

The Voice of Slaves (I)

Criticising Xi Jinping Thought

Written by Xiang Guanqi

Laiyin Publishing House

March 2018

Contents

I. Asking Xi Jinping for permission to criticise	
--Criticism of 'Xi Jinping Thought' (I)	Page 4
2. The term "moderately prosperous society" is not a scientific concept of Marxism	
—Criticism of "Xi Jinping Thought" (II)	Page 7
3. Dream or Ideal?	
—Criticism of "Xi Jinping Thought" (Part 3)	Page 11
4. What is the "original intention" of the Communists?	
—Criticism of "Xi Jinping Thought" (IV)	Page 13
5. How should we understand the main contradictions in Chinese society?	
—Criticism of "Xi Jinping Thought" (V)	Page 18
6. What are the most essential characteristics of socialist society?	
-- Criticism of "Xi Jinping Thought" (VI)	Page 41
7. "Building a 'community with a shared future for mankind'" is a revisionist diplomatic line	
—Criticism of Xi Jinping's Thought (VII)	Page 56
8. Two fundamentally contradictory basic lines	
—Criticism of Xi Jinping Thought (VIII)	Page 76
9. Understanding Xi Jinping	
—Criticism of Xi Jinping's Thought (IX)	Page 91

Old textual evidence:

1. A most timely, reliable and illustrative confession —Comment on the Resolution of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee
2. Xi Jinping is in danger —On the turning point of Xi Jinping's political career
3. Eclecticism is revisionism —Criticism of "Jinping's Political Science"
4. The key is to eliminate public ownership —Criticism of "Li Keqiang Economics"
5. Criticism of Xi Jinping

Translator's Preface

In early 2024, the comrades at ICOR sent me a Chinese text, Comrade Xiang Guanqi's "On Maoism". Having translated it, I was able to get in touch with the comrade, who sent me other writings of his.

Comrade Xiang Guanqi is still writing in his 80s. He was born in 1943 and is still in good health and can write every day.

He was admitted to the History Department of Fudan University in 1961. In 1967, he was assigned to Shandong University as a teacher. In 1988, he went to Germany as a visiting scholar. From 1989, he worked as a part-time professor in the Department of Sinology at Heidelberg University until he retired.

Having been a leading activist during the Cultural Revolution, and having lost his freedom three times in China, he now lives in Germany where he can give full play to his right to criticise the revisionism of Xi Jinping Thought, and the capitalist and social-imperialist characteristics of what the CCP still claims is "socialism".

He has now printed and published 10 books. Comrade Qi Benyu (whose "Memoirs" I translated - they are available on bannedthought.net) read the first five and gave them high praise.

Comrade Xiang Guanqi is a controversial figure in China. The "soft Maoists" of redchina.net and the Utopia website who seem to be allowed to exist because they give publicity to Xi Jinping's utterances, have attacked him. Perhaps controversy will now extend to the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist movement internationally because some of his views will be seen as unorthodox.

Personally, I admire his courage in thinking through the issues he raises from a sustained class perspective. He applies to himself the admonition to take class struggle as the key link. This is the basis of his analytical approach to how and why the revolutionary socialist China of Mao Zedong became the capitalist and revisionist China of Deng Xiaoping and the autocratic social-imperialism of Xi Jinping.

Due to my own time constraints, I have only translated the more recent writings of Comrade Xiang Guanqi in his "The Voice of Slaves". In the Contents page, I have left the titles of his "Old text materials" for the reference of comrades. I have also added footnotes where I thought they may assist non-Chinese readers. Any faults in the translated text are my own.

Comrade Xiang Guanqi told me, "I have been suffering from not being able to communicate with international communists because I don't know English."

I hope my limited efforts and the platform provided by the comrades at bannedthought.net will remedy Comrade Xiang Guanqi's sense of isolation.

Our movement is stronger for his work.

Nick G.

Criticism of Xi Jinping's Thought

Taking the 19th National Congress Political Report as an example

General Secretary Xi Jinping is the biggest revisionist in China, the biggest capitalist-roader in China, and the political representative of the biggest bureaucratic, authoritarian, and monopolistic bourgeoisie in China. When Chairman Mao was alive, the labels and criticisms that were put on revisionists are now very appropriate for General Secretary Xi Jinping.

With such class status and political identity, it is inevitable and understandable that General Secretary Xi Jinping attempted to develop the revisionist "Theory of Socialism with Chinese Characteristics" on the basis of betraying Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and put forward the so-called "Xi Jinping Thought on Socialism with Chinese Characteristics for a New Era" (hereinafter referred to as "Xi Jinping Thought").

I have long said that "time will prove that Deng Xiaoping Theory has no theory, while Mao Zedong Thought has real thought". Now, I still hold this view. Like all revisionists, from Bernstein and Kautsky to today, from "movement is everything, there is no ultimate goal", to "beef stew with potatoes is communism"¹, to "it doesn't matter whether the cat is black or white, as long as it catches mice, it is a good cat", "development is the hard truth"², etc., what theory do they have? None, not at all. Similarly, the arrogant General Secretary Xi Jinping has no theory. Is the dream, the Chinese dream, a theory? Of course not. In fact, if we carefully analyse the so-called "Xi Jinping Thought", we can't find any thought - the thought of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. At most, it is a hodgepodge of some bourgeois fashionable empty words and the dregs of feudal autocratic traditions. These things can only be the opposite of the theory of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and the opposite of the theory of scientific socialism. We Communists who adhere to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism must criticise them. I am now fulfilling this obligation.

Revisionists have always claimed to be Marxists. However, they do not really understand Marxism. Deng Xiaoping and his successors Jiang Zemin and Hu Jintao did not violate this law. Now, General Secretary Xi Jinping is also like this, and he appears to be more sincere, more high-profile, more innovative, and therefore more deceptive. In this case, we cannot but put the criticism of "Xi Jinping Thought" on the agenda.

Please understand, General Secretary Xi Jinping.

The so-called "opening up" to the outside world is to abandon Chairman Mao's basic national policy of independence, self-reliance, and appropriate foreign aid, regardless of the loss of national sovereignty and sacrificing national interests, and to welcome in international monopoly capitalism, with the principle of meeting the requirements of international monopoly capitalism. The reason why the revisionist rulers favour and promote such a capitulationist, traitorous, and comprador foreign policy is that they have abandoned class struggle as the key link and abandoned the struggle between socialism and capitalism as the key link.

¹ Following the 1956 Hungarian Counter-revolution, Hungary's revisionist leader promised an increase in living standards, referred to approvingly by Khrushchev as "goulash communism" – Trans.

² On his infamous Southern Tour at the start of 1992, Deng said "It is necessary to pay attention to the stable and coordinated development of the economy, but stability and coordination are also relative, not absolute. Development is the hard truth. This question needs to be clarified." A similar expression in English is "the last word". He was advocating that economic development must take precedence over socialist principles – Trans.

Asking Xi Jinping for permission to criticise

Article 41 of the Constitution of the People's Republic of China clearly states: "Citizens of the People's Republic of China have the right to criticize and make suggestions to any state organ or state employee; they have the right to file complaints, accusations or reports to the state organ concerned regarding any illegal or dereliction of duty behaviour by any state organ or state employee, but they must not fabricate or distort facts to make false accusations or frame others.

"The relevant state organs must investigate the facts and handle citizens' complaints, accusations or reports in a responsible manner. No one may suppress or retaliate against them."

This is a fundamental law that every citizen of the People's Republic of China should abide by. Calling the criticism of the masses "unwarranted discussion" is contrary to the provisions of the Constitution and is a gross violation of the Constitution.

As a Communist, we should have a good style of criticism and self-criticism. Chairman Mao said that the presence or absence of criticism and self-criticism is a distinctive mark that distinguishes Communists from other political parties. This is also the difference between a true Communist Party and a revisionist party. Revisionist parties are fascist parties, as Chairman Mao said, and they implement bourgeois fascist dictatorship and do not allow the masses to criticise or even speak. We cannot learn from the revisionist party and cannot do the fascist thing. We should act according to Chairman Mao's correct opinion.

Nowadays, people like to talk about "political rules". Normally carrying out criticism and self-criticism is the political norm for Communists. Whether the party's political life is lively or not depends mainly on whether there is criticism and self-criticism within the party. We still have to listen to Chairman Mao's words, "If people are allowed to speak, the sky will not fall, and we will not collapse. If people are not allowed to speak? Then it is inevitable that one day we will collapse." (People's Daily, June 21, 1967) Especially at present, for such an important and line-significant "Xi Jinping Thought on Socialism with Chinese Characteristics for a New Era" and the "Political Report of the 19th National Congress" prepared according to this thought, criticism and self-criticism should be allowed throughout the party.

To just brag, and to brag without limit, is not the style of the Communists, and even the bourgeois parties would not bother to do it. I am afraid it is still our feudal national essence. This is a vulgar regression. In his late years (February 11, 1891), our ancestor Engels wrote to Karl Kautsky, "It is also necessary to make people stop being overly cautious in treating party officials - their servants, and stop treating them like perfect bureaucrats, obeying them in everything and not criticising them." It seems that this is an old problem, and it is not surprising that the old disease has recurred now. We can only cure them according to the prescription prescribed by our ancestors - criticism.

Criticism must be based on facts and seek truth from facts. Everyone is studying the "Political Report", and several members of the Standing Committee have also asked the whole party and the people of the country to do the same. Well, let's comment directly on the "Political Report". Naturally, our opinions are mainly critical, because we think this "Report" is poorly written. It has neither the high-level theoretical style of our party during the Chairman's era nor true insights. Instead, it is full of errors and even the writing level is very poor. It is a genuine revisionist report, which is both a product of "Xi Jinping Thought on Socialism with Chinese Characteristics for a New Era" and a typical example of "Xi Jinping Thought on Socialism with Chinese Characteristics for a New Era". Viewed in this light, perhaps the only value of this report is that it is a very good negative example. Criticizing it from the perspective of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism is of positive significance for the entire Party and the people of the

country, as it enables them to once again recognize the fundamental differences between Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and revisionism on the question of China.

There are only two possibilities for criticism. One possibility is that the criticism is right, and the other possibility is that the criticism is wrong. We cannot only demand that the criticism is right. We should also allow criticism that is wrong. Following the important advice given by Comrade Xi Zhongxun³ before his death means protecting different opinions. This is an important summary of the party's historical experience and a major issue concerning whether the party's style is right or not. I hope that General Secretary Xi Jinping, as the core of the Party Central Committee and the core of the Party, will set a good example and handle this issue correctly. We must not be unhappy when we see "little people" raising opinions, and we must not make a fuss, suppress, block, or even arrest people. Let's try it and test whether there is the minimum democratic style that a Communist should have. The fate of this criticism can also be regarded as a small touchstone.

These days, it seems that everyone is too busy to read long articles. It may be because of the fast pace or the impetuosity. Whatever the reason, I have to give in. So, I divide the long articles into sections and titles to make them shorter, and publish them one by one, which may be easier to read.

³ Xi Zhongxun (October 15, 1913 – May 24, 2002) is the father of Xi Jinping. He became a member of the Communist Party of China in 1928. In 1932, Xi Zhongxun launched the Liangdang Mutiny, and then successively served as the chairman of the Soviet Government of the Shaanxi-Gansu Border Region and the secretary of the Guanzhong Special Committee of the Communist Party of China. After the victory of the Anti-Japanese War, Xi Zhongxun served as secretary of the Northwest Bureau of the CPC Central Committee and political commissar of the Shaanxi-Gansu-Ningjin-Sui Joint Defense Army. After the founding of the People's Republic of China, Xi Zhongxun served as a member of the Central People's Government, and a member of the People's Revolutionary Military Committee of the Central People's Government. Xi Zhongxun was criticised during the Cultural Revolution and emerged from it to follow the revisionist line of Deng Xiaoping – Trans.

The term "moderately prosperous society" is not a scientific concept of Marxism

General Secretary Xi Jinping clearly stated in the "Political Report of the 19th National Congress": "The theme of the Congress is: Never forget the original aspiration, keep in mind the mission, hold high the great banner of socialism with Chinese characteristics, win the decisive victory in building a moderately prosperous society in all respects, win the great victory of socialism with Chinese characteristics in the new era, and work tirelessly to realize the Chinese dream of the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation."

More than 2,000 years ago, the concept of "moderate prosperity" from the Book of Rites had a great influence in China. It briefly describes the transformation of human society from the primitive public ownership society of Datong⁴ to the moderately prosperous private ownership society. This is the memory of ancient history by mankind and the genius summary of thinkers. As far as the moderately prosperous society described in the Book of Rites is concerned, it is nothing more than a relatively self-sufficient and relatively stable class society based on private ownership. The "moderately prosperous society" pursued by later generations is also roughly the same.

What does this have to do with the ideals of the Communists, and with Marxist concepts of socialism and communism, which are scientific socio-economic and social forms?

Nothing at all.

This is not a scientific concept about socio-economic and social forms at all.

According to Deng Xiaoping's explanation, a "well-off society" is nothing more than a society that has solved the problem of food and clothing. For a Communist Party guided by scientific Marxist theory, it is ironic to use such a term as a "well-off society" as its own struggle program. Only Deng Xiaoping, a "big party boss who doesn't read books or newspapers", can do such a stupid thing. This reminds us of the famous saying of another clown, Khrushchev, "Beef stew with potatoes is communism." It is really a coincidence that the two revisionist leaders have such a consistent understanding of communism.

It is sad that the CPC, which bears the name of 'Chinese Marxism' and the signboard of 'socialism', can accept such a programme. Isn't it obvious to what extent this party has degenerated?

What is even more pathetic is that four decades have passed, and the Political Report of the 19th National Congress, which claims to have ushered in a 'new era of socialism with Chinese characteristics', still sets the goal of 'building a moderately prosperous society in all aspects' as its current goal of struggle. Doesn't this seem to be a deliberate attempt to vilify Xi Jinping Thought, which is written into the Party Constitution?

Do we still need to popularise Marxist common sense to the revisionist masters?

In the eyes of Marxists, the proletarian communist revolution is, in the final analysis, a change of social system, a revolution to replace the outdated capitalist system that is bound to perish with the communist social system necessary for the new historical development.

⁴ Datong is both the name of a city in Shanxi Province and also the title of an ancient book, translated as "The World of Great Harmony". The book depicts an ideal world where everyone is virtuous, everyone respects the elderly, everyone loves the young, there is no unevenness, and no one is lacking warmth – Trans.

This is a social revolution, not a productivity revolution, and certainly not a food and clothing revolution. In the eyes of Marxists, this is a replacement of the socio-economic and social forms. The productivity revolution is the inevitable premise of this social revolution. It is wrong and absurd to set the level of social productivity development as the goal of the Communists. According to the theory demonstrated in the Communist Manifesto, the bourgeoisie has prepared the productivity premise for the realization of socialism and communism. Naturally, the fact of subsequent historical development is that this productivity premise sometimes needs to be supplemented. However, even so, the goal of the Communists' struggle must not be just to put forward the productivity requirements.

As far as China's revolutionary practice is concerned, after the proletariat and the broad masses of working people seized power under the leadership of the Communist Party of China, due to the backward national conditions and backward productivity, there was a very urgent task of developing productivity in order to build socialism. Even Russia, which was much more advanced than China, also had huge deficiencies in productivity. Therefore, Lenin said that Soviet plus electrification is communism. It is not possible to not have electricity. The establishment of a socialist and communist society cannot be solid without its own economic foundation. Developing the economy is the basic task of all socialist countries. This is not a mysterious theoretical issue, it is common sense. As Marx said, human beings cannot survive if they do not produce for a week. People need to eat, wear clothes, and live a better and better life. This is the natural desire of human beings and a matter of course.

However, humans are not ordinary animals. They live in society and in groups. While pursuing material life, humans also pursue spiritual life and social life. In the long history of human private ownership class society, while creating their own material life, humans also created their own social life and spiritual life. However, as Marx liked to use the "alienation" viewpoint in his youth, all the progress of productivity created by humans has in turn brought endless suffering to humans. It seems that the progress of productivity has brought humans their own regression and the loss of human nature, that is, alienation. This is the fundamental characteristic and fundamental weakness of human class society. The great discovery of Marxism tells us that only when human history has developed to this day can we defeat the last class society, the capitalist society, and create a socialist society and a communist society through hard efforts and struggles. If we only talk about productivity and food and clothing, we will completely deviate from the actual process of human social historical development, and of course we will also deviate from the Marxist view of historical materialism.

The great ideal of communism is to eliminate the historical limitations of class society, eliminate private ownership, eliminate classes, and eliminate the superstructure and ideology corresponding to these foundations through the proletarian communist revolution under the possible conditions provided by history. This is what the "Communist Manifesto" calls for to achieve "two breaks", thereby enabling mankind to reproduce its good nature at a higher historical level and truly realise human freedom, equality, and fraternity (as Engels said at the end of "The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State").

This is a difficult historical process of continuous revolution. The Communists exist and take on the responsibility of leading this historical process. In this historical process, any principles, policies, and programs formulated by the Communists cannot deviate from the ultimate goal of achieving communism, which is the overall basic goal of struggle.

Marx discussed socialism, Lenin combined practice with more discussion, and Chairman Mao proposed the theory of socialist continuous revolution. In summary, the discussion of the revolutionary mentors explained that socialism is a process of continuous revolution of the social system from the perspectives of politics, economy, ideology and culture. We should not only talk about the

development of productivity and the solution of the problem of food and clothing, but also talk about the historical conditions for the elimination of classes from the perspectives of economic relations, political relations, ideological and cultural relations, and we should also talk about the issue of people, that is, the issue of human liberation. As Lenin said, socialism is the elimination of classes. The elimination of classes is not just a matter of productivity, nor is it a matter of food and clothing. When defining their historical tasks, the Communists must not only have economic indicators, but also, and even more so, political indicators, ideological and cultural indicators, indicators for the transformation of people, and indicators for the entire society. However, the word "moderately prosperous" has obliterated all of this. If we only talk about food and clothing, even pigs and dogs need food and clothing. How can this be written into the Communist Party's program? Isn't this too insulting to the Chinese Communists and the Chinese people?

It is neither surprising nor accidental that such a foolish act has occurred. First, these revisionists are not communists at all. As Deng Xiaoping himself admitted, he himself did not know what socialism is. He was not clear about socialism, let alone communism. In their minds, boosting production is everything, and the so-called "development is the hard truth" means this. This is obviously contrary to the Communist Party's goal of struggle solemnly declared in the Communist Manifesto.

Second, these revisionists do not understand the theory of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism at all. Marxism-Leninism-Maoism is a revolutionary doctrine, but this revolutionary doctrine is based on scientific theory, not a subjective good wish and pursuit. For more than 40 years, from Deng Xiaoping to the present, where is the theoretical cultivation of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism among the revisionist rulers? They only have pragmatism, not scientific research, so they can only say things like "cat theory", "touch theory", "breakthrough theory"⁵, and even "moderately prosperous" which is a vague statement, and they use their power to impose it on the whole party.

Third, the fundamental problem of these revisionists is still their class standpoint. The theory of communism is ultimately for the proletariat and the broad masses of working people to rise up and seek liberation, to replace private ownership with public ownership, to eliminate exploitation and classes; the dictatorship of the proletariat is also for this purpose. Therefore, every step forward in the cause of socialism and communism, the first and foremost consideration is the emancipation of the proletariat and the masses of the working people, which is not just a question of material productive forces or the level of economic development, but a question of what kind of society is to be constructed, or, as it is often said, the question of why the people are there. Deng Xiaoping and other revisionists have no concept of the masses in their minds. Their position is that of the bureaucratic, autocratic, and monopolistic bourgeoisie. Their "don't care" means that they don't care about the life and death of the working people, or their liberation. Their "hard truth" results in letting the bourgeoisie get rich first, especially letting the bureaucratic, autocratic, and monopolistic bourgeoisie get rich first. Their so-called "moderately prosperous" is just to give the people "food and clothing", a minimum condition that can guarantee the reproduction of labour, but they themselves are more than "moderately prosperous"? They have long been wealthy tycoons and big bourgeoisie with huge wealth in their hands. Therefore, they will not and dare not disclose their property.

⁵ "Cat theory" refers to Deng Xiaoping's encouragement to ignore the colour of the cat "so long as it catches mice"; "crossing the river by feeling the stones", also known as "touch theory", was a Chinese folk expression popularised by Chen Yun, an associate of Deng Xiaoping, and advocated ignoring theory and the experience of predecessors to find one's way by pragmatism and experiment; "breakthrough theory" is Deng Xiaoping's call for the courage to try and dare to break into the world as the practical method underlining all reform. Deng said "reform and opening up should be more bold, dare to experiment, do not be like a woman with small feet. If you see what you want, you should try boldly and break through boldly" – Trans.

When we say "never forget our original aspiration", what is the "original aspiration"? It means building socialism and communism. However, the concept of "moderately prosperous society" cannot express the scientific concept of socialism and communism, the ideal of the Communists, and the "original aspiration" that truly belongs to the proletariat and the broad masses of working people. To paraphrase the words of the revolutionary mentor, throw away the dirty shirt of "moderately prosperous society"! It damages the noble image of the Communists.

We must hold high the red flag of communism and implement into practice the specific requirements of every step forward, from politics, economy, ideology and culture to the development of society as a whole. This is what our great cause of communism requires, this is what embodies the scientific thought of continuous revolution of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, and this is the right path for mankind.

This is not a small matter, but a major one, the so-called 'what flag to hold and what path to take'. Whether or not we can draw a clear line with Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line, and whether or not we are going back to Deng Xiaoping's evil path of restoring capitalism, are all centrally reflected in this question of the programme. There can only be one choice, and there can be no compromise. Whether to build a 'moderately prosperous society' or a socialist or communist society is a test for General Secretary Xi Jinping, for every member of the Communist Party, and for the entire nation.

The correct answer of history is clear and unshakeable: socialism and communism are the only correct choice for the Chinese people.

We want a socialist and communist society, not a 'moderately prosperous society'!

10th November 2017

Dreams or ideals?

The "Chinese Dream" was proposed at the 18th National Congress. Five years later, the "Chinese Dream" was still proposed at the 19th National Congress. Can this be considered the original creation of "Xi Jinping Thought"?

Original creation cannot be considered. Martin Luther King's "I Have a Dream" has long been popular all over the world. Imitating others is always a joke. How can the leader of the Chinese Communist Party do such a stupid thing?

It doesn't matter where it was learned from. What matters is that this concept does not make sense at all.

The reason why Communists are called Communists is because they have the ideal of communism. The ideal of communism is scientific and reliable, and it can and should be pursued throughout one's life. For this ideal, countless Communists are willing to fight for their entire lives and give up everything they have, even their lives. The *Internationale*, the war song of the proletariat, sings about this truth, that is, to fight for the truth, to fight for the realisation of communism, and to firmly believe that communism must be realised and will definitely be realised.

This is the great ideal of the Communists.

Since the publication of the Communist Manifesto, the Communists, the proletariat and the broad masses of working people have been fighting for this great ideal. No matter where they are, no matter what the circumstances, whether it is difficult or victorious, the banner held high by the Communists is always the banner of the communist ideal.

I have never heard that the Communists want to raise the banner of dreams. This invention is not smart, it is stupid! Dreams, at most, express a desire, and often express an impossible desire. The so-called "dream on" means this. Regardless of the meaning, there is one thing that is beyond doubt, that is, the ideals of the Communists cannot be expressed by dreams.

The General Secretary does not have much literary talent, so there is no need to do such self-defeating tricks. I remember Lenin said, "Even if you peel my skin off, I still cannot write a poem." We will not demand that our party leaders have the same high literary talent as Chairman Mao. What we are afraid of is that we will embarrass ourselves. I think the "Chinese Dream" is an embarrassment.

Embarrassment is not the most important thing. The important thing is, how can a Communist Party that claims to believe in Marxism raise the banner of dreams?

Although there is only one character difference between dreams and ideals⁶, there is a world of difference between them. Giving up ideals and replacing them with dreams is a betrayal, a class betrayal. The communist ideal is a scientific ideological weapon for the proletariat and the broad masses of working people to seek liberation. Giving up this ideal is equivalent to disarming the proletariat and the broad masses of working people, and there is no possibility for the proletariat and the broad masses of working people to seek liberation. If this is not a betrayal of the proletariat and the broad masses of working people, what is it?

Dreams do not contain any scientific content and are a kind of deception.

⁶ In Chinese, "dream" is written as "梦想" and "ideal" as "理想", so the only difference is the first character of each word – Trans.

The only explanation for the "Chinese Dream" now is to realize the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation. However, it has not been made clear what the rejuvenation is about. What is the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation?

There was a Renaissance in history, but the real content of the Renaissance was the revolution of bourgeois ideology and culture, so it was great and had a high historical status.

But what is the "Chinese Dream" going to revive? Revive Confucianism? Revive feudal autocracy? Revive the Qin Emperor, Han Emperor, Tang Emperor, and Song Emperor? However, this kind of "revival" can only be a historical regression! Don't forget that our saint Lu Xun has long revealed that the word "cannibalism" is hidden between the lines of this period of history.⁷ If you say that "revival" means reviving "cannibalism", the General Secretary will definitely not agree. However, the facts cannot be changed. What is happening now is cannibalism, which may be the result of pursuing the "Chinese Dream".

What the Communists pursue is progress, revolution, the future, and breaking the old and establishing the new - breaking the old of capitalism and establishing the new of socialism and communism. This is the dialectics of historical progress. The revolutionary mentor has said more than once that we respect the dialectics of history, and the essence of this dialectics is critical and revolutionary, that is, the affirmative understanding of existing things includes the negative understanding of existing things, and everything is constantly advancing in affirmation and negation. This is a scientific world view and a scientific view of history. This is a criticism and negation of the absurd "rejuvenation" theory. "Rejuvenation" is just a copy of "Nine Catties Old Lady's Philosophy".⁸

This kind of dream can only be a nightmare. If it is put into practice, it will only be a nightmare, and the fact is that it is indeed a nightmare.

However, such nonsense as 'moderately prosperous society' and 'harmonious society' have been used as imperial edicts, and the whole Party and the whole country have to learn to say them. Over the past five years, the Chinese people have been forced to talk in their sleep and fulfil their dreams in this way, and they have simply become a sleepwalking nation, is this not an insult to the Chinese nation? Moreover, under a fascist dictatorship, whoever does not speak up is not in line with the Party Central Committee and the core, and whoever is labelled as usurping the power of the Party may be subject to dictatorship. This is worse than a nightmare because this is the reality.

As creepy as this is, I say to hell with the bullshit 'Chinese Dream'!

November 12, 2017

⁷ Lu Xun's 1918 story, "A Madman's Diary", depicted Confucianism as a man-eating society. See: [A Madman's Diary](#) – Trans.

⁸ The "old lady with nine catties" appears in Lu Xun's essay "The Comedy of the Nine Catties" (九斤老太). She is a symbolic character used by Lu Xun to critique a mindset resistant to change. The old lady often laments, saying: "It's not as good as before" (不如从前), representing a nostalgic yet uncritical attachment to the past. Despite her complaints, she adjusts her standards with every change, constantly comparing the present to an idealized version of the past that may not have been as good as she remembers. This embodies a paradox: dissatisfaction with progress while failing to challenge or fully grasp the issues of the past. Lu Xun uses this character as an allegory for certain conservative attitudes in Chinese society during his time. Her fixation on the "nine catties" (an old weight measurement) reflects how some people cling to outdated customs or ideals without adapting to evolving circumstances or understanding the potential benefits of change. This story is part of Lu Xun's broader efforts to provoke intellectual and cultural reform by exposing societal inertia and encouraging critical reflection – Trans.

What is the "original intention" of the Communists?

This is another unnecessary super nonsense, the so-called "never forget the original intention".

The moment the Communists took the oath of joining the party, they decided to dedicate their lives to the most magnificent cause of mankind - the cause of communism.

This is a noble, great and scientific ideal.

Generally speaking, this ideal cannot be simply expressed by the word "original intention". If we must use "original intention" to explain the problem, we must make the concept of "original intention" consistent with Marxism.

The key issue and the disagreement here are fundamentally about whether to adhere to Marxism, or in other words, whether to practice Marxism or revisionism?

General Secretary Xi Jinping said: "The original aspiration and mission of the Chinese Communists is to seek happiness for the Chinese people and rejuvenation for the Chinese nation." (See "The Political Report of the 19th National Congress") This is a bit like a universal saying, which seems to be correct, but is actually wrong. In the mouths of bourgeois politicians, such beautiful empty words can be said, and they are said a lot. This is exactly not what the Communists say.

Therefore, the title of this article is "What is the 'original aspiration' of the Communists?" The purpose is to talk about the "original aspiration" of the real Communists, and to explain that General Secretary Xi Jinping's "not forgetting the original aspiration" is not only forgetting the "original aspiration" of the real Communists, but also betraying the "original aspiration" of the real Communists.

Firstly, the Communist Party is a political party that wants to engage in communism. Communism is the most fundamental 'original intention' of communists.

A communist society requires a high degree of development of the productive forces so that it can provide sufficient material means of living for all the people. We can see that this day is getting closer and closer. Of course, this can only be a relative standard, and it is not possible or necessary to absolutise this requirement.

On the basis of the highly developed productive forces, the relations of production in a communist society are established, private ownership is eliminated, and 'to each according to his ability, to each according to his needs' becomes the custom of society. People live without exploitation, slavery, class or hierarchy.

In such a society, the state apparatus no longer exists, politics no longer exists, people manage society and themselves through the forms of management they create, and bid farewell to the state apparatus, police, army and other rulers and politicians forever. Everyone can develop freely and interact equally, achieving a truly harmonious society that mankind has never had before - not the current false and deceptive "harmonious society" with class antagonism.

