisionism. I once wrote an article criticizing the General Secretary with this teaching of Chairman Mao as the title. A prominent problem with the General Secretary's way of thinking is that he always engages in compromise. This reminds us that the proposition put forward by Chairman Mao can also be said in reverse: revisionism is compromise. The revisionist "diplomacy with Chinese characteristics" is always compromise, which is an example. Moreover, this time it was fully demonstrated on the issue of the Russo-Ukrainian war.

"Chinese revisionism has another "feature", which is that it was often criticised during the Cultural Revolution. This line, this trend of thought, and this strategy are often a "hodgepodge of feudalism, capitalism, and revisionism". This is most prominent in the general secretary. When he went to Moscow and pulled strings with Putin, his words and deeds did not even have the political level of the bourgeoisie. When Trump came to China, the general secretary's reception style was even less like that of a leader of a proletarian party. Instead, he created a typical "hodgepodge of feudalism, capitalism, and revisionism".

"Now, dealing with Russia is simply to make it a "brotherly" and "two-sided" relationship of loyalty.

"This is the "Xi Jinping characteristics" of the "Chinese-style diplomacy" under the personal leadership and command of the General Secretary - God knows whether it is black, white, or yellow, but it is not red.

"It is precisely on the basis of such a wrong diplomatic line and foreign policy towards Russia that there was a lot of clamour for a "strategic partnership" or even an alliance with imperialist Russia. A country claiming to be "socialist with Chinese characteristics" is said to need to ally with an imperialist power for its own national security and even to oppose the hegemony of American imperialism. How absurd and degenerate is this "Chinese-style diplomacy"?

"Think further: the fundamental task of a socialist country under the dictatorship of the proletariat is to defeat the capitalist and imperialist countries under the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and thus realise the transition to a communist society. In the past and now, they have proposed to form a "strategic partnership" with imperialist countries such as the United States and Russia. If they do so, are there any historical tasks that the socialist country under the dictatorship of the proletariat must undertake and complete? Isn't this the most shameless and degenerate betrayal of socialism and surrender to capitalism and imperialism? Are we wronging them by calling them traitors to the Communist Party and the communist movement?

"Just as Chairman Mao criticised Deng Xiaoping, "He is a person who does not grasp class struggle, and has never mentioned this principle. He still doesn't care whether the cat is black or white, whether it is imperialism or Marxism." Chairman Mao grasped the crux of the problem. The current problem is nothing more than the application of Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line of "regardless of whether it is socialist or capitalist" in the "diplomacy with Chinese characteristics" abroad.

“It takes more than a day to freeze three feet of ice. From Deng Xiaoping's pull on Gorbachev, to Jiang Zemin's pull on Boris Yeltsin, to Xi Jinping's pull on Vladimir Putin, there has been the implementation of an erroneous revisionist diplomatic line towards Russia. It is no coincidence that it has developed to the point where General Secretary Xi Jinping has shown some of this capitulation to Russian imperialism in the midst of Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine.”

"This inevitability is, of course, not only reflected in the completely incorrect stance and approach taken by the Russian imperialists in launching a war of aggression against Ukraine; similarly, the stance and approach taken by the "Chinese-style diplomacy" towards the hegemony of US imperialism and the continuous eastward expansion of NATO, a military tool in the hands of US imperialism, are also completely incorrect and are also a form of compromising capitulationism.

“The reason why the "Chinese-style diplomacy" has never dared to reveal the root cause of the Russian-Ukrainian war is that it is the contradiction between the continuous eastward expansion of NATO, which is controlled by the hegemony of US imperialism, and the great power chauvinism of Russian imperialism seeking westward expansion, that has led to the inevitable occurrence of this war.

“This is an obvious fact, and it is also a fundamental principle of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, which is completely in line with the law of imperialism revealed by Lenin. There will inevitably be competition and hegemony between imperialisms. The inevitable result and highest form of this competition and hegemony is war. We have seen in the "Red Group" that the vast majority of netizens have seen this fact and firmly believe in this truth.

“However, during the more than 100-day Russian-Ukrainian war, "Chinese-style diplomacy" never exposed the hegemony of US imperialism in the world, in Europe, and NATO, which exists under the control of US imperialism to achieve its hegemony in Europe. It completely betrayed Chairman Mao's theory of the "three worlds" and the analysis of the economic, political, and military relations between the United States and Europe under the guidance of this theory.

“If we say that we do not have a correct understanding and do not implement a correct foreign policy towards a new imperialist country like Russia, which is relatively friendly to China, it is easy to understand. However, towards an old imperialist country like the United States, which we have been fighting against since the founding of New China under the correct leadership of Chairman Mao, and had treated American imperialism, which dominates the world, as the number one enemy of the people of the world in a pragmatic and strategic way, how come under the rule of the revisionist line, American imperialism suddenly became a "strategic partnership" with China, which claims to be "socialist", and even figuratively described as a "husband-wife relationship", so that "there are a thousand reasons to improve Sino-US relations and not a single reason to damage Sino-US relations", it seems a bit difficult to understand.

“In fact, there is nothing difficult to understand. This reflects the "characteristics" of the diplomatic line of the Chinese revisionist ruling group. There are reasons for this "characteristic" and there are rules to follow. As a negative lesson, it is worth our serious study.

“First, historical experience tells us that if you engage in revisionism, you will inevitably engage in capitalism, and you will inevitably degenerate into a representative of the bourgeoisie, and you will inevitably degenerate into a traitor to the Communist Party.

“From Deng Xiaoping's group, through Jiang and Hu's group, to the current Xi Jinping group, they have all played such a historical role.



“Talking about "original intention" all day long, what is the "original intention" of the Communists? Since the publication of the "Communist Manifesto" in 1848, the "original intention" of the Communists has been very clear: to eliminate private ownership, and on this basis, eliminate the bourgeoisie and all exploiting classes, realise the communist ideal, and enable all mankind to be completely liberated. The General Secretary took a group of people to the site of the First Congress to take an oath and recite the oath of joining the party. Isn't it talking about this "original intention"?

“However, now, what is the ruling group with General Secretary Xi Jinping as the core actually doing? It is actually restoring capitalism, and it is restoring the worst capitalism. This is the real "original intention" of the revisionist ruling group. The high-profile "original intention" verbally is deceptive, and it is to maintain their class rule.

“Whether they are called revisionist rulers, representatives of the bourgeoisie, or traitors, in fact, in the final analysis, they are all referring to the class standpoint. Although they are still wearing the cloak of Communist Party members and should have been fighters of the proletarian vanguard, they have actually degenerated into a real bourgeois standpoint.

“The butt determines the head. The class standpoint determines the thought, world outlook, ideological line, and political line.

“As revisionists, representatives of the bourgeoisie, and traitors to the Communist Party, they have two inevitable manifestations.

“First, they must abandon Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

“Having betrayed the proletariat and sided with the bourgeoisie, how can they still believe in Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and uphold the truth of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism?

“It is precisely based on this class standpoint that they will not and cannot continue to uphold Lenin's "Theory of Imperialism" and Chairman Mao's "Theory of the Three Worlds".

“Second, they will inevitably misposition the Sino-US relationship.

“It is not surprising that they regard American imperialism, that is, the American monopoly bourgeoisie, as a "strategic partnership" and "marriage relationship" and say such words that are simply shameless in our eyes.

“With such a position, viewpoint and emotion, how can they dare to resist, fight and expose the class nature and hegemonic nature of the American monopoly bourgeoisie in the face of the aggressive rebuke and threats of American imperialism? Just as netizens ridiculed, words such as "wait and see", "solemnly protest", "be prepared", "never allow" and so on have become the "characteristic" answer terms of "Chinese-style diplomacy", which actually cover up weakness, begging and surrender.

“Having been slapped on the left cheek, they still have to turn the right cheek and say: "Both sides should put the fundamental interests of the two peoples first, world peace, stability, development and prosperity first, adhere to meeting each other halfway, strengthen mutually beneficial cooperation, effectively manage differences, avoid artificially creating new contradictions and difficulties, and handle Sino-US relations with a highly responsible attitude towards history. This is the expectation of the international community and people of all countries, and it is also the responsibility of the two major countries, China and the United States. In handling Sino-US relations, we must strengthen communication and avoid misjudgement. 'Until recently, when the General Secretary spoke to Biden on the phone, he still said some of the "bourgeois empty talk" that the revolutionary mentors repeatedly criticised: "We must have the responsibilities of a major country and have a major country's

world history perspective." This super nonsense that obliterates class nature completely deviates from the viewpoint of class analysis of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and the viewpoint of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism on the nature of imperialism. Asking the U.S. imperialists to have "responsibility" and "world historical perspective" and asking the imperialist political agents in this way is not "dreaming". The "responsibility" of the U.S. imperialists is the "international gendarme" and NATO; the "world historical perspective" of the U.S. imperialists is hegemonism and dominating the world. Obliterating the fact of the cruel class struggle in the imperialist era, which objectively existed, can only indulge in the dream of "a community with a shared future for mankind" and slide into capitulationism to the U.S. imperialists.

"The most profound and fundamental basis for examining any political or social issue is the class standpoint. The fundamental reason why the revisionist ruling group's "diplomacy with Chinese characteristics" has adopted a capitulationist line to U.S. imperialism on the issue of the Russo-Ukrainian war and other issues must be found in the class roots. The issue of revisionism is the issue of "the bourgeoisie is within the Communist Party." As long as the Communists degenerate into representatives of the bourgeoisie, it is a historical necessity to practice capitulationism in diplomacy.

"The "diplomacy with Chinese characteristics" has once again proved this truth by adopting a capitulationist strategy to U.S. imperialism on the issue of the Russo-Ukrainian war.

"Second, the essence of class and class relations is economic relations. The capitulationism shown in the policies of the bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie with Chinese characteristics to U.S. imperialism, that is, the U.S. monopoly bourgeoisie, is determined by its class nature, and this class nature is reflected in the relationship between the Chinese bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalist economy and the U.S. monopoly capitalist economy.

"Here, a basic principle of Marxism is fully reflected: economic relations determine political relations, and the deepest roots of political relations are in economic relations.

"Looking back on the historical process of China's restoration of capitalism over the past 40 years, especially the historical process of China's capitalist economic development, we can well understand why the current "Chinese-style diplomacy" must inevitably implement such a weak, pathetic, and shameful capitulationist diplomatic line and policy to US imperialism.

"One of the most fundamental, prominent, and main characteristics of the development of China's monopoly capitalist economy is its dependence on the monopoly capitalist economy of the United States and other developed capitalist countries. This is an inevitable result of abandoning Chairman Mao's line of independence, self-reliance, and self-development of the socialist economy under the rule of the revisionist line.

"Chairman Mao had foreseen this in 1965 when he was talking to Comrade Zhang Pinghua<sup>76</sup>, Secretary of the Hunan Provincial Party Committee. Later, during the Cultural Revolution, especially in the struggle of "criticising Deng and fighting against the rightist trend of reversing verdicts", when criticizing Deng Xiaoping's revisionist economic line, this point was repeatedly mentioned. The

---

<sup>76</sup> Zhang Pinghua fought alongside Mao Zedong during the Jinggangshan Mountains era. In 1965, he was first secretary of the Hunan Provincial Party Committee in 1965 when Mao proposed that they have a return visit to Jinggangshan. Discussing the return visit, Zhang proposed to Chairman Mao that he report to him on the situation of the social and educational movement in Hunan Province, but the Chairman said: 'There is no need to report, I know the situation. Now it seems that the social education movement alone cannot completely solve the problem'- Trans

historical process of China's restoration of capitalist economy in the past 40 years has verified that the criticism at that time was correct.

“This economic dependence can be demonstrated from many aspects. Here are just three examples.

“One is that the Chinese working class was sold out as a wage earner for international monopoly capitalism.

“Whether it is a wholly foreign-owned enterprise, a Sino-foreign joint venture, or a Chinese private enterprise, the Chinese working class is always employed as a wage earner. The cheap Chinese labor force at the expense of the interests of the Chinese working class has brought excess profits to Chinese and foreign monopoly capitalism, and also brought about abnormal development of the Chinese economy. The so-called "two ends outside" <sup>77</sup> economy is the most prominent and typical manifestation of this dependence. In a fashionable way, it is: "China-US economy." This is an important "characteristic" of the Chinese bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalist economy run by the Chinese revisionist ruling group. Not only was it done this way in the past, it is done this way now, and it will continue to be done this way. Mr. Long Yongtu's famous saying, "We will continue to make shirts for another 30 years," <sup>78</sup> is a vivid expression of our determination to continue this "China-US economy."

“Under this dependent economic relationship, the monopoly bourgeoisie in the United States and other developed capitalist countries is in a dominant position, while the Chinese working class, as cheap workers, can only be employed and exploited. For the Chinese economy, it can only form a deformed monopoly capitalist economy with extremely strong dependence.

“For decades, we have always been welcoming foreign monopoly capitalists to invest in China. In fact, we are welcoming foreign monopoly capitalists to come to China to exploit the Chinese working class, and the more exploitation, the better, because this will lead to the development of China's bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalist economy - although it is bound to be a deformed development. This is a bit like the idea that Chinese revisionists said to national capitalists in Tianjin in the 1950s, "I hope you will exploit, and the more the better." At that time, Chairman Mao was there, and they could not succeed under Chairman Mao's resistance. Now, Chairman Mao, the patron saint of the working people, is gone, and their "dream" has finally been realized in China and has developed. At that time, it was mainly aimed at Chinese national capitalism, but now it is inviting back the imperialism that we drove away.

“Another thing is that since the existing monopoly capitalist economies in China are dominated by the Western monopoly capitalist economies headed by the United States, in today's global capitalist economic integration, this economy will inevitably be integrated into the global monopoly capitalist economic system. Joining the WTO is just a manifestation. In the process of operating this economic relationship, the value created by China's employed workers must be transformed into surplus value, which is inseparable from the market of the global capitalist world. To borrow the words of the General

---

<sup>77</sup> “Two ends outside”, or “Two ends abroad”, refers to companies whose raw materials are imported from abroad and products are sold abroad.

<sup>78</sup> Co-Chairman of the International Capital Summit, Former Vice Minister of Commerce of China, Former Secretary-General of the Boao Forum for Asia. On the issue of foreign trade, Long Yongtu said: First of all, it is necessary to have a clear understanding of China's national conditions, that is, there are still hundreds of millions of peasants in the rural areas in China, and the level of education is not high. This determines whether China's export products will be in a low value-added stage in the global industrial division of labour for a considerable period of time. Long Yongtu believed that China may have to make shirts for 30 years, which he said was in line with reality and national conditions – Trans.

Secretary, this is a kind of capitalist "community of shared destiny". Through the international market of global capitalism, China's monopoly bourgeoisie was able to divide a part of the surplus value created by the Chinese working class. The so-called "foreign exchange" usually exchanged for foreign trade is actually the hard-earned money created by the Chinese working class. However, this hard-earned money did not belong to the Chinese working class, but went into the pockets of the Chinese monopoly bourgeoisie.

"It is precisely based on such an economic relationship that the bureaucratic monopoly bourgeoisie with Chinese characteristics feels and sees very clearly that China's several monopoly capitalist economies cannot develop and make money without the Western monopoly capitalist economy led by the United States.

"Economy determines politics. The so-called "strategic partnership", the so-called "husband-wife relationship", the so-called "there are a thousand reasons to improve Sino-US relations and no reason to damage Sino-US relations", these political speeches and political decisions have a profound basis and fundamental reason, which comes from the highly dependent Chinese monopoly capitalist economy.

"Trump's trade war also proves from the opposite side the characteristics of China's highly dependent monopoly capitalist economy. China's trade surplus with the United States and the United States' trade deficit with China are nothing more than a problem of dividing surplus value. In layman's terms, it is a problem of dividing money. The United States, with Trump as president, feels that the money has been earned by the Chinese, so it wants to launch a trade war against China; and the ruling group with "Chinese characteristics is reluctant to let the money be snatched back by the United States, so there is Vice Premier Liu He's servility in front of Trump.

"A dependent economy can only be such a slave economy.

"Under such economic background conditions, how dare "Chinese-style diplomacy" offend the United States? Whether in the Russian-Ukrainian war, in Pelosi's provocation of visiting Taiwan, or in various forms of tossing about China, "Chinese-style diplomacy" at most said some seemingly tough empty words, but in fact there were no powerful political or economic measures. It is still the economy that determines politics, profits are above all else, and economic interests control the mouth. In the face of interests, "Chinese-style diplomacy" did not hesitate to abandon the political principles of proletarian internationalism, and finally, even the face of the country could be ignored. It is still a replica of Khrushchev's nonsense: If the money is lost, what is the use of principles? ! Of course, as revisionists and traitors to the Communist Party, the principles of communism and socialism have long been sold out by them.

"It can be seen that Chairman Mao's saying that the people are not afraid of the US imperialism and the revisionists are afraid of the US imperialism has a scientific basis, and the basis lies in the different economic relations and economic status.

"Therefore, the "Chinese-style diplomacy" is not a "wolf warrior diplomacy". In the final analysis, it can only be a surrender diplomacy and a slave diplomacy. The attitude towards the United States in the Russo-Ukrainian war once again proved this point.

"Another example that everyone is very familiar with can be cited, and a few words will suffice.

"That is, China's corrupt officials and wealthy people have already transferred their property and relatives to the United States. This part of the class plays a pivotal role in Chinese politics, and it is precisely they who are most afraid of the United States and dare not confront the United States. The

reason is clear to everyone. They are most afraid that once the United States imposes sanctions, their property will be exposed or even confiscated, and their relatives will also be directly punished. This part of the class naturally has an unbreakable relationship with the United States. Not only is there "no reason" to ruin their relationship with the United States, but to put it more thoroughly, they are the United States' agents in China.

"Under such historical conditions, "Chinese-style diplomacy" can only be "Chinese-American-style diplomacy".

"Based on my superficial analysis, we can clearly realize that the weakness, compromise and surrender of "Chinese-style diplomacy" to the United States on the issue of the Russian-Ukrainian war and all other foreign affairs are inevitable and have rules to follow.

"Towards Russia, the United States, including NATO, Ukraine, and all diplomatic affairs, "Chinese-style diplomacy" is implementing the revisionist capitulationist diplomatic line. Limited to the subject of this article, I cannot discuss them one by one here.

"The reason why we spend time and energy trying to study these issues seriously and try to gain as much knowledge as possible about the laws of these issues is that only by recognizing and grasping the laws can we have a more scientific and profound understanding of the domestic and international class struggles we face, and can help us avoid being deceived by imperialism and revisionism in these complex class struggles and strive to make fewer or no mistakes."

Now it seems that these criticisms of China's "characteristic" capitulationist diplomacy are still correct.

The quote is long enough, too long, please forgive me. Interested comrades can read the article "Persist in Applying Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and Correctly Understanding the Russo-Ukrainian War". The reason for quoting a large amount of space is that these opinions are generally correct and not outdated; secondly, and mainly because these opinions are meaningful for us to learn and understand the foreign policy of Mao Zedong's proletarian internationalism, and have a positive effect on us to overcome the influence of bourgeois patriotism and national chauvinism.

Everyone should be able to see that whether it is understanding domestic issues or international issues, the fundamental problem or fundamental disagreement here is: Should we adhere to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism or slide into revisionism? Should we adhere to the proletarian revolutionary line of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism or slide into the line of class capitulation of revisionism? And the general outline is class struggle.

The theory of 'saving the Party and preserving the country' is one of the latter trends. In essence, it is also a revisionist trend, a reflection of the revisionist trend within the Maoists.

Without overcoming the interference of these revisionist currents in the Maoists, it will be impossible for the Maoists to really grasp and apply the Maoist theory of socialist re-revolution, or to have a correct understanding of the bureaucratic, authoritarian, monopoly-capitalist nature of Chinese society and of the domestic and international historical tasks that we are facing, or to realise that socialist re-revolution is the only way out and the only correct general direction of struggle for overcoming the restoration of capitalism. It is also impossible to realise that socialist re-revolution is the only way out and the only correct direction of struggle, and naturally it is impossible to take up the historical burden of launching and leading the socialist re-revolution.

#### **4. Historical Conditions for Socialist Re-revolution**

The most fundamental and important thing on this issue is to adhere to the revolutionary point of view.

Since the socialist re-revolution is a revolution, a socialist revolution of the proletariat and the broad masses of the revolutionary people, it can only follow the basic laws of socialist revolution, a mass movement of revolutionary revolt.

The basic Maoist view on this issue is very clear.

In a letter to Comrade Jiang Qing in 1966, Chairman Mao made it very clear: "If the Rightists stage an anti-Communist coup d'etat in China, I am sure they will know no peace either and their rule will most probably be short-lived because it will not be tolerated by the revolutionaries, who represent the interests of the people making up more than 90 per cent of the population. At that time, the rightists may use my words to gain power for a while, but the leftists will definitely use my other words to organize and overthrow the rightists. This Cultural Revolution is a serious exercise." In 1976, Chairman Mao left us the last and most important "Important Instructions", which is equivalent to a political will, and pointed out the nature and target of the socialist revolution more clearly: "You are carrying out the socialist revolution, but you don't know where the bourgeoisie is, it is within the Communist Party. The people in power in the party who are taking the capitalist road. The capitalist-roaders are still on the capitalist road."

One of the basic ideas emphasised by Chairman MAO in these instructions is that whether it is a continued socialist revolution or a socialist re-revolution, it is still a revolution, it is still a socialist revolution, and the masses must be mobilised to overthrow the bourgeoisie within the Party. That is why Chairman Mao stressed, 'Will there be a revolution a hundred years from now? Will there be a revolution in a thousand years? There must always be a revolution.' Revolution is the soul of Marxism, the soul of Leninism, and the soul of Maoism. Whether or not to raise the red flag of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism is the most fundamental and crucial question is whether or not to rise up for revolution.

It is on the basis of this understanding that Chairman Mao has repeatedly stressed that, in the event of the rise to power of revisionism and the restoration of capitalism, the only way out and choice for the communists, the proletariat and the broad masses of revolutionary people can only be to launch a socialist re-revolution.

And the fundamental question of revolution is the question of power. The fundamental question of socialist re-revolution is also the question of power. Socialist re-revolution means that under the leadership of the proletariat (through the Communist Party), all the working people unite to revolt against the regime usurped by the capitalists and revisionist rulers, the regime that is exercising dictatorship over the proletariat, to carry out a revolution, to 'violently smash the bourgeois state apparatus', to regain power and to re-establish the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The essence of the 'January Revolution' of the Cultural Revolution was the same. The principle of the 'January Revolution' was that the proletarian revolutionaries would unite to seize power from a small group of those in power who had taken the capitalist road. This was the 'exercise' at the time. I had the honour of being one of the participants. Chairman Mao said that the Cultural Revolution was essentially a political revolution. The greatest politics, the highest politics, is the seizure of power. The proletarian revolutionaries, united, are the most powerful material force, the reliable material force, the guarantee of violence, that can seize power from a handful of those in power who take the capitalist road.



This is a new form and a new creation, a great historical innovation, to carry out the continued socialist revolution under the socialist conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat and to carry out the principle of violently breaking up the bourgeois state apparatus.

These ideas of Chairman Mao were gradually formed in the course of a long period of class struggle under socialist conditions, and a new breakthrough, a new leap forward, was made in the Cultural Revolution.

In response to the specific historical conditions of the struggle against revisionism and capitalism, Chairman Mao had envisaged a number of possibilities:

With regard to the Party, especially the local leaders of the Party, Chairman Mao has repeatedly said that if there is revisionism in the Central Committee, that is, if there is a revisionist usurpation of power in the Central Committee in Beijing, the local parties in various places should dare to rise up in revolt against the revisionism of the Central Committee, and he even talked about the possibility of making use of the Little Three Lines<sup>79</sup> and practising local secession in confrontation with Beijing.

For the army, Chairman Mao suggested that we should learn from Cai E, who dared to rise up against Yuan Shikai, that is, to rise up against the head of revisionism at the Central Government.

With regard to the people at large, the letter to Comrade Jiang Qing spoke of the hope that the leftists would raise his banner and carry out a revolutionary revolt. Particularly in this serious manoeuvre of the Cultural Revolution, Chairman Mao showed us theoretically and practically how we should launch a socialist re-revolution, that is, the proletarian revolutionaries and the broad masses of the people should unite and dare to rebel against the capitalists and seize power from the capitalists.

This is the essence and principle of the 'January Revolution', the essence and principle of continued socialist revolution and socialist re-revolution.

The essence of the "January Revolution" is the socialist re-revolution; however, it is a socialist re-revolution carried out under the protection and support of the dictatorship of the proletariat, so it belongs to the category of the socialist continued revolution.

It is the best and most practical model left to us by Chairman Mao on how to launch the socialist re-revolution.

Chairman Mao also emphasised: "If there are warlords or revisionists in the Central Committee, in short, it is not Marxism. If we do not rebel, we will make mistakes. We must prepare to rebel." (Chairman Mao's speech at the last meeting of the Central Working Conference held in the Henan Hall of the Great Hall of the People on October 12, 1965).

From Chairman Mao's talk to visiting foreign party leaders such as Kim Il Sung and Ho Chi Minh, and from his call for Deng Xiaoping to go to the United Nations General Assembly to speak as he did, there is also an important idea of Chairman Mao, that is, if one day the Communist Party of China becomes revisionist, then the true communists all over the world should unite the people of the world and join hands to overthrow the Communist Party of China which has become revisionist.

---

<sup>79</sup> In the 1960s Chia adopted a "small three lines" policy to withstand military attack. The so-called "three lines" generally refer to the three lines that were divided by the relatively economically developed coastal areas and two multi-Province regions in the interior of the country. Industries were relocated from the coastal areas and cities like Shanghai to the interior to make the harder to destroy – Trans.

This is an important thought and important content of Maoism. From the perspective of Maoism, opposing revisionism is by no means the historical task of the Communist Party of a certain country, but the common historical task of the Communists of the world. This is an important and indispensable content of the internationalism of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. Therefore, now the communists of all countries in the world have the responsibility, right and obligation to unite with the true communists of China and lead the broad masses of revolutionary people in all countries to fight together to overthrow the Chinese Communist Party, which has become a revisionist party!

Chairman Mao's ideas are correct and revolutionary. However, as we can see, these ideas have not been implemented so far. Chairman Mao said "If you don't rebel, you will make mistakes." We have been making such mistakes, and we have neither bravely admitted our mistakes nor actually corrected them.

This is not accidental. We must find out the inevitability and law of history in order to understand why we made such mistakes and how to correct them.

To do this, we can only honestly and seriously ask Chairman Mao for advice, re-study the theories and strategies of Maoism on socialist re-revolution, and find the gaps in our theoretical understanding. This is a very targeted and practical event.

First, we must correctly understand and treat the two indispensable conditions for the occurrence of revolution discussed by Lenin.

Everyone is familiar with Lenin's statement in the book "State and Revolution" that the occurrence of revolution is not accidental. Generally speaking, it requires two conditions: one is that the ruling class cannot continue to rule as before; the other is that the ruled class is unwilling to live as before. Lenin has repeatedly talked about this truth in other works and speeches.

In fact, this is not only Lenin's personal opinion, but also the opinion of Marx and Engels.

In the "Introduction" he wrote for Marx's book "The Class Struggles in France 1848-1850" before his death (1895), Engels solemnly reiterated this truth: without crisis, revolution will not come.

On this issue, Marx and Engels have repeatedly said that after the failure of the revolution in 1848, they thought that the climax of the revolution would come again. Facts have proved that this was a wrong estimate. Because capitalism had a stable development afterwards, and there was no crisis, there would be no revolution. However, at that time, they quickly corrected this cognitive error and were the first to do so. They did not hide their mistake, but attached great importance to it and repeatedly summarised historical lessons from it, that is: without crisis, revolution will not come. Engels wrote the "Introduction" at the end and emphasised this truth again. This is not only their emphasis on this truth, but also a warning to the proletarian party based on the historical reality at that time.

The revolutionary mentor is right. If we think about it carefully, this is still a question of whether to adhere to the Marxist principle of historical materialism. The theory of historical materialism expounded by Marx in the "Preface to the Critique of Political Economy" actually contains this truth. Historical materialism emphasizes that the replacement of one social form by another is not accidental. It is the old production relations that have become the shackles of the development of social productivity. The superstructure of the entire society lags behind the requirements of social development. In this case, a crisis will inevitably occur, and social revolution will inevitably come, thus completing the historical task of replacing social forms. At the same time, Marx also emphasized that this is conditional, that is, "No social form will ever perish before all the productive forces it can

accommodate have been developed; and new and higher production relations will never appear before the material conditions for their existence have matured in the womb of the old society. Therefore, mankind always only proposes tasks that it can solve, because as long as we examine carefully, we will find that the task itself will only occur when the material conditions for solving it already exist or are at least in the process of formation." (Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Volume 2, page 83, People's Publishing House, 1972 edition.)

However, if we carefully examine the development process of human social history, we can see that the theoretical principles of historical materialism on the change of social forms are clear, correct, and highly abstract; however, the actual history is complex and ever-changing, and is by no means a simple and rigid dogma; therefore, if we want to truly unify the two, it is not easy and quite difficult to draw correct understanding and correct strategies from the complex and ever-changing reality. Otherwise, why did Marx and Engels, the founders of the theoretical principles of historical materialism, make mistakes in their understanding of the situation after the failure of the 1848 Revolution? It can be seen that it is quite difficult to correctly understand the objective conditions required and possessed by a specific historical turning point, and thus correctly grasp the regularity of a specific historical turning point.

Although this is a difficult problem that history and reality have repeatedly presented to us, we often fall into blindness in the face of this problem. This blindness is mainly manifested in that although we basically know nothing about this historical problem, we ourselves blindly and arrogantly think that we know everything and have grasped the truth.

More than 170 years have passed since the publication of the Communist Manifesto. Why have developed capitalist countries not achieved victory in the socialist revolution?

Why did the historical phenomenon of "advanced Asia and backward Europe" discussed by Lenin appear? In Asia, which was originally backward in social form, it played an advanced historical role in launching the revolution and successfully carried out the people's democratic revolution under the leadership of the proletariat - the new democratic revolution, which is essentially the people's democratic socialist revolution.

So, for a while, we were happy to see the great situation of "East Wind prevailing over West Wind".

However, history played a cruel trick on us again.

We once firmly opposed the revisionism of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and were guided by Chairman Mao's theory of continuing socialist revolution, and carried out the Cultural Revolution, which was participated in by the broad masses of the people and aimed at opposing and preventing revisionism. However, within less than a month after Chairman Mao's death, Hua Guofeng and others easily and smoothly launched a counter-revolutionary coup, including arresting Chairman Mao's wife and nephew, and there was no resistance from inside and outside the party. There was even a frenzy of people taking to the streets to march, beat drums and gongs, and express their support throughout the country. The then Politburo, the then Central Committee, and even the entire Party unanimously accepted the counter-revolutionary coup. Subsequently, with the support of the entire Party, Deng Xiaoping and other unrepentant capitalist-roaders and revisionist leaders returned to power, and Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line took the dominant position, starting the historical process of restoring capitalism in China. This process lasted for more than 40 years. The once socialist China degenerated into a genuine bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalist China. From then until today, the working people inevitably paid a heavy price.

Such a cruel capitalist restoration process could succeed so easily and smoothly, which is worthy of serious consideration and scientific answers from every true communist. However, we have not really done this so far, but are only satisfied with singing a few bold words to express our firm belief that communism must win. This cannot solve the historical task raised by reality in a down-to-earth manner - launching a socialist revolution again.

The rise of revisionism and the restoration of capitalism in China naturally had a huge impact on the world. First of all, it had a huge impact on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, and the direct result was the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe". We often scold Gorbachev, Yeltsin (including Putin) as traitors to the Communist Party (in fact, the party had long been revisionist, and the "Communist Party" was just a signboard), which is of course correct; however, the entire betrayal began with the transformation of the Chinese Communist Party into a revisionist party, and the revisionist leader Deng Xiaoping was the culprit.

Please see how convoluted and complicated history is! The country that we (and above all the revolutionary mentors) thought was most deserving of a socialist revolution did not have one; the country where the latter prevailed and had a socialist revolution, or even a continued socialist revolution, saw the rise to power of revisionism and the restoration of capitalism. In an instant, like a chain reaction, one after another "dramatic changes" of capitalist restoration won the victory when the people, if not supporting it, at least accepted it.

This is a ruthless historical fact.

Faced with this fact, we must do at least two things in our thinking. One is that we must respect this historical fact. We cannot replace the real historical facts with subjective good wishes. Another, and more important, is that we must find out the historical inevitability and historical regularity from this historical fact.

We do not want to discuss this issue abstractly here, but want to discuss this issue in conjunction with the historical facts that have already occurred in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, mainly in China.

Regarding the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe", we must make progress and improve in our understanding. We cannot be satisfied with the sentence "capitalist restoration has occurred, which is a historical regression and historical reaction" to answer the entire historical inevitability and regularity of this major historical change.

Fundamentally speaking, the occurrence of the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe" cannot be simply attributed to the betrayal of Gorbachev, Yeltsin and others. Their historical guilt exists. However, the deeper and more fundamental reasons for this historical change are by no means just on a few people.

There is a certain reason why the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe" are called "colour revolutions". The so-called "colour" refers to the social form. After the "dramatic changes", the social form has changed. The so-called "revolution" refers to the fact that the broad masses of people directly participated in this social change. From the Soviet Union to Albania, all these so-called "socialist" countries have undergone "dramatic changes", and they are all directly participated in by the broad masses of people.

This is a fact. This fact needs to be explained.

The so-called "colour revolution" is actually the people's choice of social form.

If we ask further, why do the people make such a choice?

There are of course many reasons, and we can give different answers from different angles.

Here, I just want to put forward my views on the fundamental and main reasons why the "colour revolution" occurred and why the people made such a choice.

In my opinion, it is mainly because the masses are very dissatisfied with the bureaucratic autocratic privileged society under the rule of the revisionist party from their own real life and have completely lost confidence; in contrast, the masses feel that the capitalist society under the bourgeois democratic republic system is better, so they would rather choose this bourgeois democratic republic social system and abandon the inherent bureaucratic autocratic privileged social system. This has become the broad social foundation and huge unstoppable historical driving force of the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe".

This is a very important theoretical and practical issue.

This fact actually verifies an important thought of Chairman Mao, which is also an important content of Maoism. Chairman Mao repeatedly emphasized that once revisionism comes to power and capitalist restoration occurs, fascist bourgeois dictatorship will be established, and the "worst" capitalism will be established. It is completely understandable that the people choose to abandon it because it is "the worst". The Chairman said figuratively, "Hitler is worse than de Gaulle", and the historical fact we are facing now is that the people would rather choose "de Gaulle" than "Hitler".