It is based on this that the revolutionary mentor said that this theory can be summed up in one sentence: the abolition of private property (see The Communist Manifesto); it is "two breaks" - a break with traditional private property and a break with traditional old culture and old ideas (ibid.); it is "the realization of freedom, equality and fraternity in a higher form" (see The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State), and never use "empty bourgeois words such as fairness and justice" (see Marx and Engels' letter to Brack and others).

Only such scientific communism is the true "original intention" of the Communists. Isn't it a betrayal of the "original intention" of the Communists to replace the concept of communism with the concept of "community of human destiny"?

Second, the Communist Party is a revolutionary party and a party that "takes class struggle as the key link". This is also the "original intention" of the Communists and an indispensable "original intention" for realising communism.

Communism did not fall from the sky, nor was it a gift from the capitalists, nor was it something that would naturally "peacefully grow" as long as production developed. No, the arrival of communism is inseparable from struggle, and struggle is the driving force of the dialectical development of things. Communism can only be achieved through revolution, and this revolution is the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie. To realise communism, for a considerable period of time, we must adhere to "class struggle as the key link" and carry class struggle through to the end, and this end is to achieve the final elimination of classes. When classes are eliminated, they will no longer exist and will no longer be produced, and communism will have arrived.

Of course, there are many forms of revolution. Don't simply equate revolution with violence. The revolutionary mentors have never expressed it this way. Everything should proceed from reality, respect historical laws, respect historical experience, especially the historical experience gained with the blood of our ancestors.

If we must talk about the "original intention", Chairman Mao is the one who has truly not forgotten the "original intention". It is precisely based on the "original intention" of truly realizing communism that he must talk about "class struggle as the key link", he must read the true scriptures of Marxism, and make theoretical statements that combine Marxism with the new reality of the contemporary era.

Without class struggle and continued revolution, as we all know, can communism come? No. Not only can it not, but it will also degenerate into capitalism. What is corruption? It is a phenomenon of capitalism. When we talk about "class struggle as the key link", it is not that Chairman Mao artificially exaggerates or creates contradictions, but that class struggle actually exists, and it exists cruelly. Haven't we seen enough in the past forty years? Of course, there is a question of correctly handling class struggle. The historical lessons should not only not be forgotten, but also kept in mind. In reality, there are still misunderstandings of class struggle. Lenin and Chairman Mao have emphasised this kind of problem. The Soviet Union and China have lessons, especially the lessons of the Cultural Revolution. We must not forget them. Now some people still cannot correctly understand the Cultural Revolution and do not understand the Chairman's comprehensive summary of the Cultural Revolution. However, the main tendency of the current problem is not here, but to completely negate class struggle as the key link and completely negate the Cultural Revolution.

It is very clear that if we do not take class struggle as the key link and do not grasp the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, capitalism will inevitably be restored. In this case, what kind of communism and "original intention" can we talk about?

To be a communist and to build communism, we cannot do without class struggle, and we must insist on "class struggle as the key link". In fact, this is the principle of politics commanding the economy that Lenin has emphasised since then. What is politics? It is class struggle. It is based on this principle that we must list "class struggle as the key link" as the indispensable content and foundation of "original intention".

Third, the Communist Party in power must lead the development of the socialist economy, which can also be said to be the "original intention" of the Communists. However, developing the socialist economy is not just about developing productivity. The central point of developing the socialist economy is to embody the liberation of labour, that is, the liberation of the working people. Only in this way can the development of the socialist economy be in line with the "original intention" of the Communist Party.

This also involves a basic theoretical issue of Marxism.

As we all know, the secret of capitalist exploitation is to appropriate the surplus value created by the workers' surplus labour. This phenomenon was summarised by Marx as "alien ownership of labour", which is the "alienated labour theory" discussed by Marx in "Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844", and the "alienated labour theory" used many times in "Drafts of a Critique of Political Economy", including the "alienated labour theory" elaborated in "Capital".

As Engels said, Marx's theory is "the key to understanding the entire social and historical development found in the history of labour development".

This opinion of Marx is quite important. Marx started from revealing the secret of capitalist exploitation and explained that if we want to replace capitalism with communism, we must solve the problem of labour alienation. If the word alienation is difficult to understand, then in layman's terms, it is to solve the problem of returning labour to the hands of the working working class, that is, the problem of labour liberation. Labor should be liberated from creating surplus value for capitalists to creating wealth for workers.

This is actually the issue of "rebuilding personal ownership" on the basis of public ownership of the means of production, which is discussed in Chapter 24 of Capital and has caused domestic and international debates. In 2007, I wrote "An Important Theoretical Issue on Socialist Ownership", which specifically studied and answered this question. Those who are interested can check it out.

It is this theory that tells us that communism is to liberate labour, liberate the labour of workers from the hands of capitalists, and return it to the personal ownership of workers.

To achieve this, of course, certain conditions must be met. Simply put:

1. There must be a regime that protects the working people. As Lenin said, whoever holds the power decides everything.
2. Public ownership of the means of production must be implemented under the protection of the power.
3. Workers are the masters of production, manage production themselves, and work actively.
4. The fruits of labour, minus the need for reproduction, are distributed to workers on the principle of combining distribution according to work and distribution according to need.

And so on.

These conditions are by no means just a question of productivity development, nor just a question of GDP, nor even just a question of ownership declared on paper, but a question of whether workers have truly been liberated, which can only be reflected in the entire process of social production.

This is not a very profound question, but those theoretical swindlers certainly don't understand it.

Chairman Mao created an example. The "Daqing Spirit" embodies the liberation of labour, and the "Anshan Constitution" embodies the liberation of labour.

Deng Xiaoping's capitalist restoration provides a negative example. There are too many to list one by one. In short, Chinese workers have degenerated into wage labourers again, labour has been appropriated by capitalists again, and workers have been enslaved again.

In Chairman Mao's era, the working class worked hard and lived a hard life, but that was a true socialist economy.

In Deng Xiaoping's era, workers' lives improved, but it was still a capitalist economy.

This is the inevitable conclusion drawn based on communism, the "original intention" of the Communists.

From the perspective of the "original intention", the current capitalist economy is a complete betrayal of the "original intention". Without the liberation of labour and the liberation of workers, there would be no communism. "Don't forget the original intention" means not forgetting this point.

Fourth, the "original intention" of communism means to build a brand-new social union composed of brand-new people.

The Communist Manifesto declares that "the communist revolution is the most thorough break with traditional property relations; not surprisingly, it will make the most thorough break with traditional ideas in the course of its development." Only through such "two breaks" can we build a "union" based on "the free development of each person is the condition for the free development of all people" - the communist society.

This is a highly scientific summary of the historical development of human society. How can it be compared with the specious proposal of "community of human destiny"?

The prerequisite for the realisation of communism is the elimination of private ownership and the elimination of classes, so the Communist Manifesto, in discussing the prerequisites for a communist society, does not forget the statement that 'in place of the old bourgeois society with its classes and class antagonisms, there will be a communist society'.

This is the "original intention" of Marxist Communists. Now, private ownership still exists, and classes and class antagonism still exist. It is clearly a society with class antagonism. How can it be called a "community of human destiny"?

Chairman Mao's line broke with traditional private ownership; Deng Xiaoping's line restored private ownership. Chairman Mao's line broke with the old ideas and culture of the bourgeoisie and all exploiting classes; Deng Xiaoping's line restored the old ideas and culture of the feudal bourgeoisie.

One wants to build communism, the other wants to restore capitalism. In contrast, isn't it Deng Xiaoping's line that betrayed the "original intention" of the Communists? Now that we have to "adhere to Deng Xiaoping's line for a hundred years without wavering," what "original intention" of the Communists is there?

Communism is the 'original intention' of communists. Socialism is nothing but the first stage of communism, which is essentially communism. In terms of this principle, we were already building communism in Chairman Mao's time, but it was only a fledgling communism, very low, very substandard, very limited, and very unsatisfactory. It is precisely for this reason that it is necessary to make clear that the basic task of the socialist stage is the elimination of classes, that it is necessary to

put forward the theory of continued revolution under socialist conditions, and that it is necessary to insist on the socialist road, the communist road, and to oppose the capitalist road. Adherence to this Marxist-Leninist-Maoist revolutionary line is the true 'original intention' of the communists who are striving for the realisation of communism.

It is good and proper to go to the site of the First Congress to take the oath.⁹ Don't forget that the central idea of the oath is 'to strive for communism for life'. This is the 'original intention' that every member of the Communist Party must bear in mind. The pledge says, 'Never defect from the Party', and the first thing is not to betray the 'original intention' of 'striving for communism for life'.

Leaving Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist line, socialism and communism, there is no 'original intention' to speak of, and it is a betrayal of the 'original intention'. The revisionist line pursued by the contemporary Deng Xiaoping clique, which has led to the metamorphosis of capitalism in China, is a complete betrayal of the 'original mind' of the communists and an unqualified traitor to the cause of communism.

Looking at the issue from the perspective of this principle, since we have to adhere to Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line 'for 100 years without wavering', that is, to engage in the restoration of capitalism 'for 100 years without wavering', why do you still want to talk extravagantly about the 'original intention' of communism? Isn't this a deliberate attempt to deceive the people?

That's right. The characteristic feature of revisionism is to use the red flag to oppose the red flag. Deception is the hallmark of Deng Xiaoping's revisionist politics.

Comrades must not fall for it!

9 December 2017

⁹ In 2017, as the newly-elected General-Secretary of the CCP, Xi Jinping took six other top Party leaders to the memorial hall of the first CPC National Congress in Shanghai, and led them in reciting the admission oath in front of the Party flag, reminding Party members to remain true to their original aspirations – Trans.

How should we understand the main contradictions in Chinese society?

The 19th National Congress Political Report states that "socialism with Chinese characteristics has entered a new era, and the main contradiction in our society has transformed into the contradiction between the people's growing needs for a better life and the unbalanced and inadequate development."

This statement, which is touted as a "new judgment", is not only the theoretical basis of the 19th National Congress Political Report, the theoretical basis of the "new era" of socialism with Chinese characteristics, but also the theoretical basis of "Xi Jinping Thought".

It seems a bit important. So we need to do some analysis.

However, we have to point out that this is too shallow and absurd a formulation, which is simply devoid of any theoretical colour and, therefore, not worth refuting at all. What is more, it is nothing more than a replica of the erroneous formulation of the main contradiction in Chinese society in the political report of the Eighth National Congress of the Communist Party of China (CPC), which Chairman Mao criticised more than 60 years ago.

This is not surprising. Compared with Marxism, revisionism has never been like this. There is no theory, only short-sightedness. Seeing only a little bit of immediate interests, it has no far-reaching goals for the proletariat. It lacks the ability to think theoretically, lacks a rich knowledge of history, is detached from the actual class struggle, and does not have a firm proletarian position. Even if they are 'sincere', they are still deceiving themselves and others.

From Bernstein and Kautsky, through Khrushchev and Brezhnev, to Deng Xiaoping and Gorbachev, which one of them was not like that? Which one of them has any real decent theory? No, never. Originally, they thought that 'buying a copy of the Communist Manifesto is not as good as buying a sausage', and that 'potatoes and roast beef are communism', so where was the slightest hint of Marxism, where was the slightest hint of communism in their minds? They have never known what Marxism is and what communism is, so they cannot talk about adherence and pursuit.

Therefore, there is no need for us to spend too much space on criticising this reference. Instead, we might as well study more from the positive side of the issue to see how the real communists should really understand the major contradictions in society.

(1)

The main source of disagreement is the ideological approach to analysing the main contradictions in society. If the methods of thought are not the same, the conclusions drawn will certainly be different, and the methods and conclusions are united. Therefore, here, first of all, we should focus on the question of methods of thought.

The method of thought does not come out of thin air; it is not determined by whether one is clever or not; it depends first and foremost on the class position.

Communists are proletarian revolutionaries. This particular class position determines that the ideological method of the communists is the ideological method of the proletariat, and the proletariat's ideological method chooses Marxism. This is what Chairman Mao emphasised when he said, 'The theoretical basis for guiding our thought is Marxism-Leninism'.

There are all kinds of ideas and all kinds of doctrines in the world, and anyone has the freedom to choose, but the choice of the Communists is clear: Marxism.

However, the concoctors of the Political Report, though claiming to be communists and claiming that the Political Report is the analytical understanding of the main contradictions in society by communists, have completely left the Marxist method of analysing the main contradictions in society.

The method of analysing the main contradictions in society by communists and Marxists can only be the Marxist method of historical materialism.

The Communist Manifesto, the programme document of the proletariat, is a great example of the application of this method. This was clearly stated by Engels in the Preface to the 1883 German version of the Communist Manifesto.

Engels said: "The basic thought running through the Manifesto — that economic production, and the structure of society of every historical epoch necessarily arising therefrom, constitute the foundation for the political and intellectual history of that epoch; that consequently (ever since the dissolution of the primaeval communal ownership of land) all history has been a history of class struggles, of struggles between exploited and exploiting, between dominated and dominating classes at various stages of social evolution; that this struggle, however, has now reached a stage where the exploited and oppressed class (the proletariat) can no longer emancipate itself from the class which exploits and oppresses it (the bourgeoisie), without at the same time forever freeing the whole of society from exploitation, oppression, class struggles — this basic thought belongs solely and exclusively to Marx." This opinion was repeated in the "Preface" to the 1888 English edition of "The Communist Manifesto".

Engels told us that the basic idea implemented in The Communist Manifesto is the materialist conception of history. The materialist conception of history is the great discovery of the founder of Marxism and the only scientific conception of history for understanding human social history. It is both a conception of history and a methodology, a methodology for scientifically understanding human social history.

It is from this scientific view of history and scientific methodology that the Communist Manifesto scientifically explains that the history of human society since the disintegration of the primitive commune is the history of class struggle. The historical basis of this class struggle comes from the different stages of production development. "The bourgeoisie has played an extremely revolutionary role in history." The bourgeoisie led the "constant revolutionisation" of productive forces, production relations and all social relations. "The productive forces created by the bourgeoisie in its less than 100 years of class rule are more numerous and greater than those created by all previous generations combined." However, by the time when Marx and Engels lived, "the productive forces possessed by society could no longer promote the development of bourgeois civilization and bourgeois property relations; on the contrary, the productive forces had become so powerful that these relations could no longer adapt to the situation", so the era of a new socialist revolution was bound to arrive. "The task of the Communist Manifesto is to proclaim the inevitable demise of modern bourgeois property."

The Communist Manifesto uses the materialist conception of history to scientifically prove that "the demise of the bourgeoisie and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable", leaving the Communists with a scientific method and a model for learning to correctly analyse social contradictions. Communists must persist in using the materialist conception of history methodology when recognising the historical tasks they face.

Engels' teaching on the basic ideas implemented in the Communist Manifesto tells us that the application of the materialist conception of history must start from the contradictory movement of productive forces and production relations. This is the basis of the word "materialism", but the focus of cognition is on the scientific analysis of class relations and class struggles based on this economic relationship.

This is the correct way to understand and apply the materialist conception of history, and this is its true methodological significance.

The Manifesto says that "the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles"; analyses "bourgeoisie and proletariat"; explains that "at every stage of development of the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the Communists always represent the interests of the movement as a whole"; says that "the theoretical principles of the Communists are by no means based on ideas or principles invented or discovered by this or that world reformer. These principles are nothing more than the general expression of the real relations of the existing class struggle, the historical movement before our eyes", etc., etc. These assertions all reflect that the materialist conception of history is the conception of history that "takes class struggle as the key link". Undoubtedly, this class struggle is based on the different historical stages of production development, but it is not the conception of production history, nor the conception of economic history.

The materialist conception of history is a red line for understanding the history of human society, and this red line runs through the Communist Manifesto.

It is this method of understanding that can scientifically explain the historical mission of the Communists and provide scientific strategies for the proletarian socialist revolution led by the Communists.

This is the fundamental principle of our disagreement with all revisionists in understanding and applying the materialist conception of history.

At this point, I want to insert a piece of history.

In the 1980s, some scholars, in order to help others and to act as the so-called "court writers" that they had just scolded, saw that Deng Xiaoping denied "class struggle as the key link" and proposed "taking economic construction as the centre", so they also provoked a discussion on the "driving force of historical development" in the historical community. They denied that class struggle was the driving force of historical development, proposed that productivity was the driving force of historical development, and other similar views. In fact, this artificial debate was not an academic discussion, but a political necessity. Productivity is naturally the most basic driving force for the advancement of human society. Even if classes disappear, productivity still exists and society still progresses. Is there still a need for debate? The question is, as the object of social science research, at what level should we explain the history of class society? Comrade Liu Danian gave the best explanation of this point at the time. In short, the historical task of social science is to explain the movement of society. As the history of civilization, class struggle is naturally the fundamental driving force of social movement. Of course, the essence of class relations is economic relations and production relations, and the basis of these economic relations and production relations is productivity. These naturally need to be studied and explained, but from the perspective of the tasks of social science, class struggle is indeed the lever of social development. It is correct to say that it is the basic driving force, the main driving force, or the fundamental driving force. This does not exclude the driving force of productivity and production relations. It is precisely necessary to start with productivity and production relations.

The debate in the historical community at that time was actually a secondary battlefield between Marxism and revisionism, which was specifically manifested in the differences in the interpretation and application of historical materialism. Now, of course, even the cloak of historical materialism is gone.

Back to the topic.

The analysis and summary of the so-called "new era" main contradictions in Chinese society in the "Political Report of the 19th National Congress" violates Marxist historical materialism.

First, it doesn't make sense to say that this contradiction is the main social contradiction of the "new era".

The so-called "contradiction between the people's growing needs for a better life and the unbalanced and inadequate development" only exists in the new era. Didn't it exist in the past? No. It existed in the past and has always existed. At most, the word "people" has historical significance.

This statement is just a general statement about a contradiction of productivity, and it is not rigorous. What does "good life" mean? Food, clothing, housing and transportation? Or harmonious coexistence among people? Or becoming a billionaire? There are many implications, which are unclear and therefore unscientific. Generally speaking, "good life" is always needed, not just today; as for "increasing", it is always hoped for, not just today. Aren't people always pursuing the need for "good life"? When did people no longer need "good life"? Does this desire to pursue only occur in the "new era"? None of them make sense.

Second, the statement of "unbalanced and inadequate development" also makes no sense.

First of all, the sentence is not coherent. What is the "unbalanced and insufficient development" of? There is no explanation. A typical language feature of Wang Huning -- not using Chinese grammar. He made a fool of himself when he made the "July 1st Speech" for Jiang Zemin that year. Some scholars pointed out that there were at least 100 grammatical errors. This time, it is just a relapse of the old problem. Maybe he has learned too many foreign languages and can't speak his mother tongue Chinese. In the future, it is better to ask linguists to review such important documents at the end, otherwise it will be embarrassing. It's okay to embarrass an individual, but it's not good to embarrass the party -- even if it is a revisionist party.

Grammatical errors are minor, theoretical errors are major. The "unbalanced and inadequate development" here obviously refers to the "unbalanced and inadequate" development of production and economy, which is also a problem of productivity. However, when will productivity be balanced and sufficient? This is not theoretically and philosophically correct. The development of productivity, like the development of any other thing, is always moving forward through struggle and effort in the contradictory movement of balance and imbalance, sufficiency and insufficiency. Balance and sufficiency can only be relative. It is absurd and impossible to pursue absolute balance and sufficiency. Putting it into practice will lead to big mistakes.

As for saying that this "unbalanced and inadequate development" is a unique problem of the "new era", that is even more unreasonable. Production in any era will face the problem of "unbalanced and inadequate". Once the old "unbalanced and inadequate" is solved, new "unbalanced and inadequate" will appear, and it will never stop at a balanced and sufficient level. Electronic computers have made enough progress, and quantum computers are coming out. This is the law of human historical development, the law of production development and economic development, and a problem that is

constantly being solved and constantly emerging. It is definitely not a unique problem that only appears in the "new era".

Third, and most importantly, this conclusion, this method of cognition, does not conform to Marxism, does not conform to the Marxist method of historical materialism.

Since we are talking about the main contradiction in society, how can we only talk about the contradiction of productive forces? Is there still a contradiction between production relations and productive forces? Is there still a class contradiction?

Is there still a contradiction between the economic base and the superstructure? These are all basic social contradictions. Do they not exist? If we believe that they do not exist and are not the main contradiction, we must also give a theoretical explanation. But they do not give one.

The emergence of this erroneous formulation is not accidental. It can be said that this is an old issue in the repeated struggle between Marxism and revisionism within the party, and it is also a focal issue.

Anyone who knows a little about the party's history can see at a glance that this erroneous formulation is nothing more than a continuation of the erroneous formulations of the Eighth National Congress and the Third Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee, both of which deny Chairman Mao's scientific conclusion that class struggle exists in socialist society.

Chairman Mao inherited and developed the Marxist-Leninist understanding of socialist society, and proposed that in socialist society, there will still be class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and the struggle between the socialist road and the capitalist road. Therefore, we must adhere to class struggle as the key link and continue the revolution under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

This is a correct understanding of the main contradiction in socialist society and a scientific conclusion that conforms to the reality of socialist society.

However, the revisionists within the party do not understand the main contradiction in socialist society in this way.

The formulation of the Eighth National Congress was: "The principal contradiction in the country is the contradiction between the people's demand for an advanced industrial country and the reality of a backward agricultural country, and the contradiction between the people's need for rapid economic and cultural development and the current situation where the economy and culture cannot meet the people's needs."

The formulation of the Third Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee was: "The principal contradiction in our society is the contradiction between the people's growing material and cultural needs and the backward social production."

Obviously, the current erroneous formulation is nothing more than a continuation of the erroneous formulation in the past. It is fine to say that it is a development, but the development of the error makes the terminology even more clumsy and even more incomprehensible.

The fundamental error of this formulation is that it completely violates Marxism and the Marxist historical materialist method.

As we have said, the Marxist method of analysing social problems is mainly the method of historical materialism, which is modelled by the Communist Manifesto. According to this method, the analysis of the main contradictions in society starts from the development of production, but the final point

should be to analyse the class relations and class struggles based on a certain stage of production development, so as to formulate the revolutionary strategy of the proletariat. The revolutionary mentors all did this and led the revolution to victory after victory.

Should we also adhere to this analytical method when analyzing socialist society? There are differences between Marxists and revisionists. For example, Chairman Mao and Deng Xiaoping had differences.

Chairman Mao said, "Class struggle is the key link." Deng Xiaoping said, "The three directives are the key links." Chairman Mao criticized, "What three directives are the key links? Class struggle is the key link, and the rest are the details."

What is the "key link"? How is the "key link" found? The key link is the main contradiction in society. The key link is to find the main contradiction in society from many basic social contradictions. If the main contradiction in society is found correctly, the key link will be grasped correctly. On the contrary, if the main contradiction in society is not found correctly, the key link will be grasped incorrectly.

Society is a complex unity of contradictions. Social contradictions at all levels can be analysed. Marxism starts with the analysis of productivity and production relations, reveals the contradictions at all levels of society, takes class contradictions as the axis of many social contradictions, drives other social contradictions, and promotes the development of social movements. This is in line with social reality and is therefore scientific. "Class struggle as the key link" is a concise expression of this scientific analysis method.

However, the analytical method of the "19th National Congress Political Report" clearly betrayed this Marxist analytical method. It made the same methodological mistakes as the 8th National Congress and the 3rd Plenary Session of the 11th Central Committee when analysing the main social contradictions.

The main problem is that it only talks about the contradictions of productive forces, not class contradictions, not social contradictions, only talks about the economy, not politics, and the party has become a production party. This is the common methodological mistake of these three statements. Although the level of expression varies, the 19th National Congress is the worst.

Chairman Mao said, "Not many people in our party really understand Marxism-Leninism." This is true. Such an important report was written by the most capable writer, but he wrote such layman's words without any understanding of Marxism-Leninism. This shows that the revisionists are really "completely ignorant of theory" as the revolutionary mentor said.

The emergence of these three revisionist propositions should be said to be related to Deng Xiaoping. Deng Xiaoping's thinking method is a typical revisionist thinking method. From "Three Directives as the Guideline" to "One Centre and Two Basic Points", to "No Matter Whether it Socialism or Capitalism", "Development is the Hard Truth", etc., his basic thinking method is "No Matter Whether it is a Black or White Cat" "Theory of Productivity Only", which only looks at productivity, not production relations, class relations, and superstructure. To use a popular old saying to criticize him, it is "Only looking at grain, cotton and oil, not distinguishing between enemies and friends".

This is where the problem lies. Of course, productivity must be looked at, and "grain, cotton and oil" must be looked at, but "only looking at" is wrong. The "19th National Congress Political Report" is "only looking at". This statement only looks at the imbalance and insufficiency of production and economic development. As for the form in which this production and economy develop, what are the class relations, class contradictions, and class struggles, whether it is a socialist economy or a capitalist economy, and what kind of social conditions it will lead to, all of this is beyond their vision.

This way of thinking and cognition has nothing in common with the Marxist way of thinking and cognition, and is anti-Marxist.

This way of thinking and this theoretical framework are rooted in Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line.

The first "representative" of Jiang Zemin's "Three Represents" is to only talk about productivity, and it doesn't make sense. The Communist Party is a political party, how can it represent the requirements of the development of productivity? The Communist Party can represent the requirements of the development of production relations and promote the development of productivity by changing production relations, but it cannot directly represent the requirements of the development of productivity. Only manual and mental labourers embody the requirements of the development of productivity. Hu Jintao's "Scientific Outlook on Development" is more obviously just talking about the scientific development of production and economy, and it is only a matter of productivity. The current "Xi Jinping Thought" is just a stupider statement, and the basic theory has not changed. It can be seen that these erroneous statements are in the same vein, all of which only talk about productivity, are "cat theories", and the root cause is Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line.

Some people use the excuse that the Communist Party was a revolutionary party before seizing power and was engaged in class struggle; after seizing power, it became a ruling party and was no longer a revolutionary party. This is absurd and untenable.

It is true that it became a ruling party after seizing power, but does it mean that the ruling party is no longer revolutionary and has no revolutionary historical mission? This is where the disagreement lies.

The Communist Party is a political party. I am afraid no one will object to this. The Communist Party is not an enterprise, not a production party, and I am afraid no one will object to this.

A political party is, of course, a party that engages in politics. In today's world, all political parties are probably like this. And the core issue is to seize power. In a brief letter to the Italian Party in his later years, Engels made this point very straightforward. He emphasised that only by adhering to class struggle and persisting in the ultimate goal of seizing power through class struggle can it be a Marxist working class party. It is based on this criterion that he fully affirmed the Italian Party.

The reasoning of Engels is not complicated. Politics is class struggle. The central point of politics is the issue of political power. No political party can avoid this basic issue.

However, when analysing the basic contradictions of society, the "Political Report of the 19th National Congress" only has economic analysis, not political analysis. The economic analysis also only talks about productivity and analyses productivity.

This is an old problem in the struggle between Marxism and revisionism, an old problem in the struggle between Chairman Mao's Marxist revolutionary line and Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line, and an old problem in the struggle between Chairman Mao and Deng Xiaoping. The "Political Report of the 19th National Congress" is just a continuation of this struggle.

The essence of the difference in understanding of the principal social contradiction and in the method of understanding lies here. This is the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the struggle between the Marxist world outlook and the revisionist world outlook, and the struggle between Marxist historical materialism and revisionist historical idealism.

(2)

Different ways of thinking naturally lead to different understandings of the main contradictions in society. Specifically, the issue we are debating now is how to understand the main contradictions in today's Chinese society. There are also inevitable fundamental differences.

How to understand the main contradictions in society will determine how to understand the nature of society. How to answer this question is a basic question that Communists must correctly answer when determining their historical tasks and struggle strategies.

At present, there are fundamental differences in the view of the nature of Chinese society. This difference comes from the difference in the understanding of the main contradictions in society.

The "Political Report of the 19th National Congress" said that we are facing a "socialist society with Chinese characteristics." In our view, we are no longer facing a socialist society with Chinese characteristics, but a transformed (often using the word "restoration", but it is not a simple restoration) bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalist society with Chinese characteristics. This fundamental difference in the view of the nature of China's current society is the inevitable result of the fundamental opposition in the understanding of the main contradictions in Chinese society.

Let us further analyse the errors in the main social contradictions discussed in the 19th National Congress Political Report from the standpoint, viewpoint and method of Marxism.

Let us first discuss the errors in the second half of this sentence, the so-called "unbalanced and inadequate development".

Lenin has a famous saying that communism is equal to Soviets plus electrification. Lenin said this repeatedly. Soviets refer to the dictatorship of the proletariat, and electrification refers to productivity. This formula and this principle tell us that after the Communists establish the dictatorship of the proletariat and take power, they must attach importance to the development and construction of productivity and must be good at using all the advanced technologies and management systems provided by capitalism, because this is the foundation of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The two are unified and indispensable. Without Soviets, electrification, and highly developed productivity, there would be no socialism or communism. Lenin was absolutely right.

Based on this principle, it is natural for the Communists to attach importance to the development of productivity when they are in power. Vigorously developing productivity and focusing on economic construction must be a long-term basic historical task and a long-term basic strategic policy. Grasping revolution and promoting production, one of the main purposes of grasping revolution is to promote production. Only by grasping revolution can we liberate productivity. Attaching importance to the development of productivity is not only good, but also a necessity for the socialist revolution. This is the true meaning of the theory of socialist continued revolution.

However, the 19th National Congress Political Report completely misses the point in its statement on this major issue. The "inadequate and unbalanced development" probably refers to productivity and the economy. Here we will discuss how to correctly understand this issue from the perspective of productivity.

When Lenin talked about electrification, he grasped the embodiment and symbol of the development of productivity in a specific era. As we all know, the means of production are the embodiment and symbol of productivity in a specific historical era. The means of production are created, used, and developed by labourers. Only when the labourers and the means of production are united can we talk about productivity. As far as the means of production used by labourers are concerned, there are the so-called Paleolithic Age, the Neolithic Age, the Iron Age, the Machine Age, etc. In the Machine Age,

there is the Steam Engine Age, the Electrification Age, and so on. The development of the means of production is the embodiment and symbol of the development of productivity. Lenin grasped electrification, which was the key to developing productivity at that time. He grasped the Soviets, which was the guarantee for developing productivity at that time. Politics commands the economy. This is a scientific way of thinking and political policy for analysing and dealing with the development of productivity. However, when we say "inadequate", we don't know what inadequate is and what is sufficient. When we say "unbalanced", we don't know what unbalanced is and what is balanced. This cannot be used as a program or policy for people to put into practice clearly.

First of all, we need to understand what the symbol of contemporary productivity is. I think it is the mechanisation of artificial intelligence. There is a process of understanding this issue, and it is still under study. In the past, there were many sayings such as the electronic age and the computer age. However, as the development process of contemporary productivity continues to unfold, I think, in summary, these sayings all refer to the mechanisation of artificial intelligence.

Since humans entered the mechanised era, we can further divide the stages based on energy and power. However, from a macro perspective, the development of artificial intelligence-operated machinery is an epoch-making leap compared to manual operation of machinery. It is this leap that allows us to see that the most fundamental feature of contemporary production tools is artificial intelligence mechanisation, which is the embodiment and symbol of contemporary productivity.

However, the "Political Report of the 19th National Congress" did not understand the current productivity issues in China from the embodiment and symbol of this contemporary productivity, nor did it see the historical role of workers in creating contemporary productivity.

Productivity always develops in certain production relations. The study of productivity issues is inseparable from production relations, and production relations are inseparable from politics. Only by combining production relations and political relations can we correctly understand the current development of productivity. This is the minimum requirement of Marxist socialist political economics and the minimum requirement of socialist workers' political economics.

In other words, we cannot understand this problem from the perspective of bourgeois political economics.

In connection with China's current reality, I think we can at least see where the main problem of "insufficient" development of productivity lies.

I think it is mainly because the development of productivity is severely constrained by production relations. The development of artificial intelligence mechanised productivity in my country does not meet the objective requirements of economic development and the objective requirements of the times. If it is "insufficient", it should be understood in this way.

This problem arises mainly from the fundamental question of the path of our economic development. Whether it is the road of independent socialism or the road of subordinate capitalism dependent on the imperialist economy determines the fate of our relations of production, the fate of our labour force and, ultimately, the fate of the development of our productive forces.

The road of 'making shirts for foreign countries for another 30 years' is the road of a dependent economy, in which we sell cheap labour and use backward means of production. It is impossible for such productive forces to be fully developed and to take the lead in modern times.

Similarly, the path of passive dependence on foreign investment is also a path that hinders the development of productive forces. It is not wrong to actively introduce foreign capital, and it is possible to take over at a certain cost. However, it is totally wrong to rely fully on foreign investment, to lose control and to become a vassal. Many large industrial enterprises are said to be joint ventures, but the core technology, that is, the core productivity, is in the hands of foreign investors, and we are merely acting as multinational wage earners, which is a typical revisionist mistake in the economic line. Under such circumstances, it is simply impossible for our productivity to be raised.

The deeper question is whether to develop the productive forces under capitalist economic relations or under socialist economic relations, whether to treat workers as wage labourers or to liberate the productive forces so that workers can exercise their mastery and autonomous creativity, which makes all the difference in terms of the outcome of the development of the productive forces. The fact is that we have chosen to produce under capitalist economic relations. In this way, for the wage labourers, there is no invention of the productive forces to speak of, and the most active and positive factors in the development of the productive forces are stifled. This is the capitalist mode of production for the development of the productive forces, which is in complete opposition to the 'Angang Constitution'.¹⁰

To paraphrase the 'Three Represents',¹¹ the Communist Party represents the demands that hinder the development of the productive forces and satisfy the demands of the internal and external capitalist economy for the exploitation of surplus value. Is such a 'representative' still a 'Communist Party'?

Science and technology are the soul of productivity. Artificial intelligence is the soul of productivity in today's world. First, there is artificial intelligence, and second, there is basic industry. The unity of the two is artificial intelligence mechanisation. The realisation of this point ultimately depends on people, on mental and physical workers. Only by adhering to independence and self-reliance, to use an old saying we often say, only by adhering to Chairman Mao's economic development line, that is, the people's democratic dictatorship plus artificial intelligence mechanisation, can China's productivity be at the forefront of the world. This is evidenced by the positive experience of Chairman Mao's era and the achievements of some successful companies today.

This is our Marxist understanding of the laws of production, especially the development of the productive forces. The so-called 'insufficient and unbalanced' development in the Political Report of the 19th National Congress, firstly, fails to identify the signs of contemporary development of the productive forces, and secondly, fails to look at the problem from the perspective of the reaction of the relations of production on the productive forces, and how to emancipate the productive forces, and as a result, it only fails to get to the point, and people are not able to grasp the meaning of what is being said.

The reasoning is not complicated. Chairman Mao has said and practised it over and over again. If you don't listen, if you don't understand it, and if you despise Chairman Mao, the result can only be that it goes in the opposite direction.

¹⁰ The Constitution of the Anshan Iron and Steel Corporation was adopted in 1960. It vested power in the hands of the workers and aimed at narrowing differences between them. Mao Zedong was a strong supporter of the Angang Constitution – Trans.

¹¹ Jiang Zemin's "Theory of the Three Represents" called on the Party to: Represent the development trend of China's advanced productive forces; Represent the orientation of China's advanced culture; and Represent the fundamental interests of the overwhelming majority of the Chinese people. It resulted in millionaires being able to join the CCP as part of China's "advanced productive forces" – Trans.

We should still listen to Chairman Mao's words, adhere to the 'Angang Constitution' and take the Chinese road to socialism. Independence, self-reliance, mobilisation of all positive human factors, artificial intelligence mechanisation to drive the development of the entire productive forces.

Then we come back to the first half of the sentence 'the people's growing need for a better life'. Needless to say, this sentence is obviously not written in a fluent manner, and the main problem lies in the theory.

The people do want to live a good life. But what is a good life and what is meant by a good life here? It has not been made clear. Whether it is not clear, or whether it does not want to be clear, it is not said. We can only analyse it.

Firstly, when it comes to 'the people's growing need for a better life', it seems to be relative to 'insufficient and unbalanced development'. In this regard, it may refer to the material 'needs for a better life'. However, the phrase does not specify what kind of material conditions are to be attained and what is to be considered 'the needs for a good life', which makes it impossible to understand precisely.

A bigger problem lies in the fact that the 'people' mentioned here is a very big and very broad concept, and the people within the 'people' can be divided. Even if this is not the case, the existence of different groups of people within the people is an obvious fact that is widely recognised. The reality of the living conditions of these different groups of people is very different. The extreme extravagance of the billionaires at the 'high end of the population' and the poverty of the 'low end of the population' are already a huge polarisation that can be seen everywhere. Can these two extremely different groups of people have the same need for a 'good life'? In the Political Report of the 19th National Congress, who exactly are the 'people' referred to? The billionaires? Or does it mean the 'lower end of the population'? There is a huge difference between the two in terms of the need for a 'good life'!

In the face of this distinction, it is impossible to reflect the 'people's growing need for a better life' by taking the total amount of economic production or per capita income, because the people's real living conditions are not determined by the average distribution of the total amount of economic production; these totals and averages have only numerical significance, and the actual life is distributed according to the capital, and thus generates great polarisation.

There is no profound truth in this. This is the reality of life. Every person living on Chinese soil feels it every day: on one side there is endless joy, and on the other side there is endless sadness. Under this artificially caused bipolar economic relationship, if you say you want to give people a "better life" and "increase day by day", no one will believe it. It's a lie!

Second, the deeper error in this statement of the main contradiction in society is that it limits the people's "needs for a better life" to the needs of material life, which is a mistake that completely betrays the principles of socialism.

The 19th National Congress Political Report is a report on building "socialism with Chinese characteristics". Regardless of the "characteristics", since it is said to be "socialism", then to use the words emphasised by General Secretary Xi Jinping since he took office: "The basic principles of socialism cannot be abandoned. If they are abandoned, it will no longer be socialism."

That's right.

Then based on the basic principles of socialism, how should we understand the "needs for a better life" of the people in a socialist society?

In order to survive, human beings have to work most of the time. Work is an important part of people's lives. This is true in any society. When talking about the "good life" of the people under the conditions of socialist society, it is natural to talk about work, for whom to work, and how to work. This is a major theoretical issue, and one of principle, that distinguishes socialist society from capitalist society and other exploitative class societies.

Since the publication of the Communist Manifesto, the revolutionary mentors of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism have repeatedly emphasised that socialism is the liberation of labour and the liberation of the working people. Wage workers in capitalist society become masters of labour in socialist society. In the past, labour created surplus value for capitalists, but now labour creates a better life for the people themselves. In the past, they were enslaved wage workers, but under socialism they are conscious and active workers for the whole society and for themselves. In the past, labour was suffering, but in a socialist society labour is happiness. The "Anshan Constitution" and the "Daqing Spirit" embody the essential characteristics of this socialist labour.

The position of workers in labour is determined by the position of workers in possession of the means of production. The means of production are owned by workers, which is the basis of socialist production relations. Once the means of production are owned by capitalists, workers can only become wage labourers again. Therefore, when examining the position of workers in labour, it is inseparable from the examination of the ownership of the means of production.

How to work and for whom to work is one of the fundamental boundaries between socialism and capitalism. When examining the people's "needs for a better life", these issues cannot be ignored.

However, when describing the people's "needs for a better life" and "inadequate and unbalanced development", the "Political Report of the 19th National Congress" did not mention the status and conditions of the working people in their work at all, as if how to work, for whom to work, and who owns the means of production are not included in the list of the people's "needs for a better life" and are not the basic content of the people's "good life". A Communist Party that claims to be socialist, without knowing who owns the means of production, the status of workers in their work, in a word, without knowing the production relations, and talking about the "people's growing needs for a better life" without any boundaries, isn't this just writing a worthless empty check and deceiving the working people with beautiful empty words that are essentially revisionism and the bourgeois?

This is a serious theoretical error of principle, a typical revisionist cliché of "potatoes and beef", and completely contrary to the fundamental purpose of the Communists to build socialism and communism. General Secretary Xi Jinping said "don't forget the original intention", but his "Political Report of the 19th National Congress" actually forgot the "original intention" of the Communists.

Third, the fundamental error in this statement of the main contradictions in Chinese society at present is that it has left the essence of socialism, the people's democratic dictatorship, and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The essence of socialist society is the people's democratic dictatorship and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin put the Soviets first and said that "socialism is the elimination of classes", which means he put the dictatorship of the proletariat first. Chairman Mao said that "class struggle is the key link" and that the revolution should be continued under socialist conditions, which also put the dictatorship of the proletariat (a specific form is the people's democratic dictatorship) first. Only when the dictatorship of the proletariat exists can there be socialism. Without the dictatorship of the proletariat, there would be no social status for the working people, no public ownership, and nothing for the working people. Lenin said that the class in which the political power is held determines

everything. This is an absolute truth. It is this truth that tells us that the greatest "need for a better life" of the working people is to have the people's democratic dictatorship and the dictatorship of the proletariat. In simple terms, it is for the working people to be the masters of their own country.

The truth is very simple and clear. Only when the working people are masters of their own affairs can they live as masters of society. If they lose their mastery of their own affairs, they will degenerate into wage labourers and slaves of the bourgeoisie. Forty years of history have vividly unfolded this fact, the fact that capitalism has been restored and the working people have suffered again. No amount of sophistry can cover up the bloody truth or alleviate the suffering of the working people.

Who is in charge? This is social life, this is the essence of social life. When we talk about whether the people, the working people, have a good life, the first question is whether the working people are the masters of the country. Without the people's democratic dictatorship, without the dictatorship of the proletariat, without the people being the masters of their own house, it is impossible to have a good life, and they can only be wage earners, slaves, and can only be called the 'low end of the population' and the 'fart people'.

Like all revisionists, the Political Report of the 19th National Congress deliberately avoids the commander-in-chief of the whole of social life, the ---- dictatorship of the proletariat, which is the core of all political struggles and class struggles, that is to say, it avoids the core issue of the working people being masters of their own house.

The greatest advantage of socialist society and the most fundamental difference from capitalist society lies in the dictatorship of the proletariat and the fact that the working people are the masters of their own country. The reason why the working people in socialist society have a good life is that in this society, the working people have become the masters of society for the first time. The song "Socialism is Good" expresses this truth: "Socialism is good, socialism is good, and the people in socialist countries have a high status."

The people's democratic dictatorship and the dictatorship of the proletariat are the lifeblood of the working people. When power is in the hands of the working people, life will always be good and can "grow day by day". If power is lost, no matter how "full" and "balanced" production development is, in the end, it will only belong to the monopoly bourgeoisie at home and abroad, not to the working people. What the working people can only get is the "new three mountains"¹² and a miserable life. As for the "good life", as has already happened, it can only belong to the monopoly bourgeoisie.

The basis of social problems lies in production relations, economic relations, and class relations and class struggles arising from such economic relations. The central issue of class struggle is the issue of political power. This is the most basic theory and method of historical materialism in Marxism. We have already talked about it in the first section. The specific analysis here shows us again that the "Political Report of the 19th National Congress" violates such analysis. It does not talk about the contradictions in production relations and economic relations, the contradictions in class relations and class struggle, the nature of political power, the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the people being the masters of the country. Without these basic contradictions and these basic issues, nothing can be explained clearly. In this case, boasting that a new major social contradiction in the new era has been found can only result in nonsense and make people laugh.

¹² Chairman Mao said that prior to Liberation, 'three big mountains' -- imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism, had oppressed the Chinese people. Since the restoration of capitalism, three new big mountains have emerged to oppress the people: they refer to people's livelihood problems and difficulties in medical care, education, and housing -Trans.

Filling "Xi Jinping Thought" with such absurd theories is simply a mockery of Xi Jinping, and is like putting on the emperor's new clothes for Xi Jinping.

They harmed Jiang Zemin, then Hu Jintao, and now they are harming Xi Jinping. Wang Huning¹³ is mean enough, and the emperor is stupid enough. You see, the unstoppable laughter and well-intentioned calls can't stop the model performance of the emperor's new clothes.

(3)

So, how should we understand the main contradictions in today's Chinese society?

Before discussing this issue, we must first talk about Chairman Mao's views on the main contradictions in socialist society. We can also say that we must first defend Chairman Mao. Because Chairman Mao's theory on socialism and the theory that revolution should continue under socialist conditions were negated by the "Resolution"¹⁴ made by the Chinese Communist Party, which still flies his banner.

However, the nearly 40 years of history since the negation have irrefutably proved that the negative conclusion made by the "Resolution" is wrong. Chairman Mao is right, and it is the "Resolution" that should be negated. I have a more detailed discussion on this issue in my book "Re-understanding Mao Zedong, Re-understanding Deng Xiaoping", and comrades who are interested can check it out. I will not repeat it here. I will only briefly talk about Chairman Mao's theory.

A key issue here, and also a key issue that has caused differences, is how to understand socialist society.

It should be pointed out that the understanding and theory of the revolutionary mentors of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism on this issue are consistent, unified and coherent. The only difference is that with the development and change of historical conditions, the understanding and theory of socialist society are also developing and changing.

From the publication of the Communist Manifesto by Marx and Engels to the subsequent series of works on scientific socialism, including letters, there are several basic ideas that are clear.

1. The transition from capitalist to communist society involves a transitional period and a process of class elimination, and in order to achieve this there must be a dictatorship of the proletariat.
2. The dictatorship of the proletariat exists in relation to the revolt of the bourgeoisie and is an indispensable instrument of the class struggle.
3. Socialist society is a process of constant revolution, because this society has developed from capitalist society and cannot but bear the traces of the old society, and it is only through such a process

¹³ Wang Huning (born 6 October 1955) is a political figure of the Communist Party of China and the People's Republic of China, a political scientist, and a national-level leader. He is currently a member of the Standing Committee of the Political Bureau of the CPC Central Committee, Chairman and Secretary of the Party Leadership Group of the National Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference, Deputy Director and Director of the Office of the Central Committee for Comprehensively Deepening Reform, and President of the China Council for the Promotion of Peaceful Reunification. Wang Huning is considered to be the political think tank and theoretical writer of Jiang Zemin, Hu Jintao, and Xi Jinping for three consecutive terms as general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, and has been responsible for political theory work within the party for a long time, known as the "National Teacher of the Three Dynasties" – Trans.

¹⁴ The Resolution on Certain Questions in the History of Our Party since the Founding of the People's Republic of China is a 1981 document which was unanimously adopted by the sixth plenary session of the Eleventh Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party on 27 June 1981. It expressed Deng Xiaoping's determination to repudiate the Cultural Revolution, impose revisionism on the Chinese Party and set it firmly on the road to a restoration of capitalism – Trans.

of constant revolution that the classes can be eliminated and the foundations created on which the classes can neither exist nor arise again, and thus the transition can be made to a classless, completely new communist society.

4. In a typical fully socialist society, which is only the first stage of a communist society, the mode of distribution can only be mainly 'distribution according to labour'. (Practice has shown that it is also necessary to combine it with 'distribution according to needs' and gradually increase the content of 'distribution according to needs'). 'Distribution according to labour' does not go beyond bourgeois right. This is the basis for the continued existence of the dictatorship of the proletariat, since it is necessary to limit the bourgeois right and its influence.

It may be that my generalisation is incomplete, but it is also already clear from just these basic ideas that I have summarised that, in the Marxist view, socialist society must adhere to the dictatorship of the proletariat, and that the dictatorship of the proletariat exists because the class struggle still exists, and that the dictatorship of the proletariat can be said to be the class struggle.

Lenin inherited and developed the Marxist theory of socialist revolution, thus advancing Marxism to the Leninist stage.

Lenin is another great genius after Marx. Lenin is a well-deserved theoretical master of Marxism. Lenin has had a very good and mature Marxist theoretical cultivation since his youth. The book "What the "Friends of the People" are and How They Attack the Social Democrats" written at the age of 24 is already a mature and outstanding Marxist theoretical work. Lenin is also a great revolutionary practitioner. Lenin not only successfully led the great October Socialist Revolution, but also successfully led the 7-year socialist continued revolution and socialist economic construction. He also timely and profoundly summarised the theoretical experience of socialist revolution, socialist continued revolution and socialist economic construction from the struggle practice of these two historical stages. It is the two great theoretical achievements of these two historical stages that developed Marxism to the stage of Leninism.

Here we mainly discuss Lenin's latter theoretical achievement, namely, the theoretical contribution to the continued revolution and economic construction of socialist society.

1. Lenin inherited the theoretical thought of Marx and Engels that socialist society must adhere to the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin clearly pointed out that socialist society is a historical period of struggle between declining capitalism and growing communism. Socialism is the elimination of classes. This is the theoretical basis for adhering to the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin clearly pointed out for the first time that the dictatorship of the proletariat is the continuation of class struggle under the condition of the proletariat being in power. It can be said that this is the first clear statement of the theory of continued socialist revolution.

2. Lenin saw that the newly built socialist society was impure, incomplete, and not typical. Lenin believed that from a political point of view, the dictatorship of the proletariat had been established, and therefore it was qualified to be called a socialist republic; however, once it came to economic relations, it could not be said to be completely socialist because there were many economic elements. Lenin said there were five: "(1) patriarchal, that is, largely natural peasant economy; (2) small commodity production (including the majority of the people who sold grain); (3) private capitalism; (4) state capitalism; (5) socialism." (Selected Works of Lenin, Vol. 3, p. 511) Obviously, only the last one is a truly socialist economic relationship. During the period when Lenin was in power, he repeatedly used this idea to warn the whole party and guide the work of the whole party. The implementation of the

New Economic Policy is to implement the proletarian state capitalism. As Lenin emphasized, this is something that Marx and Engels never said before. It is our brand-new creation.

It is precisely because of the recognition of the coexistence of such multiple economic elements that class struggle is inevitable. Therefore, the existence and operation of the dictatorship of the proletariat is also inevitable and necessary.

3. Lenin correctly solved the relationship between the dictatorship of the proletariat and the development of the economy. Lenin wrote many times in a vivid way: "Communism is Soviet power plus national electrification." He also wrote: "Soviet power plus Prussian railway management system plus American technology and trust organization plus American national education and so on and so on equals socialism."

This formula is of profound significance.

Lenin was well aware of the significance of economic development. Lenin said: "Labor productivity is, in the final analysis, the most important and primary thing to ensure the victory of the new social system." He also said: "Improving labour productivity is a fundamental task, because without this, it will be impossible to finally transition to communism." Lenin's teachings are correct. Without the development of productivity and without the premise of highly developed productivity, it is impossible to reliably build the production relationship foundation of socialism and communism, and it is impossible for socialist and communist society to be consolidated and to achieve final victory. Lenin believed that "our main politics now should be to engage in the economic construction of the country." Lenin firmly opposed empty politics and pointed out sharply: "The best politics in the future is to talk less about politics."

However, Lenin was not a productivity theorist. Lenin's formula was that the Soviets were at the head. The dictatorship of the proletariat, the politics of the proletariat, was the commander and the soul. When Trotsky criticised Lenin for saying that the best politics was to talk less about politics, Lenin retorted, "I did say that, but what I meant was that after the correct political line was established, we should talk less about politics. The problem now is that there is something wrong with politics, and "politics, compared with economics, must take the first place."

Lenin was absolutely right. This is an important Leninist theory on building socialism. This theory, once unfolded, is very rich in content and of immense practical significance today; it is the second great contribution of Leninism.

4. Lenin made a great theoretical and practical contribution to the necessity of upholding the dictatorship of the proletariat under socialist conditions.

Here, I can only briefly make two points on my limited experience.

A. Lenin correctly grasped the essence of the dictatorship of the proletariat and correctly handled the forms of proletarian democracy.

Lenin's adherence to the dictatorship of the proletariat was handled quite accurately in theory and practice.

Lenin upheld the principles of proletarian democracy in the dictatorship of the proletariat, including the principles of the Paris Commune.

For example, Lenin repeatedly said that the Bolsheviks' right to govern came by election and was for a limited period, until the election of the next soviet, after which the ruling party could be replaced by election.

He advocated a coalition with the Left Socialist Revolutionary Party to govern together. They did govern together for a time. Later, the Left Socialist Revolutionary Party withdrew from the coalition. Lenin firmly implemented the principles of the Paris Commune for the Bolshevik Party's rulers, allowing them to only receive the wages of ordinary workers.

Lenin himself set an example by severely criticising officials who wanted to increase their own wages, and also criticised Bolshevik officials who compared themselves with non-party officials and demanded the same wages.

However, Lenin defended the principles of proletarian democracy on the premise that it was conducive to upholding the dictatorship of the proletariat, and would never interfere with the dictatorship of the proletariat because of following democratic forms.

This led to the support for the convening of the Constituent Assembly and its dissolution; the repeated changes in the slogan "All power to the Soviets"; the coalition government and the banning of hostile parties; the defence and restriction of various democratic rights, etc. On these issues, Lenin was often attacked and misunderstood, and even had differences with Rosa Luxemburg.

Lenin was always right. One of Lenin's basic considerations was whether or not it was favourable to the establishment and maintenance of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin saw clearly that democracy is, after all, a formality, and that the form in which it is to be exercised depends on the historical conditions that are to be faced, and on what is most favourable to the establishment and persistence of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin was not obsessed with forms, and especially not with today's so-called 'universal values', but rather with the actual situation, the actual needs. From this point of view, Rosa Luxemburg was a bit more pedantic. In terms of reason, there is nothing wrong with this, but in terms of the realities of the struggle, it could be a mistake, a mistake for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

B. Lenin keenly felt that the question of the party was the central question for the survival of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Under the constraints of the brutal class struggle, Russia gradually moved towards one-party rule by the Bolshevik Party.

This was a necessity at that time. The bourgeois parties adopted hostile positions and practices towards the Bolshevik Party and the struggle was extremely brutal.

However, once the party moved to one-party rule, they accused the Bolsheviks of one-party dictatorship. Lenin defended it by saying that it was a "one-party dictatorship", but it was the Bolshevik Party's line, principles, and policies over the years that represented the interests of the proletariat and the broad masses of the people. That is to say, the Bolshevik "one-party rule" was the real dictatorship of the proletariat.

Obviously, Lenin was right.

But this also meant a danger. Lenin keenly saw that if the Bolshevik Party went wrong, it would jeopardise the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin seized the work of the party without letting go, and put the protection of the party's purity at the top of his list.

Lenin waged an active ideological struggle (actually a line struggle) within the party. Trotsky, Bukharin and other leaders were seriously criticised.

Lenin saw that bureaucracy was the antithesis of the dictatorship of the proletariat, that the bureaucrats were a group of nascent privileged elements, and that the existence of bureaucracy and bureaucrats would lead to a metamorphosis of the proletarian state apparatus, a historical phenomenon which was again inevitable for backward Russia. Lenin pointed out that bureaucracy would not exist only if the entire population participated directly in the management of the state, which was not possible in Russia at that time. The backwardness of Russia determined the inevitable existence of bureaucracy in every respect, and therefore the struggle against bureaucracy was the long-term historical task of the Bolshevik Party. Lenin was a model of leadership in this struggle.

Lenin also saw that there were bad people infiltrating the party, and he decisively led the purge. Lenin pointed out that at the height of the revolution, especially when the Bolshevik Party was in power, bad people would infiltrate the party in order to gain benefits. They were undermining the party's work and undermining the party's prestige. Therefore, the party must be purged. Lenin has a famous saying, "It is better to have one good pear than a basket of rotten pears." This shows how determined he was.

In his later years, Lenin became increasingly worried about the party splitting and problems. He repeatedly proposed to strengthen the control and supervision of the Party Central Committee through institutional reform. For example, the establishment of supervisory agencies such as the Central Supervisory Committee and the Workers and Peasants Supervisory Council were institutional measures to control and supervise the party leaders and rulers. These ideas of Lenin show that in Lenin's view, the issue of the political system that is compatible with the dictatorship of the proletariat has not been completely resolved. How the Communist Party can prevent its transformation as a ruling party and the state apparatus of the dictatorship of the proletariat from transforming is a historical task that needs to be continued in terms of system.

These ideas left by Lenin are very valuable and profound, and their importance has been proven by later history.

Lenin is worthy of being a loyal successor of Marxism and a true proletarian revolutionary mentor. Leninism is a new development of Marxism and Marxism in the era of socialist revolution and socialist construction (in a broad sense).

Like Marxism, Leninism has red lines and programs running through it. The main social contradictions to be solved are the class struggle of the time, the tasks of the proletarian revolution faced by the time, and the consolidation and development of the proletarian dictatorship of the time.

Lenin was great. Lenin's theory and practice, in the words of Chairman Mao, can be summarized as "class struggle as the key link". The phrase "class struggle as the key link" seems simple and dogmatic, but it is actually profound and accurate. The more thorough the understanding of things, the simpler the summary will be. This is the advantage of our national thinking. Chairman Mao fully demonstrated this advantage.

Unfortunately, Lenin's legacy was not fully understood and accepted by Stalin. The main problem lies in class struggle. Chairman Mao criticized Stalin many times, saying that Stalin did not talk about the existence of classes and class struggle in socialist society.

Failure to talk about the class struggle is not in line with the reality of socialist society, is not in line with the main social contradictions of socialist society, and deviates from the programme of the communists to carry out the continuing revolution of socialism.

The direction and line go wrong, the road goes wrong, the system goes wrong, the economy goes up, but so does revisionism and so does capitalism. The privileged class arose, the monopoly bourgeoisie arose, and the failure of socialism became inevitable. The satellites went up, the red flag fell to the ground, and it was only a question of time and nodes. Is this a small matter? No. This is a big matter, a matter of life and death. Chairman Mao's criticism has grasped the key points.

What we actually saw was that as soon as Comrade Stalin died, Khrushchev revisionism came to power. This was not accidental or surprising at all. Today, the application of Chairman Mao's thought and theory is sufficient to scientifically explain all this.

But at that time, it was like a bolt from the blue. That the divine Stalin should be overthrown and that the Soviet Communist Party should engage in revisionism was a shock to the Communists.

One must always take lessons from both positive and negative sides. Lenin was a positive teacher and Khrushchev was a negative teacher, and Khrushchev's role as a negative teacher was no less important than Lenin's role as a positive teacher, and from this point of view, we have Khrushchev to thank.

Khrushchev put before the Communists the problem that there would be in the Party a faction in power that would follow the capitalist road, that there would be a revisionist line, that there would be a privileged class.

Chairman Mao and the Communist Party of China learnt the Marxism of the new era from both positive and negative instructors. The theoretical struggle in the form of polemics with several revisionist parties at that time was a great classroom for learning Marxism-Leninism and understanding the new class struggle under the new historical conditions.

It was from this new practice of class struggle that Chairman Mao gained a new understanding of class struggle under the conditions of socialist society.

It was with this new understanding that Chairman Mao looked back on the struggles that took place within the CPC and made a qualitative leap in his understanding and theory of the nature of the line and the class nature of the struggles within the Party.

This was a new problem of class struggle under the historical conditions of socialist society.

The problem lies within the Communist Party, but, in terms of position, it is a class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie; in terms of ideological world-view, it is a class struggle between the proletarian world-view and the bourgeois world-view, and, in terms of road, it is a class struggle between those who take the road of socialism and those who take the road of capitalism; and in terms of line, it is a class struggle between the Marxist revolutionary line and the revisionist line.