Combined with the painful facts of the restoration of fascist capitalism that we have experienced ourselves, it should be said that it is easy to understand that the people of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe would make such a choice when the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe" occurred.

Then, people will easily raise another question: why did China not continue to move forward in the socialist direction guided by Chairman Mao, nor did it undergo a "color revolution" of bourgeois democracy, but instead embarked on the worst bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalist society of fascist bourgeois dictatorship? Moreover, why did the broad masses of working people not raise the banner of Chairman Mao to launch a socialist revolution for more than 40 years?

This requires us to return to the question of how to correctly understand the "crisis" and the two conditions required for revolution mentioned by the revolutionary mentor.

Only social crisis will bring about social revolution. Because it is the social crisis that will promote the maturity of the two conditions required for revolution.

However, to what extent the social crisis will develop before the two conditions required for the revolution mature is subject to a variety of historical conditions, not just an issue of economic crisis. The historical background of the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe" is a good example for understanding this issue. In addition to economic factors, political factors, ideological and cultural factors are also at work. Representatives of various classes and political forces, including Gorbachev, Yeltsin, and even Putin and Shoigu<sup>80</sup>, are all at work. As Engels said: "History is created in this way: the final result is always produced from the conflict between many individual wills, and each of these wills becomes what it is due to many special living conditions. In this way, there are countless

---

<sup>80</sup> General Sergei Shoigu is Secretary of the Security Council of the Russian Federation and former Minister of Defence of Russia – Trans.

intertwined forces, countless parallelograms of forces, and from this, a general result is produced, that is, historical events, which can be seen as the product of a force that acts unconsciously and involuntarily as a whole. "(Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Volume 4, page 478.) The "colour revolution" at that time did not deviate from this law mentioned by Engels, but overall, in the entire movement, the class power of the bourgeoisie within the party dominated, Gorbachev, Yeltsin and other bourgeois representatives controlled the direction of the movement and determined the outcome of the "historical events". This was very clear at the time. The Communists denounced Gorbachev, Yeltsin and other bourgeois representatives, revisionist leaders, and capitalist-roaders, which also came from this clear fact.

Observing the situation in the entire Soviet Union and Eastern Europe at that time, it was roughly the same, and basically all of them had the two conditions required for revolution as mentioned by Lenin. It is precisely because of these two conditions that the historical inevitability of the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe" and the "colour revolutions" is clearly manifested.

However, the situation in China that we see now is not like this. In general, China at present does not have these two conditions for launching a socialist revolution.

Why?

Whether a social crisis occurs or not, and whether it reaches the level of a social crisis, is dialectically unified with the two conditions mentioned by Lenin. When there is a social crisis, the two conditions will arise; when there are the two conditions, a social crisis will arise. That is to say, the formation of a social crisis is dialectically unified with the formation of the two conditions. Once they can be unified, a revolution will occur; on the contrary, if the two cannot be unified, even if there is a crisis, a revolution will not necessarily occur. Therefore, we cannot rigidly and dogmatically understand the relationship between crisis and revolution. Don't forget that revolution is, after all, a great struggle for people to exert their subjective initiative.

Engels emphasized more than once: "I don't know what can be more authoritative than revolution." (Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Volume 4, page 399.) Revolution is the highest form of people's transformation of society and promotion of social progress, and it is also the highest form of people's historical activities. However, this always requires awakened people to carry out and complete it.

This is a very important theoretical issue, and also a very important issue of ideological methods. Naturally, it is also a question of whether the teachings of revolutionary mentors can be correctly understood and grasped. We can only use such theories and methods to understand the relationship between the social crisis and social revolution currently facing China.

China's current social crisis is quite serious. If we make a comparative study with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe in the past, we can see that the social problems actually existing in China are much more serious than those in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe in the past. China's fascist bourgeois one-party dictatorship has deprived the broad masses of the people of all their rights, and has always recklessly suppressed and persecuted all voices and behaviours that dare to resist. Its brutality, backwardness, and reactionaryness far exceed those of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe in the past; the huge polarisation that has rapidly emerged in Chinese society, the sharp contrast between the luxurious and dirty lives of the upper-level corrupt officials and billionaires and the generally poor lives of the lower-level working people, is also far greater than that of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe in the past; the status of the Chinese working people in the production process and in the entire society, under the heavy pressure of the new three mountains, is regarded as "low-end



population" and "insignificant people", which is far greater than that of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe in the past.

This, I am afraid, is a fact that is obvious to all.

It is in this context that one of the two revolutionary conditions, the unwillingness of the dominated class to go on living as usual, has gradually come to maturity in China. Moreover, there is another fundamental difference with the Soviet East, that is, the dominant class forces, the political forces, among the dominated classes who are not willing to live as usual, hope for and seek a new society, not the capitalist society of the bourgeois democratic republics, but a genuine Marxist-Leninist-Maoist scientific socialist society. This is the result of the popularisation and education of Maoism, and of the transformation of Maoism, the spirit, into matter.

Of course, this is in terms of the dominant class and political forces. Class and political forces that want to take the capitalist road of a bourgeois democratic republic also exist in China, mainly among the intellectuals and the exiled overseas pro-democracy activists.

So, if we ask further, why is it that against such a historical background, social contradictions still have not intensified to the extent of launching a socialist re-revolution?

This is not accidental, there are reasons for this.

One is that, as far as the broad masses of the people as a whole are concerned, the learning and mastery of Chairman Mao's theories of continued socialist revolution and socialist re-revolution against the rise to power of revisionism and against the restoration of capitalism are still very inadequate. The Maoists should be regarded as belonging to the more advanced section of the broad masses of the people, but it is this section that still has great limitations, both in terms of its theoretical level and its practical strength; and from the point of view of the broader section of the masses, although dissatisfaction is widespread, dissatisfaction is not the same as enlightenment, and it is only through enlightenment that a revolution can be set in motion, and in order to become enlightened it is necessary to learn and to accept Marxism, Leninism and Maoism, and as far as the actual situation is concerned, it is only possible to say that this is the only way of learning and accepting Maoism. As far as the actual situation is concerned, it can only be said that this process is still in progress.

Without this process, it is impossible to launch a socialist re-revolution.

To answer this question, it is necessary to go back to what has been said many times before, that China is a country with an ocean of petty bourgeoisie, and that it is impossible for the petty bourgeoisie to truly accept Chairman Mao's theories of socialism and re-revolution from their standpoints and worldviews. The weakness and conservatism of the petty bourgeoisie, its submission to authoritarianism, is the inherent fatal weakness of this class; and in China, since ancient times, the souls of the entire society have been bound by the authoritarian, hierarchical, imperialist ideology, which, though not a Western religion, is similar to, or even superior to, Western religion. Through the measures of continuing the socialist revolution such as "fight self, repudiate revisionism", "make revolution in the depths of the soul", "destroy the four olds and establish the four news", and even launching the Cultural Revolution, tremendous results have been achieved; however, if we want to thoroughly cleanse the entire society, from the vast economic field to the huge superstructure field, it cannot be done or accomplished in a short period of time. For the broad masses of the people, if they want to truly get rid of the influence of old ideas, to be reborn in terms of class, and to be completely renewed in terms of thought and soul, it is a rather difficult process of self-transformation, and not everyone can do it easily. In such a relatively backward social soil, it is easy to imagine the difficulties

of launching a high-level socialist revolution. No matter how you estimate it, it is probably not an exaggeration. No matter how anxious or complaining, it will be of no avail.

This is the biggest and most practical difficulty we encounter in launching the socialist re-revolution. China can still have such a serious fascist bourgeois autocracy, and openly regress to the feudal monarchy autocracy of "one person in power", but the whole party and the people of the whole country can tolerate and accept it, and have not risen up in rebellion; on the contrary, there are many treacherous flatterers who crawl at the feet of the emperor and shameless literati who play the role of trumpeters, including the so-called "rescue faction" and "new version of Wang Ming" dogmatists in our Maoist team. These are the inevitable products of China's existing social soil. This not only completely disappoints Chairman Mao's expectations, but also shows that if compared with the working class in the developed countries of the world, our Chinese broad masses of working people still have backwardness and shortcomings that deserve serious self-reflection.

Another problem is that under the conditions of the fascist bourgeois dictatorship, the formation of a party is not allowed. Several attempts to form a party secretly or openly have been brutally suppressed and failed. Under such circumstances, there is also a problem that the leadership group composed of comrades with a higher level of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism has not yet been formed, or it can only be said that it is in the process of gradually forming. In addition to the brutal suppression of the fascist bourgeois dictatorship from the enemy's side, from our side, it is related to the fact that there are not many people in our team who really understand Marxism-Leninism, as Chairman Mao said, and the weakness of the petty bourgeoisie in our team who are not good at unity. We have not really understood the organic unity between the masses, classes, political parties, and leaders as explained by Lenin in his book "'Left-Wing Communism', an Infantile Disorder".

Another thing is that the youth, who have always been the vanguard of the revolution, are limited in their education under the social conditions of capitalist restoration, especially since the entire society has become a decadent, backward, bureaucratic, autocratic, and monopolistic capitalist society. This cannot but seriously affect their acceptance of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. The dominant ideology in a society is always the ideology of the ruling class. The situation of the young generation cannot but affect the re-launching of the socialist revolution.

Not to mention the proletarian socialist revolution, even the bourgeois "colour revolution" that led to the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe", the youth also played the role of the main force. This is a very important and very realistic difficulty faced in re-launching a socialist revolution. The young students of Peking University have played the role of revolutionary pioneers in modern Chinese history. However, looking at the current situation of Peking University students, it is a microcosm of the current situation of Chinese college students.

These facts and many reasons tell us that in China today, the ruled class has not really reached the point where they are unwilling to live as usual. Therefore, there is still a lack of an indispensable condition for launching a socialist revolution.

If we make a further theoretical analysis of this issue, we should see that there is no absolute, eternal and unchanging standard for the oppressed class's unwillingness to live as before, but only relative and specific possibilities that are adapted to local conditions. This possibility is ultimately reflected in the degree of consciousness and revolutionary courage of the oppressed class. In his later years, Chairman Mao repeatedly said that if the Central Committee showed revisionism, we must rebel. This was to encourage the people to "be unwilling to live as before" - to rebel - in the case of capitalist restoration. However, in reality, we have not done this. This is not subject to Chairman Mao's will, but is determined

by the specific historical conditions of China. We often feel resentful, but history is history, and history has its own laws, which are not subject to the will of an individual or a few people. This is an issue worthy of serious study by comrades. It is impossible to deeply understand and solve the problems of the masses by just reciting "the masses are the real heroes" and "the people are the creators of history", always "feeling good about ourselves", blindly confident and blindly proud. I am afraid that we still need to re-study the scientific exposition of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism on the problem of the masses, including learning the teachings of Lu Xun.

This actually involves an analysis and understanding of the masses. After all, the history of human society is created by humans. Understanding the laws of development of human social history cannot be separated from understanding the laws of human development. This is a question of whether Marxist historical materialism can be correctly understood, and naturally it also involves the question of whether Marxist historical materialism can be correctly applied. Engels once clearly criticised that Marxist historical materialism cannot be understood as mechanical materialism, but must be understood as dialectical materialism.

In my book *New Thinking on Epistemology*, I put forward some new thoughts on this issue. I wrote: "Social change is carried out and completed by people, which requires the use of historical materialism to examine what level people can reach to initiate, carry out and complete social change.

"To achieve this, it is not enough to only examine the level of development of material production and economic relations. At the same time, it is also necessary to examine the level of development of spiritual production. Only when we see that the two are dialectically unified and reflected in people, and people have reached a level of material power that can meet the level required to complete social change, can social change occur.....

"When understanding the materialist conception of history, we must integrate it with the correct understanding of the historical role of people. When examining social changes, we must include people. We cannot only look at things and not people, or only look at the development of economic relations and not the development of people. Economic crises often bring about social revolutions, but economic crises do not mean that social revolutions are destined to happen. Lenin said in "The State and Revolution" that the occurrence of revolution requires two conditions: one is that the ruled do not want to live as usual; the other is that the rulers cannot rule as usual. Lenin talked about the problem of people. This is completely in line with historical reality, a scientific summary of historical experience and historical laws, and a methodology that must be grasped when applying the materialist conception of history."

I think it is not meaningless to raise such a question. Whether social change can happen or whether social revolution can happen, it is necessary to analyse and study the people who are the main force in launching social revolution. In particular, socialist revolution is the cause of the proletariat and the broad masses of the people. To study whether the socialist revolution can be launched, whether it can succeed, and whether it can be consolidated, it is necessary to scientifically analyse and study the proletariat and the broad masses of the people as the main body of historical creation. Without such scientific analysis and research, there is no practical mass line.

This is a problem of ideological method that is often encountered in the Maoist team. The purpose of raising it here is only to hope that comrades will do further research so that we can launch a socialist re-revolution movement with workers and peasants as the main body as soon as possible.

The discussion of the issue of socialist re-revolution should also be linked to Lenin's view that it is easier to launch a revolution in backward countries. Generally speaking, the more backward a country

is, the more cruel the oppression and exploitation of the ruling class is, the easier it is to cause a crisis, and the easier it is to launch a revolution, because the historical level of the revolution is relatively low. The October Revolution and the Chinese Revolution both have such a historical background. In fact, China's current fascist bourgeois autocratic bureaucratic monopoly capitalist society is the most backward, cruel, barbaric, and therefore reactionary form of capitalist society. According to common sense, under such historical conditions, launching a socialist revolution should be relatively easy, at least easier than in Europe and the United States, because the historical starting point and historical requirements are relatively low. The key issue now is whether the Chinese Communists and the Chinese people can truly listen to Chairman Mao's words, arm themselves with Maoism, reach the level of consciousness and fighting courage required to create history, and launch a socialist revolution. We hope to achieve this goal as soon as possible.

As far as the facts we see now are concerned, since the ruled class is still barely living as before, then from another perspective, we have to admit that the ruling class can still barely rule as before.

Actual life tells us that the two are unified. If the ruled class is still willing to live as before, then the ruling class will inevitably and even "easily" continue to rule as before. If the ruled class is unwilling to live as before, then the ruling class will inevitably not be able to rule as before. The two are mutually causal, interdependent, and mutually transformative. Among the two, whether the ruled class is unwilling to live as usual is the decisive factor of the contradiction. As Lenin said, the reason why the ruling class can continue to rule is based on the unconsciousness of the ruled class; as Lenin also said, if the ruled class becomes conscious, the ruling class will not be able to rule for even a day. Since the birth of Marxism, revolutionary mentors have repeatedly emphasized that "the liberation of the working class is the business of the working class itself." The Internationale also sings "To create human happiness, it depends entirely on ourselves." During the Cultural Revolution, it was repeatedly promoted that "the masses liberate themselves." This is an irrefutable truth that has been repeatedly proven by history.

It is not incredible that the fascist bourgeois autocracy in China can still rule as usual, even though it is so "worst", but it is very bad after all. There are two points that can particularly illustrate this fact.

One is that the highest autocratic ruler of the party still has relatively stable authority. This is mainly reflected in the two extraordinary "political rules" that were broken by the amendment of the Constitution to the term limit and the continued re-election of the general secretary, which were passed so smoothly, and the autocratic centralisation continues to strengthen. From the bottom to the top of the party, especially at the highest level, no one stood up to resist. This is the biggest corruption, decadence, and hopelessness of this party. As for some occasional phenomena, there is no need to over-interpret them. For example, the video of Hu Jintao 'being removed' from the venue does not tell us anything.

Another point is that under one-party dictatorship, the army, the armed police force, the public prosecutor, the judiciary and other instruments of dictatorship of the State apparatus are still able to exercise fascist bourgeois dictatorship over the masses of the working people in a relatively stable state, often playing the role of an 'iron tiger'.<sup>81</sup>

---

<sup>81</sup> The "iron tigers" are people in relatively unassailable positions of authority who rule over others with iron fist. From time to time they are held to account. When Sheng Guangzu, former party secretary and general manager of China Railway Corporation, was put on trial recently suspected of "serious" violations of discipline and law, the Chinese media dubbed him an "iron tiger" – Trans.

The state apparatus is a tool of violence. It is a real material force, composed of people and the guns in their hands. The reason why China's bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie can "rule as usual" is because the people who are tools of violence and the guns in their hands are still obedient under the "political rules" such as "the party leads everything" and "the party commands the gun". They are still honestly working hard to maintain the monopoly bourgeoisie's "rule as usual", and they often self-satisfiedly and aggressively carry out fascist violent suppression on the broad masses of the people. This constitutes a new version of "Hitler is worse than Charles de Gaulle" and "Deng Xiaoping is worse than Chiang Kai-shek."

However, when talking about the upper rulers, we should not forget that although the ruling class that holds power is only a small part of the people, as we often say, it is only a "small handful", or as we often say, it is only one, two, or three percent, but the dictatorship machinery controlled by the ruling class - the army, the public security, the procuratorate, the courts, etc., etc., even as small as the urban management, its basic members are all from the ordinary lower class. It is these lower class people who provide the upper ruling class with the possibility to continue to rule. Therefore, when discussing whether the lower working class is conscious or not, we must not forget this part of the masses who have been alienated from the lower working class and become tools of the ruling class. This is an important sign and reason why the upper ruling class can continue to rule and the lower ruled are willing to live. When discussing the issue of mass consciousness, we must not forget this part of people. Only when this part of people splits away from the upper ruling class and stands on the side of the lower working class again, will the two conditions required for the revolution mature.

The best example is that in the late 1980s and early 1990s, both China and Romania experienced "turmoil" at the same time. However, it was the different conditions of the two countries' armies that led to different outcomes.

This is a good historical example that can inspire us in many ways. We should learn many valuable things about the laws of historical development and historical changes from it.

It is precisely because of the relative stability of the ruling class's rule that the proletarian revolutionaries will deeply feel that not only all democratic rights will be deprived, but all revolutionary activities will be suppressed. This is the actual difficulty encountered in re-launching a socialist revolution. This proves from the opposite side that the ruling class can indeed "rule as usual".

If we look at the problem from the perspective of economic development, we can also see that although China's economy has exposed more and more problems and is constantly "downward", it has not reached the level of a serious economic crisis. Economic crisis is the basis of social crisis and political crisis. As Marx and Engels repeatedly emphasised, social crisis and political crisis cannot occur without economic crisis, and revolution cannot be put on the agenda. In terms of China's current actual economic situation, this is also a fundamental reason why socialist revolution cannot be put on the agenda.

However, as mentioned earlier, economic reasons are not the only reason. Other political, ideological and cultural social reasons are also at work, including external international reasons. In the final analysis, all these conditions that may lead to social revolution are ultimately reflected in whether the lower-level ruled class is still willing to live as usual and whether the upper ruling class can continue to rule as usual.

This requires multi-faceted analysis and comprehensive investigation.

It is on the basis of such analysis and comprehensive investigation that we can see that the two conditions for re-launching a socialist revolution in China cannot be said to be mature at present, but perhaps it can be said that the two conditions for re-launching a socialist revolution are gradually maturing.

Under such historical background and conditions, should we deny the possibility and necessity of socialist re-revolution? On the contrary, the more such a situation is, the more we must firmly believe in the necessity of socialist re-revolution and prepare for this revolution under realistic conditions. This is the historical responsibility of the Communists who truly persist in revolution. As Engels said, if there were no difficulties, what would we Communists do? Or as Lenin said, once the climax of the revolution comes, even bastards will be involved in revolutionary activities. Or as Chairman Mao said, the more difficult the times are, the more we Communists must see the light and the more we must increase our courage.

We should listen to the revolutionary mentors and unswervingly prepare for launching the socialist re-revolution. We should now seriously study what the path and form of the socialist re-revolution should be.

## **5. The path and form of the socialist re-revolution can only be the mass revolutionary rebellion movement**

Marxism teaches us that all genuine proletarian revolutionary movements are and can only be mass revolutionary rebellion movements of the broad masses of working people, and the socialist revolution is no exception.

Everyone is familiar with Chairman Mao's famous words in Yan'an: Marxism consists of thousands of truths, but they all boil down to one sentence: It is right to rebel. According to this principle, we resist, struggle, and build socialism. Then, who rebels, who resists, who struggles, and who builds socialism? Of course, it is the proletariat and the broad masses of working people.

This principle has been repeatedly confirmed as a true and irrefutable truth by the proletarian socialist revolution and the people's democratic revolution of the colonial and semi-colonial people for national independence and national liberation over the past 150 years since the revolution of the Paris Commune.

Today, if we want to solve the problem of capitalist restoration in China, if we want to overthrow the reactionary rule of the bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie, if we want to rebuild a socialist society under the dictatorship of the proletariat where the working people are the masters, we still need to unswervingly follow Marxism. This fundamental principle is to take the revolutionary path of mobilising the broad masses of working people to rise up in rebellion, which is to take the path of socialist re-revolution. Apart from this, there is no other path that can work and solve the historical tasks we face.

So, the next step is to answer, how should the proletariat and the broad masses of revolutionary people rise up in rebellion? What specific form should it take?

First, we must unswervingly adhere to the violent revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

Since the publication of the Communist Manifesto, violently smashing the bourgeois state machine has become a basic principle of the proletariat's socialist revolution. The revolution of the Paris Commune implemented this principle, and the October Revolution and the Chinese Revolution also



implemented this principle. If this principle is implemented, the revolution may be victorious, and if this principle is abandoned, the revolution will definitely fail. This has been repeatedly proven by history.

Even the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe" that occurred nearly 30 years ago did not deviate from the principle of violent revolution; and the "turmoil" in China at the same time also ended with the use of violence.

This means that even though history has developed to the 21st century today, major historical changes, especially the replacement of social forms, are still inseparable from violent struggle - the highest form of class struggle.

For understanding China's problems, such experiences and lessons, especially the bloody lessons, are deeply engraved in the hearts of the Chinese Communists and will never be forgotten. The failure of the Great Revolution in 1927 was due to the Party's leadership and the Party's line, which abandoned the principle of violent revolution; the victory of the Chinese Revolution was due to the fact that under the leadership of Chairman Mao, the principle of violent revolution was firmly grasped. In the vivid words of Chairman Mao, it is a matter of "sharpening the knife". The enemy is sharpening the knife, and if you don't, you will lose your head. Everyone can recite Chairman Mao's quotation: Everything reactionary is the same; if you do not hit it, it will not fall. This is also like sweeping the floor; as a rule, where the broom does not reach, the dust will not vanish of itself.

Today, we are facing the fascist dictatorship of the bureaucratic monopoly bourgeoisie. Is there any reason to abandon the principle of violent revolution? Just because they hold the flag of Marxism, hang the sign of socialism, and are called by the name of the Communist Party, will they be more merciful to the working people than ordinary landlords and bourgeoisie? Will they not wield the butcher knife against the working people when facing major political struggles and social revolutions? If you really hold such a thought, you have forgotten that since ancient times, the history of the rebellion and revolution of the working people has always been a history of being suppressed and massacred by the ruling class and the exploiting class; even in modern times, every resistance of the proletariat was eventually drowned in a pool of blood? Didn't the "April 12th Counter-Revolutionary Coup" of 1927 kill enough Chinese Communists? Wasn't the "October 6 Counter-Revolutionary Coup" of 1976, a counterattack against the proletarian revolutionaries and a "complete eradication of evil", also bloody? It can be said that this is a reprint of "April 12th", and as long as class struggle exists, reprints of "April 12th" will inevitably continue to exist. This is a historical lesson written with the blood of revolutionary martyrs. If we forget this lesson written in blood, we will inevitably repeat the mistakes of right opportunism, that is, revisionism, which led to the failure of the revolution.

However, in the face of such a cruel class struggle, there are still a few comrades who have confused ideas in their minds, and even have illusions about the ruling class. They imagine that the revisionist leaders who represent the bourgeoisie can lead us to "return" to socialism, so we must "save the party and protect the country" with a sincere heart.

The result is naturally a slap in the face again and again. In the minds of these comrades, Chairman Mao's teachings have not taken root.

1. These comrades did not accept what Chairman Mao said, that when revisionism comes to power, it means that the bourgeoisie comes to power, and it will establish a fascist bourgeois dictatorship and the worst capitalism. The so-called "worst" image is "Hitler is worse than de Gaulle."

Chairman Mao expressed a very clear view on class and class struggle here, which is a scientific conclusion that must be drawn from the analysis of the current situation of Chinese society by adhering to the class analysis method of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

However, some of our comrades do not adhere to class analysis, do not understand the current Chinese society from the perspective of class and class struggle, and fail to see that the class contradiction between the monopoly bourgeoisie camp, which is led by the bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie and jointly constituted by the private monopoly bourgeoisie and the foreign monopoly bourgeoisie, and the working people camp, which is jointly constituted by the broad working people class, which is mainly composed of the working class and the peasant class, is the main contradiction in current Chinese society.

It is impossible not to see that the CPC, which has already metamorphosed and degenerated, has no more than revisionism as its basic political characteristic, but is in essence a bourgeois party representing the monopoly bourgeoisie from the bottom up and from the inside out.

Therefore, it is impossible to further deeply understand and grasp that the struggle with the monopoly bourgeoisie represented by this bourgeois party characterised by revisionism is a life-and-death, irreconcilable class struggle.

This means that we have completely left behind the most important teachings that Chairman Mao left us in his later years, and inevitably left behind the principle of class struggle. We cannot have a correct understanding of the basic nature of the class struggle that actually exists in China and the cruelty and regularity of this class struggle, and we cannot talk about launching a real class struggle, let alone re-launching a socialist revolution. As we often see, some spontaneous resistance and struggles always remain at the level of the so-called "melon-eating masses"<sup>82</sup> who "hit the east with a hammer and the west with a stick"<sup>83</sup> to discuss the matter at hand. Apart from making impassioned speeches and giving vent to pent-up discontent, it may seem to be a lively and sensational moment, but in the end nothing can be solved, especially the fundamental question of the line and the question of the regime, which cannot be touched in any way. It is not that these struggles have no positive significance at all, but they are not, after all, serious class and political struggles under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

2. The limitations of the understanding of the masses of working people determine the limitations of action and the delay in launching the socialist re-revolution. This has been proved over and over again by the passivity and weakness of the vast number of working people in China under the barbaric deprivation and brutal exploitation and oppression of capitalist restoration for more than four decades.

There can be no movement of class struggle if the banner of class struggle cannot be raised high.

In October 1894, in his later years, Engels wrote a letter to the editor of the magazine *Social Review* entitled *International Socialism and Italian Socialism*. In the letter, Engels wrote: "If the Italian socialists declare that 'class struggle' is the overwhelming factor in the society where we live, if they form a 'party for the purpose of seizing power and leading national affairs', then they are carrying out genuine Marxist propaganda; they strictly follow the line pointed out by Marx and me in the *Communist Manifesto* published in 1848; their activities are the same as those of the socialist parties in France, Belgium, Switzerland, Spain, and first of all, Germany. Among these parties, there is not one that does

---

<sup>82</sup> The phrase "melon-eating masses" is a new internet expression. It is not really melons, but melon seeds which people crack between their teeth to extract the paper-thin inner content. Eating melon seeds is a relaxed, almost idle way of passing the time, so in the social media context it refers to people who idly watch what others are posting without having much of an opinion of their own – Trans.

<sup>83</sup> A Chinese metaphor for doing something randomly, without a plan, or speaking without a clue – Trans.

not want to seize power, just as other parties, such as the Conservative Party, the Liberal Party, the Republican Party, etc., also want to seize power. "(Collected Works of Marx and Engels), Vol. 22, pp. 559-560.) Then Engels specifically talked about the principle of class struggle. Engels wrote: "As for 'class struggle', it not only takes us back to the 'Middle Ages', but also to the internal conflicts that occurred in the ancient republics - Athens, Sparta and Rome. All these conflicts are class struggles. Since the disintegration of the primitive commune, the struggle between the classes that make up each society has always been the great driving force of historical development. This struggle will only disappear after the classes themselves disappear, that is, after the victory of socialism. Before that time, the opposing classes, the proletariat, the bourgeoisie, the landed aristocracy, will continue to fight each other, regardless of what the Italian semi-official press says." (Ibid.)

This opinion expressed by Engels in his later years is very important. The most important point is that Engels summarized "the line pointed out by Marx and me in the Communist Manifesto published in 1848", and the basic content of this line, Engels explained very clearly, one is to persist in class struggle, and the other is that this class struggle is "for the purpose of seizing power and leading national affairs". Lenin did this, so he won the victory of the October Revolution; Chairman Mao also did this, so he won the victory of the Chinese Revolution. In particular, the "exercise" of the Cultural Revolution launched and led by Chairman Mao himself also embodied such a Marxist line, which is actually the line of socialist continued revolution and re-revolution.

In his "Important Instructions" of 1976, Chairman Mao said: "What is the Cultural Revolution for? It is class struggle." In 1968, he also emphasized: "The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution is essentially a great political revolution under socialism in which the proletariat opposes the bourgeoisie and all exploiting classes. It is a continuation of the long-term struggle between the Chinese Communist Party and the broad masses of revolutionary people under its leadership and the Kuomintang reactionaries. It is a continuation of the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie." This was the consistent ideological and political line of Chairman Mao's leadership of the ten-year Cultural Revolution. At the banquet on December 26, 1966, Chairman Mao emphasised that a nationwide class struggle would be launched next year. It was precisely because of this line of class struggle that Chairman Mao repeatedly said during the Cultural Revolution that things would be easier if the masses rose up. He said this to Shanghai and the whole country. The proletarian revolutionaries led by Chairman Mao during the Cultural Revolution united to seize power from the capitalist-roaders, which was also the implementation of Engels' line, fully reflecting that "the fundamental issue of revolution is the issue of political power" (Lenin's famous saying).

The socialist re-revolution must also implement this Marxist-Leninist-Maoist line, with class struggle as the key link and seizing power as the goal. The so-called mobilisation of the broad masses of the people to rebel is also the implementation of this line. Rebellion is class struggle; rebellion means seizing power.

Now, the ideological gap of some of our comrades lies in this issue. This is not a small issue, but a line issue and a direction issue. First, they fail to realise that what we want to carry out is class struggle and political struggle, not just rights protection struggle and economic struggle, and we must bravely put forward that the fundamental purpose of our class struggle is to seize power. Seizing power is the fundamental task of the socialist re-revolution and the symbol of the victory of the socialist re-revolution. If we cannot understand why we launched the mass rebellion movement and the political goals we want to achieve from the height of such an ideological line, then rebuilding socialism will always be just an empty talk, and the liberation of the broad masses of working people will always be just an empty talk.

3. We must firmly believe in the principle of violent revolution and correctly apply it.

If we dare not uphold the principle of class struggle, we cannot talk about adhering to the principle of violent revolution and correctly applying it.

I am afraid that a considerable majority of comrades are not mentally prepared for this. This involves many ideological issues worth discussing.

The first question is whether the principle of violent revolution is outdated? Of course it is not outdated.

From a practical point of view, in recent decades, whether in China or in the world, the use of violence in class struggle and political struggle, no matter what form it takes, is a basic, common and repeated phenomenon. As Lenin said, this law of repetition means that it contains inevitability and regularity.

Theoretically, the state apparatus itself is a tool of violence, created and exists for the use of violence. Those who imagine that the state apparatus will not use violence, will give up violence in the face of kneeling and begging, can only pay the price of blood and heads falling. "Smashing the bourgeois state apparatus" is the fundamental requirement of the proletarian socialist revolution, and the word "smashing" means that it is inevitable to rely on violence, and the most powerful material basis of violence is the masses. When the masses rise up, they are the most powerful material force, and they will find the most appropriate form to use this material force. It is still the old saying: "as a rule, where the broom does not reach, the dust will not vanish of itself." Back then, in Yan'an, a landlord's earthen wall could not rely on "peaceful transition", let alone the entire state apparatus and state power? !

The seizure of power during the Cultural Revolution was carried out under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, when the entire state apparatus was still in the hands of the proletariat. Specifically, it was carried out under the protection of the army - "supporting the left", when the broad revolutionary masses united to seize power from a handful of capitalist-roaders. However, even so, this was not a "peaceful transition". The rise of the broad masses of the people was a material force; the word "seize" in seizing power meant a specific form of violence.

Moreover, we have now lost the prerequisite of the dictatorship of the proletariat. We are facing the brutal fascist bourgeois dictatorship. In this case, how can we shake the principle of violent revolution?

Therefore, the principle of violent revolution must be adhered to unswervingly. However, there is another point, that is, the form of applying the principle of violent revolution must be combined with the actual conditions of reality. It must not be mechanically applied to the successful experience under past historical conditions, but boldly innovated according to the new historical conditions that have changed. This point is also very important. If it is ignored, it will lead to the error of dogmatism.

Because Chairman Mao had written the poem 'Re-ascending Jinggangshan', and during the Cultural Revolution, when he lost his temper with the rightists, he also said that he would go back to Jinggangshan, some comrades think that it is still possible to 'go back to Jinggangshan' now and take the road of armed struggle in which the countryside surrounds the city. Is this possible? The historical conditions now are completely different from those at that time. In the article "Why Can Red Political Power Exist?", Chairman Mao thoroughly analyzed the historical conditions for establishing rural revolutionary bases and local red political power at that time. Comparing Chairman Mao's article with the real conditions we are now facing, it is clear that the historical conditions that allowed us to take the road of Jinggangshan no longer exist, that is to say, in the light of today's historical conditions, the road of armed struggle in which the countryside encircles the city, which is rigidly copied and applied, is not in line with reality, does not work, and if we insist on doing it, we are bound to fail, and the

lessons of failure of attempts to do so, which were met with repression, have already been learnt. Moreover, there have already been failed attempts to do so that were suppressed.

Under today's fascist bourgeois dictatorship, under the relatively stable rule of national unification, and with modern communication science and technology, any attempt to pick up a gun and organise a revolutionary army, be it in the city or in the countryside, will be immediately suppressed and will not succeed. In those days, after the failure of the Revolution, the implementation of the 'Li San Line'<sup>84</sup> and urban riots ended in a disastrous crackdown, with communists shedding their blood and causing the White Zone to lose almost all of its strength. Today's historical conditions are not comparable to those of that time. Anyone who tries to replicate the 'Li San Line' will only meet with failure and bring the revolution to its knees. It will only lead to failure and bring losses to the revolution.

How, then, can the principle of violence be implemented in a future socialist re-revolution?

Let us first look at a little historical experience. Far away is the experience of the Paris Commune Revolution. At that time, in the context of the political crisis caused by the Franco-Prussian War, the proletariat and the masses of the people, including women, rose up and organised their own armed forces, the National Self-Defence Forces. When the reactionary government tried to mobilise 30,000 troops to suppress the revolution, the people of Paris, especially women, led by the heroine Michelle, bravely took to the front line and shouted at the reactionary army, which was eventually dismantled and transformed, followed by the victory of the revolution on 18 March.