This class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is the main social contradiction among the various social contradictions under the conditions of socialist society, the main social contradiction that governs and influences all other social contradictions in socialist society, and the general principle that governs and influences all other social contradictions in socialist society.

The factions in power who take the capitalist road are the concrete manifestation of the bourgeoisie within the Communist Party, a new scientific theoretical concept derived by Chairman Mao from the new class struggle that has taken place under the historical conditions of socialist society.

This scientific concept contains profound significance. It tells us that the class struggle that takes place within the Communist Party under socialist conditions is a class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie with the struggle over the line and the road as the focus. This is the continuation of

the struggle against opportunism and revisionism within the Party under new historical conditions, and it is also the continuation of the inevitable reflection of the class struggle at home and abroad within the Party.

The position of the Communist Party as the ruling party determines that the conflict with the capitalists is the main conflict, that the class struggle with the capitalists is the main struggle, and that 'class struggle as the key link' is put forward on this basis.

It was from this new fact of class struggle that Chairman Mao theoretically put forward a complete theoretical system of continued revolution under socialist conditions, with the focus on opposing the capitalist-removalists.

This is a great contribution.

This is the second great new contribution made by Chairman Mao to the development of Marxism-Leninism. Together with the theory of New Democracy, it marked the formal establishment of Maoism. Marxism had developed to the stage of Maoism, and deservedly could be collectively called Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

Through the above brief historical narrative, we can clearly see that from Marx, to Lenin, to Mao, and up to the present day, in the light of the social realities we are facing, in the light of the main contradictions in society we are facing, the soul of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism is still the revolution, class struggle, and dictatorship of the proletariat, and that this fundamental truth, this basic principle, has not changed, and should not change.

This is the true Marxist position, viewpoint and method of observing the problems of socialist society.

We often said that we were engaged in a socialist revolution and building socialism, and even now, do we not still claim that we are building a 'socialist society with Chinese characteristics'? So, why should the word 'socialism' be highlighted? Why is 'adherence to socialism' one of the so-called 'four adherences'? The rationale for this must be made clear. That is to say, the programme, aim and belief of the Communists are to develop socialism, and as the ruling party, the whole purpose is to develop socialism. Moreover, the need for socialism is relative to the need not to have capitalism. Capitalism still exists in the world today, and it is even said that capitalism is still quite strong, and socialism is still under siege. Under these circumstances, isn't it precisely in response to the sharp contradictions and struggles that exist between socialism and capitalism that we talk about socialism and 'confidence in theory, confidence in the road, confidence in the system, and confidence in culture'? In Chairman Mao's words, the question of who will win and who will lose in the struggle between socialism and capitalism has not yet been fully resolved. The emphasis on socialism is based on the historical reality of class contradictions and class struggle between socialism and capitalism.

Therefore, the correct understanding should be that the emphasis on socialism rather than capitalism is an answer to the main contradiction in society that we are actually facing.

To emphasise the need for 'socialism' on the one hand and to say that the main contradiction in society is only the development of the productive forces on the other is contradictory, logically confusing and indefensible.

Lenin said that politics is the concentrated expression of economy. Compared with economy, politics must take the first place. Socialism is politics and the class struggle with capitalism. Socialism is the key. Only socialism leading economic development is the goal of the Communists. It can be called "original intention". Socialism is the "original intention".

However, the Marxist standpoint, viewpoint, method and basic principles of understanding socialism were abandoned by Deng Xiaoping and his successors.

Deng Xiaoping did not understand Marxism or Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. Deng Xiaoping's world view and level of understanding determined that he would inevitably formulate a revisionist line. Deng Xiaoping rejected Chairman Mao's and the Party's criticisms of him, and rejected the Cultural Revolution's and the people's criticisms of him, and insisted on his 'cat theory', which, like all revisionist theories, is a theory without a theory. Deng Xiaoping's theory is nothing more than economic development, and economic development is everything; only the economy has no politics, and the economy shocks politics. From "It doesn't matter if the cat is black or white, as long as it catches mice, it is a good cat", to "Three Directives as the Guideline", to "One Center and Two Basic Points", to "No matter whether it is socialist or capitalist, development is the hard truth", in the end, there is no class struggle, no socialism, only economic development, no matter what the "name" of the economy is, the actual result is bound to be the development of capitalist economy. Therefore, Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line is a line that denies class struggle, denies socialism, and will inevitably restore capitalism in the end. This is the essence of Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line.

It can be seen that on the question of building socialism, the difference between the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist line and the revisionist line is not over whether or not to develop the economy, but over how to develop the economy. Whether to adhere to the 'class struggle as the key link' or to reject it is the focus of the whole struggle.

Forty years of history have amply proved this.

It is precisely because of the lack of political understanding of the problem of building socialism, the lack of adherence to socialism, and the lack of adherence to the 'class struggle as the key link', that, although the economy has developed, society has retrogressed to a capitalist society.

Under these circumstances, it is all the more absurd to continue to use the erroneous formulation of the main social contradiction in a socialist society, since the premise of socialism no longer exists.

What we are facing is already a genuine capitalist society, 'special' in the sense that it is a fascist bourgeois dictatorship with the traditional Chinese authoritarianism attached to it.

For such a bureaucratic authoritarian monopoly capitalist society, the formulation of the main contradiction of socialist society is no longer applicable, because the premise of socialist society no longer exists.

However, it is still necessary and imperative to insist on a class analysis of the class contradictions in this society.

Why?

Because the Communist Party is a revolutionary party, a revolutionary party to achieve communism, and to achieve communism, class struggle must be the key link, politics must take precedence, and this must be carried out not only in analysing the capitalist society, but also in analysing the socialist society until the communist society is achieved. When we reach classless communism, there will be no more class conflicts, no more tasks of class revolution, and naturally there will be no need for class analysis. However, before that day arrives, we must still honestly insist on making a class analysis of the main contradictions in society from the practical point of view, from the class contradictions that actually exist.

This is how we recognise the main contradiction in current Chinese society.

In China, after four decades of capitalist restoration, the revisionist rulers have peacefully but forcibly pushed back socialism and constructed a bureaucratic, authoritarian, monopoly-capitalist society with Chinese characteristics, calling itself 'socialist society with Chinese characteristics'.

In this bureaucratic authoritarian monopoly capitalist society with Chinese characteristics, there are some special classes and class conflicts. We can only briefly explain them.

In terms of the exploiting and oppressing classes, there is the bureaucratic authoritarian monopoly bourgeoisie, the big and middle bourgeoisie, and the foreign monopoly bourgeoisie.

In terms of the exploited and oppressed classes, there is the proletariat (working class, blue-collar and white-collar), the peasantry, the petty bourgeoisie at various levels, and the vast number of intellectuals with different world views belonging to different classes.

The confrontation between the two major class camps is clear, and is a basic thread running through present-day Chinese society, and naturally a thread for understanding the basic contradictions in Chinese society.

In this basic contradiction, the dominant class in power is the bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie. The big and middle bourgeoisie were nurtured by this class and became rich through power-money transactions. The foreign monopoly bourgeoisie was "introduced" by this class and they willingly played the role of comprador. Therefore, this basic contradiction can be further analysed and expressed, that is: the contradiction between the bourgeoisie led by the bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie and the broad working class led by the proletariat, with the peasant class as the main ally, including the petty bourgeoisie and progressive intellectuals, is the main contradiction in today's Chinese society.

A profound understanding of the basic and major contradictions in present Chinese society can enable us to have a profound understanding of the nature of present Chinese society and the nature of the proletarian socialist revolution that China is now facing. We can clearly define the historical task of carrying out the proletarian socialist revolution and find a series of policies and strategies for carrying out the proletarian socialist revolution. We can thus concretise class struggle as the key link and the steps for carrying out the proletarian socialist revolution, thus guiding the proletarian socialist revolution to win a great victory.

Such analysis and understanding are based on the real situation in China. The invasion of foreign monopoly capitalism and the existence of the big and middle bourgeoisie are all visible. As for the bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie, I think the millions of corrupt officials who have been found out are ironclad evidence, as are the billions of wealth in their hands and those of their families. This is only what has been found out, and the large number of people who have not been found out does not mean they do not exist. This can no longer be explained as "some people" or "individuals". This is already a complete and pure class phenomenon, and it is precisely caused by the restored bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalist system. The facts are very clear and known to everyone, and there is no room for debate.

It is impossible for the revisionist rulers and the bureaucratic, autocratic, and monopolistic bourgeois rulers to know and understand Chinese society in this way. They claim that they are doing "Sinicization of Marxism", but where is the shadow of Marxism, where is the shadow of Marxist class struggle and class analysis? They only call foreign monopoly capitalism foreign-funded enterprises, and they only call large and medium-sized capitalist enterprises private enterprises. The viewpoint of class has long

been thrown out of their mind. The viewpoint of class struggle has long been completely obliterated by them.

There is a fundamental difference between our understanding of Chinese society and that of the revisionist rulers, and there is also a fundamental difference between our understanding of the main contradictions in Chinese society and that of the revisionist rulers. These are two fundamentally opposed lines of understanding and two fundamentally opposed political lines.

To obliterate the major contradiction in Chinese society, to obliterate the class struggle in Chinese society, to talk only about production, not politics, not the class struggle, is nothing but an attempt to deceive the working people, nothing but an attempt to solidify the rule of capitalism.

And we are just the opposite. We are trying to reveal the class contradictions that actually exist, especially the main class contradictions among them, so that the working people's understanding of reality can be united with the scientific theory and revolutionary line of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, so that they can awaken and organise themselves for socialist re-revolution.

This is the essence of all the differences.

We have made no secret of the fact that our fundamental purpose of exposing and criticising the revisionist rulers' erroneous reference to the main contradiction in Chinese society is to mobilise the workers, peasants and the rest of the vast masses of the working people to awaken as soon as possible, to carry out a great socialist re-revolution as soon as possible, and to re-establish people's democratic socialism in China.

The rule of the bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie can no longer continue.

The plunder of bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalism cannot continue.

Upholding the banner of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, we will resolutely carry out the socialist re-revolution and fight for the re-establishment of people's democratic socialism in China.

This is the inevitable conclusion we have reached through our analysis of the main contradictions in Chinese society, and it is also the minimum programme we must adhere to in the current class struggle.

Long live the triumph of socialist re-revolution!

Long live people's democratic socialism!

26 December 2017 Commemoration of Chairman Mao's Birthday

What are the most essential characteristics of socialist society?

The Political Report of the 19th National Congress clearly states that ‘the most essential feature of socialism with Chinese characteristics is the leadership of the Communist Party of China’. On different occasions, General Secretary Xi Jinping has also reiterated this reference time and again. So the question to ask is, is this formulation, right or wrong? From the theoretical point of view of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, does this formulation stand or fall?

The answer can only be no.

I. The Importance of Correctly Understanding the Most Essential Characteristics of Socialism

For a Communist Party that wants to build socialism, it must of course correctly understand the most essential characteristics of socialism. This should not be a problem. However, now, ironically, this problem that should not be a problem has become a problem for General Secretary Xi Jinping.

Obviously, it is a major mistake in theory to describe the most essential characteristics of socialism as the leadership of the Communist Party. If put into practice, it will bring serious consequences. This is exactly the historical fact that has happened in the past. Therefore, this issue must be clarified.

What are the most essential characteristics of socialism? To answer this question, we must first clarify what kind of society is a socialist society, or in other words, socialism is what kind of society. This should not be a difficult problem.

Since the publication of the Communist Manifesto, in the more than 150 years of the communist revolutionary movement, various revolutionary mentors of Marxism have given various clear and scientific answers to this question from different angles.

As we all know, Marx, in his book Critique of the Gotha Programme, has given an eloquent account of what a socialist society is and why there is bound to be such a stage in history as a socialist society, and he has also made it clear that a socialist society is the first stage of a communist society.

This characterisation is very important.

It tells us:

Firstly, socialist society is essentially communist society.

Secondly, it is only due to the limitations of historical conditions that socialist society has certain shortcomings and certain elements that do not belong to communist society, which is inevitable for a new society that has just emerged from capitalist society. This predetermines that this new socialist society cannot but have the characteristics and attributes of a constant, long-term and even fierce struggle between growing communism and decaying capitalism, which is a historical necessity for socialist society as the first stage of communist society.

However, even in this historical context, the communist element is still, and necessarily, predominant in a socialist society, otherwise it would not be the first stage of a communist society, and it would not be a truly socialist society.

A socialist society can only be a unity of these two points, and only by understanding the problem in this way is it correctly and accurately in keeping with Marx's scientific definition of socialist society as the first stage of communist society.

Having understood this basic Marxist truth, one can further realise that in order to figure out what the essential features of socialist society are, fundamentally speaking, one must first figure out what the essential features of communism are. It can be said in this way that a person who does not understand what the essential characteristics of a communist society are will certainly not understand what the essential characteristics of a socialist society are.

We must see and realise that socialist society is communist society, but it is only the first stage of communist society.

It is a common misunderstanding for people to completely separate socialist society from communist society, or even to regard socialist society and communist society as two completely different societies. This misunderstanding is often overlooked or not recognised at all. If such a mistake occurs in theory, then mistakes will inevitably occur in practice, and even revisionism will occur.

It is necessary to adhere to the principles of communism and the direction of communism in socialist society, otherwise it will be impossible to complete the historical task of transitioning from the first stage of communism to the higher stage of communism, and it will not even be a socialist society at all.

This is the tragedy of the revisionists. General Secretary Xi Jinping's incorrect statement of the essential characteristics of socialism shows that he neither understands what socialism is nor what communism is. The "socialism" in his mind is nothing more than a revisionist "socialism", a "socialism" that is opposed to the true Marxist scientific socialism, a "socialism" that will inevitably lead to one-party dictatorship and the implementation of fascist bourgeois dictatorship, that is, "socialism with Chinese characteristics".

Is this a socialist society? No. This is a capitalist society, and the worst bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalist society.

It must be seen that this is the inevitable consequence of attributing the most essential characteristics of socialist society to the leadership of the Communist Party. The seriousness of the problem lies here.

Why do we say this? It is worth our analysis and study.

There is a well-known quote in the Communist Manifesto, which is, "The Communists can sum up their theory in one sentence: the abolition of private property." The concept of communism itself refers to this meaning. "Communism" is nothing more than the negation of private property. It is on the basis of negating private property that communist society can negate exploitation and oppression, the alienation of labour, and class and class confrontation, and truly enter a society of "freedom, equality, and fraternity." The state has disappeared, there is no politics, political parties are no longer needed, people manage themselves, and truly realise what we often say now, "the people are the masters of the country."

In such a society, it is naturally absurd to talk about the leadership of the Communist Party as the most essential feature of this society.

Of course, in the first stage of communist society, socialist society, due to historical conditions, it is impossible to do all this and reach such a high social level. This is something that can only be done in the advanced stage of communist society. We cannot transcend history.

However, the most important thing here is that, first, the basic principles of communism must be upheld; second, the transition to the advanced stage of communism cannot be shaken.

This is what the Communists must do. The socialist revolution and the socialist continued revolution are nothing more than doing this.

According to this reasoning, from the historical conditions faced by a socialist society, we should and must socialise communist principles. That is, although it is not possible to completely eliminate private ownership at the moment, we must insist on public ownership as the main body; although it is not possible to eliminate classes, class struggle, and make the state completely wither away at the moment, we must insist on the dictatorship of the proletariat, the people's democratic dictatorship, and the people being the masters of the country, and realise what Lenin called the "semi-state" and transition to the complete withering away of the state. In simple terms, the first is public ownership, and the second is the people being the masters of the country. This is the most fundamental feature of socialist society. Public ownership refers to the economy, and the people being the masters of the country refers to politics. Politics commands the economy, and the people being the masters of the country commands public ownership. The people being the masters of the country is the general principle. Without the people being the masters of the country, everything, including public ownership, will be in name only and in reality empty.

This principle has been tested by practice.

So, in the final analysis, the most essential feature of socialist society is that the people are the masters of the country. In the scientific language of Marxism, it is the dictatorship of the proletariat, or the special form of the dictatorship of the proletariat - the people's democratic dictatorship.

At this point, some people may ask, why is it incorrect to say that the most essential feature of socialism is the leadership of the Communist Party? Doesn't socialism require the leadership of the Communist Party? What is the relationship between the leadership of the Communist Party and the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship?

This is exactly what we are going to explain next.

(2)

We must put the relationship between the leadership of the Communist Party and the most essential characteristic of socialism -- the people being the masters of the country -- in the right place.

Chairman Mao said that the core force leading our cause is the Communist Party of China, and the theoretical basis guiding our thinking is Marxism-Leninism. To seize power for the proletariat and the broad masses of working people, it is necessary to carry out a socialist revolution; to consolidate power for the proletariat and the broad masses of working people, it is necessary to carry out a continuing socialist revolution. The revolution in these two historical stages is inseparable from the leadership of the Communist Party. The leadership of the Communist Party is an indispensable condition for carrying out the socialist revolution. Conversely, without the leadership of the Communist Party, it is impossible to complete the great historical task of the socialist revolution.

However, can we say that the most essential feature of socialism is the leadership of the Communist Party?

No.

General Secretary Xi Jinping said this because he did not understand the relationship between the leadership of the Communist Party and socialist society, and did not really understand the Marxist theory on the leadership of the Communist Party and socialist society. Although he has a doctorate in

this field, it is illusory and often unworthy of the name. The mistake here is really a common sense mistake.

Political parties are tools of class struggle and political struggle, and exist to establish or maintain a certain society. But what is the most essential feature of this society to be established and maintained? It does not depend on which political party is leading it, but on what kind of social economic form and social form this society established and maintained under the leadership of this party is.

Chairman Mao stressed the importance of the party's line, stressed that the line is the key, and stressed that the correctness of the ideological and political line determines everything. This is completely correct. However, how can we test whether the "ideological and political line" mentioned by Chairman Mao is correct? It can only be tested by the results of social practice in implementing this line. This tells us that whether a party has the most essential characteristics of a socialist society cannot be seen from the leadership of the Communist Party, but from the results of the leadership of the Communist Party.

The leadership of the Communist Party is only a means, and building socialism is the goal. The means and the goal cannot be confused, and the means cannot be used to replace the goal. General Secretary Xi Jinping did not clarify this issue. This is a principled mistake in theory, and putting it into practice will bring bad consequences. This is an inevitable and major misstep of the revisionists.

This major mistake in theory and practice once again fully proves that the revisionist rulers who engage in the so-called "socialism with Chinese characteristics" have never understood what socialism is.

A simple Marxist principle is that in the advanced stage of communism, private ownership is eliminated, classes are eliminated, and the state disappears, and political parties have no basis and reason to exist. The absence of political parties, including the absence of the Communist Party, is the most fundamental characteristic of communism. In this case, how can we believe that the leadership of the Communist Party is the most essential characteristic of the first stage of communist society, that is, socialist society? Yes, in order to transition from the first stage of communist society to the advanced stage of communist society, in this complex and difficult historical process, the leadership of the Communist Party is needed, but we should not forget that in terms of the historical mission of this entire historical process, the ultimate goal is the disappearance of the state, including the disappearance of political parties. If the leadership of the Communist Party is taken as the most fundamental characteristic of socialism and is perpetuated, solidified and continuously strengthened, it will become the opposite of the dictatorship of the proletariat or the people's democratic dictatorship, and it will run counter to the direction of the development of communism. The most typical consequence is the trend towards one-party dictatorship, which is proved by the cruel fact that the ruling Communist parties from the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe to China had all moved towards one-party dictatorship.

We emphasise the need to uphold the leadership of the Communist Party in order to realise the revolutionary ideal of socialism and communism through the socialist revolution. The significance of upholding the leadership of the Communist Party is to build socialism, to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship. If we do not build socialism, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship, what is the significance of the leadership of the Communist Party? Is it even the leadership of the Communist Party? Therefore, the relationship between the leadership of the Communist Party and socialism is not that the leadership of the Communist Party is the most essential characteristic of socialism. On the contrary, whether or not socialism is being practiced is the criterion for measuring the most essential characteristic of the

Communist Party. Without the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship, there is no socialism. Even if the sign of "socialism with Chinese characteristics" is hung, the sign of the Communist Party, the leadership of this Communist Party can only be the leadership of a revisionist party, and its most essential characteristic can only be capitalism.

This is how historical facts unfolded. This is where the seriousness of the problem lies.

This is a serious tampering of the Marxist theory of scientific socialism. After such a tampering, the actual result is that the most essential feature of socialist society has been tampered from the people being the masters of the country to the party being the masters of the country. The correct "the Communist Party leads everything" and the correct "strengthening the party's unified leadership" have degenerated into the party controlling everything, the party replacing everything, the party being above everything, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship have degenerated into a one-party dictatorship, and a one-party dictatorship. Such a party that is above the entire society and above the country will inevitably degenerate into a privileged class. Such a privileged class can only be the opposite of socialism and the class basis for the transformation of socialist society into a society of authoritarian privilege. In this sense, it can be said that the leadership of this revisionist party is indeed the most essential feature of this society of authoritarian privilege, and is also the most essential feature of the further development of bureaucratic authoritarian monopoly capitalist society. The history of the dramatic changes from the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe to China, where socialism temporarily failed and capitalism temporarily won, fully proves this point.

It is true that Lenin and Chairman Mao, who were in power, had emphasized strengthening the leadership of the Party in theory and practice.

Lenin and Chairman Mao were certainly correct.

This is because Lenin and Chairman Mao, first, correctly explained the relationship between the leadership of the Communist Party and the construction of a socialist society (in a broad sense), and especially correctly explained the relationship between the leadership of the Communist Party and the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship. They repeatedly emphasized that strengthening the leadership of the Communist Party is to strengthen the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship, and unified strengthening the leadership of the Communist Party with strengthening the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship. Chairman Mao repeatedly said that our power was given by the broad masses of the people, which is what he meant, that the people are the masters of the country. Second, Lenin and Chairman Mao repeatedly warned us that the reason why we must adhere to the leadership of the Communist Party is because the Communist Party implements a correct line that conforms to the proletariat and the broad masses of the working people. Only by adhering to such a correct line can we achieve victory in the socialist revolution and the socialist continued revolution. In this way, striving for, upholding, defending and developing the socialist cause is precisely in the fundamental interests of the proletariat and the broad masses of the people, and it fully reflects the most essential characteristics of socialism.

Third, both Lenin and Chairman Mao saw that strengthening the Party's leadership and preventing the Party from becoming revisionist must be unified. Lenin put a lot of thought into it, wrote some articles, and established certain supervisory bodies; Chairman Mao did even more work, until he launched the Cultural Revolution and proposed that "You are making the socialist revolution and 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.” Lenin and Chairman Mao’s theories and practices on this issue are still worth studying and learning.

Chairman Mao has repeatedly expressed the opinion that if Lin Biao and his ilk were to come to power, it would be easy to establish a capitalist system, and the worst kind of capitalism, and implement fascist bourgeois dictatorship.

Why did such a historical phenomenon occur?

From many existing materials, we can see that Chairman Mao has repeatedly thought about this issue since the 1950s, and compared it with the political systems of European and American capitalist countries. Until 1974 during the Cultural Revolution, he also specifically explored this issue from the perspective of our economic system and made very important "theoretical instructions". Subsequently, in 1976, he issued Document No. 4 of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, announcing his final thoughts on this issue to the entire party and the people of the country. This is the precious theoretical legacy left to us by Chairman Mao, and it can also be said that this is the political will left to us by Chairman Mao. Its great significance cannot be overestimated.

If we carefully study Chairman MAO's theoretical thinking, we will be able to figure out that the problem with socialist society is mainly the Communist Party, which is the cause of its metamorphosis and failure.

The metamorphosis of the correct Communist Party leadership into a one-party dictatorship will inevitably lead to the imposition of a fascist bourgeois dictatorship.

Under the protection of a one-party dictatorship, a privileged class will inevitably emerge, and socialist society will inevitably degenerate into a bureaucratic dictatorship of privilege.

The changes in history will not stop here. The so-called Communist Party leadership is actually led by a revisionist party, which will forcibly promote the revisionist line, that is, the line of restoring capitalism, through the form of a one-party dictatorship and under the protection of the state apparatus of the fascist bourgeois dictatorship, and gradually transform and build a bureaucratic, autocratic, monopolistic capitalist society.

Contemporary history from the Soviet Union to China, especially the history of China's reform and opening up in the past 40 years, is the best example for us to understand and decipher this problem.

The leadership of the Communist Party under the conditions of socialist democracy is the guarantee of a victorious socialist revolution and continued socialist revolution.

If the leadership of the Communist Party is usurped as the leadership of a one-party authoritarian revisionist party, it will inevitably bring about the defeat of socialism and the restoration of capitalism, and the restoration of the worst kind of bureaucratic authoritarian monopoly capitalist society practising the dictatorship of the fascist bourgeoisie.

General Secretary Xi Jinping, by describing the leadership of the Communist Party as the most essential feature of socialism, is in fact advocating one-party dictatorship, a revisionist defence that is totally wrong in theory and extremely harmful in practice, and whose consequences will lead to the failure of socialism and the restoration of capitalism, and the worst kind of capitalism at that.

This is the fundamental reason why we must criticise this erroneous theory contained in ‘Xi Jinping Thought’.

3. Learning the lessons of history, correctly understanding and dealing with the leadership of the Communist Party.

Adhering to the leadership of the Communist Party is not wrong in itself. The mistake lies in not correctly understanding and handling the leadership of the Communist Party. The key to this mistake is the transformation from the leadership of the Communist Party to one-party dictatorship. This is clear from the historical lessons of the Communist countries changing from revisionism to capitalism. It can be said that if we want to solve the problem of revisionism, prevent the transformation into capitalism, and carry out the cause of socialism to the end, the most important, core, and key point is to solve this problem.

Here I would like to share my superficial thoughts.

First, to uphold the leadership of the Communist Party, there is no doubt that the first condition and premise must be that the party is a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist party, not a revisionist party.

A revisionist party that sells dog meat under the guise of sheep's clothing is certainly not able to embody the leadership of the Communist Party. However, there are strict standards and requirements for whether it is a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist Communist Party. Historical experience and lessons have enabled us to have a clearer understanding of these standards and requirements.

Example:

This party, must have a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist leadership.

This party must be a revolutionary party armed with Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, and the majority of its members must be revolutionaries determined to dedicate themselves to the cause of communism and to the service of the people.

This party must be a party that practices the democratic system both inside and outside the party, a party that is able to completely abandon authoritarian thinking and the authoritarian system, a party that is able to carry out normal internal ideological struggles within the party, and to formulate the party's line, policy, guidelines and strategies through democratic consultation under the democratic system.

This party, which must be a party that truly understands the theories of socialism and communism, and which must be able to correctly understand and deal with the relationship between the party and the state, and between the party and the Constitution, is able to work both as a ruling party and as a non-ruling party. In both cases, the Party can fulfil its role as the vanguard of the proletariat and the leader of the socialist cause.

This Party, must have a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist revolutionary line, and only by doing this, only by grasping this programme, can it truly manifest the leadership of the Communist Party, the leadership of the Communist Party in name only.

It can be seen that the key to adhering to the leadership of the Communist Party and whether such leadership can gain the recognition and support of the general public still lies in the Communist Party itself.

Secondly, adherence to the leadership of the Communist Party can only be manifested through adherence to the correct line of the Communist Party's socialist revolution and continued socialist revolution, and it does not mean that the Communist Party has to have the power to rule for eternity.

Chairman Mao said that the correctness of the ideological and political line determines everything. It is based on this principle that only by adhering to the revolutionary line of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and, under the guidance of this line, continuously advancing the socialist revolution and the socialist continuing revolution and gradually transitioning to the advanced stage of communism, can the leadership of the Communist Party embody the purpose of the Communist Party and be the ultimate goal of the Communist Party's leadership.

The line is the lifeline of the party. The line it implements determines the nature of the party. As we have seen, the Communist Party of China is a truly revolutionary party when it implements Chairman Mao's revolutionary line. However, once revisionism comes to power and implements Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line, the Communist Party of China does not change its name, but its nature changes and it becomes a revisionist party. At this time, talking about the leadership of the Communist Party is nothing but empty talk.

It can be seen that whether the problem of the line can be solved correctly is the fundamental condition for whether the leadership of the Communist Party can be realised.

The emphasis on the leadership of the Communist Party is mainly reflected in the leadership of the line and the formulation of major policies and guidelines. This political thought, this political theory, and this political principle are a criticism and negation of one-party dictatorship, the party's monopoly of everything, and especially the party's replacement of the government. It is very important both in theory and in practice for us to solve the historical task of reforming the political system we are facing and for building a new socialist political system that meets the requirements of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship.

This is Chairman Mao's consistent thought. The historical lessons of the party's transformation tell us that Chairman Mao's thought is correct. We need to study and understand it again, and combine it with the reality we face.

Third, strengthening the leadership of the Communist Party must be implemented in strengthening the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship, that is, it must be implemented in the people being the masters of the country.

We must never repeat the mistake of one-party dictatorship, where the party is above the state and the people, and deviates from the political principles of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship.