The historical experience left behind by the Paris Commune is invaluable and still deserves our serious study and learning today. At that time, in the context of the crisis that came as a result of the war, the working class and the masses of the people acted. And, taking advantage of the fact that the nature of the war had been transformed, the National Self-Defence Army, the armed forces of the masses of the people, was organised against the background of the opposition to the Prussian aggression. The disintegration and transformation of the reactionary army and the bringing of the army to the side of the people, in the context of the confrontation between the revolutionary and counter-revolutionary armies, is an important and successful historical experience.

The dramatic changes in the Soviet East, and especially the army reversal that took place in Romania<sup>85</sup>, have also left behind very important historical experiences that are worth studying.

---

<sup>84</sup> The Lisan line refers to the "leftist" adventurist mistakes represented by Li Lisan during the Second Civil Revolutionary War. On June 11, 1930, the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, under the auspices of Li Lisan, passed the resolution "A New Revolutionary Upsurge and the First Victory of One or Several Provinces", which formed the "leftist" adventurist error represented by him. Soon after, Li Lisan drew up an adventurous plan for organizing an armed uprising in the central cities of the country centred on Wuhan and concentrating the Red Army on attacking the central cities throughout the country, and then merged the leading organs of the party, the youth league, and the trade unions at all levels into action committees at all levels to prepare for the armed uprising, thus bringing all regular work to a standstill. In September of the same year, the Communist Party of China convened the Third Plenary Session of the Sixth Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, which corrected Li Lisan's "leftist" adventurist mistakes - Trans.

<sup>85</sup> During the late 1980s and early 1990s, the Romanian Army played a significant and transformative role in the country's political upheaval, specifically during the Romanian Revolution of December 1989. This period saw a critical reversal in the Army's traditional role as an enforcer of the authoritarian state under the rule of Communist leader Nicolae Ceaușescu.

Initially, the Romanian Army was deployed to suppress the growing anti-government protests, acting on orders to enforce Ceaușescu's oppressive regime. However, as the protests intensified and Ceaușescu's government lost control, the Army experienced a notable shift in allegiance. Instead of continuing to oppress the

As for our own experience and lessons, they may be felt a little more deeply. The twists and turns of the Cultural Revolution, the final 'October 6th coup d'état' and the subsequent political changes in the upper echelons, as well as the occurrence of the 'storm' and the dissenting voices in the army, have all left behind valuable historical experiences and lessons, both positive and negative.

In summary, these historical experiences and lessons have repeatedly told us that in carrying out the socialist re-revolution, we must adhere to the guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, we must adhere to "taking class struggle as the key link", and we must insist on mobilising the masses to form a mass rebellion movement, that is, a mass class struggle movement. Once the masses rise up and the revolutionary situation is formed, we must unswervingly and unhesitatingly persist in using revolutionary violence to smash the bourgeois state machine, seize power, and establish a new state machine of the proletarian dictatorship. Marx said that material forces must be destroyed by material forces. When the masses rise up, they are the most powerful material force. With such a powerful material force, we must adhere to the principle of using violent revolution, and the forms can and must be flexible and diverse. We must adhere to the principle of starting from reality. In the revolutionary situation where "one day equals twenty years", the wisdom of the masses is endless, while the reactionary class facing collapse and extinction will be divided and disintegrated. At this time, the progressive forces of history, representing the direction of historical progress, will crush and rot, sweep away all reactionary and decadent class enemies, and ultimately win the complete victory of the revolution.

At the critical moment of such a great historical decisive battle, the truth that the line determines everything will be reflected. As long as there is a Communist Party armed with Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, as long as it adheres to the correct ideological and political line of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, and formulates specific guidelines, policies and strategies for the socialist re-revolution based on the actual historical conditions, it is possible to win the victory of the socialist re-revolution.

Second, the socialist re-revolution requires a difficult preparation process.

#### 1. Theoretical preparation work.

Everyone knows Lenin's famous saying: "Without revolutionary theory, there can be no revolutionary movement." This statement can be understood from at least three aspects.

First, revolutionary theory is a banner for launching socialist revolution, a scientific understanding of the historical tasks of revolution, and the theoretical basis for formulating the line, principles, policies and strategies of revolution.

Second, only under the guidance of the scientific theory of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism can we establish a "strong socialist party, because revolutionary theory can unite all socialists, they can gain all beliefs from revolutionary theory, and they can use revolutionary theory to determine the methods of struggle and the mode of activity." (Lenin: "Our Program", "Selected Works of Lenin", Volume 1, page 203.)

---

demonstrators, many soldiers and officers defected to the side of the protesters. This decision was pivotal, as the Army began to protect citizens and actively opposed Ceaușescu's forces.

This reversal was crucial in tipping the balance against Ceaușescu, leading to the rapid collapse of his regime. After a brief period of intense fighting, the Romanian Army effectively joined the popular uprising, facilitating Ceaușescu's capture and subsequent execution. The Army's shift from a tool of state repression to an ally of the revolutionary forces marked a profound turning point in Romania's transition from dictatorship to a democratic society. (ChatGPT)



Secondly, the socialist revolutionary movement is a movement of the masses. Only when the revolutionary theory is accepted by the masses can the revolutionary movement of the masses rise. This is a process of the masses transforming from a class in itself to a class for itself. In the words of Chairman Mao, this is a process of spiritual transformation into material, that is, a process of transforming revolutionary theory into a revolutionary movement of the masses.

Theory is the forerunner of revolution, which is the universal law of all revolutions; the socialist revolution of the proletariat embodies this law at the highest historical level and the highest scientific level.

What theoretical work should we do?

First of all, we must study and research Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, especially the theory of socialist re-revolution of Maoism. If we want to make others understand, we must first understand it ourselves.

If we want to publicise the theory of socialist re-revolution of Maoism to the masses, then we must first study and truly understand the theory of socialist re-revolution.

In this regard, we have been making continuous progress. However, firstly, progress is not enough, and secondly, progress has no end. For example: Why does revisionism emerge? What is the revisionist line? What is the core problem of the revisionist line? Why did revisionism come to power and capitalism was restored, and the worst kind of capitalism under the dictatorship of the fascist bourgeoisie? How should Chinese society be characterised after the restoration of capitalism? How should the problem of the restoration of capitalism in China be solved? Should we launch a socialist revolution? How should we launch a socialist revolution? If the socialist revolution is victorious, how should we continue the socialist revolution under the new conditions? Can we find better measures to prevent revisionism from coming to power and capitalism from being restored? All these questions deserve our renewed consultation with Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, especially Mao Zedong Thought. The most realistic, important and core question is how to launch a socialist revolution and how to win the victory of the socialist revolution.

In the process of theoretical study and research, Maoist comrades bear an unshirkable historical responsibility. I believe that Maoist comrades should use certain forms of contact to allow comrades who care about theoretical study and research and have a certain theoretical level to collectively and organisedly study, discuss, and communicate, and jointly promote our comrades, especially Maoist comrades, to understand and grasp the Maoist theory of socialist re-revolution.

Another thing is to strengthen the criticism of the "socialist theory with Chinese characteristics."

The essence of the "theory of socialism with Chinese characteristics" is the theory of capitalism with Chinese characteristics. It is a "special" theory of restoring capitalism in the form of revisionist deception. The so-called "Deng Xiaoping Theory", Jiang Zemin's "Three Represents", Hu Jintao's "Scientific Outlook on Development", and until now "Xi Jinping Thought on Socialism with Chinese Characteristics for a New Era" (abbreviated as "Deng, Three, Science, Xi") are all junk of this "theory of socialism with Chinese characteristics". It is a typical theory without theory, a typical hodgepodge of "feudalism, capitalism, and revisionism", among which Deng Xiaoping is the root and Xi Jinping is the worst.

However, the "theory of socialism with Chinese characteristics" also has its specific value, which is that it enables us to more deeply and clearly understand what revisionism is and why capitalism will inevitably be restored under the rule of the revisionist line. By criticising this theory of restoring capitalism in the form of revisionism, we can improve our understanding of Mao Zedong's theory of

socialist re-revolution; at the same time, it can also help the broad masses of the people no longer be deceived by revisionist theories and capitalist restoration theories, and better, faster and more thoroughly accept Chairman Mao's theory of socialist re-revolution, so that they can awaken and devote themselves to the socialist re-revolution movement.

There is another element of theoretical preparation that cannot be ignored, namely, the need to make serious criticisms of such erroneous ideas as 'saving the Party and preserving the country', bourgeois national chauvinism and 'patriotism', which exist among the masses of the revolutionary masses.

This paper is only a preliminary step in this direction.

The importance of this issue has already been confirmed by the interference of these erroneous trends in the ideological understanding of the Maoists and the revolutionary masses, and thus in the revolutionary movement of socialism, during these decades.

As we have already emphasised, the erroneous ideas of 'saving the Party and preserving the country', bourgeois national chauvinism, 'patriotism' and so on are in fact the reflection of revisionist ideas in the ranks of the Maoists. If we do not fight against these erroneous ideas and remove them, the revolutionary masses will not be able to truly accept the Maoist theory of socialist re-revolution, will not be able to really launch a socialist re-revolutionary movement, and will even, on the contrary, become ignorant lackeys or cannon fodder under the rule of the bureaucratic, autocratic, monopolistic capitalist State.

The practical significance of this issue is that the "save the party and protect the country" trend of thought, bourgeois national chauvinism, and "patriotism" trend of thought still have a considerable influence, especially some big names and representatives who have concocted and promoted these erroneous trends of thought, and are exerting a wide influence on the Maoists and the broad masses of revolutionary people through various media forms such as articles, videos, and the Internet. Therefore, this has become an ideological and theoretical struggle task that we must persist in carrying out at present.

Another point to be said is that the focus of our theoretical work should be on promoting and popularising Mao Zedong's socialist re-revolution theory to the broad masses of revolutionary people.

'The most basic, concrete and realistic meaning of the principle that there can be no revolutionary movement without revolutionary theory is that there can be no socialist re-revolutionary movement with the participation of the broad masses of revolutionary people without their mastery of revolutionary theory.

Chairman Mao has always emphasised the importance of the work of the masses, and one of the most important aspects of this work is 'propaganda for the masses'. When we talk about mobilising the masses to start a socialist re-revolutionary movement, how do we mobilise them? It is to rely on theoretical propaganda to make the revolutionary masses accept the Maoist theory of socialist re-revolution. If this is done properly, a leap can be made from 'spiritual to material' and the purpose of 'mobilisation' can be achieved. Once the masses have grasped the theory of socialist re-revolution, they will be able to set in motion a movement for socialist re-revolution. As Marx emphasised, the theory can be grasped by the masses only if it is thorough. The Maoist theory of socialist re-revolution is the most thorough revolutionary theory for solving the restoration of capitalism and re-establishing genuine socialism in which the working people are the masters. Therefore, we must persistently and with great enthusiasm and patience propagate the Maoist theory of socialist re-revolution to the broad masses of the revolutionary people in every possible form. It can be said that the level of development

of the work we are doing to propagate the theory of socialist re-revolution is synchronised with the actual socialist re-revolutionary movement. The better the work of propagating the theory of socialist re-revolution is done, the more likely it is that a magnificent socialist re-revolutionary movement will be set in motion.

The high development of modern science and technology has provided us with excellent conditions for propagating and popularising the theory of socialist re-revolution. Although highly developed science and technology is a double-edged sword, we are active and they are passive. We often say that the masses have unlimited creativity, and this is also true in this issue. In fact, everyone is doing this. Relying on highly developed science and technology, we are propagating Mao Zedong's theory of socialist re-revolution to the masses in various flexible and clever forms, so that it becomes a theoretical weapon in the hands of the masses. We should continue to do this. This is a key point of theoretical work. If this work is done well, what Lenin said, that the ruled class is unwilling to live as usual, can become a realistic historical condition for launching a socialist re-revolution.

## 2. Organisational preparation.

A proletarian socialist revolution cannot be carried out without the vanguard organisation of the proletariat - the Communist Party. This is a truth repeatedly emphasised by the revolutionary teachers of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, an unbreakable truth proven by the history of the communist movement, and a truth accepted by all.

The rulers of the fascist bourgeois dictatorship, from their class instincts, also perceive this truth. Therefore, over the years, what they fear most is the organisation of the masses of the people at large, and in particular, the organisation of a Communist Party by the masses of the people. The several attempts by comrades to organise a Communist Party were brutally suppressed and they were all arrested and sentenced to imprisonment.

Article 35 of the current Constitution clearly states 'freedom of association'. This is a democratic right to which all citizens of the People's Republic of China are entitled. However, the fascist rulers will not respect the Constitution. Even in such cases, the use of the Constitution for certain legitimate struggles may be costly, but it has positive significance, as in the case of the legitimate struggle for the 'Chinese People's Party for the Defence of Mao Zedong'.<sup>86</sup>

In terms of reality, it is more feasible to make use of the advantages of the Internet to organise 'red groups' to unite revolutionary comrades. In the future, when the conditions are right, they can easily be transformed into political party organisations. This is self-evident.

The Red Group should improve its level and not remain at a low level. It should not be run as a quasi-chat place for venting dissatisfaction, relieving troubles, or simply expressing nostalgia for Chairman Mao in exchange for a little self-consolation. This is not the purpose of our Red Group. The Red Group should grasp the principle of class struggle and the struggle between the two roads of socialism and capitalism, link them with the reality, strengthen the study, understanding and research of Mao Zedong's theory of socialist re-revolution, and especially participate in actual struggles. Only in this

---

<sup>86</sup> The Chinese People's Party for the Defence of Mao Zedong was scheduled to hold its First Congress on December 26, 2016, the 40th anniversary of the birth of Mao Zedong. It had announced its formation on August 8 of the same year as a fraternal party of the Chinese Communist Party and because of its founder's love for Mao Zedong and his understanding of the concept of popular sovereignty. However, on the same day, December 26, he was called by the Shijiazhuang police to "drink tea", and then decided to cancel the meeting. The Party was banned in China in 2017. In 2021 it affiliated with the International Coordination of Revolutionary Parties and Organisations (ICOR) – Trans.

way can the Red Group play the role of making theoretical and organisational preparations for launching socialist re-revolution.

In addition, it should be noted that the form of the Red Group should adapt to the needs of the struggle. The comrades of the Red Group come from all corners of the country, which is a good phenomenon. However, reforms should also be made in the organisational form. China is so large and has so many people. If the comrades of a Red Group come from all corners of the country, it is difficult for them to communicate and participate in activities together, let alone participate in the struggle together. I suggest that the Red Group should be organised according to administrative divisions. For example, a Maoist Red Group in a province or a Maoist Red Group in a city. In a city, comrades with different views can also organise their own Red Groups, and several Red Groups can coexist at the same time. In this way, a large network of Red Groups can be gradually formed throughout the country, which is very necessary and beneficial for the transition to a higher level of organisational form and for welcoming the comprehensive class struggle across the country.

At the end of his famous book *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back*, Lenin left us this classic statement: "In the struggle for power, the proletariat has no weapon other than organisation. Since the proletariat is dispersed by the anarchic competition that occupies a dominant position in the bourgeois world, since it is oppressed by the forced labour for capital, since it is often thrown to the "lowest level" of poverty, brutality and degradation, the proletariat can and must become an invincible force because its ideological unity, formed on the principles of Marxism, is consolidated by the material unity of organisation, which unites millions of workers into a great army of the working class. In the face of this great army, neither the already decaying Russian autocracy nor the decaying international capitalist regime can stand. (Selected Works of Lenin, Volume 1, page 510)"

Lenin's teachings are not outdated, and they are still instructive for the socialist revolution we are about to carry out today. Without the organisation of the working class, it is impossible for the working class to be liberated. As long as the working class is organised, it is impossible for the bourgeoisie to avoid failure.

So, the reason is simple. Do you want to launch a socialist revolution? Do you want to win the socialist revolution? Then you must hold the most powerful weapon to defeat the bourgeoisie and all exploiting classes - organisation!

3. In the practice of struggle, promote the process of socialist re-revolution.

A single spark can start a prairie fire. The proletarian revolutionary movement, like all revolutionary movements in history, started from scratch, from small beginnings, and has a gradual development process. The socialist re-revolution cannot deviate from this law. The idea of process is an important idea of materialist dialectics. We cannot imagine that the socialist re-revolution will win in one go. That is impossible. Victory never falls from the sky. As a process, the socialist re-revolution requires us to start from scratch, from small beginnings, from bits and pieces, and through step-by-step, down-to-earth struggle practice, launch the climax of the socialist re-revolution.

There are at least a few key points to grasp.

A. Go deep into the workers and peasants, especially the workers, and support all their struggles, including the struggle for rights and economic struggles. At the same time, we must publicise the revolutionary mentors' emphasis on rising from economic struggle to class struggle and political struggle.

The most important significance of this struggle is that only through such struggle practice can the workers and peasants, first of all the workers, gradually realise the combination with Mao Zedong's theory of socialist re-revolution and become the basic and main class force of socialist re-revolution.

Don't forget that socialist re-revolution cannot succeed without the basic class foundation and class force of the broad masses of workers and peasants. This is the fundamental principle and reason why we must attach importance to this struggle.

Looking at the problem from the perspective of our national conditions, especially after more than 40 years of capitalist restoration, various bourgeois, petty-bourgeois, and even feudal ideas have had a greater or lesser, deeper or shallower influence on the broad masses of workers and peasants. To eliminate these influences and let the broad masses of workers and peasants truly accept the ideological theories of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, especially the theory of socialist re-revolution of Maoism, requires a long and arduous ideological and theoretical propaganda work. This is not an easy task.