In his book *The Civil War in France*, Marx clearly pointed out that the Paris Commune was the government of the working class, the dictatorship of the proletariat. Engels also reiterated this view again and again in his later years. This view tells us that the dictatorship of the proletariat, including its specific form, the people's democratic dictatorship, is not just a phrase, but a real material force. This is the state apparatus, this is the government, including all its dictatorship tools. The dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship embody the class dictatorship of the proletariat and the class dictatorship of the broad working people. The state apparatus, the people's government, and all dictatorship tools are nothing more than the embodiment of this class dictatorship and the dictatorship of the working people. In order to ensure the class nature of the state apparatus, a corresponding political system is needed. The Paris Commune made such an attempt. The Paris Commune Committee is the highest authority, the state, and the government. The members of the Paris Commune Committee are elected. They represent the people of Paris and embody the will of the people of Paris. The people of Paris also have the right to recall the members of the Paris Commune Committee, which shows that the Paris Commune Committee is always under the supervision and

control of the people of Paris. The members of the Paris Commune at that time came from three different political factions: Bakuninists, Proudhonists, and Communists of the First International. No political faction had the power to override the Paris Commune Committee, and this did not happen in practice. This political system ensured the nature of the Paris Commune as a proletarian dictatorship. The historical experience of the Paris Commune is worth studying and inheriting.

Later, Russia's Soviet system and China's People's Congress system were actually the successors of the political system of the Paris Commune, and were concrete forms of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship. Unfortunately, the ruling Communist Party did not properly handle the relationship between the leadership of the Communist Party and the Soviets and the People's Congresses, and gradually degenerated, creating a political system in which the Party was above the Soviets and the People's Congresses, with the Party replacing the government and the country, and the Party's leadership of everything became the Party taking charge of everything, gradually forming a political system of one-party dictatorship and one-party autocracy. The ultimate result was that the Party became revisionist, the country changed colour, and socialism failed.

This is a major topic that must be re-studied and re-understood under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

Here, I would like to share some of my initial thoughts.

First, we must respect and abide by the Constitution.

The Constitution states: "All power in the People's Republic of China belongs to the people." "The organs through which the people exercise state power are the National People's Congress and the local people's congresses at all levels." "The National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China is the highest organ of state power."

"The people manage state affairs, economic and cultural undertakings, and social affairs through various channels and forms in accordance with the law."

It is clear that there are three meanings here, which must be adhered to. First, all power in the state belongs to the people. Second, the National People's Congress is the highest organ of power from the central to the local level. Third, it is the people themselves who, in accordance with the law, "manage state affairs, economic and cultural undertakings, and social affairs through various channels and forms."

The Constitution does not say that all power belongs to political parties, including the Communist Party; nor does the Constitution say that any political party, including the Communist Party's congress or committee is a power organ; nor does the Constitution say that any political party, including the Communist Party, can directly manage the state, manage economic and cultural undertakings, and manage social affairs.

According to the Constitution of the People's Republic of China, it is obvious that the so-called "the party leads everything" and "the party's unified leadership" that puts the Communist Party above the state and the people, is completely wrong, violates the Constitution, and violates the fundamental principles of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship.

It is precisely this mistake that is the fundamental institutional reason for the party to become revisionist, the state to change colour, the emergence of revisionism, and the move towards bureaucratic autocracy and monopoly capitalism. It is also the bridge for the dictatorship of the

proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship to inevitably degenerate into the fascist bourgeois dictatorship.

The Constitution is the fundamental law for realizing and maintaining the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship. To uphold the leadership of the Communist Party, we must first respect the Constitution, abide by the Constitution, and do everything in accordance with the Constitution.

Secondly, we must unswervingly follow the principles of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, follow the Constitution, carry out political system reform, and thoroughly eliminate the one-party dictatorship.

The key to political system reform is to change the one-party dictatorship. This is a problem that everyone can see clearly. The revisionist party and the fascist party also see this and understand this, so they dare not and cannot carry out political system reform.

However, after the socialist re-revolution, we will rebuild the socialist society and rebuild the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship. We must, on the basis of learning from historical experience and lessons, thoroughly reform the existing political system and create a new political system for a socialist society. The fundamental requirement is that this political system must be unified with the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship, that is, it must be unified with the people being masters of the country, and it must ensure that state power is always in the hands of the people.

Is this a high requirement? No. This is the most basic and minimum requirement for the socialist political system.

Is it difficult to achieve this requirement? Not difficult. As long as the various provisions of the Constitution of the People's Republic of China, which was personally led by Chairman Mao, are implemented, it will be easy to achieve this requirement.

In fact, the most critical issue here is that this political system must implement the provisions of the Constitution, "All power in the People's Republic of China belongs to the people. The organs through which the people exercise state power are the National People's Congress and the local people's congresses at various levels. The people manage state affairs, economic and cultural undertakings, and social affairs through various channels and forms in accordance with the law."

Comparing with the Constitution, we can see that to carry out political system reform and create a new type of socialist social political system, the main thing is to reform the political system in which the Communist Party directly exercises state power into a political system in which the people's congresses exercise state power.

As for what should be done specifically, we can fully trust the wisdom of the people. After discussion, brainstorming, and repeated experiments, we can always find a good political system to implement the Constitution. Here are a few reference opinions that I thought of.

End the one-party dictatorship of "the Party Committee waves its hands, the National People's Congress raises its hands, and the CPPCC claps its hands". No political party can have its own ruling system. The Communist Party's one-party dictatorship and the National People's Congress are in name only. This is a reversal of the original meaning of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship, and a betrayal of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship. This historical reversal must be reversed again.

Re-understand the theory of the ruling party. The form of the regime of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship does not necessarily have to follow the ruling party system of the Western bourgeoisie.

According to the Constitution, all staff members serving the people at all levels, from the central government to the local governments, should be elected by the National People's Congress. The National People's Congress should elect specific staff members serving the people, not the ruling party. If any political party, including the Communist Party, wants to obtain the power to govern, it can only do so through the party members who are recognised by the people in the election and receive more votes than other candidates, thereby obtaining the power to hold certain positions serving the people. If a party has a large number of such positions, or even more than half of them, it can be said that the party has the power of a ruling party at this time, and therefore it is easier to implement the party's line, principles, and policies, and serve the people with such lines, principles, and policies, reflecting the leadership role of the party.

If the Communist Party wants to play a leading role in socialist revolution and construction, it should encourage its members to win the approval of the people in order to win the election.

Doing so should be a natural part of abiding by the Constitution. As long as this is done, there will be no problem of one-party dictatorship.

As Lenin pointed out, only when the whole people directly manage the state can bureaucracy be completely overcome. This is a completely Marxist view. That is to say, from entrusting a few people to manage the state to the whole people directly managing the state, this is the fundamental way to prevent the state from degenerating, and it is also the fundamental way to strengthen the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship. Naturally, it is also the fundamental way for the state to gradually wither away. It is based on this idea, which also embodies the basic spirit of the Constitution. All state government staff and public officials in various positions should be elected as much as possible through direct elections and an open recruitment system, gradually expanding the scope of direct management of the state by the people and transitioning to direct management of the state by the whole people.

In parallel with the electoral system, there should also be a supervision system and a recall system. The establishment of such institutions and the selection of such staff should also be in the hands of the people, specifically, in the hands of the National People's Congress. Legislation, administration, and supervision are organically unified under the management of the National People's Congress.

I have some ideas on how to deal with the relationship between these three in books such as "On Semi-Socialism" and "On People's Democracy". I will not repeat them here.

This is a profound reform of the proletarian state apparatus. As long as we understand Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, act strictly in accordance with Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, learn from historical experience and lessons, respect the initiative of the masses, and create a new type of truly socialist political system, the historical task can be fully accomplished. Even if it is imperfect for a while, it can be gradually improved. The most important thing is to insist that we want to build a state apparatus of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship. As long as the ideological line is correct, the method is not a problem. So I don't want to talk about specific ideas here. Collective wisdom and repeated practice are always better than individual hard thinking.

Judging from the lessons of history and Lenin's final thoughts on the operation of the state machine, the problem of supervision must be solved in the future. Losing the power of supervision will always

cause problems. This not only requires solving the problem of the system, which is only one aspect, but also the other, and more important aspect, is to solve the problem of supervision by the broad masses of the people.

The question here is whether the masses have the right to freely form a party.

The Constitution stipulates that citizens have the right to freely associate, and forming a party is a form of association. The Communist Party is one of these parties. There may be one Communist Party or multiple Communist Parties. Some comrades do not understand this principle and believe that there can only be one Communist Party and that it can only be a one-party dictatorship. In their view, since the Communist Party is the vanguard of the proletariat, how can there be two vanguards of the proletariat, two Communist Parties? This is simply the level of thinking of elementary school students. The history of the communist movement proves that this is not the case. The theory and practice of the revolutionary mentors are not like this. According to the thinking of these comrades, we can't help but ask, since there is freedom of association, then which part of the people have the right to organize a Communist Party, and which part of the people do not have the right to organize a Communist Party? If a part of the people organises a Communist Party, who will judge whether this party is a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist party and a vanguard of the proletariat? Don't the current revisionist parties also claim to be Marxist parties and Communist parties? It is this party that does not allow the working people to organise the Communist Party again. It is this party that insists on one-party dictatorship, which is actually the dictatorship of the fascist bourgeoisie. Therefore, the theory of not allowing free party formation is, firstly, against the Constitution and tramples on the Constitution; secondly, it is exactly the theory that the revisionist party needs. Our comrades must understand this theory clearly and cannot sing the same tune as the revisionist party.

The working people can freely organise the Communist Party. Whether it is a real Communist Party or an unqualified Communist Party must be tested by revolutionary practice and by the working people. Any Communist Party is just a party, and the relationship between this party and other political parties is equal. No political party itself has the natural meaning of ruling without elections, and the Communist Party is no exception.

The expenses required for the activities of any political party should be paid from the party dues, not from the state treasury. One Communist Party plus eight democratic parties, spending state money and wasting money, should be stopped.

Political parties are political tools for the proletariat and the broad masses of working people to seek liberation; they are also political tools for the proletariat and the broad masses of working people to manage the country; they are also political schools for the proletariat and the broad masses of working people.

Lenin once made many important remarks on the significance of trade unions to the working people under socialist conditions, which are still worth our careful study and practice. Lenin's ideas are not only applicable to political parties, but we should also further realise that political parties are higher than trade unions and have greater and higher political significance.

The mass organisations during the Cultural Revolution were a good practice. It showed that once the masses had political organisations, they could pay close attention to national affairs, participate in the management of national affairs, and fight against revisionism, which was of great significance. However, practice has shown us that the form of mass organisations also has shortcomings. The main reason is that it is not a political party and has no corresponding laws and regulations. As a result, it is inevitable that "chaos" will occur, and many problems that should not happen will occur, and even tragedies will

occur. In the struggle of "criticising Deng and fighting against the right deviationist wind of reversing correct verdicts", Chairman Mao summarized the experience and lessons of using mass organisations and clearly instructed that this time "we should not set up fighting teams, but mainly the leadership of the Party". He said that "now the level of the masses has improved, we should not engage in anarchy, overthrow everything, or engage in all-out civil war". We should earnestly study and understand Chairman Mao's opinions, combine the positive and negative experience and lessons provided by the practice of the revolutionary masses, and in order to help the broad masses of the people care about national affairs, participate in national management, and constantly improve their political level in practice, sublimate mass organisations into political parties, and allow, support and encourage the broad masses of the people to freely form parties. This is a favourable measure, completely necessary and feasible for consolidating and developing the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship, realising socialist democracy, and promoting the direct management of the country by the broad masses of the people.

Therefore, under socialist conditions, we should not only allow the broad masses of the people to freely form a party, but also support the broad masses of the people to freely form a party, and create conditions for the broad masses of the people to freely form a party. As Lenin repeatedly emphasized, in order to realize people's democracy, we must provide the best assembly halls and venues for the working people, provide the best printing houses, and so on. Chairman Mao strongly supports the "Four Majors". They all hope to create conditions that will facilitate the broad masses of the people to directly care about national affairs. Under the conditions of highly developed modern technology, we can better implement the opinions of Lenin and Chairman Mao. Provide better conditions for the broad masses of the people to freely form a party and for the broad masses of the people to carry out party activities. This is a reflection on the dictatorship of the proletariat that corresponds to the dictatorship of the fascist bourgeoisie, and on socialist democracy under the people's democratic dictatorship.

On this issue, we should not engage in stupid debates on whether to allow free party formation. Instead, we should think about how to ensure the construction of a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist party and establish a correct line of Marxist-Leninist-Maoist socialist re-revolution and socialist continuous revolution, so as to shoulder the great historical mission of the proletarian vanguard. We must not repeat the historical limitations of "not many people in our party really understand Marxism-Leninism", and we must not create a revisionist party. This is the problem that the real Chinese Communists should seriously study and work hard to solve.

Judging from the current actual situation of Maoists, there is still a considerable gap from this requirement. This is a very practical and important realistic problem. If it is not handled well, there will be a situation of socialist re-revolution, but there will not be a truly qualified Marxist-Leninist-Maoist party. As a result, there will be many factions, and there will be many parties under the banner of the Communist Party, but in reality they are Communist in name only. This is the situation in Russia after the dramatic changes. It is said that there are more than a thousand parties, but there is not a real Marxist-Leninist-Maoist Communist Party. Even the influential Russian Communist Party led by Zyuganov was not a truly qualified Marxist-Leninist-Maoist Communist Party in terms of its line, program, theory and practice. The so-called Communist Parties in some Eastern European countries also had this situation. Therefore, they could not win the support of the broad masses of working people within the framework of the bourgeois democratic republic, and naturally could not win the election to become the ruling party. This historical experience is worth noting.

Thirdly, the rights of citizens of the People's Republic of China stipulated in the Constitution must be implemented.

These rights are not only the personal rights that citizens of the People's Republic of China should obtain, but also the rights of citizens of the People's Republic of China to manage the country. Only the existence and realisation of these rights can truly reflect that the People's Republic of China is a country of proletarian dictatorship and people's democratic dictatorship.

For example, the current Constitution, which is often mentioned, stipulates in Article 35 that "Citizens of the People's Republic of China have freedom of speech, publication, assembly, association, procession and demonstration." Obviously, these freedoms reflect the individual freedom of citizens of the People's Republic of China, but its most important and highest value is that citizens of the People's Republic of China can use these rights to express their political opinions and manage the country. It is precisely because of this significance that we are fighting against revisionist rulers and fighting for democracy today, and we have raised the banner of the Constitution and firmly demanded the implementation of Article 35 of the Constitution. The essence of this struggle is by no means limited to fighting for individual rights, but using the Constitution as a legitimate weapon to wage class struggle and political struggle against the fascist bourgeois dictatorship. In a class society, there are no individual rights that transcend classes, and rights are always class rights. This is the class significance of striving to implement the various rights of citizens of the People's Republic of China stipulated in the Constitution.

This is very easy to understand for those who have actually experienced the fascist bourgeois dictatorship after the revisionists came to power. Without the rights of the people, there can be no dictatorship of the proletariat, no people's democratic dictatorship, no people being the masters of their own country, and no socialism. Doesn't the history of the past forty years fully illustrate this point?

Only when the people have the right to protect the socialist country can they protect this socialist country and can socialism be stable.

The above-mentioned superficial thoughts are more like teachings from practice than theoretical discussions. A cruel fact we face is that revisionism comes to power, restores capitalism, and implements the fascist bourgeois dictatorship, and it is very difficult for the people who are suppressed and oppressed to resist. Chairman Mao said that if Lin Biao and his kind come to power, it will be easy to establish a capitalist system. Now I can add that if Lin Biao and his kind come to power, it will be very difficult for the people to oppose the establishment of a capitalist system.

It is these two historical lessons that tell us that the system and institutions we have built and their operation have drawbacks and loopholes, and are not in line with the Marxist theory of proletarian dictatorship and proletarian state theory. Therefore, on the one hand, it is easy to establish a capitalist system; on the other hand, it is very difficult to oppose the capitalist system. It is from this fact that I have the above ideas.

I think that as long as we respect this fact and start from this fact, comrades can definitely make more and better summaries.

Now, we can end this article.

The General Secretary attributes the most essential characteristics of socialism to the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party, which is essentially to maintain the one-party dictatorship of the Chinese Communist Party, which has become revisionist. According to the General Secretary, the leadership here actually refers to the political power, and the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party here refers to the Communist Party holding political power. Moreover, according to this statement, as long

as it is claimed that socialism is carried out in China, the revisionist Chinese Communist Party should always hold political power.

The matter is very clear. We have different views from General Secretary Xi Jinping on what are the most essential characteristics of socialism. In our view, it is not surprising that such a disagreement has arisen. It is a completely understandable and explainable historical necessity. To put it bluntly, this is the fundamental contradiction between Marxism and revisionism on the essence of socialism. This contradiction reflects the class struggle between the proletariat, the broad masses of working people, and the bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie. Isn't this a realistic historical necessity?

It is this historical inevitability that tells us that General Secretary Xi Jinping's opinions are the opinions of the bureaucratic monopoly bourgeoisie. From this, we can also conclude again that "Xi Jinping Thought" is not Xi Jinping's personal thoughts in essence, but the thoughts of the bureaucratic monopoly bourgeoisie.

This is a hat that is neither too big nor too small, and it is just right.¹⁵ I wonder if the General Secretary can accept it?

January 1, 2018

¹⁵ The placing of a "hat" on a person was the same as labelling that person – Trans.

"Building a 'community with a shared future for mankind'" is a revisionist diplomatic line

In the "Political Report of the 19th National Congress", as an important part of "Xi Jinping Thought on Socialism with Chinese Characteristics for a New Era", it is proposed that "China's major power diplomacy with Chinese characteristics should promote the building of a new type of international relations and promote the building of a community with a shared future for mankind".

This statement by General Secretary Xi Jinping tells us that they want to carry out "China's major power diplomacy with Chinese characteristics" and "promote the building of a new type of international relations", and the focus is on "promoting the building of a community with a shared future for mankind".

What a "community of shared future for mankind"!

Is this the "original intention" of the Communists that the General Secretary claims to be? Is it the "mission" of the Communists?

This slogan is a slogan that betrays the "Communist Manifesto" and a slogan that obliterates the fact that the world today is still in the era of imperialism. Therefore, it is a deceptive and reactionary slogan!

It is normal and inevitable that this slogan exists as a part of "Xi Jinping Thought on Socialism with Chinese Characteristics for a New Era". It simply proves that "Xi Jinping Thought on Socialism with Chinese Characteristics for a New Era" is indeed a revisionist thought, a bourgeois thought labelled as Marxism.

Therefore, we need to analyse and criticise this wrong slogan.

1. Two fundamentally opposing viewpoints on the theme of the times and the historical tasks

What kind of era are we in? What is our historical mission in this era? The answers given by the real communists who adhere to Marxism and the fake communists who engage in revisionism are completely different and fundamentally opposed.

Like many major issues with fundamental differences, this is not a new issue, but an old issue. Marxists and revisionists have been fighting over this issue from the time of Marx and Engels, through the time of Lenin and Stalin, to the time of Chairman Mao. This is no exception. The current struggle is nothing more than a continuation and development of the previous struggle.

For more than 100 years since the publication of Lenin's "Imperialism", communists have always believed that our era is an era in which imperialism in the stage of monopoly capitalism dominates the world, and an era in which the proletariat and the broad masses of the people are carrying out socialist revolution and people's democratic revolution around the world to liberate themselves from the rule of capital. In short, as Stalin said, it is an era of imperialism and proletarian revolution.

In judging the nature of the times, all traitors to the communist revolutionary movement and all revisionist parties have abandoned the Marxist position and viewpoint on this issue without exception. This is true from Khrushchev's "Three Harmonies (peaceful coexistence, peaceful competition, and peaceful transition) and Two Alls (a state for all the people and a party for all the people)" to Deng Xiaoping's "peace and development" as the theme of the contemporary world. Now, General Secretary Xi Jinping has come up with "building a community with a shared future for mankind", which is also the case.

If we truly adhere to the viewpoints of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, it is not difficult to understand some basic characteristics and basic contradictions of the contemporary world and the contemporary era.

For example, it is very obvious that in today's world and this era, classes, class contradictions, and class struggles still exist everywhere. That is to say, the world and the era we live in are still in a class society, and the law of class struggle still plays a decisive role. This is the most basic premise for us to understand this world and this era. Facing a society with class confrontation, it is nothing but a foolish dream to talk about building a community with a shared future for mankind. This is General Secretary Xi Jinping's "world dream".

It is also very obvious that the world today is completely dominated by monopoly capitalist economy. The so-called "global economic integration" is actually the integration of global monopoly capitalist economy, which is a new level and new stage of global monopoly capitalist economic development. This not only does not negate Lenin's scientific analysis of monopoly capitalism, but proves that Lenin's scientific analysis of monopoly capitalism is completely correct and not outdated at all. For example, none of the five characteristics of imperialism analysed by Lenin are missing, and not only still exist, but also more prominent.

It is on this globalized monopoly capitalist economic foundation that the struggle between imperialist countries is inevitable; the bullying of backward and weak countries by imperialist countries is also inevitable. The proposition that "imperialism is war" has never been outdated. Since World War II, wars of all sizes have never ceased.

Chairman Mao inherited and developed Lenin. Based on the political, economic, and military situation of the current imperialist era, and the new factor of the Soviet Union's revisionism and transformation into a social-imperialist country, Chairman Mao proposed the theory of "three worlds." This is Lenin's theory of imperialism, a new development in the contemporary era, and an important part of Mao Zedong Thought. Chairman Mao's theory is still relevant today, and the general line of the international communist movement derived from this theory is also relevant today.

On June 14, 1963, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, in its reply to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, clearly wrote: "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 expand the socialist camp, gradually realize 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."

The letter also said: "This general line is based on the overall situation of world reality, on the class analysis of the basic contradictions in the contemporary world, and is aimed at the global counter-revolutionary strategy of U.S. imperialism.

"This general line is a line to establish a broad united front against imperialism headed by the United States and reactionaries in various countries with the socialist camp and the international proletariat as the core.

"From Lenin to Stalin to Chairman Mao, they have actually been implementing such a Marxist general line of the international communist movement and resolutely fighting against all revisionist lines that

betray this line. At that time, the struggle against the Khrushchev revisionist group was such a struggle, including this reply letter.

The reply letter severely criticised the revisionist line of the Khrushchev revisionist group and clearly pointed out that "if the general line of the international communist movement is one-sidedly reduced to "peaceful coexistence", "peaceful competition" and "peaceful transition", it is a violation of the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement, that is, abandoning the historical mission of the proletarian world revolution, and deviating from the revolutionary theory of Marxism-Leninism."

"The general line of the international communist movement should express the general law of the development of world history" and "should point out the basic direction for the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and the people of all countries." This line is the line for the people of all countries to resolutely carry out revolutionary struggles and carry the proletarian world revolution through to the end; it is also the most effective line to oppose imperialism and defend world peace."

Subsequently, according to the development of the international situation, Chairman Mao proposed the famous "theory of the three worlds". On the basis of adhering to the original general line of the international communist movement, he added the content of uniting the second world and isolating and attacking the two hegemons of the United States and the Soviet Union to the maximum extent.

It was under the correct leadership of Lenin, Stalin and Chairman Mao, under the guidance of the correct general line of the international communist movement, combined with the favourable international class struggle situation, that the communist movement in the world has made great progress, the national democratic liberation movement in the world has made great progress, and a great situation of "the east wind prevails over the west wind" has emerged, which is a climax of the communist movement.

Revolution is the driving force of social and historical development, including the driving force of productivity development. Grasping revolution and promoting production is a universal law. The great victories achieved by the Soviet Union in the Lenin and Stalin era and China in the Mao era in socialist construction are obvious to all. There were setbacks, mistakes, and painful lessons, but overall, the great victories achieved cannot be erased by any tricks.

Things always exist in comparison. Compared with the losses brought to the international communist movement by the revisionist line of Khrushchev and Deng Xiaoping, which line is truly Marxist? Which line is more in line with the interests of the proletariat and the broad masses of the people? Which line can promote the progress of history? The right and wrong are very clear.

Practice has tested the truth. Moreover, it now seems that under the leadership of Chairman Mao, the Chinese Communist Party's criticism of the Soviet revisionist party has not become outdated, and these critical opinions can be applied to General Secretary Xi Jinping without any changes.

If there is anything to add, it is that the General Secretary's revisionist line of "building a community with a shared future for mankind" goes further, slides deeper, and is more irrelevant than Khrushchev's revisionist line back then.

Therefore, we must criticise it.

2. The diplomatic line of "building a community with a shared future for mankind" must be criticised

The diplomatic line of "building a community with a shared future for mankind" is a revisionist line. This line is a revisionist line implemented internally, and its continuation in foreign policy is an integral part of the entire revisionist line.

The basis of the revisionist line is to deny the existence of class struggle, and then deny class struggle as a key link. This is true for both internal and external affairs, domestic and foreign affairs.

Just as they deny the existence of classes and class struggle in their own country, they also deny the existence of classes and class struggle in the real world. In their eyes, this real world has no imperialism, no monopoly capitalism, no class contradictions and class struggles between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the proletariat and the broad masses of the working people, no exploitation and oppression, no suffering of the working people, no aggression, and no war, and therefore there is no need for a proletarian socialist revolution. Therefore, Deng Xiaoping proposed that "peace and development" is the theme of today's world, and Xi Jinping further developed it and proposed to "build a community with a shared future for mankind." It can be said that these nonsenses are worthy of the inheritance and development of Khrushchev's revisionist reactionary fallacy of advocating the establishment of a "three-no world" of "no weapons, no army, and no war."

This is a distortion of the fundamental nature of the real world today.

Theoretically, it is of course a betrayal of the scientific theoretical analyses of the nature of capitalism in the real world that have been made from Marxism, through Leninism, to Maoism, and it is also a betrayal of the ideal of carrying out a proletarian revolution and realising communism that the communists have insisted on keeping faith with since the publication of the Communist Manifesto.

Practically speaking, it is in turn a betrayal of the communist revolutionary movement of more than 100 years, and a betrayal of the countless revolutionary martyrs who sacrificed their lives in this great revolutionary movement for the liberation of the proletariat and the masses of the people.

They took the blood of the revolutionary martyrs to colour their own roofs red, they took the lives of the revolutionary martyrs to exchange for their own interests, they betrayed the revolution, they betrayed their principles, they described what is obviously a society full of suffering with class confrontation under the rule of monopoly capitalism as a classless society in which it is possible to 'build a community of human destiny'. Isn't that the most shameless and unforgivable betrayal of all?

The line determines the political direction, the major political policy, the policy strategy and the ultimate outcome. It is precisely under the guidance of this revisionist diplomatic line that the revisionist ruling clique has been adopting a policy of capitulation towards the imperialist countries led by the United States over the past few decades.

The first and most prominent problem is naturally manifested in the policy towards the United States and in the handling of Sino-American relations.

On 20 May 1970, Chairman Mao made a statement entitled 'People Of The World, Unite And Defeat The U.S. Aggressors And All Their Running Dogs!' - a great statement. In Chairman Mao's time, our Party's diplomatic line was a revolutionary line that resolutely supported the proletarian international communist movement, a revolutionary line that resolutely implemented the internationalism of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. At that time, we saw very clearly that United States imperialism was the number one enemy of the people of the whole world, and firmly and courageously raised a very appealing revolutionary red flag: 'The people of the whole world unite to defeat imperialism and all its reactionaries, led by United States imperialism'. At that time, this played an extremely great role in promoting the socialist revolutionary movement and the national democratic liberation movement.

China is the holy land to which all the revolutionary people of the world aspire, China is the reliable rear of all the revolutionary people of the world, Beijing is the red flag of the world, and Chairman Mao is the revolutionary leader respected by the people of the world.

However, in today's China under the rule of revisionism, everything has changed. China-United States relations have been described as a 'strategic partnership' and likened to a 'husband-and-wife relationship',¹⁶ and the General Secretary has even declared that 'there are a thousand reasons to improve China-United States relations, and there is not a single reason to make it worse'. But when the United States was in an economic crisis, our Premier was so worried that he said, 'To save the United States is to save China',¹⁷ and he willingly tied himself to the chariot of the United States.

This is a lesson from history. It shows that a revisionist diplomatic line is inevitably a capitulationist line.

This was true for Khrushchev, Deng Xiaoping, and Deng Xiaoping's successors. This shows that this is not an accidental phenomenon, but is determined by the nature of revisionism. The history of the communist movement tells us that opportunism and revisionism within the workers' movement will always betray and sell out the interests of the working class, and will always pursue a capitulationist line toward the bourgeoisie. From Khrushchev to Deng Xiaoping, they pursued a class capitulationist line toward imperialism in diplomacy, which was nothing more than an external extension of their class capitulationist line at home. The essence is the same, which is class capitulation to the bourgeoisie. This is the essence of what we must recognise.

Secondly, we often say that the process of the restoration of capitalism in China is the process of privatisation. At the same time, we must also see that this process of privatisation is also a process of transformation of the Chinese economy by international monopoly capitalism. This is a very clear fact that we all see. This fact is enough to prove that the capitulationist essence of the revisionist diplomatic line is the surrender to capitalism. The restoration of capitalism in China can be said, to a certain extent, to be the restoration of international monopoly capitalism in China. International monopoly capitalism, which was driven out by Chairman Mao, has been invited back by the capitulationist Deng Xiaoping, and it was invited back in a fawning manner.

It is under the rule of the international monopoly capitalist economy that the former masters of the country and the masters of the enterprise have once again become miserable wage earners. The Chinese working class was betrayed by the revisionist traitors, and the level of consciousness of the Chinese working class was not enough after all. They did not follow Chairman Mao's teachings to bravely raise the banner of rebellion against revisionism and against taking the capitalist road. Therefore, they could only struggle in a miserable life as an oppressed and exploited wage labour class. This is the class suffering that is inevitably brought about by class capitulation.

We cannot but admit that the capitalist mode of production is still a huge driving force for China's economic development today. It is under the cruel oppression of the capitalist mode of production that the smart, high-quality and cheap Chinese workers have created high surplus value for the Chinese and foreign monopoly bourgeoisie, while also bringing about the rapid development of China's economy. Things that could have been done and done better under socialist conditions have now

¹⁶ In 2013, when the United States participated in the U.S.-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue, Chinese Vice Premier Wang Yang compared the U.S.-China relationship to a "husband and wife," saying that the two sides could not "divorce," otherwise "it would be too costly to break up like Murdoch and Wendi Deng" – Trans.