B. Article 13 of the "Sixteen Articles" during the Cultural Revolution once emphasized: "Cultural and educational units and party and government leading organs in large and medium-sized cities are the focus of the current proletarian cultural revolution movement." This is still instructive for us to launch a socialist re-revolution today.

One is that the focus of work and struggle should be placed on large and medium-sized cities, because the working masses are mainly in large and medium-sized cities, the main political forces are in mass cities, and the political power is even more in large and medium-sized cities; moreover, colleges and universities are concentrated in large and medium-sized cities. Young college students have always been an important force in the revolution, and in the future socialist re-revolutionary struggle, the younger generation of college students will also play such a role.

Therefore, from the perspective of launching a socialist re-revolution, doing a good job of propaganda and mobilising the masses in large and medium-sized cities, and paying special attention to doing a good job of college students, is a very important and must-grasp key task. Undoubtedly, Beijing, the capital, is the focus of the focus.

C. Do a good job in the work of intellectuals.

From the founding of the Communist Party of China to the subsequent new democratic revolution and socialist revolution under the leadership of the Communist Party of China, China's progressive and revolutionary intellectuals have played a great role and made great contributions to both the revolutionary cause of the proletariat and the socialist construction cause. This historical fact tells us that we must have a correct analysis and evaluation of Chinese intellectuals. This is a very important theoretical and practical issue in the entire historical period from the people's democratic revolution to the socialist revolution.

Under the leadership of Chairman Mao, our party has gained rich and successful historical experience on this issue; under specific historical circumstances, mistakes have also occurred, but valuable historical lessons have also been learned.

As we carry out the socialist re-revolution today, we must learn and study these historical experiences and lessons and do a good job in the work of intellectuals.

To do a good job in the work of intellectuals, we must have a correct and scientific analysis of the current situation of Chinese intellectuals. Intellectuals engaged in material production activities, that

is, white-collar workers, are now often referred to as white-collar workers. Because of their different positions in the production process, they are quite different from blue-collar workers in terms of thought and world outlook; however, they are mental workers after all, and as a whole, they are still part of the working class. As for high-paid executives, they have already merged with monopoly capitalists. This very small number of people should be said to be part of the monopoly bourgeoisie.

The situation is more complicated for scientists engaged in scientific research, that is, senior intellectuals, and intellectuals engaged in ideological theory, culture and education. We should pay more attention to starting from reality and making specific analysis.

As far as the current actual situation in our country is concerned, it should be said that the majority of intellectuals are good. Here, good means that there are not only a few intellectuals who believe in Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and communism, but also the majority of other intellectuals can be won over to become class forces inclined towards Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and communism; this naturally also includes that in addition to this tendency, we must not forget that there will always be another tendency influenced by bourgeois ideology and world outlook, and this requires work.

Of course, we must also see that among intellectuals, there are indeed a considerable number of extreme rightists who hate Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, hate communism, and especially hate Chairman Mao. The "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe" left such a historical lesson. At that time, this type of people played a very important role. As far as the actual situation we see now is concerned, there is also such a political force among Chinese intellectuals today. We must have a clear and correct understanding of this group of people. In the future socialist revolution, we must be prepared to deal with these people correctly. They will be the opinion makers for the monopoly bourgeoisie to seize power from the "special characteristics", and therefore, they will inevitably be the vanguards of inciting a "colour revolution" in China - the struggle for power by the bourgeoisie.

This is the issue of fighting for leadership in the struggle to overthrow the bureaucratic monopoly bourgeois regime that Marxism-Leninism-Maoism has repeatedly taught us and has been confirmed by bloody lessons.

D. Do a good job in the work of the broad masses of cadres and party members.

We have said before that the Chairman specifically warned us in the Nine Commentaries that we must believe that the broad masses of cadres and party members of the CPSU are good, want revolution, and do not approve of revisionism. In 1976, in the last "important instructions" left to us, it was also said: "Will there be revolution in a hundred years? Will there be revolution in a thousand years? There will always be revolution. There will always be a part of people who feel oppressed. Small officials, students, workers, peasants, and soldiers do not like big people to oppress them, so they want revolution."

The Chairman distinguished between the petty officials and the soldiers here, and said that "the majority of cadres and party members are good", which is the same as warning us not to simply equate these people with the bureaucratic monopoly bourgeoisie.

Chairman Mao's opinion is worth our deep consideration. In his "Important Instructions", when talking about "big officials", Chairman Mao said, "Some comrades, mainly old comrades, still have their thoughts stopped at the stage of bourgeois democratic revolution, do not understand the socialist revolution, have resistance, and even oppose it. When they become big officials, they must protect the interests of big officials. They have good houses, cars, high salaries, and waiters, which is



much better than capitalists. With the socialist revolution they themselves come under fire. At the time of the co-operative transformation of agriculture there were people in the Party who opposed it, when it comes to criticising bourgeois right, they resent it. You are making the socialist revolution, and yet don't know where the bourgeoisie is. It is right in the Communist Party – those in power taking the capitalist road. The capitalist-roaders are still on the capitalist road.” It can be seen that when Chairman Mao talks about the bourgeoisie as the object of socialist revolution, he mainly links and unites it with the ‘big officials’, while when he talks about the need for revolution for the workers, peasants and soldiers, he links and unites it with the ‘small officials’. The revolution of the workers, peasants and soldiers is linked and united with the ‘petty officials’.

Chairman Mao is actually using plain language to scientifically analyse the different class and political forces under socialist conditions, as well as the formation and situation of the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie as determined by these class and political forces. Chairman Mao's analysis has been proved by the historical facts of the capitalist restoration that we are experiencing today. Today, the ‘big officials’ have been transformed into a bureaucratic, authoritarian and monopolistic bourgeoisie, while the ‘small officials’ are still mostly able to subordinate themselves to the working masses of workers, peasants and soldiers.

Therefore, when formulating policies and strategies for socialist re-revolution in the future, this opinion of Chairman Mao's class analysis will still be of guiding significance to us. It can help us to strive for maximum isolation of a handful of class enemies, to strive for maximum unity with all the forces that can be united, to avoid confusing two types of contradictions of different natures, to avoid knocking down everything, to avoid isolating ourselves, and thus to strive for a more favourable and certain victory in the socialist re-revolution.

Policy and strategy are the life of the Party. Under the leadership of Chairman Mao, our Party has left behind many successful experiences in this respect in its history, including the strategy of disintegrating the enemy and prompting the enemy to revolt at that time, all of which are successful experiences from which we can still draw today, and all of which can help us to learn how we should go about the work of disintegrating the enemy.

E. Resolutely following the general line of the communist movement, ‘Proletarians of the world unite’.

It must be fully understood that the socialist re-revolution in China is part of the communist movement of the whole world, and that it is the historical task not only of the Chinese communists and the Chinese people, but also of the communists and revolutionary peoples of the whole world. Therefore, our struggle must be united with the communist movement of the communists and revolutionary people of all countries in the world, and we must strive to get in touch with the communist parties of all countries, and endeavour to achieve mutual concern and support for each other, so as to jointly promote the socialist revolutions and socialist re-revolutionary movements that are being carried out in their respective countries.

We have already made a little initial breakthrough in this area, having made contact with some international communist organisations and become members of them, and we will continue to step up our work in this area in the future.

Chairman Mao's theory of socialist re-revolution is rich in content and serves as a theoretical guide for our socialist re-revolution today. We have not studied it enough, to the extent that we have not even put it forward as an independent theoretical content. The work I am doing here is only a preliminary attempt. I hope that it will attract the attention of comrades, and even more so that, with their collective efforts, the study of this theory will be pushed forward.

## VII. The Maoist theory of the three worlds

Maoism is not a theory of nationalism but a theory of the international communist movement, as the 'three worlds theory' of Maoism amply demonstrates.

The birth of the 'three worlds theory' of Maoism shows that Maoism is not only a theory for the liberation of the Chinese people, but also for the liberation of people all over the world. Maoism takes as its object of understanding not only the historical tasks of the Chinese proletarian revolution, a product of its integration with the reality of the Chinese socialist revolution, but also the historical tasks of the proletarian revolution throughout the world, a product of its integration with the reality of the socialist revolution throughout the world.

Only by recognising this can we correctly understand the theoretical content and historical status of the 'three worlds theory' of Maoism, the fact that Maoism is the third stage in the development of Marxism, and the historical basis on which Marxism, Leninism and Maoism can and should be juxtaposed.

The 'three worlds theory' of Maoism takes the historical task of the socialist revolution of the proletariat all over the world as the object of its understanding, and is a theoretical product of its integration with the reality of the socialist revolution all over the world.

The Maoist theory of the 'three worlds' has had a historical process of gradual formation in line with the development of the times.

Initially, in the course of the struggle against revisionism, Chairman Mao put forward the 'general line of the international communist movement'. This has already been discussed. It was the first expression, under the conditions of the times, of the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist theory, line and strategy for the socialist revolution of the proletariat throughout the world, and for the revolution of the oppressed nations and peoples for national liberation and national independence.

Subsequently, as a result of the complete revisionism of the Soviet Union, which transformed itself into a social-imperialist country and became another hegemonic country alongside the United States, the pattern of the class struggle throughout the world underwent a major change, with the emergence of the United States and the Soviet Union as the two hegemonic countries in the entire imperialist camp. Under this new situation of class struggle throughout the world, Chairman Mao further developed his understanding of the 'general line of the international communist movement' and put forward the theory of the division into 'three worlds', on the basis of which he formed a new line and guideline for the international communist movement. On the basis of this theory, a new line, guideline, policy and strategy for the international communist movement was formed. This theory and strategy was based on Lenin's theory of imperialism and was a development of Lenin's theory of imperialism.

This theory and strategy, under the conditions of the era when Chairman Mao was alive, provided practical lines, guidelines, policies and strategies for the proletariat and the masses of the people all over the world to join forces, unite and jointly wage the anti-imperialist struggle against the two hegemonic superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, as the number one enemies on a worldwide scale, and gave a great impetus to the great struggle of the time.

Nowadays, the international situation has changed profoundly from that of Chairman Mao's time. This reality requires us not to be dogmatic about the Maoist theory of the 'three worlds'.

However, this is not the same as saying that this theory is completely outdated. We must realise that the basic principles and strategic ideas of this theory on the analysis and understanding of the pattern

of the class struggle throughout the world are still of guiding significance in the present-day struggle of the proletariat and the masses of the people throughout the world against imperialism led by the United States.

In the future, if certain countries, such as China, are able to achieve victory in the socialist re-revolution, under such new historical conditions, it may be even more appropriate to apply Mao's Three Worlds Theory to formulate new revolutionary lines, guidelines, policies and strategies.

Therefore, it is of great practical and historical significance for us to seriously study the Three Worlds Theory of Maoism today. Here, I would like to make some brief comments based on my own experience.

### **1. The 'three worlds theory' is a contemporary development of imperialist theory.**

The class and theoretical basis of the Maoist 'theory of the three worlds' is the Marxist theory of capital, especially the Leninist theory of imperialism. That is to say, the 'theory of the three divisions of the world' is a theory and strategy based on the class struggle as a programme, a theory and strategy against the bourgeoisie, and in particular against the monopoly bourgeoisie led by the United States of America in the imperialist era.

This is the most basic understanding that we must adhere to: the 'three worlds theory' is a theory of adherence to the class struggle, a contemporary developed theory of imperialism, a genuine Marxist-Leninist-Maoist revolutionary theory, not a revisionist theory of surrender and compromise.

According to the teachings of the Leninist theory of imperialism, ours is an era of imperialism and proletarian socialist revolution. In such an epoch, the proletariat must formulate correct lines, guidelines, policies, and strategies for carrying out the socialist revolution of the proletariat throughout the world under the guidance of the Leninist theory of imperialism. The Maoist theory of the three divisions of the world was formulated to answer such an epochal question.

The Maoist theory of the division of the three worlds adheres to the basic principle of the Leninist theory of imperialism: that the essence of imperialism is monopoly capitalism, and develops the Leninist theory of imperialism by seeing both that there is an imbalance in the development of the various imperialist countries, an imbalance in their status, and that there are actually distinctions in various respects, and that, consequently, it is possible and desirable to divide the imperialist bloc into the first and second worlds; and at the same time, seeing the economically and politically unequal relationship between the developed imperialist countries and the underdeveloped developing countries, which is essentially a relationship of class oppression and class exploitation, and reflecting truthfully this class relationship in theory and formulating a proletarian revolutionary strategy in practice that is in line with this class relationship, it is only natural that we should separate out the Third World. This is the theoretical basis of the Maoist theory of the 'three worlds'.

Mao Zedong's theory of the three worlds upholds the Leninist theory of imperialism that monopoly capitalism has developed into global, international capitalism, and that monopoly capitalism is the main target of the proletariat's socialist revolution in the era of imperialism. It further develops the Leninist theory of imperialism, proposing that the international proletariat and the broad masses of working people must unite to jointly oppose the grand strategy of international monopoly capitalism headed by hegemonic countries, and formulates lines, principles, policies, and tactics for this struggle.

Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory" adheres to Leninism's view that contradictions and struggles for hegemony are inevitable among imperialists, and further develops Lenin's theory of imperialism, proposing that the United States and the Soviet Union are the two hegemonic superpowers that dominate the imperialist world and are the main targets of the proletariat and the broad masses of working people's struggle against imperialism.

Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory" adheres to Leninism's theory of imperialism on the uneven development of imperialism, and further develops Lenin's theory of imperialism, scientifically analysing the relationship between imperialist countries, and proposing a new distinction between the first world and the second world - that is, the middle zone - for imperialist countries, which is both in line with objective reality and of great strategic significance, providing a reliable theoretical basis and strategic principles for the "Three Worlds Theory".

Mao Zedong's theory of the three worlds upholds the slogans of Leninism's theory of imperialism: "Proletarians of the world, unite!" and "Proletarians of the world, unite with the oppressed nations and peoples." This slogan is a development of the slogan "Proletarians of the world, unite!" put forward in the Communist Manifesto based on the new historical conditions of Lenin's time. Chairman Mao's three worlds division further develops the slogans "Proletarians of the world, unite!" and "Proletarians of the world, unite with the oppressed nations and peoples." This new theory and slogan is more in line with the reality of the revolutionary struggle of the people of the world against imperialism in the era of Chairman Mao, and has the significance of a broader united front. For example, there was a saying at that time that mocked our diplomatic line, saying that our friends were "little friends" (referring to Prince Sihanouk of Cambodia), "girlfriends" (referring to Mrs. Bandaranaike of Sri Lanka), and "poor friends" (referring to the vast countries in the Third World). In fact, this just shows that the "Third World" in the "Three Worlds Division Theory" has the significance of establishing a broader revolutionary united front against imperialism and colonialism.

Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory" adheres to the basic content of Leninism's theory of imperialism. At the same time, it scientifically defines the Soviet Union, which has degenerated into social-imperialism, as part of the entire imperialist camp. Moreover, because it has the characteristics of neo-tsarist chauvinism and hegemonism, it belongs to the first world on a par with American imperialism.

This is a new development of Leninism's theory of imperialism. Lenin did not encounter this problem. Chairman Mao encountered this problem and answered it scientifically. This is of great theoretical significance. First, this is a new content; second, once a socialist country ruled by a Communist Party becomes revisionist, it will degenerate into a new imperialist country and become the target of the proletarian revolution. From the perspective of class struggle, the class nature of the social-imperialist country has changed. It has been transformed into a class enemy of the proletariat and the broad masses of working people, and a cunning but particularly vicious class enemy with a new form.

As mentioned earlier, Chairman Mao asked Deng Xiaoping to express this theoretical thought when he delivered a speech at the UN General Assembly. At that time, he was talking about China. He was talking about if one day the Chinese Communist Party became a revisionist party and China became a social-imperialist country, the communists, the proletariat and the broad masses of the people in the world would unite to overthrow the Chinese Communist Party and overthrow social-imperialist China.

This was of course a prophecy at the time, but it expressed a theoretical thought with universal significance. In connection with the reality that the Soviet Union had degenerated into social-imperialism at the time, Chairman Mao placed Soviet social-imperialism in the first world of the "Three Worlds Theory", as a class enemy that the proletariat and the broad masses of working people in the

world must jointly oppose, and a revolutionary object that must be jointly opposed. This elevated the fact of social imperialism that was caused by the rise of revisionism and the restoration of capitalism from practice to theory, and to an important content of Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory".

Just from my superficial learning experience, I can see that Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory" is a new theory of Maoism put forward on the basis of inheriting Marxism's Capital and Leninism's theory of imperialism, in accordance with the new pattern of classes and class struggle in the world in Chairman Mao's era, the new historical conditions, and the new historical characteristics. As well as the new line, principles, policies and strategies for the proletariat and the broad masses of the people under the leadership of the Communist Party to fight against imperialism under the guidance of this theory.

Internationally, some comrades who have not understood Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and are accustomed to using dogmatic thinking methods do not understand the revolutionary significance of Chairman Mao's "Three Worlds Theory" and even attack Chairman Mao's "Three Worlds Theory". This is understandable. The mistake is not in Chairman Mao's "Three Worlds Theory", but in the fact that these comrades themselves do not truly understand Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, and their thinking methods are full of dogmatism, which has led to their great misunderstanding of Chairman Mao's "Three Worlds Theory".