¹⁷ When the subprime mortgage crisis broke out in the United States in 2008, there was a slogan that "to save the United States is to save China" that was very popular, after China bought a large number of US bonds – Trans.

become a means for Chinese and foreign monopoly capitalism to seize China's wealth at a high price in the form of a cruel capitalist economy. This is the fact that the result and essence of implementing a capitulationist line to the outside world is to surrender to capitalism. The "economic transformation" that has been shouted all the time is actually the transformation from socialism to capitalism under the command of international monopoly capitalism.

The nature of capital is bloody and cruel oppression and plunder. Monopoly capitalism has not only caused polarization in China, with billionaires living in luxury on one side and people suffering under the pressure of the three new mountains on the other. Moreover, China's precious mineral resources have been plundered, and China's beautiful green mountains and clear waters have been polluted, leaving harm to future generations. Such losses cannot be calculated in money, they cannot be recovered or compensated, and they are the eternal misfortune of our nation and our motherland. From this point of view, what monopoly capitalism has brought us is not development, but destruction. The revisionist capitulationist line has not only betrayed socialism, but also betrayed our nation and our motherland. One day, our descendants will angrily denounce their perverse behaviour today.

Third, the line of "building a community with a shared future for mankind" is a betrayal of the communist ideals of the Communists and the communist revolutionary movement of the Communists.

General Secretary Xi Jinping has repeatedly said "never forget the original intention", and the whole party has repeatedly boasted "never forget the original intention". What is the "original intention" of the Communists? It is to engage in class struggle, to engage in socialist revolution, and to strive for the realisation of communism. However, this original intention that should not be forgotten has been tampered by General Secretary Xi Jinping into "building a community with a shared future for mankind". What a "construction"! What a "community with a shared future for mankind"! How to do it is called "construction"? Is there still class struggle? Is there still socialist revolution? In today's world where imperialism and monopoly capitalism dominate, can we "build a community with a shared future for mankind"? Can billionaire capitalists and impoverished hired workers "build" a "community with a shared future"?

This is a deception of the Chinese working class and the broad masses of working people, and also a deception of the working class and the broad masses of working people all over the world.

Taking the route of building a community with a shared future for mankind to replace the route of proletarian revolution pursued by the communist movement since the publication of the Communist Manifesto is essentially betraying the proletariat and the broad masses of working people, surrendering to the bourgeoisie, and helping the bourgeoisie build a global capital community on the basis of eliminating the proletarian revolutionary movement.

Isn't this exactly the case?

From Deng Xiaoping's "'Peace and development' is the theme of the contemporary world" to Xi Jinping's "building a community with a shared future for mankind", this revisionist party's revisionist international line has replaced the general line of the international communist movement of adhering to proletarian revolution by the Chinese Communist Party led by Chairman Mao. Its direct consequence and great harm is that it has led the international communist movement into a trough.

Originally, when the Soviet Communist Party became revisionist, Chairman Mao led the Chinese Communist Party to raise the red flag of the international communist movement, resolutely criticize and oppose revisionism, adhere to the revolutionary principles of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement adopted by the Communist and Workers' Parties of various countries at the two

Moscow Conferences in 1957 and 1960, and defend the general line of the international communist movement formulated in the Declaration and the Statement. Beijing became the centre of the world revolution. Chairman Mao became a leader loved and supported by the revolutionary people of the world. The communist movement in the world is developing, and the struggles of the oppressed people and oppressed nations in the world are developing. The days of American imperialism are not easy, and the days of Soviet revisionist social imperialism are not easy. In the words of Chairman Mao at the time, the enemy is getting worse and worse, and we are getting better and better.

However, after the Chairman's death, history took a major turn. The revisionist group headed by Deng Xiaoping came to power. Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line replaced Chairman Mao's revolutionary line. The revisionist reforms carried out internally and externally were actually taking the capitalist road and rebuilding capitalism, and the worst kind of capitalism. Deng Xiaoping set a bad example, and Gorbachev followed closely, causing capitalism to surge in like a tide. Although a small "storm" in 1989 was not enough to shake the rule of the Chinese revisionist party, under different historical conditions, it gave rise to the dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. From Khrushchev and the Soviet Party's anti-Stalin movement to Deng Xiaoping and the Chinese Party's anti-Chairman Mao movement, the path taken by revisionism is the same, the betrayal of the Marxist proletarian revolutionary line is the same, the selling out of the cause of socialism and communism is the same, and the ultimate restoration of capitalism is also the same.

In such a big background, with the goal of "building a community with a shared future for mankind", the Chinese revisionist party can no longer raise the red flag of the proletarian socialist revolution, nor can it shout revolutionary slogans against imperialism and capitalism, nor can it support the revolutionary struggles of the people of all countries in the world. On the contrary, they play the role of running dogs of the reactionaries headed by US imperialism everywhere, and are even worse than some countries that insist on nationalism, oppose bullying and aggression.

Not to mention, in Southeast Asia, they directly betrayed and sold out the Communist parties that were engaged in armed struggle, and did what the reactionaries in these countries wanted to do but could not do.

Don't listen to or believe those beautiful empty words. The most appropriate hat to put on their heads is the word: traitors! Traitors to the proletariat and the broad masses of working people! Traitors to the international communist movement!

Fourth, don't blaspheme patriotism! Deng Xiaoping and his successors have no patriotism, only treason.

General Secretary Xi Jinping is a loyal successor of Deng Xiaoping. Just as Deng Xiaoping was criticized for promoting a traitorous line during the Cultural Revolution, today, General Secretary Xi Jinping is also promoting a traitorous line. His "building a community with a shared future for mankind" is to sell out the interests of China and the Chinese people to build a community with a shared future for imperialist countries led by the United States.

Are there still few such facts in the past 40 years?

Selling the Chinese working class, who were originally the masters of the country, to international monopoly capitalism as workers, slaves, and pathetic cheap labour is a class betrayal. It is doing what the imperialists tried to do with armed aggression but failed to do. It is complete treachery.

To sell out socialist enterprises, which originally belong to the Chinese people, not only to private capitalists in China but also to international monopoly capitalists through various despicable means of theft such as 'bankruptcy', is again a complete betrayal of the country.

To create high profits for international monopoly capitalism at the expense of China's natural environment and mineral resources and in conjunction with China's cheap labour force is again a complete betrayal of the country.

With the high degree of development of the productive forces in contemporary society, there has been the global integration of the monopoly capitalist economy, which is in fact the control and plundering of the global economy by international monopoly capitalism, led by the United States, especially the economies of the third world countries. The price for China's bureaucratic authoritarian monopoly bourgeoisie to join this chorus of the international monopoly capitalist economy is to completely abandon the socialist economic model and completely adopt the capitalist economic model; to completely abandon the socialist economic construction line of independence and self-reliance; to completely give up China's economic sovereignty, and to fully open the door for the international monopoly capitalist economy to invade China. The 'building of a community of human destiny' is such a product. The so-called 'opening up' of Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line is a surrender, a betrayal of the country, a surrender to international monopoly capitalism, and a betrayal of China to international monopoly capitalism. The 'building of a community of human destiny' is but a continuation of this line. To talk about 'being more open' is to be more surrendered, to be more traitorous, and to carry out an even more thoroughgoing line of treachery. They will continue to surrender and betray their country in this way, and we will certainly continue to see them sink deeper and deeper into all kinds of shameless crimes of surrender and betrayal. We will wait and see.

This is the essence of treason which cannot be concealed under the broken banner of 'patriotism'.

Patriotism is class-based. It depends on which class is holding the 'country'. When the state is already in the hands of the bureaucratic dictatorship and monopoly bourgeoisie, patriotism at this point in time is nothing more than asking people to 'love' the state of the bureaucratic dictatorship and monopoly bourgeoisie and to defend the state of the bureaucratic dictatorship and monopoly bourgeoisie. The state machinery which controls the destiny of the country no longer belongs to the working people, but is a tool of dictatorship over the working people. In the present age, there is no abstract super-class state apparatus, but only a concrete state apparatus belonging to a certain class. The class nature of the state apparatus determines the destiny of the state, including the destiny of the class of working people in that state. Therefore, once one talks about patriotism, one must first find out, which class's patriotism is being talked about here? What kind of class content does the patriotism of this class have?

Once we look at the issue in this way, we will see that the banner of 'patriotism' in the hands of the bureaucratic, autocratic and monopolistic bourgeoisie is in fact a broken banner to cover up capitulationism and treason.

Not only that, we must further see that under the broken banner of "patriotism" of the bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie, the so-called "building a community with a shared future for mankind" also has the manifestation of social-imperialism, which is also determined by the nature of the revisionist line of "building a community with a shared future for mankind."

Just as the Soviet revisionists were bound to move towards social-imperialism, the Chinese revisionist party of "socialism with Chinese characteristics", is also bound to move towards social-imperialism. This is not difficult to analyse. "Socialism with Chinese characteristics" is essentially China's

bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalism. Since it is monopoly capitalism, it must have the basic characteristics of imperialism analysed by Lenin, and it must have the basic manifestations of social-imperialism. This is exactly the case.

The biggest fact is export of capital.

Comrade Lei Feng's class brothers in the Third World were the ones we wanted to help in the past, but now they have become the targets of exploitation by China's bureaucratic autocracy and monopoly capitalism. "Socialism with Chinese characteristics" not only "reforms" the Chinese working class into an oppressed and exploited wage labour class under the control of the monopoly capitalist economy, but also extends its hand to the Third World, "reforming" the working class there into an oppressed and exploited wage labour class under the control of China's monopoly capitalist economy.

The former proletarian internationalism of the Communist Party of China has degenerated into the neo-colonialism of the current revisionist party, and has been denounced by the leaders of the third world countries. They denounced well, rightly, and justly, and we firmly support them! This is not proletarian patriotism at all, but also the treason and capitulationism of the bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie. The bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie does this and exports capital in this way, which is a surrender to international monopoly capitalism and a community of shared destiny for capitalists who sell themselves to international monopoly capitalism.

From another aspect, this once again exposes the class nature of the so-called "building a community of shared future for mankind."

Lenin taught us that imperialism not only engages in the export of capital, but also that, along with the export of capital, there is inevitably competition for capital, competition for colonies, the division of colonies, and that, in the interests of capital, wars are often waged, even at the cost of starting world wars. History and reality have verified Lenin's teaching. Now, Chinese social-imperialism is also acting in accordance with the laws of imperialism revealed by Lenin. Political, military, economic and diplomatic means, in all their forms and by all means, are being used interactively for a single purpose, the export of capital. What is 'great country diplomacy', 'strong country politics', economic power, what is 'Awesome, my country'¹⁸, competing for orders, competing for ports, and thinking that they are proud of themselves are in fact the ugliness and evils of social-imperialism. This is not 'building a community of human destiny'. It is to take part in imperialist rivalries and to play the role of social-imperialism. This is neither proletarian socialist patriotism nor the pride of the Chinese people, but a disgrace to the Chinese Party and the Chinese people.

In the imperialist struggle, the Chinese-style social-imperialism has its own "characteristics" and advantages. First, there is a large number of high-level, docile and cheap labourers such as Chinese workers, and second, there is a bureaucratic and authoritarian political system that can mobilise the whole country to participate in the struggle. The original superiority of socialism has transformed into the "characteristic superiority" of social-imperialism. This cannot but cause dissatisfaction among imperialist countries led by the United States. The Sino-US trade war occurred because of this, and the Trump administration's demand that China change its economic system also occurred because of this.

¹⁸ "Awesome, My Country" is a documentary film jointly produced by CCTV and China Film Co., Ltd. which was released on the Chinese mainland on March 2, 2018. The film creates propaganda around poverty alleviation, ecological civilization construction, medical security, the national security system and other aspects. These are all attributed to the leadership of the Party Central Committee under Xi Jinping following his election as Party General Secretary at the 18th national Congress of the CPC in 2012 – Trans.

Imperialism is war. It started with economic struggle, and the next step is military struggle. War is inevitable.

Chairman Mao repeatedly warned us during his lifetime that one of the principles of China's foreign relations is not to seek hegemony. We will not seek hegemony now, will not seek hegemony even when we become powerful, and will not seek hegemony ten thousand years from now. However, Deng Xiaoping and his followers have long betrayed Chairman Mao's teachings. This is determined by their revisionist nature, their monopoly capitalist nature, their social-imperialist nature, in a word, their class nature. This is not an accident of personal sin, but an inevitable nature of the monopoly bourgeoisie, the most cruel and predatory exploiting class.

Don't forget that when the bourgeoisie became the richest class in human history, it was at the cost of annihilating countless backward nations with cruel and inhumane means. We, the Chinese nation, survived only because our ancestors were not afraid of sacrifice and continued to fight. Today, how can we "build a community with a shared future for mankind" together with the monopoly bourgeoisie that has slaughtered and is slaughtering the oppressed and exploited people all over the world? Isn't this a complete lie, deception and betrayal?

'Building a community of human destiny'! To paraphrase Chairman Mao's advocacy of the entry of colloquialisms into literature, it should also be dismissed as: no farting!

We must keep a clear mind and we cannot abandon Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, this sharp ideological weapon. Facing this cruel capitalist world, facing extreme poverty, extreme hardship, extreme misery on the one hand and extreme wealth, extreme luxury, extreme profligacy on the other hand, facing the inevitable class confrontation and class struggle on this basis, we cannot believe that there is any "community of human destiny". We are facing a community of class confrontation and class struggle. Our historical task can only be to break this community, transform this community, and build a human communist community with the means of class struggle and the means of proletarian dictatorship. This is the only way for human history scientifically demonstrated by Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

Time waits for no one. Faced with the destruction of the environment, resources, and the earth, the foundation for human survival is destroyed, and all of this is caused by cruel monopoly capitalism. We must protect the environment and the earth, but to truly achieve this, we must eliminate capitalism. Capitalism is the culprit in destroying the earth. Eliminating capitalism and protecting the earth are synchronised and have the same meaning. Leaving this basic fact, leaving this basic background, and not talking about capitalism, the greatest scourge of mankind, actually proposed the so-called "building a community with a shared future for mankind" that is super-class and super-realistic. Isn't this using an illusory dream to cover up the cruel reality? The natural foundation of the "community with a shared future for mankind" is on the verge of destruction. Without the natural conditions for human survival, where can we "build a community with a shared future for mankind"? What else is this if not bullshit?

This is a thoroughly bourgeois slogan. It has nothing in common with the theories, beliefs and worldviews of the Communists. The Communists have always adhered to the principle that only through class struggle against the bourgeoisie and a historical period of proletarian dictatorship can a communist society be achieved. At that time, "building a community with a shared future for mankind" will not be empty talk or deception, but something that can actually be done. This is the scientific nature of the communist ideal.

We can only adhere to the slogan of striving for the realization of communism, and cannot accept the slogan of "building a community with a shared future for mankind". Speaking of "original intention", this is the original intention of the real Communists.

3. Hold high the red flag of "The Internationale"

From August 15 to September 12, 1971, Chairman Mao visited the south. During this period, Chairman Mao taught us many times with the Internationale. Chairman Mao said: "For the Internationale, Lenin wrote an article to commemorate Eugène Pottier on the 25th anniversary of his death. It has been a hundred years! The lyrics of the Internationale and Lenin's article are all Marxist positions and viewpoints." He also said: "We should not only sing the Internationale, but also explain it and follow it. The lyrics of the Internationale and Lenin's article are all Marxist positions and viewpoints. It talks about slaves rising up to fight for the truth. There has never been a saviour, nor do we rely on gods and emperors. We have to save ourselves. Who created the human world? It is us, the working people."

Today, I listened to Chairman Mao's words, reread Lenin's articles again and again, and sang "The Internationale" again and again. I shed tears, I was excited, my soul was shaken, and I once again learned a little bit of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism's ideas, theories and revolutionary lines.

I deeply feel that the teachings of the revolutionary mentors of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism are not outdated, and "The Internationale" is not outdated. We must still hold high the red flag of "The Internationale", bravely engage in the fight against the bourgeoisie, and move forward unyieldingly and one after another! Forward!

The truth of "The Internationale" tells us that our era is not an era of "peace and development" or an era of "building a community with a shared future for mankind", but an era of "Arise, slaves who are starving and cold! Arise, suffering people of the world! With your blood boiling, you must fight for the truth! The old world will be smashed to pieces. Slaves, rise up, rise up! Don't say we have nothing, we want to be the masters of the world! This is the final struggle. Unite until tomorrow, and the Internationale will surely be realised!"

More than a hundred years have passed, and the description of our era by "The Internationale" has not become outdated. Its scientificity and accuracy can still withstand the test of history. History is developing and capitalism is changing, but the basic laws of capitalist society revealed by Marxism still exist and still dominate this era. Our era is still the era of imperialism and proletarian socialist revolution. The historical task of the proletariat and the broad masses of the people is to rise up, to make the final struggle, to smash the old world to pieces and realize the Internationale!

So, from the perspective of Marxist proletarian internationalism, how should we deal with the diplomatic line of a socialist country that has won the victory of the socialist revolution and obtained state power?

Let's talk about a few ideas.

First, we must see that the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution is also a historical process. Today, socialism is not getting farther and farther away from us, but getting closer and closer to us.

There is a scientific basis for this statement.

With the high development of contemporary science and technology, mankind has created unprecedented huge productivity. It is this productivity that has pushed monopoly capitalism to a

higher level and launched a global monopoly capitalist economic integration. The global economy has never been as closely linked as it is today. This provides a solid economic foundation for the development of the international communist movement and the realization of socialism around the world.

The revolutionary mentor taught us that highly concentrated monopoly capitalism is the eve of socialism. The highly developed monopoly capitalism and the global integration of monopoly capitalism have created excellent material prerequisites for global socialist integration, and have more fully demonstrated the historical inevitability of socialism.

This historical inevitability is also manifested in the capitalist matrix. From the publication of the Communist Manifesto to the present, driven by the struggle of the proletariat and the broad masses of the people and the progress of human history, capitalism has been developing and gradually transitioning from its lower stage to its higher stage. In this historical process, capitalism cannot but carry out reforms that are suitable for the development of productivity. As Lenin said, reform is a by-product of class struggle. Of course, this is also the inevitable result of the development of productivity and the inevitable result of the progress of human history and culture.

Therefore, today we can see, as Lenin said, that a large number of socialist factors have emerged in the womb of capitalism. The Nordic social democratic society is such a typical example. This is a fact that does not need to be denied but only explained. This fact is firstly obtained through the struggle of the working class and the broad masses of working people, and secondly, it proves the historical inevitability of the transition from capitalism to socialism. The more capitalism develops, the more socialist factors there are, which provides the possibility and inevitability for launching the socialist revolution.

This is not reformism. This is exactly the truth that the revolutionary mentors have put forward and theoretically demonstrated. Revolution cannot be abolished. Abolition of revolution will inevitably slide into reformism. No matter how highly capitalism develops and reforms, from capitalism to socialism, from private ownership to public ownership, revolution is inevitable. What can be studied and explored, and can be flexibly applied based on reality, is just the form of revolution. One thing is certain, which is sung loudly in the "Internationale" and is also what Chairman Mao has repeatedly taught us, that is, the proletariat and the broad masses of working people must rise up, rise up to fight the final struggle, that is, rise up to revolution! This is the inevitable law of historical progress. As Chairman Mao said, there will be revolution ten thousand years time!

The historical possibility of the socialist revolution is also reflected in the consciousness of the working class and the broad masses of working people. The working class and the broad masses of working people are the main force of the socialist revolution. Without the urgent demands of the working class and the broad masses of working people for the socialist revolution, the socialist revolution will not happen. The objective demands and possibilities of history are reflected through the subjective forces of history. This has been proven by the history of the international communist movement for more than 150 years since the publication of the Communist Manifesto.

The awakening of the masses is a historical process. Under the guidance of Marxism and the leadership of Lenin and Chairman Mao, the people won the victory of the October Revolution and the victory of the Chinese Revolution. Socialism is advancing victoriously. Not only did we win the victory of the anti-fascist struggle in the Second World War, but we also created a socialist camp and a great situation of "the east wind prevailing over the west wind" emerged. In this revolutionary process, the masses gave full play to their historical initiative and played the great role of the creators of socialist history. However, the path of historical development is not straight, but tortuous. Due to the difficulties

determined by the limitations of historical conditions, and the fact that the cause of socialism is a brand-new historical subject unprecedented in history, it is inevitable that the Communists will fall into blindness and make certain mistakes in leading the cause of socialism. The biggest difficulty is that the problem of revisionism has not been solved. The Communist Party metamorphosed into a revisionist party, the revisionist party came to power, and the revisionist line dominated, so that socialist societies metamorphosed into bureaucratic dictatorships and privileges, as in the case of the USSR, or even into bureaucratic dictatorships and monopoly capitalisms, as in the case of China. In the face of this historical regression, the people still need a process of realisation. In the Soviet Union, it was transformed through dramatic changes into a capitalist society in the form of a bourgeois national republic; in China, the genuine Chinese Communists, represented by the Maoists, are leading the Chinese people in a difficult struggle against revisionism and against the restoration of capitalism.

People need both positive and negative education. "Socialism is good" is not an empty phrase. The mistakes made in the process of building socialism were used by the enemy to attack socialism, to create a theoretical basis for the restoration of capitalism, and to deceive the masses. However, the cruel facts of blood and tears after the restoration of capitalism educated the masses again. Under the education of both positive and negative facts, the masses returned to the banner of Chairman Mao and accepted the theory of Maoism on the continuation of socialist revolution. It can be said that never before have the Chinese people truly understood Maoism and truly accepted Maoism like today, which will be the material force of the great socialist revolution that can completely defeat capitalism.

China is a big country with a population of 1.4 billion. Once the Chinese people become awakened, it is self-evident what great significance it will have for the socialist revolutionary movement around the world.

The tortuous history of the socialist movement is also educating the working class and the broad masses of working people in developed capitalist countries in Europe and America. They will also constantly improve their consciousness and continue to advance the struggle against capitalism under the enlightenment of both positive and negative historical lessons, and ultimately realise the requirements of the socialist revolution.

History has never created a reliable natural foundation for the realisation of "Unite the proletarians of the world" like today. Since the global integration of monopoly capitalism has achieved global integration of capitalist economy, it has inevitably achieved global integration of the working class and the broad masses of working people. The global integration of monopoly capitalism and the unity of the proletarians of the world are an inevitable unity of opposites. In the words of the Communist Manifesto, capitalism not only inevitably breeds its own gravediggers, but also, as it develops today, capitalism inevitably unites its own gravediggers. This makes us believe even more that the death knell of capitalism has sounded, and the demise of capitalism and the victory of socialism are equally inevitable.

When we observe the historical possibility of socialist revolution, we must also see that although the revolutionary mentors of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism are gone, Marxism-Leninism-Maoism is still here, and the communists educated by Marxism-Leninism-Maoism are still here. Moreover, after the tempering of the victory and failure of socialism, the communists all over the world are improving their ability to understand and practice the theory of socialist revolution. With such communists and the vanguard of the proletariat composed of such communists, the Communist Party, it is fully capable of taking on the historical responsibility of leading the new socialist revolutionary movement.

In China, under the conditions of the fascist bourgeois dictatorship pointed out by Chairman Mao, it is not allowed to openly organise a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist Communist Party. This is of course an open

violation of Article 35 of the current Constitution. But there is no reason to argue with the revisionist fascist rulers, and their so-called "rule of law" is just a lie. This exposes their class nature from the opposite side, is an education for the revolutionary people, and eliminates all illusions of possible legal struggle. This is both a bad thing and a good thing. It tells the Communists that under the conditions of high-tech development and diverse means of communication, it is entirely possible to find special ways to connect and organise the Communists. As long as we adhere to the guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and have a unified understanding of the correct ideological and political line, once the revolutionary opportunity comes, the invisible organisation can be immediately transformed into a tangible organisation. The most important thing is to improve the level of understanding of the ideological theory of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. Now the Chinese Maoists are doing this work, which is a correct strategy that is completely in line with reality.

Socialism is at a low ebb and in a difficult time. This is a fact. We cannot ignore this fact, but can only scientifically understand it and treat it correctly. History has laws and inevitability. Marx said that history is a natural process. The natural here refers to laws and inevitability. Facing the reality of the socialist movement, blind optimism and blind pessimism are wrong. We still need to learn from Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and learn to analyse the situation with Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. In his famous article "Serve the People", Chairman Mao taught us: "In times of difficulties, our comrades must see the achievements, see the light and boost our courage." What we have discussed above is that we hope that when socialism is at a low ebb and in difficulties, our comrades will see the achievements, see the light, and see the historical inevitability and favourable conditions for socialism to defeat capitalism, thereby boosting our determination and courage to launch the socialist revolution in China and throughout the world.

Second, it is precisely based on the understanding of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism of the times that we must adhere to the line of opposing imperialism, opposing revisionism and supporting socialist revolution in international affairs. The above-mentioned 1963 statement of the Chinese Communist Party on the general line of the international communist movement is such a line.

As we all know, Chairman Mao repeatedly stressed in his later years that our party's line must be the line of "class struggle as the key link", not the line of "three directives as the key link" of Deng Xiaoping, the line of "white cat, black cat". Chairman Mao grasped the focus of the differences between Marxism and revisionism. Only by persisting in class struggle and carrying it through to the end, carrying it through to the dictatorship of the proletariat, carrying it through to the continuation of class struggle under the dictatorship of the proletariat, can we truly follow the line of thorough Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, and this is truly thorough and demarcated from the revisionist line.

History has proved that Chairman Mao was completely right. All revisionists dare not persist in class struggle, dare not carry it through to the end, practice class reconciliation, class surrender, and surrender to the bourgeoisie.

Today, the correct line we adhere to in international affairs can also be simply summarized as adhering to the line of "class struggle as the key link".

At all times, in all matters, and in all places, when dealing with any international affairs, we must adhere to observing problems from the perspective of class and class struggle, and we must handle problems based on the line of class struggle as the key link. We must adhere to supporting all class struggles of the proletariat against the monopoly bourgeoisie, and firmly support all class struggles to replace monopoly capitalism with socialism, so as to promote the development of the socialist movement throughout the world.

Adhering to the line of taking class struggle as the key link is consistent with our understanding of the current era. Imperialism and the proletarian socialist revolution refer to the class struggle between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the proletariat and the broad masses of working people. It means that the proletariat and the broad masses of working people want to overthrow the monopoly bourgeoisie and replace monopoly capitalism with socialism.

With such a correct revolutionary general program, we must also have a correct revolutionary strategy.

The era of imperialism and proletarian socialist revolution, as a historical event and historical process, is also constantly developing and changing. During the First World War, there was one situation; after the First World War, there was another situation; during the Second World War, the situation changed significantly; after the Second World War, the socialist camp emerged, and the situation changed again; later, revisionism emerged, and the two hegemonies of American imperialism and Soviet revisionism emerged, which was a new situation and new change. As Lenin pointed out long ago: "World hegemony is the content of imperialist politics, and the continuation of this politics is imperialist war." (Lenin: "A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism", "Collected Works of Lenin", Volume 23, pages 26-27.) The nature of imperialism will not change. The process of imperialism's development and change is precisely the unfolding of the nature of imperialism. It is precisely from this historical reality that we must see that the era of imperialism and proletarian socialist revolution is not a dead, static, unchanging thing, but a constantly developing thing with new situations constantly emerging. Therefore, in the face of such a dynamic era, our strategy for carrying out the proletarian socialist revolution must also be constantly adjusted as the situation changes.

Chairman Mao did just that. Chairman Mao has grasped the new characteristics of the era in which we live with profound accuracy and, starting from this reality, has put forward the famous theory of the division of the three worlds, that is, the hegemony of the United States and the Soviet Union is the first world, the advanced capitalist countries of Europe are the second world, and the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America are the third world. The second world is the 'middle ground' between the first and third worlds. This is a grand strategy that has guiding significance for the socialist revolutionary movement of the proletariat and the masses of people all over the world.

The ideological basis of this theory and strategy of Chairman Mao is Lenin's theory of imperialism, a corollary drawn from the nature of imperialism and its main features as discussed by Lenin. This is Chairman Mao's latest development of Marxism-Leninism, a major contribution to the international communist movement and an important element of Maoism. This theory and strategy of Chairman Mao has not become obsolete and is still of guiding significance to the socialist revolutionary movement all over the world.

Specific situations still change.

In the case of the Soviet Union, the hegemon, there was a major change, not only did the Soviet Union disintegrate, but the position of Russia also had to be re-conceptualised. The two hegemonies became the one hegemony of the American Empire. This is a concrete change in the first world, which has to be analysed and recognised, but the category of the first world is still valid.

As for China's change to revisionism, to capitalism, to social-imperialism, it is a more significant and important change.

It is not surprising that the situation has changed; change is always absolute, and there is no such thing as unchangeable, so everything must be done from a practical point of view, that is to say, from the

actuality of what has changed. In adhering to Chairman Mao's theory of the three divisions of the world, we must likewise implement such a correct method of thought.

In adhering to Chairman Mao's theory of the division of the three worlds, we must first of all insist that U.S. imperialism, as the first world and hegemonist, is the number one enemy of the people of the whole world, and not, as the revisionists are now saying, that the relationship between the U.S. empire, the U.S. imperialists, and us is that of a 'strategic partnership,' or even a 'husband-and-wife relationship. This is a totally wrong political viewpoint, a viewpoint that departs from the teachings of the revolutionary mentors of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, obliterates the class nature of the monopoly bourgeoisie of the United States imperialists, and betrays the proletariat and the masses of the working people all over the world, who are being bullied, oppressed and exploited by the United States imperialists.

We should fearlessly raise the red flag of revolution against the world hegemon, United States imperialism, and we are duty-bound to be at the forefront of the fight against this number one enemy of the people of the world. This is the international obligation of a great socialist country that has come to power! It is an obligation, but it is also an honour.

We don't want war, we want peace, as Lenin emphasised: 'Only the working class can carry out a policy of peace in practice, not in words, after the seizure of power.' And so it was; immediately after the victory of the October Revolution, the new revolutionary regime declared, 'The Russian Soviet Socialist Republic wishes to co-exist peacefully with the peoples of all countries and to devote all its strength to internal construction.' (Lenin, 'The Eighth National Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolshevik),' Lenin's Collected Works, vol. 30, p. 164.) This is our aspiration. Under certain historical conditions, the struggle for peace can be realised to a limited extent if we adopt a correct proletarian strategy of international struggle. But let us not forget that in an era of imperialist dominance, imperialism is war and war is inevitable. War is absolute, peace is relative. Therefore, when Russia overcame an armed intervention from fourteen foreign countries and achieved a relatively peaceful environment, Lenin promptly warned the Party and the people that 'this is a postponement of war, and the capitalists will find excuses to fight.' (Lenin, 'Speech at the Congress of Activists of the Moscow Organisation of the Russian Communist Party (Bolshevik)', Lenin's Collected Works, vol. 31, p. 416.) "Whoever forgets that as long as world imperialism exists, the danger that constantly threatens us will not be eliminated, whoever forgets this, has forgotten our republic of the working people." Chairman Mao's thought is consistent with Lenin's thought. Chairman Mao calls on us to "be prepared for war", "prepare for war, prepare for famine, for the people", "dig deep holes, store up grain, and do not seek hegemony". As Chairman Mao taught us, "If you are prepared, the war may not necessarily be fought." This is the true Marxist-Leninist-Maoist position and strategy on the issue of war and peace.

Communists are by no means passive on the question of war and peace. The Communists, who have already gained power, will not forget their great ideal of realising communism throughout the world, nor will they forget their internationalist obligations.

Contrary to Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line of not sticking his head out, not taking the lead, and keeping a low profile and biding one's time, the Communist Party of China led by Chairman Mao has never been afraid of U.S. imperialism and has firmly and courageously held high the revolutionary red flag against U.S. imperialism. Chairman Mao's famous statement of 20 May 1970: 'People of the whole world unite to defeat the American aggressors and all their running dogs!' is such a revolutionary declaration. Resistance to the United States and aid to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and resistance to the United States and aid to Vietnam are such revolutionary practices.

We do not export revolutions. Revolutions are never launched and won by exporting them. However, as communists, we are obliged to support the revolutionary struggles that have been waged and are being waged by all the masses of working people everywhere in the world. We must especially support the just struggle of the masses of people in the Third World. Lenin taught us: 'Socialists should not only demand the immediate liberation of the colonies unconditionally and without cost, socialists should also support most resolutely the most revolutionary elements of the bourgeois-democratic national liberation movements of these countries, help them to stage uprisings and, if circumstances permit, to wage revolutionary wars. should also help them in their revolutionary wars against the imperialist powers that oppress them.' This is how Lenin and Stalin supported the Chinese revolution back then. This is something we will never forget, and it is also our example. Our Party, under the leadership of Chairman Mao, has inherited and developed this issue, which is an important and new element of Maoism. Our Party overcame the influence of great power chauvinism, insisted on the equality of all parties, big and small, and on the relationship of brotherhood, highly valued the historical achievements of the struggling brother parties, thanked them for weakening the power of imperialism and ushering in the environment of peace-building for us, and repeatedly declared that our assistance to them was our internationalist duty, and that it was insignificant in relation to the bloodshed and sacrifices that they were shedding. This is a true communist mindset. As a result, he won the high praise and respect of the people of Asia, Africa and Latin America, for Chairman Mao, for the Communist Party of China and for the Chinese people. When Deng Xiaoping came to power, he betrayed the international communist movement and the revolutionary struggle of the people of the world. For a while, he regarded Chairman Mao's support and assistance to the Third World as dogmatic folly, and regarded such grandiose words as 'tighten our belts and support the liberation struggles of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America' and 'never forget that two thirds of our class brothers in the world have not yet been emancipated' and so on, as pathetic jokes. In fact, it was Deng Xiaoping's perverse behaviour that disgraced the Chinese Party and the Chinese people. This contrasts sharply with the great historical role played by the Chinese Communist Party under the leadership of Chairman Mao. After the resolution of the regime issue in the possible future, we must inherit Chairman Mao's glorious tradition, carry it forward, and better and more often fulfil our incumbent internationalist obligations, so as to make up for the great loss that Deng Xiaoping's erroneous line has inflicted on the international communist movement.

Here, I would also like to highlight a problem that exists among the Maoists.

If we only see anti-imperialism and not anti-revisionism, or even use anti-imperialism to cover up anti-revisionism, and say that the main contradiction we face is a national contradiction, this is wrong. Some people make a big fuss about this, saying that they only fight against imperialism and not revisionism. This is a wrong statement that is divorced from reality. If we keep saying this, it really makes people feel that we are deceiving others.

We must clearly see that it is impossible to implement Chairman Mao's theory of the three worlds under the dominance of revisionism, nor is it possible to implement a proletarian Marxist-Leninist-Maoist internationalist line. Moreover, the seriousness of the matter lies in the fact that "socialism with Chinese characteristics" has degenerated into social-imperialism with Chinese characteristics, and in terms of capital export, it has far exceeded the social-imperialism of the Soviet revisionists in those days. Under such circumstances, if we only oppose American imperialism but not Chinese revisionism, the actual result will always be to stand on the side of social-imperialism, borrow the narrow nationalism of the bourgeoisie to deceive and mislead the masses, and sing the same tune as social-imperialism. We must keep a clear mind on this issue, must adhere to Marxist-Leninist-Maoist internationalism, and draw a clear line between these erroneous theories and erroneous statements.

The matter is very clear. If China wants to adhere to Chairman Mao's theory of the division of the three worlds and implement a correct Marxist-Leninist-Maoist internationalist line, the first and foremost problem, of course, is that it must first solve the problem of China, and it must put an end to the rule of revisionism. Anti-imperialism must be preceded by anti-revisionism, and this is the premise of the matter.

Thirdly, the Internationale is the battle cry of the proletariat's international communist movement, sung to the effect that the proletarians of the whole world are united in the final struggle!

We must hold fast to this great principle of the Internationale and hold high this red flag of the Internationale.

The socialist revolutionary movement has never been a matter for the proletariat of one country; the socialist revolutionary movement of the proletariat of any country has always been an integral part of the socialist revolutionary movement of the proletariat of the whole world. The proletarians of the whole world support the socialist revolutionary movement of the proletariat of any country, and likewise the proletariat of any country has to support the socialist revolutionary movement of the proletariat of the whole world.

This truth, this principle, has been clearly stated since the publication of the Communist Manifesto. It is also on the basis of this truth, this principle, that the Communist Manifesto ends with the solemn declaration: Proletarians of the world unite!

The revolutionary mentors, Marx and Engels, set us a shining example on this issue. The First International and the Second International, both founded and working under their guidance, played a great role in promoting the international communist movement.

In the face of the Second International's change of heart, Lenin raised the red flag of the Third International - the Communist International - in time to continue to promote the proletarian revolutionary movement all over the world, including support for the democratic revolutionary movement in the backward countries of the East. Our Chinese revolution is among them. Although some of the views of the Comintern were not always correct, the positive significance of the Comintern for the success of the Chinese Revolution cannot be erased, and the contribution of Lenin, Stalin, Dimitrov and other revolutionary mentors of the international communist movement in guiding the Chinese Revolution is something that we Chinese Communists will always bear in mind.

We are all most familiar with the contribution made by Chairman Mao under the leadership of the Communist Party of China (CPC) to the international communist movement. We have taken up the historical burden of opposing Khrushchev's revisionism, resolutely opposing Khrushchev's 'Three Harmonies and Two Wholes' revisionist line, defending the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary line of the international communist movement, resolutely opposing the imperialists led by the United States and the reactionaries in various countries, and resolutely supporting the revolutionary movements of the proletariat in Europe and the United States and the national democratic liberation movements in the countries of the Third World. The struggle against the United States and in favour of Vietnam is a page of glorious victory. There was a saying at the time that it was the honourable duty and obligation of the Chinese people that China was the great rearguard of the world revolution. Chairman Mao has always opposed big power chauvinism and has never claimed to be the leader of a big power, but has always taught us that we should be grateful to the proletariat and the broad masses of the people of various countries who are struggling, who stand in the front line of the struggle against imperialism and the reactionaries of various countries, and whose struggles have created an environment for us to build peace and who have helped us and supported us. What a noble broad-mindedness of a

proletarian revolutionary mentor. Beijing was then effectively the revolutionary centre of the international communist movement, but our Party never said so. It was under the education of Chairman Mao in this true spirit of proletarian internationalism that Comrade Lei Feng uttered the famous line that we must not forget that in this world there are still two thirds of our class brothers who have not been liberated.

The problems with Deng Xiaoping's revisionist foreign affairs line are clear when we compare it with Chairman Mao's proletarian internationalist line. Deng Xiaoping's repeated statements of 'not sticking out his head' and 'not taking the lead' actually mean that he does not take part in the international communist movement, betrays the international communist movement, and does not take up the proletarian internationalist responsibility that a communist party that has already gained power is supposed to take up.

The problem is not just this: not to stick one's head out means not to stick one's head out against imperialism, especially against American imperialism; not to be the head is not to be the head of the leadership against imperialism, especially against American imperialism; and the inevitable result of doing so is to surrender to the imperialist countries led by the United States. As we can all see, Deng Xiaoping's foreign affairs line is such a line of capitulationism, a line of betrayal of the Communist revolution. The facts are all there, so there is no need to say more.

Boasting all day long that they are a responsible big country and a responsible big party, always wanting to play the role of a pivotal big country in the world of international capitalism, they spend a lot of the country's money, hold so many international congresses in Beijing, and invite so many bourgeois politicians to come to Beijing to show their support. This head, they are trying to stick out, this leader, they are even trying to be, just, not yet. In contrast, they never invite the Communist Party to come to Beijing for meetings, let alone the Communist Party which opposes revisionism, let alone the Communist International. This head, they do not want to stick out, and this head, this leader, moreover, they do not want to be. This is in stark contrast to what Chairman Mao did in Beijing back then. The two lines are clearly separated. There is no need for us to make an outline, for the outline is there. Chairman Mao's revolutionary line is not an empty phrase; neither is Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line. The two lines, the two practices and the two results are fully manifested everywhere and in everything.

We must not learn from Deng Xiaoping, and we must draw a clear line with Deng Xiaoping's revisionist foreign affairs line. If the true Communist Party is able to return to power in the future, we must resolutely implement Chairman Mao's proletarian internationalist line.

We must fulfil our international obligations, we must raise the red flag of socialism high in Beijing, and we must invite communists from all over the world to come to Beijing to discuss the major plans of the international communist movement, the anti-imperialist and anti-revisionist plans, and the promotion of the development of the socialist revolution throughout the world.

We must once again raise the revolutionary flag of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, once again form the command of the communist movement of the proletariat throughout the world --- the Comintern, co-ordinate, promote and support the socialist revolutionary movement of the proletariat throughout the world, and fight for the early realisation of the Internationale throughout the world.

We must effectively implement Chairman Mao's revolutionary theory of the division of the three worlds and his strategy of struggle, taking the proletariat and the working people of the three worlds as the main body, uniting the available forces in the middle zone of the second world, and isolating and combating to the maximum extent possible United States imperialism, the world's number-one enemy of the world's people.

We must do a good job in China, endeavour to make China a model of socialism, put 'socialism is good' into practice and into the hearts and minds of the people of the world, and attract the people of the world to take the road of socialism by the power of example. If we do this well, it will be our contribution to the world revolution and to the development of mankind.

We cannot be social-imperialists, and we must remember Chairman Mao's teaching of 'no hegemony' at all times. There is no such thing as a party of sons, only a party of brothers; there is no such thing as inequality between big and small countries, but only the five basic principles of peaceful coexistence; and, as Lenin taught us, the proletariat and the labouring masses of the whole world, wherever they go, whatever hardships they encounter, as long as they have the Internationale to sing, and as long as they have the Internationale as the red flag, they are all one and the same. We are all class brothers under the great slogan 'Workers of the world, unite'.

We are the ones who must adhere to proletarian internationalism, even if, as in Chairman Mao's time, we will have to pay a certain price and make certain sacrifices, we must firmly assume the historical responsibility of being the great rearguard of the world revolution, which is an honour given to us by history. In order to achieve this, we must bury Chinese revisionism, which is not only a historical task entrusted to us by Chairman Mao, but also a demand made on us by the world revolution. This means that we must bury Chinese revisionism, both in terms of China's destiny and in terms of the destiny of the world. In this sense, burying Chinese revisionism is a revolutionary task of international significance.

It is based on these understandings that we once again feel the great revolutionary significance of "The Internationale" and realise that "The Internationale" is full of Marxist principles. Let us listen to Chairman Mao's words, hold high the red flag of "The Internationale", and, filled with the revolutionary passion sung by "The Internationale", reignite the socialist revolution in China, reignite the socialist revolution in the world, and let the Internationale win a great victory throughout the world!

A higher level of socialism is not far away, let's welcome it with our revolutionary struggle!

18th February 2018

Two fundamentally opposing basic lines

1. The fundamental difference lies in the line

Chairman Mao has a wise saying which has been repeatedly tested in practice: Whether the ideological and political line is correct or not is decisive for everything.

This is Chairman Mao's summary of the historical experience of the international communist movement, and even more so, Chairman Mao's summary of his own historical experience of the brutal, tortuous and repetitive class struggles and intra-party struggles that he has personally experienced in more than half a century.

This short sentence, however, accurately and scientifically reflects the infinite richness of historical content and reveals one of the most profound, basic and major laws of struggle that the Communists are bound to face in their class struggle and intra-Party struggle.

The reality we face has verified the truth revealed by Chairman Mao. Over the past 40 years, China's step-by-step capitalistization has verified the truth revealed by Chairman Mao. Everything that China has now is determined by Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line. General Secretary Xi Jinping is just continuing to implement Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line. From Jiang Zemin to Hu Jintao to the General Secretary, they have all done so. There is nothing new. Whether it is the "Three Represents", the "Scientific Outlook on Development", or the "Thought on Socialism with Chinese Characteristics for a New Era", there is nothing new. It is nothing more than making some new tricks and self-boasting in order to leave a name in history. In fact, the general outline is Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line. In old terms, this is a replica of Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line. In new terms, this is an upgraded version of Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line. The same meaning, no matter how things change, they still remain true to their roots. They follow Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line and are Deng Xiaoping's disciples.

In the last "Important Instructions" left to us by Chairman Mao in 1976, he used the popular language "the capitalist roaders are still on the capitalist road". The capitalist roaders are the ruling clique that takes the capitalist road. How do they take the capitalist road? What guides them to take the capitalist road? They rely on the line, the revisionist line. The essence of the revisionist line is the line of restoring capitalism. The result of following the revisionist line is the inevitable restoration of capitalism. The cruel history of more than 40 years has proved this. The Chinese Communist Party abandoned Chairman Mao's basic line of continuing the socialist revolution and replaced it with Deng Xiaoping's basic line of revisionism. The result is the inevitable restoration of capitalism. This is what happened, and it went further and further and got deeper and deeper.

When we talk about line struggle, it is not abstract or empty, but has a real class basis and content of class struggle. Line is the concentrated political reflection of the class interests and class demands of a class. Line struggle is actually the concentrated expression of class struggle. It is not limited to the Communist Party. The line struggle within the Communist Party is the concentrated expression of class struggle within the Communist Party. It determines whether this party is a proletarian party that adheres to Marxism or a bourgeois party that wants to degenerate into revisionism. This is of course a major event related to the fate of the party. Grasping the line struggle within the party is grasping the class struggle within the party, and it is grasping the class struggle within the party more deeply, more concentratedly and more accurately. Of course, line struggle also has a broader significance. For example, our struggle against Khrushchev's revisionist line and our struggle against Chiang Kai-shek's one-sided anti-Japanese line during the War of Resistance Against Japan are all manifestations of the rise from class struggle to line struggle. In the face of different class struggles and line struggles under

different historical conditions, we must proceed from the actual situation and analyse specific issues in a specific manner. Line is nothing more than a general strategy, a general policy, and a general outline. Its significance is of course great. The historical experience and lessons of class struggle are also concentrated in the line struggle. Chairman Mao taught us during the Cultural Revolution: "Historical experience is worth noting. A line or a viewpoint must be often and repeatedly spoken about. It is not enough to only tell a few people, but to make the broad revolutionary masses know it." Chairman Mao personally practiced and repeatedly spoke about the historical experience and lessons of the line struggle within the party at the Central Committee meetings. His purpose was to improve the political level of our entire party and the entire people through historical experience.

This truth is not only known to us, but also to revisionist leaders like Deng Xiaoping. Back then, their struggle with Chairman Mao centred mainly on the issue of line. Chairman Mao wanted the class struggle to be the key link, while they wanted the 'three instructions to be the key link' and denied that the class struggle was the key link. This constitutes a struggle between two lines. One is the revolutionary line of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, and the other is the revisionist line of denial of the revolution. To speak of the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, to speak of the struggle between the socialist road and the capitalist road, is to concentrate on the struggle between such two lines. To say that they are the ruling faction on the capitalist road, to say that the bourgeoisie is within the Communist Party, is also to draw conclusions from the struggle between such two lines. The struggle for lines is the crux of the problem, the essence of the class struggle. If you don't believe me, please read General Secretary Xi Jinping's confession, 'The whole Party should firmly grasp the basic national condition of the primary stage of socialism, firmly base itself on the greatest reality of the primary stage of socialism, firmly adhere to the Party's basic line, which is the lifeline of the Party and the State and the happiness of the people, lead and unite all ethnic groups of the country, focus on economic construction, adhere to the four basic principles, and adhere to reform and opening up, be self-reliant and hard-working, and strive to build our country into a rich, strong, democratic, civilised, harmonious and beautiful modern socialist power.' What the General Secretary has stressed here is the need to adhere to their basic line of 'one centre, two fundamentals'. As I have said many times, the line of 'one centre, two basic points' is nothing but a replica of the line of 'three directives as a key link'. This shows that the General Secretary has not been wrongly accused of continuing to adhere to Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line, nor has he been wrongly accused of holding on to the same line.

This fact tells us that, in the fight against revisionism, we must grasp the key link of the struggle for the line, and that 'we cannot fight only against corrupt officials but not against the emperor', because the line is in the hands of the 'emperor'. Moreover, it is difficult to change the head of the revisionist line.

When we criticise Xi Jinping's ideology, we are saying that political problems, economic problems, ideological and cultural problems, all these problems are all based on the line, and are all determined by the line. Chairman Mao's repeated emphasis that the line determines everything is not wrong at all. Xi Jinping's ideology, with all its faults, is wrong on the line, wrong in that it is still subordinate to Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line, and is a continuation and expansion of Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line.

Therefore, if we want to wage a struggle against revisionism and oppose this capitalist restoration that has already taken place, we must grasp the key link of the line and use Chairman Mao's Marxist-Leninist-Maoist proletarian revolutionary line to oppose and criticise the revisionist bourgeois counter-revolutionary line of Deng Xiaoping and his disciples who are engaged in capitalist restoration.

This should become the general strategy of our proletarian revolutionaries who adhere to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and socialist revolution.

On this issue, our comrades have a little different view. I will make a little brief discussion here.

Some comrades believe that revisionism is only a trend of thought, a problem of the bourgeois world view, a problem within the Communist Party, and that therefore the struggle for the line exists only within the Communist Party. They assert that since the coup d'état of 6 October 1976, it is no longer possible to use the term revisionism for the struggles we are facing, but only the bourgeoisie, and that we can only talk about the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

This is a view that I do not agree with. In terms of method of thought, I think it is too mechanical, too simplistic, too wordy, and therefore inevitably leaves the real life and fails to illustrate the complexity of real life.

The concept of revisionism, when used in practice, has a rather broad meaning. For example, Chairman Mao says that if revisionism comes to power, it means that the bourgeoisie comes to power, that there is going to be a fascist bourgeois dictatorship, that there is going to be a restoration of capitalism, and that it is going to be the worst kind of capitalism. Obviously, Chairman Mao did not use the concept of revisionism here, just as a trend of thought, a world view. Rather, he is referring to the revisionist group, the revisionist party, and even the bourgeoisie. This is how we generally understand and use the concept of revisionism. Everyone understands it.

The question of understanding the concept is only one aspect of the problem. What is more important is whether or not we should still use the term revisionism and whether or not we should still use the term line struggle. This is indeed an important theoretical and practical issue.

Since Deng Xiaoping to the present day, China has metamorphosed into a bureaucratic authoritarian monopoly capitalist society. There is basically no disagreement on this characterisation. The disagreement lies in the fact that if we make further observations and analyses of this society, especially from the perspective of the ruling party which has caused all this and is continuing to cause all this, should we speak of revisionism, of a revisionist party, of a revisionist line? I think the answer is yes, there is no doubt about it.

The process of developing capitalism in China is synchronised with the process of revisionism of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP). It is the CPC which has rejected Chairman MAO's line of continued socialist revolution, accepted Deng Xiaoping's revisionist counter-revolutionary line of restoration of capitalism, and taken the road of capitalism to turn China, step by step, into the present bureaucratic dictatorship and monopoly capitalist society. When Chairman MAO talked to Kim Il-sung in the 1960s, he foresaw that the CPC might degenerate into a revisionist party. In response to Kim Il-sung's thought that 'no way', Chairman Mao once again emphasised this historical possibility. Chairman Mao knows history well and has a tremendous sense of history. Chairman Mao's worries were not unfounded, but well-founded. Chairman Mao saw it right, said it right and was verified. Without the ruling Communist Party of China (CPC) turning revisionist, China would not be what it is today. The path taken by China in its transformation into capitalism is different from that taken by the capitalist countries of Europe and the United States; it is a special case, a 'special feature', so to speak. In order to explain the specificity of this contradiction, it is impossible not to face this special historical fact, and in particular, not to face the modified Communist Party of China (CPC), which plays a decisive role in the process of coming to power.

Can we analyse the revisionist Communist Party of China without discussing the theoretical viewpoints on revisionism? Can we not discuss the struggle between the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist line and the revisionist line? No.

True, the revisionist party has degenerated into a bourgeois party. But does it still have revisionist features? This needs to be analysed concretely. Like some of the old social democratic parties in Europe, which have long since thrown away Marxism, which have long since thrown away the class struggle, which have long since thrown away the proletarian nature of the party, which have long since thrown away the communist programme, which, in short, have long since changed their flags, which do not even want to wear the communist party's signboards, and which are already naked bourgeois parties, it is very difficult to illustrate them by the notion of revisionism in such a case, nor does anyone do so anymore.

However, the situation of the Chinese Communist Party we are facing is not like this. The Chinese Communist Party is still called the Communist Party. Whether it is the party program or the constitution, it is written that it wants to build socialism, and it is socialism under the guidance of Marxism. At most, the word "characteristics" is added. In the world today, which bourgeois party is doing this? No, not one. Only the Chinese Communist Party is doing this, and it has vowed that it will never take the evil path of changing its flag. The General Secretary even led the Standing Committee members to the site of the First Congress to swear that they would never forget the "original intention" of the Communists, and once again recited the oath of joining the party loudly and solemnly. How many people were moved at the time? ! Bourgeois parties will not and cannot do this. However, just doing this, just declaring this, is it a real Communist Party? Of course not. So, what is this? This is positive revisionism, and this is the characteristic of revisionism. Not talking about this characteristic is not in line with reality. First, it does not take off the sign of socialism, second, it does not change the name of the Communist Party, and third, it does not give up the banner of Marxism. This is the characteristic of revisionism. Not talking about this characteristic, not analysing this characteristic, is not in line with reality, and therefore cannot correctly interpret this reality. It is correct and necessary to emphasise its nature as a bourgeois party, to emphasise that it is leading China on the capitalist road, and to emphasise that it is actually engaged in bureaucratic autocracy and monopoly capitalism. However, a certain essence is always linked to and unified with a certain form. Any unfolding of the essence has its characteristics and its specific form. "Socialism with Chinese characteristics", that is, capitalism with Chinese characteristics, is the product of the unity of the bourgeois nature and revisionist form of the Chinese revisionist party. It is precisely because of this characteristic that we still need to talk about and study the characteristics of revisionism, the characteristics of the revisionist line, and how capitalist degeneration and bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalism are produced through such a special form.

This is the correct scientific method for studying and criticising 'socialism with Chinese characteristics'. This is also the method we should follow when we criticise Xi Jinping's thought today. It is from this scientific method that we can correctly understand the meaning of 'the line determines everything' and 'the line is a guideline, and the guideline is the key to everything.'.

There is nothing wrong with persisting in opposing revisionism; there is nothing wrong with persisting in opposing the revisionist line; and there is nothing wrong with grasping the line struggle as an outline. This is the correct line and policy in keeping with the reality of class and class struggle in Chinese society. This is the red flag of class struggle, the red flag of revolution, handed to us by Chairman Mao, and we must hold this red flag high and unwavering!

2. The key to the difference in lines lies in whether to uphold class struggle as the key link

In the struggle to criticise Deng Xiaoping and fight back against the Right deviationist wind of reversing correct verdicts, Chairman Mao clearly pointed out, "Does socialist society have class struggle? What is this 'Taking the Three Directives as the Key Link'? Stability and unity do not mean that we do not want class struggle. Class struggle is the guideline, and everything else is just the purpose." In the struggle to criticize Deng Xiaoping and fight back against the Rightist trend of reversing verdicts, Chairman Mao clearly pointed out, "Does socialist society have class struggle? What is the 'Three Directives as the Guidelines'? Stability and unity do not mean writing off class struggle; class struggle is the key link and everything else hinges on it."

Chairman Mao made it very clear that the fundamental differences between the two lines and the fundamental key to the line struggle were all about the word "key link", that is, whether to "adhere to class struggle as the key link".

Chairman Mao severely criticised Deng Xiaoping, "Xiaoping proposed the "taking the three directives as the key link." This he did not research together with the Politburo, did not discuss with the State Council, and did not report to me. He just said it as so. This person, he does not grasp class struggle; he has never referred to this key link [of class struggle]. Still his theme of "white cat, black cat," making no distinction between imperialism and Marxism."

Chairman Mao's opinion is very clear. The history of the past forty years has verified that Chairman Mao spoke the truth, including the so-called "Xi Jinping Thought", which has not deviated from this truth. The so-called "Xi Jinping Thought" is a revisionist thought and an idea that promotes the revisionist line because this so-called thought does not mention the class struggle as a guideline at all.

This is the crux of the so-called "Xi Jinping Thought" and the crux of General Secretary Xi Jinping's continued promotion of the revisionist line.

Here are three truths for the General Secretary.

Firstly, if we give up the class struggle as the key link, we are bound to betray the aims of the Communist Party.

Why did the proletariat organise its own vanguard, the Communist Party, and what did the proletariat organise the Communist Party to do, that is, as we often say, what are the aims of the Communist Party?

This would have been a clear-cut question not worth discussing because it has been answered clearly since the publication of the Communist Manifesto in 1848, and, for more than 150 years, the proletariat and the masses of working people all over the world have followed the principles of the Communist Manifesto in their indomitable struggle for the realisation of communism.

What is the principle of the Communist Manifesto? It is that class struggle is the key link, that is, the proletarians of the world should unite to overthrow the reactionary rule of the bourgeoisie, to eliminate the capitalist private mode of production and replace it with the communist mode of production based on public ownership, to put an end to the prehistoric state of mankind, and to establish a truly free, equal and fraternal communist society where there is no more alienation.

It is based on this principle that Chairman Mao summarised it in popular language: "Marxism consists of thousands of truths, but they all boil down to one sentence: It is right to rebel. Based on this principle, we should resist, struggle, and build socialism." Chairman Mao's words are very brilliant and to the point, which is easy to understand and remember. Chairman Mao really understood and mastered Marxism. In a conversation with Snow, Chairman Mao once said: "There are three books that

are particularly deeply engraved in my heart and made me establish my belief in Marxism. Once I accepted Marxism as the correct interpretation of history, my belief in it has never wavered. The three books are: The Communist Manifesto, the first Marxist book published in Chinese; Class Struggle by Kautsky and History of Socialism by Kirkapp. " (Oral Biography of Mao Zedong, page 87, recorded by Edgar Snow, translated by Zhai Xiangjun, Fudan University Press) Chairman Mao also told Snow that he chose the two words "class struggle". When Chairman Mao thinks about problems, he is always good at grasping the main contradictions, so as to seize the key points, bring up the outline, command the whole situation and grasp the whole picture. Chairman Mao's method of thinking is well worth our study. Class struggle is the key link, which is the best, most profound, and most accurate summary of Marxism. Rebellion is justified, isn't it class struggle? Therefore, resistance, struggle, and socialism, isn't it also class struggle?

There are many works by revolutionary mentors, but the main point is that they all talk about class struggle as the key link. Only by adhering to class struggle as the key link can we resist, fight and build socialism.