In China, some comrades believe that Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory" is just a strategic idea, not a theoretical creation. Our analysis above actually includes criticism of this misunderstanding. Strategy and theory cannot be separated, especially some major strategies, which are always based on corresponding theories. These comrades actually do not really understand the profound theoretical significance of Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory", and their understanding is still somewhat superficial and dogmatic. We believe that after careful study of Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory" and discussion and exchange among comrades, this problem is not difficult to solve. Therefore, this article does not take the form of a debate with these comrades, but only expounds on the theoretical and strategic significance of Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory" in a positive way, hoping to inspire these comrades.

Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory" is a very important theoretical content of Maoism. It is a new development of Marxism and Leninism by Maoism, and a new and important component of the developed Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

## **2. The "Three Worlds Theory" is the basic strategy against imperialism**

The revolutionary theory of the proletariat and the revolutionary strategy of the proletariat are consistent and unified. Once the revolutionary theory of the proletariat is put into revolutionary practice, it will inevitably be transformed into the revolutionary strategy of the proletariat. The same is true of Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory". It embodies the basic strategy of the proletariat and the broad masses of working people in the world to jointly oppose the revolutionary movement with the United States and the Soviet Union as the main enemies under the conditions of the times and under the leadership of the Communist Party.

This basic strategy has distinct Maoist characteristics and is the inheritance and development of the Marxist and Leninist ideas on the strategy of proletarian struggle.

As the basic strategy against imperialism, the Maoist theory of the three worlds is essentially the strategy of the proletariat's class struggle against the bourgeoisie. It is the thorough implementation of the line of taking class struggle as the key link that Chairman Mao has always emphasised in the

struggle of the people of the world against imperialism and in the struggle of the international communist movement.

Class struggle is the class basis of the basic strategy of Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory". Today, it is absolutely necessary to emphasize this point, because history has repeatedly proved that any so-called "strategy" that is separated from class and class struggle will inevitably slide into the revisionist line. In order to draw a clear line from the revisionist line, we must always firmly grasp "taking class struggle as the key link" and formulate the revolutionary strategy of the proletariat based on class struggle.

This is a basic idea that must not be forgotten when mastering and applying Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory" as the basic strategy of the revolutionary movement.

With this foundation and this basic idea, we need to have a further and deeper understanding of Mao Zedong's strategic thinking.

Everyone knows that Chairman Mao is the master of using struggle strategies, whether in military struggle, political struggle, or other struggles.

Why was Chairman Mao able to do this?

That is because Chairman Mao had a sharp ideological weapon in his hand: materialist dialectics. Chairman Mao summarised materialist dialectics as the theory of contradiction, which was completely correct and grasped the core and general outline of materialist dialectics. No matter how complex a thing is, it is a systematic collection formed by the organic unity of contradictions. Grasping contradictions means grasping things. When Chairman Mao talked about philosophy, he particularly emphasised the pair of categories of analysis and synthesis, which made a lot of sense. Analysis is to analyse the contradictory aspects of things; synthesis is to synthesise the organic unity of the contradictory aspects of things and their laws of motion.

It was by using this method of analysis, this method of synthesis, this method of analysing and synthesising contradictions that Chairman Mao did not view imperialism as a monolithic entity, but instead analysed out the two dominant hegemonic countries, the United States and the Soviet Union. Chairman Mao called them the First World. At the same time, he analysed that other developed imperialist countries, especially those in Europe, did not occupy a dominant position in the imperialist camp, but were subject to the two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, and had contradictions and struggles. Chairman Mao called them the Second World. Chairman Mao also analysed the contradictions and struggles between imperialism and backward and developing countries from the macroscopic pattern of the world, and thus the Third World came into being. There is a Second World between the First World and the Third World, which Chairman Mao called the "intermediate zone." This is an extremely flexible proletarian struggle strategy based on reality. On the one hand, it reduces the number of enemies to be attacked, and on the other hand, it expands its own team by uniting all forces that can be united to form the broadest revolutionary united front. This is a revolutionary strategy that Chairman Mao has always used skillfully in his lifelong revolutionary struggle. The "Three Worlds Division Theory" also embodies such a strategy.

This analysis shows that the focus of the struggle of the proletariat and the broad masses of the revolutionary people against imperialism is to first concentrate on opposing the two dominant superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, which is the so-called "first world".



This scientific and grand proletarian strategy for dealing with the world's class struggle pattern reflects Chairman Mao's materialist dialectical method of thinking, that is, the contradictory method of thinking.

Everyone knows that Chairman Mao has an important strategic thought, that is, a tactical thought, which is that in every historical period, we should concentrate our forces to attack the most isolated and the fewest enemies. The reason is very simple, to win by numbers. In Chairman Mao's military strategy, it is called concentrating superior forces to defeat the enemies one by one. Chairman Mao also said in popular terms that we should make the enemies few and our friends many. The division of the imperialist camp into the first world and the second world, and the proposal of the third world, have such significance.

Of course, this is a well-founded scientific analysis, not a subjective imagination or wish. From a philosophical point of view, in any historical period, there will always be certain main contradictions, and the main contradictions determine the nature of things. Grasping the main contradictions and resolving them may promote the transformation of the nature of things. The main contradictions will continue to change, so people need to flexibly and timely adapt to such changes and constantly adjust their grasp of the main contradictions. Chairman Mao divided the imperialist camp into the First World and the Second World based on the contradictory relationship between the First World, which occupies a dominant position, and the Second World, which occupies a secondary position. This is an objective existence that requires seeking truth from facts. By grasping and utilizing this contradiction, we can separate the First World and the Second World, which will help concentrate our forces to strike at the two hegemonic superpowers in the First World, which occupies a dominant position and is the most reactionary.

Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory" also includes Mao Zedong's idea of establishing the broadest united front. The idea of the united front is an existing idea in Marxism and Leninism. However, in the process of leading the Chinese revolution, Chairman Mao developed the idea of the united front to a new height and provided many new contents. The "Three Worlds Theory" has such significance.

In 1939, Chairman Mao summarized in the "Introduction to The Communist": "The united front, armed struggle, and party building are the three magic weapons of the Chinese Communist Party to defeat the enemy in the Chinese revolution." Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory" has the meaning of such a "magic weapon."

It is this 'magic weapon' that divides the first and second worlds from the entire imperialist camp. There is a scientific basis for this. Chairman Mao has discussed the rationale behind it. At that time, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs said that the United States imperialists were now 'shifting their strategy eastwards'. Chairman Mao said, 'No, it is not a "strategic shift eastward", but an "eastward shift of forces", because the strategic centre of Americanism is in Europe, and the main economic interests of American imperialism are in Europe. This creates what Chairman Mao calls a 'middle ground' between the first and third worlds. It was on the basis of such a scientific analysis of economic relations that the division between the first and second worlds came about. Chairman Mao has repeatedly said to visiting European leaders that we want to see a strong Europe. To the German leaders, he said that we would like to see the reunification of the two Germanies. The meaning of Chairman Mao's words is very clear: he wants to see a strong Second World to counterbalance and check American imperialism in the First World.

It is quite clear that this is a bold, but scientifically significant strategy. Lenin's theory of imperialism had no such content or strategy, and the division of the imperialist camp into the first and second

worlds was a new and developed Maoist understanding of the relations between the imperialist countries, and of the strategy that the proletariat should adopt accordingly, on the basis of the theory of imperialism.

Chairman Mao is a master of the flexible application of dialectics, and therefore of strategy. In the period of the People's Democratic Revolution, Chairman Mao has always advocated the need to be able to divide and disintegrate the enemy, and to endeavour to always isolate and combat the fewest, and most dominant, class enemies in a given period. The division between the first and second worlds is the international application of Chairman Mao's strategic thinking.

The Maoist idea of the strategy of the third world is a new development of the Marxist-Leninist idea of the strategy of building an international revolutionary united front under the leadership of the proletariat. In the past, there were already two slogans: 'Proletarians of the whole world unite' and 'Proletarians of the whole world unite with the oppressed peoples and nations', which were the slogans of an international revolutionary united front of the proletariat and the masses of the revolutionary people under the leadership of the proletariat. Now Chairman Mao has come up with a new slogan of the unity of the entire Third World. Undoubtedly, this is a new understanding, a new theory and a new development of Maoism with regard to the Marxist and Leninist international revolutionary united front.

This new formulation, this new slogan, has a broader class content and a more practical revolutionary significance than the slogan 'Proletarians of the whole world unite with the oppressed peoples of the oppressed nations'.

The theory of the 'three worlds' put forward by the Maoists is based on a practical approach and is in line with reality. The fact of the matter was that the oppressed nations and peoples were united with the oppressed countries, and that although the countries of the region during this period were still in the hands of the exploiting classes, including even some princes and nobles, they were either colonies under imperialist rule, or directly subject to imperialist neo-colonial economic exploitation, or under imperialist control where both existed side by side. In short, they are all countries oppressed, exploited and bullied by imperialism. Therefore, the opposition to imperialist aggression and to imperialist oppression, exploitation and bullying has become the common demand of the progressive class forces in these countries. Maoism deeply recognized such class and political foundations, and thus put forward the theory of the Three Worlds. The essence of this theory is to go further from the oppressed nations and oppressed peoples to the oppressed countries. The concept of oppressed countries has a broader class and political content, and also has a broader strategic significance for the united front. This clearly shows that the theory of the "Three Worlds" is a new development of Maoist theory and strategy on the proletariat's struggle against imperialism in the era of imperialism.

History has proven that this theory, this strategy and this line are completely correct. It is under the guidance of this theory, this strategy and this line that the world's magnificent struggle against imperialism, for national liberation and for national independence has achieved one great victory after another, thus basically ending the rule of colonialism throughout the world.

This is the great contribution of Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory" to mankind. The people of all progressive classes and strata in the Third World are full of respect for Chairman Mao and still miss him deeply. Chairman Mao deserves it and no amount of praise is too much.

Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory" is a theory based on the political structure of the world at that time. In this political structure, there is also an indispensable historical condition for the implementation of the "Three Worlds Theory", that is, the existence of a socialist country with a

proletarian dictatorship (or people's democratic dictatorship) ruled by a Communist Party armed with Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and the leadership and support of the struggle.

An indispensable condition for the proletariat's socialist revolution is the leadership of a Communist Party armed with Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. This is true within a country and also internationally. In the international context, the existence of the First International, the Second International and the Communist International is a concrete manifestation of the Communist Party's historical mission of leading the proletarian revolutionary movement throughout the world. Without the leadership of the Communist Party, it is impossible to carry out a socialist revolutionary movement in any country. Similarly, without the leadership of the Communist Party, it is impossible to carry out a socialist revolutionary movement internationally.

Under the historical conditions that the Soviet Union and the Communist parties in Eastern Europe had become revisionist and the socialist camp no longer existed, the historical task of leading the socialist revolutionary movement around the world fell on the shoulders of the Communist Party of China.

The leadership position is not self-proclaimed, nor is it artificially created, but is formed naturally. The Communist Party of China under the leadership of Chairman Mao played such a historical role at that time. The Communist Party of China at that time had such historical conditions.

At that time, the Communist Party of China had a great leader like Chairman Mao as its leader. Under the leadership of Chairman Mao, the Communist Party of China adhered to the theory of socialist revolution and socialist continued revolution, and had a line of adhering to socialist revolution and socialist continued revolution. The Communist Party of China was indeed a strong proletarian party armed with Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. Moreover, the Communist Party of China was a large party with tens of millions of members, and this party leads a large country with 9.6 million square kilometres of land and hundreds of millions of people.

Although the socialist camp had been lost, as a strong socialist country with the above-mentioned superior historical conditions, it was still possible to become the strong leader, strong force and strong pillar of the socialist movement in the world. Moreover, just as the First and Second Internationals were led by Marx and Engels, and the Third International, that is, the Communist International, was led by Lenin and Stalin, now there was the leadership of Chairman Mao. Chairman Mao was both the standard-bearer and the helmsman of the socialist movement of that era.

It was precisely because of such historical conditions that Chairman Mao's "Three Worlds Theory", a major strategy of the socialist movement, was born. Without Chairman Mao, it would have been impossible to propose the "Three Worlds Theory"; without the Chinese Communist Party under the leadership of Chairman Mao, it would have been impossible to implement the "Three Worlds Theory".

Chairman Mao said at the Moscow Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties of the World that socialist countries must always have a "head". Now, history had eliminated the revisionist Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and Chairman Mao and the Chinese Communist Party under the leadership of Chairman Mao had assumed the role of the "head" of the international communist movement in the new era, and also assumed the role of the "head" of the Third World. Without this historical condition, the "Three Worlds Theory" could not be implemented.

Now we are facing such a situation. After the Chinese Communist Party became revisionist, it is impossible to simply apply the "Three Worlds Theory", and it is even more impossible to actually

implement the "Three Worlds Theory", because there is no longer the historical condition of the Communist Party's leadership and the socialist country as the "head".

Moreover, the pattern of class struggle in the world has also undergone many new changes.

The United States, in the first world, has a more prominent hegemonic position in the world, and several major historical events were led by the United States. Soviet revisionist social imperialism no longer exists, and has been separated from the first world. However, these countries have undergone profound changes after the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe", especially Russia's path to neo-tsarist imperialism, which still has a significant impact on the world pattern. The occurrence of the Russo-Ukrainian war is closely related to this change.

Some new situations have also emerged in the Second World. The new form of capitalism produced by the reform of capitalism represented by the Nordic countries is having a great impact on the world; and the tendency of trying to get rid of the control of American imperialism, as foreseen by Chairman Mao, represented by the European Community, is strengthening. All this tells us that we cannot stick to our original views on the Second World and must keep up with the development and changes of the situation.

The changes in the Third World are also very prominent. China has transformed into a social-imperialist country and has separated from the Third World, while some countries have also developed into monopoly capitalist countries, and some countries still have some special historical traditions and current conditions of their own. This makes us have to have a new understanding of the current situation in the Third World.

In short, driven by the powerful new scientific and technological productivity, world history and the world pattern are developing and changing at an accelerated pace. Although it is difficult to summarise it as "the world today is experiencing a major change that has not been seen in a century", new situations and new problems have emerged in the development and change of the entire world, and history has put forward new requirements. This is a reality that cannot be ignored or avoided. This has also put forward a new topic for international communists that needs to be explained in theory.

However, as far as the theoretical research results that have been achieved are concerned, they are still far from meeting the requirements of the times and the requirements of the communist movement.

However, these new changes do not mean that Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory" has no meaning today. This cannot be understood. Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory" still has practical significance in terms of theory and strategy. As long as we do not apply the "Three Worlds Theory" dogmatically, but connect it with reality, as the deputy commander-in-chief said, "learn it flexibly and apply it in practice", the theoretical and practical significance of the "Three Worlds Theory" will still guide us.

### **3. The "Three Worlds Theory" embodies proletarian internationalism**

Finally, it is necessary to say that the "Three Worlds Theory" embodies the internationalism of the proletariat. In today's world where bourgeois nationalism is rampant, it is still very necessary to talk about this truth.

Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory" is the theory, line, policy, and strategy of the socialist and communist movement against imperialism on a global scale, "taking class struggle as the key link." It is in the form of the three worlds division, with the proletariat of the world as the main body, holding

high the banner of internationalism, uniting all progressive revolutionary forces, and fighting against imperialism with the two hegemonic superpowers of the first world as the main enemy.

This is the most thoroughgoing revolutionary line of proletarian internationalism, a great creation of Chairman Mao, and an important part of the Maoist "Three Worlds Theory". Without proletarian internationalism, it is impossible to correctly understand the Maoist "Three Worlds Theory"; adhering to proletarian internationalism is unified with adhering to the Maoist "Three Worlds Theory".

The essence of the Maoist "Three Worlds Theory" is the theory of the proletariat's socialist revolution against the bourgeoisie and imperialism. This is the class basis of this theory. When understanding and applying the "Three Worlds Theory", we cannot leave this class basis, this minimum requirement.

It is from this point of view that Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory" is unified with the great ideal and great goal of the proletariat to pursue the realisation of communism. And communism is unified with internationalism, or in other words, communism itself is internationalism. The implementation of Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory" is not just to seek the liberation of a certain country or a certain nation, but to realise the liberation of all people in all countries in the world. In other words, it is often said that communism is a great theory and great ideal for the liberation of all mankind. To implement such a line and for such a purpose, it can only be internationalism, not the narrow nationalism and narrow patriotism of the bourgeoisie.

In the era of Chairman Mao, there was a phrase that we often said: "Have a global vision and look at the world." This simple and bold phrase expressed the proletarian vision of the Chinese people under the education of Chairman Mao and their lofty ambition to realise communism throughout the world. Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory" expresses such a sentiment and thought.

Only by understanding Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory" with Marxist communist theory can we understand the internationalist true meaning of this theory.

The theoretical basis of the "Three Worlds Theory" is the theory of imperialism, and as a stage of monopoly capitalism, imperialism is more profound and comprehensive in its international nature, and has penetrated almost every corner of the world. Now there is the saying of "global economic integration", which is actually the global monopoly capitalist economic integration. The General Secretary has the saying of "a community of shared future for mankind", but in fact he wants a community of shared future for the global monopoly capitalist economy. It is this economic foundation that not only unites the bourgeoisie of the world, but also inevitably unites the proletariat and the broad masses of working people of the world. Class struggle is no longer limited to one country, but always manifests itself as class struggle on an international and global scale.

Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory" is adapted to the needs of class struggle under this new situation. It can be said that Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory" is a theory of class struggle on an international and global scale. Such a theory must be internationalist in nature, and will correctly understand and handle patriotism, and make a clear distinction between it and the erroneous, narrow, and reactionary patriotism of the bourgeoisie.

It is precisely because of the adherence to Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory" that under the leadership of the Communist Party of China with Chairman Mao as its leader, the proletariat and the broad masses of working people in the world are closely united, and the struggle of the proletariat and the broad masses of working people in any country is always unified with the struggle of the proletariat and the broad masses of working people in the world.

That's how history was at that time. In particular, the victory of the vast majority of countries, nations, and peoples in the Third World against imperialism and colonialism fully demonstrated the great revolutionary significance of Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory". It is not an exaggeration to describe the struggle of those years as "vigorous and violent". This was a struggle to put "The Internationale" into practice. It was a further development and enrichment of the slogan "Proletarians of the world and oppressed nations and peoples, unite!" put forward by Lenin and the Communist International, and included "oppressed countries". This fully demonstrated Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory", which is a theory of proletarian internationalism and a revolutionary red flag guiding the people of the world to seek liberation together!

Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory" was developed and implemented under the leadership of a country that had already seized power, implemented the dictatorship of the proletariat, and was building socialism. This placed high demands on such a country, and at that time, China, under the leadership of Chairman Mao, correctly fulfilled such internationalist obligations. This was completely consistent with the historical tasks that the First International, the Second International, and the Communist International had undertaken. However, because of a new historical condition, that is, the socialist country that had seized power and established a socialist society was the one that undertook this historical task, which placed new and special demands on such a country.

At this time, on this issue, it was a major test for the established socialist countries, that is, whether they could sacrifice their own national interests under certain conditions and within a certain scope to support the struggles of oppressed countries, oppressed nations, and oppressed peoples. At that time, under the leadership of Chairman Mao, we in China did this. At that time, we had a saying: Even if we tightened our belts, we must support the struggles of our third world class brothers. This was not just a boastful statement, but under the leadership of Chairman Mao, we actually did this. This fully proves that if we want to truly implement the theory, line, principles and policies of the three worlds of Mao Zedong Thought, we must draw a clear line between narrow patriotism and narrow nationalism, and we must unswervingly adhere to proletarian internationalism. As the old saying goes: whether we are close or not depends on our class. The proletariat of the whole world, regardless of nationality or country, is one family. The proletariat that has been liberated has the obligation and responsibility to fully assist the fraternal proletariat that is struggling for its own liberation. The proletariat has this mind, and only the proletariat has this mind. Not only can it do this itself, but it can also lead the broad masses of working people to do this together. This has been repeatedly proven by the epic history of the proletariat's international communist movement.

As long as the proletariat exists, as long as the proletariat continues to fight for the liberation of its class and all mankind, it will continue to do so.

There is a famous truth in Marxism: a nation that oppresses other nations cannot be liberated. Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory" combines this truth with the actual situation of the world today, enriches the content of this truth, and develops the significance of this truth.

The proletariat and the broad masses of the people of the First and Second Worlds, under the leadership of their respective Communist Parties, firmly support all anti-imperialist struggles waged by the Third World countries in order to safeguard the interests of their countries and nations. As a member of the Third World, socialist China under the leadership of Chairman Mao could more directly unite the various countries of the Third World, jointly put forward the demands of the Third World in all aspects of politics and economy, and, together with the proletariat and the broad masses of the people of the First and Second Worlds, actively and forcefully fight against imperialism, especially the



two imperialist superpowers of the United States and the Soviet Union that pursue hegemony and colonialism.

This is actually a struggle for the proletariat and the broad masses of working people in the three worlds to unite and fight together to achieve common liberation. Isn't this a further implementation and development of the Marxist truth that "a nation that oppresses other nations cannot be liberated"?

Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory" is not only meaningful in helping the Third World countries achieve political liberation, but also in helping the Third World countries achieve economic liberation. This is a new and important content of the Third World countries' struggle against imperialism, especially the First World imperialism.

The countries of the Third World are basically economically backward, and the imperialist colonial aggression and rule have deepened this backwardness. If the Third World countries want to achieve final liberation, they must have a great development and breakthrough in their economy, and strive to narrow the economic gap with the First and Second Worlds in a relatively short period of time. Only by doing this can the political independence of countries around the world be reliably guaranteed. Therefore, an important new content of Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory" is to help the economic development of third world countries. Socialist China under the leadership of Chairman Mao took the lead in doing this and led the third world countries to unite and fight against the imperialist countries dominated by the first world for the economic development of the third world countries. This struggle has achieved remarkable results, including the establishment of corresponding agencies in the United Nations, which has greatly promoted the economic development of third world countries. Obviously, this is the new content and new development of proletarian internationalism.

This struggle has far-reaching influence and profound historical significance. Whether it is called the Third World countries or the developing countries, the significance is the same, and the struggle has continued to this day.

The struggle in the Third World has positive significance in promoting the struggle of the proletariat and the broad masses of working people in developed capitalist countries. As long as developed capitalist countries are exploiting and bullying the weak Third World countries, the proletariat in developed capitalist countries cannot be liberated; and as long as monopoly capitalism and imperialism exist, they will inevitably invade and exploit foreign countries. It is from this sense that the proletariat and the broad masses of working people in developed capitalist countries and the proletariat and the broad masses of working people in the exploited and bullied Third World countries share the same fate and breathe together. The only way to resolve the unequal relationship of big bullying small and strong bullying weak brought about by monopoly capitalism and imperialism is to launch a socialist revolution and eliminate monopoly capitalism and imperialism. This is the only way for the proletariat of the world, whether it is the proletariat and the broad masses of working people in the first and second worlds, or the proletariat and the broad masses of working people in the third world, to be liberated.

This is the ultimate destination of Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory", and also the destination of communism. Only through such a socialist and communist revolution that eliminates monopoly capitalism and private ownership can all mankind be liberated.

The development of world history is uneven. Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory" recognises this imbalance, respects this imbalance, and based on this imbalance, requires the proletariat and the broad masses of working people in developed countries to help the proletariat and the broad masses of working people in underdeveloped and even backward countries. This is the historical requirement

that the "Three Worlds Theory" puts forward to the proletariat and the broad masses of working people in the world based on the real historical pattern of the world. This also reflects the internationalist spirit of Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory".

Mao Zedong's "Three Worlds Theory" not only fully embodies the internationalist thought of the proletariat, but also fully embodies the thought of the proletariat's united front, fully and organically unifying the two. Moreover, the "Three Worlds Theory" introduces the concept of the state into the united front, giving the united front a broader content. All classes, strata, political groups, and even princes and nobles who are exploited and oppressed by imperialism but are progressive are united in the united front in the form of the state.

Chairman Mao applied the proletarian strategy to the extreme, fully embodied the proletarian revolutionist, and was the greatest revolutionary and politician in the history of human society.

In comparison, the narrow patriotism and narrow nationalism of the bourgeoisie and even the feudal landlord class that are currently popular in the country are so foolish. Such narrow vision and mind are far from the far-sightedness and broad mind of the proletariat!

Today, we have lost Chairman Mao, the Chinese Communist Party that adheres to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism as its guide, and a socialist China under the leadership of such a leader and such a party. Under such historical conditions, we are no longer able to implement and apply Mao Zedong Thought's "Three Worlds Theory", because the premise of running the "Three Worlds Theory" is to have a socialist country led by Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. However, this does not mean that the theoretical principles and struggle strategies of Mao Zedong Thought's "Three Worlds Theory" have become outdated forever. We cannot understand it this way. The theoretical principles and struggle strategies of Mao Zedong Thought's "Three Worlds Theory" can still play their guiding role as long as they are combined with new historical conditions. This is the commonality of any revolutionary theory and struggle strategy of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. In particular, the thought method of historical materialism that runs through these theoretical principles and struggle strategies is always a new and effective ideological weapon that helps us to be proficient in everything.

As we have said before, real life has indeed put forward such new requirements. Many new phenomena that have emerged in the world today are not only not in the era of Marx, Lenin, but also in the era of Chairman Mao. This requires us to start from the actual conditions of the times when we understand the new class struggle pattern and the new political struggle pattern in the contemporary world. This requires innovation in theory and practice.

It is quite difficult to understand some problems, and we need to have enough courage and level to conduct research with major theoretical breakthroughs.

One is that new historical phenomena have emerged in some developed capitalist countries, with the capitalist social forms of several Nordic countries being the most special and typical. How should we explain this historical phenomenon and the historical regularity contained in it? It directly affects our understanding of contemporary monopoly capitalism and our understanding of contemporary proletarian revolutionary struggle strategies.

Another thing is that some new monopoly capitalist countries have emerged from the countries of the Third World. How to understand these countries is also a new issue. Comrades of the German Marxist-Leninist Party call them new imperialist countries. I personally prefer to call them monopoly capitalist countries in general, and then add specific adjectives based on the specific characteristics of these countries to explain their specific characteristics. If they are called imperialist countries or new

imperialist countries because they are monopoly capitalist countries, whether it conforms to Lenin's theory of imperialism and whether it is scientific is worth further study.

More importantly, these new monopoly capitalist countries have different historical traditions and different social foundations, and their social forms have different characteristics and complexity. If compared with European and American monopoly capitalist countries, the difference is even greater. How to understand and summarise the basic characteristics of these new monopoly capitalist countries is a new historical issue before us. These countries have contradictions and struggles with American imperialism. How to correctly understand these contradictions and struggles cannot be based on the old views of more than half a century ago. Instead, we should analyse and understand these contradictions and struggles based on the reality that the social nature of these countries has undergone fundamental changes. For example, the ongoing war in the Middle East is such a historical issue.

Another thing is that we must not forget that China is a bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalist country. It is natural to follow the terminology of Chairman Mao's era and call it a "social-imperialist country." It is also possible to call it a "characteristic" bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalist society; however, "characteristics" cannot explain specific characteristics, because everything is a "characteristic" thing with contradictory particularity, and saying "characteristics" is equivalent to saying nothing. There are also sayings such as "crony capitalism", but these sayings do not highlight the fundamental characteristic of monopoly capitalism, and it seems unacceptable. I prefer to be more verbose and add the important and prominent characteristic of revisionism as the attributive, such as "bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalism characterised by revisionism" or "bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalism in the form of revisionism."

Of course, the most important thing is to understand the regular characteristics of various aspects of China's bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalist society with its own characteristics. Externally, it shows its dependence on developed monopoly capitalist countries represented by the United States and practices capitulationism; while it shows its aggressiveness and exploitation in exporting capital to backward countries and practices neo-colonialism. Internally, it implements the dictatorship of the fascist bourgeoisie and promotes cruel monopoly capitalist oppression and exploitation. It is based on these historical characteristics that determine the class situation and class struggle laws of Chinese society today, and thus determine what path China should take for socialist re-revolution and what kind of socialist re-revolutionary line should be implemented.

These are some of the new circumstances that have arisen in the world since Chairman Mao's death. Naturally, Maoism would not include theories that reflect this new historical reality. We mention this issue here only to emphasise that the method of thought bequeathed to us by Maoism has not become obsolete and will not become obsolete, as it is still of paramount methodological significance in understanding the new situations and problems that we encounter today.

We must also emphasise that in studying Maoism's "Three Worlds Theory", we must also study Chairman Mao's vision and mind, that is, the true proletarian worldview. Only by standing firm on the proletarian standpoint and mastering the proletarian worldview can we truly understand the scientific content and methodological significance of Maoism's "Three Worlds Theory", take over the great banner of the "Three Worlds Theory", take over the great banner of proletarian internationalism and communism, keep up with the pace of the times, meet the requirements of the times, and continue to strive for the great victory of the socialist and communist revolutions throughout the world!

## 8. Concluding remarks

That's all I have to say about my study of Maoism.

The theory of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, like all theories, can either be synthesised and summarised or analysed and developed. When analysed and developed, it can be said to be a thousand words; when synthesised and summarised, it is nothing more than one sentence, as Chairman Mao said: Rebellion is justified.

The four Maoist theories of socialist revolution constitute the theoretical system of Maoism's theory of socialist revolution. This huge theoretical system, with its very rich content, is an inexhaustible theoretical treasury for our socialist revolution.

We must study and research this theoretical system with perseverance and diligence. Since this theoretical system is the theoretical system of revolt, the theoretical system of socialist revolution, whoever bids farewell to revolt and revolution will inevitably have to bid farewell to the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist theory of socialist revolution.

We are Chairman Mao's loyal students, we will always be soldiers under Chairman Mao's red flag, and our historical mission and lifelong task is two words: rebellion! Or rather: revolution.

The socialist revolution has encountered setbacks and difficulties, but this is precisely the process that history must undergo. Without setbacks and difficulties, what else would we Communists need? Chairman Mao can best express our moods, feelings and will. The two lines of the poem, 'Idle boast the strong pass is a wall of iron, With firm strides we are crossing its summit'<sup>87</sup>, have never made us feel so particularly close and inspired as they do today, as if the old man had come back to us and was again directing us to take steps over the failures of socialism and to start the socialist revolution 'from the beginning'! 'The road ahead in history is always tortuous!

Isn't it an iron law that the path of history is always winding, but the future of history is always bright?

26th December 2023 in Marx's hometown

### Appendix:

This is an insight from my study of Maoism, and the original title faithfully reflects this, so it was called 'An Insight from Studying Maoism', but some young comrades have suggested that it is better to call it 'On Maoism', which is more distinctive and eye-catching. There is some truth in this. However, with this change, it is a bit of a misnomer, that is to say, the content of the article does not match the requirements of the title. This is actually the case. My level of understanding and theory is not up to the requirements of the topic. It is clearer and more eye-catching, but it is accompanied by errors that are also clearer and more eye-catching.

People should have self-knowledge, so I will first tell readers the limitations and mistakes that are bound to exist in my humble work, and welcome readers' criticism.

The superiority of socialist production is collective labour. In the past, I participated in the writing group of Chairman Mao's era, which was also collective labour, but it was collective mental labour. This

---

<sup>87</sup> From Chairman Mao's poem *Loushan Pass*, written in February 1935 – Trans.

creation makes mental labour also have the superiority of socialism. However, now I can only work alone, and I work alone at the age of 80. I feel that I am unable to do this topic well. I have to tell readers the ugly words here truthfully, and I hope readers will not be too demanding of me. It is still what I said in another postscript in the past, don't just look at what I said wrong, but also look at what I said right. Perhaps, only in this way can this shallow booklet play a little role.

This makes me miss the writing group very much. At that time, everyone could discuss with each other, inspire each other, help each other, and criticize each other, so that we could better exert the collective wisdom, do better research, and write better articles. Moreover, I was very lucky to meet many respected theorists and scholars, including the five teachers of the "Luo Siding"<sup>88</sup> group (Jin Chongji, Zhu Yongjia, Wu Ruiwu, Zhu Weizheng, and Wang Zhichang), who gave me advice. The teacher-student relationship in that era was truly a socialist teacher-student relationship. Teachers always regard the training of students as a requirement of the socialist cause. The ancients said that teachers are like parents. At that time, teachers are better than parents. This is not accidental, but inevitable. It was Chairman Mao and that era that made me so lucky. In this regard, it also shows that the socialism of Chairman Mao's era was better. Unfortunately, it is all gone. Perhaps through the negation of negation, under the historical conditions of rebuilding socialism in the future, in the research and construction of social sciences, the superiority of the socialist mental labour production mode can be reflected again.

This is exactly the purpose of launching a socialist revolution again and rebuilding socialism.

Today is the day when Chairman Mao left us forever; however, Chairman Mao will never leave us. Am I not doing this work under the guidance of Chairman Mao?

Chairman Mao will live forever. Chairman Mao will always be with us. Chairman Mao will always be our best teacher. We will always be Chairman Mao's most loyal students.

This learning experience is a homework assignment that I submit to Chairman Mao.

Revised on September 9, 2024

---

<sup>88</sup> Luo Siding was the pen name of the writing group of the Shanghai Municipal Committee of the Communist Party of China during the Cultural Revolution. It was formed in July 1971 and ended in October 1976 – Trans.

## **Appendix (title and brief description only):**

1. "A Report, A Disaster" (This book reflects the level of understanding I reached in the later stages of the Cultural Revolution (1974 and 1975) about the theory of socialist continuation of the revolution.)
2. "On the Two Precious Ideas Left by Lenin" (Leninism is composed of two great contributions, one is the theory of the proletarian socialist revolution, and the other is the theory of the continuation of the socialist revolution. )
3. "Chairman Mao's Conversation on Two Things" Truth Test (Chairman Mao did have the idea of doing two things in his life, which is the theoretical guidance for our understanding of Maoism today; But that so-called "conversation" was a forgery with ulterior motives. )
4. "On Semi-Socialism" (belongs to my discussion of Maoism)
5. "On Mao Zedong's Historical Thought" (belongs to my discussion of Maoism)
6. "Re-understanding Mao Zedong and re-understanding Deng Xiaoping" (belongs to my discussion of Maoism and criticism of Deng Xiaoping's revisionism. )
7. "Anti-Revisionism" (ibid.)
8. "On Socialism with Chinese Characteristics" (It belongs to my discussion of the historical inevitability of revisionism and capitalist restoration and the basic characteristics of "socialism with Chinese characteristics".) )
9. "On People's Democracy" (belongs to my discussion of the political system after the reconstruction of socialist society. )
10. "New Thinking on Epistemology" (belongs to my study and discussion of philosophical epistemology, the purpose is to master scientific thinking methods and improve my cognitive ability. )

These pamphlets generally reflect the process of my understanding of the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist theory of socialist revolution. It was on the basis of these discussions that the current "On Maoism" was developed.