When history develops to a socialist society, will there still be class struggle? Should we still insist on class struggle as the key link? In the last days of his life, Chairman Mao used Deng Xiaoping, the biggest capitalist-roader and the biggest revisionist at the time, as an example to warn us that the fundamental difference between the Marxist line and the revisionist line is still in the two words "class struggle" and in the issue of class struggle as the key link. Chairman Mao is the true successor of Marxism and Leninism and the founder of Mao Zedong Thought. Lenin said that socialism is to eliminate classes. This is a profound and great proposition, and this is a profound and great program. This proposition and the proposition that class struggle is the key link are identical and synonymous. Socialism means the elimination of classes, it means the elimination of the bourgeoisie, it means passing through the historical stage of the elimination of the bourgeoisie and entering into a communist society. To destroy the classes, to destroy the bourgeoisie, is it not also to insist on the class struggle, to insist on the class struggle as the key link? It means exactly the same thing. Chairman Mao recites the true scriptures of Marxism. On the contrary, the extreme successor Deng Xiaoping, has precisely denied the core idea and core principle of Marxism, and denied the class struggle as the key link. To say that they have betrayed Marxism, that they are engaging in revisionism, and that their line is a revisionist line is in line with reality, is appropriate, and hits the nail on the head.

Now, the General Secretary has inherited Deng Xiaoping's legacy and continues to deny class struggle as the key link. In all fields and on all issues, class struggle is no longer mentioned, and class struggle is no longer grasped as the key link, let alone launching the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie and the struggle of socialism against capitalism. In this case, calling it the Communist Party, hanging the sign of socialism on it, and raising the flag of Marxism are all deceptions. Class struggle has been abolished, and class struggle has been abolished as the key link. These names, signs, and flags have lost their inherent true scientific meanings.

The reason why we label General Secretary Xi Jinping's thoughts and practices as capitalist, revisionist, and a revisionist line, and say that the General Secretary has betrayed the purpose of the Communist Party, is mainly because the General Secretary still denies class struggle as the key link and the line of class struggle as the key link.

We dare not wrongly accuse the General Secretary who is "deemed as the supreme leader" and says that he "does not forget his original intention". How can he not forget? Not only did he forget, but he also betrayed. We cannot but respect the facts.

Secondly, abandoning class struggle as the key link will inevitably lead to the capitalist road, and capitalist restoration will inevitably occur.

When we say that class struggle is the key link, we mean the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and the class struggle between the socialist road and the capitalist road.

This way of looking at things is based on the reality of socialism. As the revolutionary mentors, especially Lenin and Chairman Mao, emphasised, socialist society is a historical period of struggle between growing communism and declining capitalism. This is an inevitable transitional historical stage with two development directions and two historical possibilities. In such a historical context, abandoning the principle of class struggle and abandoning the struggle between the socialist road and the capitalist road will inevitably give the green light to the capitalist road and capitalist restoration will occur.

Chairman Mao repeatedly talked about this principle. The so-called question of who will win or lose between socialism and capitalism has not been resolved. This is a principle summarised from this reality. Chairman Mao criticized Deng Xiaoping for not grasping the principle of class struggle, saying that it was still "'white cat, black cat,' making no distinction between imperialism and Marxism". Deng Xiaoping did not accept Chairman Mao's criticism. Chairman Mao said at the time, "Deng is willing to make self-criticism." "We should help him. Criticising his mistakes is helping him. It is not good to go along with him. We should criticise him, but we should not kill him with one blow. Our party has always had a policy for those who have made shortcomings and mistakes, which is to punish past mistakes to prevent future ones and cure the disease to save the patient."

Deng Xiaoping did make self-criticisms, but, like his never reversing the correct verdicts, they were unreliable and actually false, meant for him to muddle through. Later, when he came back to power, not only did he not admit his mistakes and overturned the correct verdicts, but he even reversed right and wrong, saying that Chairman Mao was wrong and handing down the Resolution on the mistakes Chairman Mao had made. What 'development is the hard way', what 'not to argue' about the social and capitalist name, or his old ways of disregarding whether it was a white cat or black cat, regardless of socialism or capitalism. The 'three directives as a platform' has been transformed into 'one centre and two basic points'¹⁹, but the essence is the same, as the old saying goes: 'only care about food, cotton and oil, and make no distinction between friend and foe'.

This leaves us with an important historical experience. Those who engage in revisionism abandon class struggle as the key link, which actually means abandoning the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, abandoning the struggle of socialism against capitalism, and ultimately abandoning socialism.

The historical experience of the international communist movement shows that those who engage in opportunism and revisionism have abandoned the class struggle as the key link, while ultimately surrendering to the bourgeoisie. This is also the case with Deng Xiaoping's class of revisionists. When Deng Xiaoping said that he would not argue, that he did not care about socialism or capitalism, he was not actually not caring; they always said one thing and did another; what they were doing was to control socialism, to liberalise capitalism, to take the road of capitalism, to develop capitalism, and ultimately to move towards a society of bureaucratic dictatorship and monopoly capitalism.

¹⁹ "One centre, two basic points" is the core of the party's basic line for the "primary stage of socialism" put forward at the 13th National Congress of the Communist Party of China by Jiang Zemin, which refers to taking economic construction as the centre, adhering to the four cardinal principles, and persisting in reform and opening up – Trans.

The fact that they have abandoned the line of 'class struggle as the key link' does not mean that they have really given up the class struggle; on the contrary, their grip on the class struggle is still very tight. As Chairman Mao said, what they are practising is a fascist bourgeois dictatorship, which is very vicious and cruel. This fully proves that revisionism's abandonment of the class struggle as a platform, of the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, of socialism against capitalism, is not an abandonment of the class struggle in general; no, they are waging the class struggle on behalf of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat, and on behalf of capitalism against socialism, and that this key link of the class struggle is something which they still have to grasp, and grasp it very tightly. The history of revisionist rule over the past 40-odd years has fully verified this, and it is a very good negative textbook for us.

It is from this antithetical textbook that we see that the revisionist rulers have denied and abandoned the class struggle as the key link, but only in order to paralyse and disarm the revolutionary spirit of the proletariat and the masses of working people, to deprive and suppress the proletariat's and the masses of working people's struggle against it, so as to make their way to the road of capitalism even more unhindered and unobstructed; and it is precisely in this way that, after forty years have elapsed, they have transformed a good old socialist new China into the worst kind of bureaucratic authoritarian monopoly capitalist society step by step.

It can be seen that to give up class struggle as the key link is to give up socialism. Those who give up the class struggle as the key link, their line of thought, their political line, is inevitably to follow the capitalist road, is inevitably to engage in capitalism. This is first of all a question of position, then a question of ideological line, of political line. It is true to their name to say that they are capitalist-roaders. They are capitalist-roaders, and they deserve the name. How can capitalist-roaders agree to take the class struggle with the opposition to capitalist-roaders as the core as the key link? They do not agree, they want to deny they are capitalist-roaders and deserve the name. How can capitalist-roaders agree to take the class struggle with the opposition to capitalist-roaders as the core as the key link? They do not agree, they want to oppose, they want to abandon the key link, it is very natural and normal. Yes, they want to abandon, it is very natural and normal.

Under the domination of the revisionist line which denied the class struggle as a platform, the Party changed into a revisionist one, the country changed colour, and a capitalist restoration swept across the whole of China. We all have personal experience of this, so I won't go into details here.

In brief.

Politically, the country has metamorphosed from a people's democratic dictatorship under the leadership of the Communist Party to a fascist bourgeois dictatorship under the rule of the revisionist Party. There is no more people's sovereignty, and the Communist Party has become a fascist party. Where is the rule of law and the strict rule of the Party? Empty words! The bourgeoisie's deceitful empty words.

Economically, the country has been transformed from a socialist economy based on public ownership to a bureaucratic monopoly capitalist economy based on capitalist private ownership. With the development of productive forces in this way, even if the level of productive forces is high, it will not be 'people-centred' but capitalist-centred. The polarisation is so great that even Deng Xiaoping had to admit that it was a failure of reform, but in fact, it was a victory of capitalist reform.

Ideologically and culturally, the country has been transformed from a country dominated by socialist ideology and culture, which exalted the spirit of communism, to a country dominated by bourgeois

ideology and culture, which has revived the corrupt and reactionary feudal culture and all other kinds of spiritual rubbish.

The organic and inextricable unity of all this constitutes a bureaucratic authoritarian monopoly capitalist society with Chinese 'characteristics'.

Why do they deny that class struggle is the key link? It is in order to realise their great dream of restoring capitalism, and the worst kind of capitalism at that. The General Secretary said that this is a rejuvenation, but no, we do not agree. This is not a rejuvenation of the Chinese nation, this is a restoration of capitalism, this is a catastrophe for the Chinese nation, this is an unfortunate twist in the history of the Chinese nation.

Sadly, the son of our honourable proletarian revolutionary Comrade XI Zhongxun has followed Deng Xiaoping, betrayed the communist revolution and played the role of a proletarian traitor. To date, he still treats nightmares as beautiful dreams and falls into blind self-indulgence.

Thirdly, abandoning class struggle as the key link will inevitably lead to degeneration into social-imperialism.

During his lifetime, Chairman Mao repeatedly warned the Chinese people that we, China, would never be hegemonic, that we were not strong enough to be hegemonic now, but that in the future, when China is strong, we still have to refrain from being hegemonic.

When Chairman Mao led our Party in polemics with the Soviet Union under Khrushchev, he repeatedly criticised the Soviet Union for going down the road of social-imperialism and said that our Party, our country, must never go down that road.

It was the great revolutionary forerunner, Dr Sun Yat-sen, who said in his will "Unite all nations that treat us equally in the world (according to Ms. He Xiangning's recollection, when Dr. Sun dictated his will, she was beside him and she heard Dr. Sun say, 'Unite all oppressed nations in the world', which Wang Jingwei recorded and compiled into the current text) to fight together."

In his later years, Chairman Mao proposed the theory of the three worlds, which is a great creation of the strategy of the contemporary international communist movement, a major development of Marxism, and an important part of Maoism.

However, if we abandon the principle of class struggle, all of Chairman Mao's thoughts and opinions, in short, Chairman Mao's Marxist proletarian internationalist line, will also be abandoned.

Instead, it is replaced by Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line, which is called "keeping a low profile". The line of keeping a low profile is to abandon the line of class struggle as the key link.

If we do not engage in class struggle and 'bide our time', of course, we will not talk about the struggle against imperialism, and we will not dare to raise the red flag of the revolutionary struggle against imperialism. On the contrary, it surrenders to imperialism, follows imperialism, and claims to be in a 'strategic partnership' or a 'conjugal relationship' with imperialism. This is not surprising. Betrayal of the proletariat and the working people in general inevitably leads to a desire to integrate oneself into the imperialist family.

Is there any trace of the 'original spirit' of the communists in the General Secretary's repeated underhand remarks in favour of US imperialism, and his ugly performance of getting close to bourgeois politicians of various countries on various occasions? Like Nikita Khrushchev, who put up such an ugly show back then, this is a great shame for the communists, as our party has bitterly denounced.

By not engaging in the class struggle and 'biding one's time', it will inevitably betray the proletariat and the masses of the people, and will not stand on the side of the working class, the peasantry and the masses of the labouring people at home; and, similarly, it will not stand on the side of the proletariat and the masses of the labouring people of all countries at the international level, still less will it support them in their revolutionary struggles against the bourgeoisie and its reactionaries in their own countries. The General Secretary said to the imperialists that we do not export revolution and we do not export poverty. The meaning behind 'not exporting the revolution' here is actually not supporting the revolution. This is the truth. Their countless abstentions are hard evidence that they have given up the revolution, do not support the revolution and have betrayed the revolution. They have long since thrown away the internationalist obligations that communists should fulfil.

Of course, with the development of China's bureaucratic monopoly capitalist economy, with China becoming the world's second largest economy, and naturally with the expansion of the General Secretary's personal ambitions, driven by the class nature of the monopoly bourgeoisie, the General Secretary is no longer content to 'bide his time', and Wang Huning, who specializes in giving bad ideas, took the lead in shouting, "My country is awesome!" He blatantly put on a posture of realising the "dream of a strong country" immediately, and indeed started such an adventure. What "dream of a strong country"! This is not Chairman Mao's language, this is Hitler's language. What "dream of a strong country"? It is the dream of social-imperialism!

It can be said that this is a further development of Deng Xiaoping's strategy of 'biding one's time and not sticking one's head out', and is also the actual aim pursued by the strategy of 'biding one's time and not sticking one's head out'. The strategy of 'biding one's time and not sticking one's head out' is a temporary strategy. The 'dream of a strong nation' is the real aim pursued by the revisionist rulers. Taking the road of social-imperialism is the inevitable path for all those in power who take the road of capitalism and all revisionist rulers. It is in order and understandable that the General Secretary should embark on this path. But for the General Secretary to lead the Chinese people to embark on this path, is totally contrary to Chairman Mao's teachings and will bring disaster to the Chinese people.

Why do I say this? Lenin and Chairman Mao have taught us.

Lenin's theory of imperialism is not outdated, and Chairman Mao's theory of the three worlds is not outdated. The nature of imperialist competition will not change, and the nature of imperialist hegemony will not change. The imbalance of imperialist development is absolute, and the attempt to break this imbalance is also absolute. This will inevitably cause conflicts between imperialists, which will bring wars. Therefore, Lenin said that imperialism is war. Chairman Mao said that the Soviet Union and the United States were the first world and that they were competing for hegemony. He told the people of the country to "prepare for war" and formulated the revolutionary strategy of "dig tunnels deep and store grain everywhere, and do not seek hegemony." These teachings of the revolutionary mentor are not outdated. However, the General Secretary has long betrayed the teachings of the revolutionary mentor, taking the road of bureaucratic autocracy, monopoly capitalism, and social imperialism, participating in the imperialist struggle, and even wanting to dominate the world. When the General Secretary raises the broken flag of narrow patriotism and narrow nationalism and incites the masses to support his social-imperialist line, the actual result can only be that China will be plunged into the quagmire of imperialist rivalry, or even into a war of imperialist hegemony. This is the essence of the bourgeois slogan 'Dream of a Strong Country' and the evil consequences it will inevitably bring.

Politics is the concentrated expression of economics. Social-imperialist politics is the concentrated expression of social-imperialist economics. Such slogans as "great power strategy", "great power military", "great power diplomacy", "responsible great power", etc., etc., all these cries of

determination to participate in the hegemony and struggle of the imperialist powers, as well as the various idiot performances of being proud of being in the political clubs of the imperialist powers, and the pursuit of overseas ports and strategic locations, have only one purpose, that is, to gain political advantages and military guarantees for the export of their own social-imperialist capital.

China is already a major capital exporter. It already exports more than one-third of the world's total capital. Lenin taught us that capital export is one of the essential characteristics of imperialism that has developed to the stage of monopoly capitalism. Socialism with Chinese characteristics, that is, capitalism with Chinese characteristics, China's bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalism, has fully possessed this essential characteristic of imperialism that Lenin talked about. This is an absolutely true economic fact. Economics is the foundation of politics. Capital export determines that socialism with Chinese characteristics will inevitably move towards social-imperialism. This is not subject to human will. In other words, this is not determined by the personal qualities of the leaders, but by the driving force of the underlying economic relations and economic interests. This is the basic common sense of historical materialism.

From Chairman Mao's "no hegemony" to the General Secretary's "hegemony", it reflects a historical inevitability, that is, if the revisionist line replaces the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist line, socialism will inevitably degenerate into capitalism, and it will inevitably degenerate into the worst kind of capitalism, including social-imperialism.

This is the historical law that Chairman Mao has discovered, and he has issued a warning to the whole party and the people of the country. Chairman Mao is right. The Soviet revisionists were like this before, and the Chinese revisionists are even more so now.

We need to remember this lesson of history.

Well. We have told the General Secretary, with what has happened, the hard facts, that Chairman Mao's saying that the correctness or otherwise of the ideological and political line determines everything is an unbreakable truth, and that everything that has happened in China over the past 40 years, the fact that China has finally metamorphosed into a bureaucratic authoritarian monopoly capitalist society, the main reason, the fundamental reason, analysed politically, is that because of the revisionism that came to power, the introduction of the Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line, and it is this line that has determined all this in China now.

The problem now is that the General Secretary is still carrying out this line, and as long as this line is carried out, it will inevitably follow the capitalist road, it will inevitably make China a bureaucratic dictatorship and monopoly capitalist society, and, moreover, it will inevitably make China a social-imperialist country.

In this connection, to say that the General Secretary is the biggest capitalist-roader of our time, the biggest revisionist leader of our time, and the biggest bourgeois representative of our time is entirely in line with the reality, and it is apt. I hope that the General Secretary can realise this point and accept it. The General Secretary may not change his position and may continue to follow Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line, but he should not say that we have made up our mind and put a big hat on him. This hat is made up of historical facts and is ironclad. It will not change because of the "four safeguards" or "one person in charge". It will be written in history, but it will not leave glory for the General Secretary, but shame.

3. No illusions in the fight against revisionism

Chairman Mao attached great importance to the historical lessons of line struggle. During the Cultural Revolution, Chairman Mao had, on a number of occasions, recounted the historical lessons of line struggles in the history of the Party at meetings of the Central Committee, in the hope that we would, from these historical lessons, learn something and raise our awareness and level of line struggles.

There is one rule that we keep in mind. That is, it is difficult for those who pursue an opportunist or revisionist line to change their ways. Chairman Mao recounted many struggles between lines in history, showing that the leaders of the wrong lines never repented. In the process of fighting against the Lin Biao group, Chairman Mao once again revealed this law when greeting the leading comrades of the major military regions. It is obvious that the whole party and the people of the whole country should be vigilant against the Lin Biao group. A thrilling struggle to crush the coup proved that Chairman Mao was right. The subsequent struggle with Deng Xiaoping once again verified the truth revealed by Chairman Mao. Deng Xiaoping had made a painful self-criticism and said that he would "never overturn the verdicts." However, once he came back to power, he overturned the verdicts and turned the tables, which made Chairman Mao sigh and say that he was unreliable and could not be counted on to never overturn the verdicts. After the criticism of Deng, did he obey? Did he change? Still no. As soon as the Chairman died, he became even more aggressive, beautifying himself, boasting about himself, exaggerating himself, and even turning the tables to make decisions that Chairman Mao had made mistakes. Deng Xiaoping was a capitalist-roader who would never repent.

We are fortunate to have personally experienced these class struggles and line struggles. Today, we must never forget Chairman Mao's instructions and practices, and we must unwaveringly follow Chairman Mao's instructions and practices. Otherwise, we will make mistakes and inevitably struggle endlessly in the pain of oppression and exploitation as we do now.

Now when we talk about line struggle, it is no longer a question of line struggle within the Party. When we talk about revisionism, it is no longer a question of revisionist thoughts or capitalist-roaders within the Party. This revisionist party is already a bourgeois party, and, to paraphrase Chairman Mao, it is the worst bourgeois party. What we are facing is class struggle, a class struggle between the broad working class led by the proletariat and the internal and external monopoly bourgeoisie led by the bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie. We use the term line struggle simply because the rule of this ruling party, this bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie, has revisionist forms and characteristics. This point must not be misunderstood. We must not forget that the line struggle we are talking about is nothing more than a concentrated expression of the class struggle in current Chinese society.

Class struggle cannot be reconciled. The class nature of the bourgeoisie will not change. If the leaders of the revisionist line within the party will not repent, then the political representatives of the bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie, which is in a dominant position as the ruling party, will be even less likely to repent. At this point, the revisionist line has become the political line of the bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie and the lifeline of this class. They will not abandon this line. This is determined by their class nature. We must not have any unrealistic illusions about this. This is a question of whether or not to adhere to the viewpoint of class struggle, and also a question of whether or not to adhere to the method of class analysis. We must hold on to the basic viewpoints of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and persist in observing and analysing this issue with the viewpoint of class struggle of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. Only by doing so can we avoid making mistakes in theory and practice, and even slipping into the quagmire of revisionism.

We have more than 40 years of history at hand. Have the revisionist rulers, in the course of more than four decades, changed the nature of their revisionist line by proclaiming time and again that they want

to practise 'socialism' and saying over and over again that they want to 'put the people first', and by saying all these good words endlessly? Have they changed their nature as the bureaucratic, authoritarian, monopolistic bourgeoisie? No, not at all, not possibly.

This is a kind of class struggle that has never existed in the past, a new kind of class struggle under new historical conditions, and we must have a deep understanding of, and endeavour to grasp, the historical particularities of this new kind of class struggle, and not to be blinded by superficial falsehoods.

Leaders like Hu Jintao and others are of a generation that grew up under the red flag with red scarves and singing 'The East is Red'. They, having joined the Young Pioneers, the Communist Youth League and the Communist Party, grew up under the care of the Party and the people and the nurturing of Mao Zedong Thought, and were not only high achievers, good students and outstanding student cadres of prestigious universities, but also, in some cases, have already been selected to be groomed as the Party's successors for the cause of proletarian revolution. As for leaders like the General Secretary and the Premier, all of them had the valuable experience of going to the countryside and, moreover, performed well in all aspects back then, and were able to serve as party branch secretaries of their brigades, leading the peasants to change the world, and were the advanced youths of that era. Needless to say, the General Secretary is also a 'second-generation Red', and has a good father, Comrade Xi Zhongxun, a proletarian revolutionary who was highly praised by Chairman Mao and revered by the Party and the people.

However, history is grim. Just like the old comrades who had decades of revolutionary experience and made certain contributions to the Chinese revolution, they later engaged in revisionism; leaders such as Hu Jintao and the general secretary later accepted revisionism, became the successors of revisionism, followed the revisionist party, took the capitalist road, served as officials and masters to restore capitalism, became a member of the bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie, and climbed step by step to the highest leadership of the revisionist party and the fascist bourgeois party.

Why this degeneration has occurred is a topic worth studying. However, this is a cruel fact, and we must first face this fact correctly. No matter what the history of these people is, they are now the leaders of revisionism, the leaders who promote the revisionist line, the leaders who are engaged in the restoration of capitalism, and the representatives of the bureaucratic autocracy and monopoly bourgeoisie. They are no longer true communists, but traitors to the Communist Party; what they are doing is no longer socialism, but capitalism, and the worst capitalism. They are traitors to the communist movement; they have betrayed the purpose of serving the people and are serving the bourgeoisie, especially the domestic and international monopoly bourgeoisie. They are traitors to the proletariat and the broad masses of working people. No matter what their subjective motives may be, the objective facts are like this. They may not want to admit these crimes, and kind people may feel that these crimes are too heavy, but these are facts, cruel facts. This is not an exaggeration, nor is it an unfounded accusation. As long as we look at the cruel class oppression and class exploitation after the restoration of capitalism in China, as long as we look at those shocking and innumerable crimes, there is no doubt that we can only understand these revisionist rulers in this way.

It is precisely because of this that we must admit that we are facing a brutal class struggle, a class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. This class struggle is irreconcilable and cannot be reformed. "Kindness, mercy", "fairness, justice" are just "bourgeois empty words" for such a class struggle, as the revolutionary mentor said.

In fact, since Deng Xiaoping came to power, the party and its leaders have never expressed their intention to repent. On the contrary, they have repeatedly expressed their intention to "unswervingly" "continue to implement" Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line and "unswervingly" "continue to work hard" to develop socialism with Chinese characteristics. Major policies, short-term and long-term plans, all follow Deng Xiaoping's established guidelines. After the General Secretary came to power, he was no exception and still stubbornly adhered to the old revisionist set. The so-called "four confidences", namely "confidence in theory", "confidence in the path", "confidence in the system" and "confidence in culture", are an open confession of this stubborn revisionist bourgeois stand and attitude. The more one insists on this kind of 'self-confidence', the more reactionary and retrogressive one can only be, and one is now not far from being a feudal emperor. This is the General Secretary giving us a lesson. What 'socialist principles cannot be lost, for if they are lost, it will not be socialism', 'the two 30 years before and after should not be denied to each other', and so on and so forth, not to say that the General Secretary intends to use these words to deceive people, but the fact is that these words are nothing but empty words, and what the General Secretary is doing is contrary to these words.

The political dictatorship of the fascist bourgeoisie, in the 'new era' of the General Secretary, has surpassed that of his predecessor, both in terms of public opinion and in practice. In the past, there were a few websites promoting Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, but after the General Secretary came to power, they were all shut down. Later, there were groups, but if someone sounded unpleasant, the group and the account would be immediately blocked. If someone made a statement that "made irresponsible comments" about the emperor, the tools of dictatorship would be used. As for whoever dared to try to form a party, they would not only be arrested, but also sentenced. This can be regarded as a new development of the General Secretary's "new era", which is further fascist. Several of our comrades are still in the General Secretary's prison. The General Secretary's speech on the Constitution was very pleasant and sacred, but what he actually did was very brutal and despicable, and he ruthlessly trampled on the Constitution. Article 35 of the Constitution of the People's Republic of China stipulates that "citizens of the People's Republic of China have freedom of speech, publication, assembly, association, procession and demonstration." To this day, this is just a piece of paper. In a country with 1.4 billion citizens, only the General Secretary enjoys these freedoms. The other 1.4 billion citizens must obey the "one man in power" General Secretary and are not allowed to make "irrelevant comments". Even if they slander in their hearts, they are also disloyal. This is the current "Constitution" of China. The General Secretary has truly achieved the fascist bourgeois dictatorship that Chairman Mao talked about. Chairman Mao said that Hitler was worse than Charles de Gaulle, and the General Secretary has truly achieved it. The General Secretary probably thinks that this is a strong performance of his power and an indispensable means to achieve "one person in power". In fact, this is the most stupid thing. This is just repeating the mistakes made by Yuan Shikai.²⁰ This absurd dream can only break people's last illusions about the General Secretary. Where there is oppression, there is resistance. The greater the oppression, the fiercer the resistance. How could the General Secretary forget these old sayings?

The fascist bourgeois dictatorship serves the restoration of capitalism. This is how China's capitalist restoration over the past forty years was forged. This can only show that creating any illusions about the revisionism of the party, and especially of the emperor, thinking that socialism can be rebuilt by relying on them is unrealistic, a reversal of the cruel and bloody reality, and a complete and thorough

²⁰ Yuan Shikai (1859 1916), was a leader of the Beiyang warlords. After the Qing emperor was forced to abdicate, he become provisional President of the Republic of China. In December 1915, he announced that he would proclaim himself emperor and change the name of the country to the Chinese Empire – Trans.

lie. The theory of protecting the party and saving the country²¹ is such a lie, and we must not be fooled again.

What we are facing is class struggle, and the line struggle we are talking about now is nothing more than the concentrated political expression of this class struggle. This is a class struggle under the historical conditions of "socialism with Chinese characteristics" and with its own contradictory particularities. Chairman Mao's theory of socialist revolution has not become obsolete, and the policies and strategies that Chairman Mao formulated for us to deal with this class struggle have not become obsolete. From this point of view, it can be said that Chairman Mao is still directing us to fight. We must hold high the revolutionary red flag of Mao Zedong Thought, listen to Chairman Mao's words, follow Chairman Mao's instructions, persist in struggle, persist in revolution, persist in opposing revisionism, and especially dare to oppose the bourgeois headquarters and the emperor!

This is the correct line of socialist re-revolution handed down to us by Chairman Mao, a truly Marxist-Leninist-Maoist revolutionary line. Only by adhering to this line can we draw a clear line with the various forms of the salvationist and reformist lines that have abolished the revolution, and mobilise and lead the workers, peasants and the masses of the working people to seize the great victory of the socialist re-revolution!

History is surely moving forward, and no retrogression can stop its progress. The victory of the right line over the wrong line, the victory of people's democracy over fascist dictatorship, and the victory of socialism over capitalism are all inevitable in history, and are objective laws that no subjective will can change. It is only that the advance of history needs time and conditions in all aspects to be prepared, which requires people to take the historical initiative to create, which is precisely the responsibility and honour of the revolutionaries, and as Chairman Mao's students and warriors, aren't we not doing just such an endeavour?

History has its own pace. It is not good to rush, but it is different to struggle or not to struggle. Chairman Mao said in his famous article "Serve the People", "We must work hard". Today, under the dark conditions of the fascist bourgeois dictatorship, it is very difficult but even more necessary to persist in struggle. Chairman Mao is always with us, and he is leading us to walk the Long March again. This is our most well-founded and greatest confidence.

The long road ahead is as hard as iron, but we will start from the beginning. Let us take the revolutionary steps unswervingly and push the socialist revolution forward step by step. We will win, we will definitely win. The day when we report the good news to Chairman Mao will not be too far away!

Long live the victory of the socialist revolution!

March 5, 2018

²¹ This was a viewpoint advocated on such "red" websites as Utopia and Red China Network. It generally acknowledged that capitalism had been restored in China but said that most Party members were good and that the Party should be supported and not struggled against. Readers of Chinese can see representative articles from 2011 and 2013 respectively here: [我为什么支持“保党救国”论 - 乌有之乡](#) and [保党救国本不错 - 红色社区论坛 红色中国网](#) – Trans.

Understanding Xi Jinping

Like knowing anything, there is a process of recognition, and, more often than not, it is an iterative and convoluted process. It is even more so with historical figures, because people are more complex and there are special difficulties in getting to know them.

People's understanding of General Secretary Xi Jinping has inevitably gone through such a process.

When Xi Jinping took over as General Secretary, initially, people had high hopes. This is not accidental, not without a little basis, there are still some reasons.

When the General Secretary was a teenager, he had the opportunity to work in the countryside in the old revolutionary base areas during the movement initiated by Chairman Mao. He first ran back to Beijing privately, and then went there again. He performed well, joined the Youth League, joined the Party, and served as the Party branch secretary of the brigade. As he himself admitted, this influenced his life and laid a good foundation for his life.

The General Secretary also started from grassroots work, experienced the training of grassroots work, and gradually stepped up to the central leadership position step by step. Although there were no particularly outstanding achievements, there were no major mistakes.

Judging from the recollections of the General Secretary's friends and colleagues, the General Secretary's personal style also has many advantages. He is honest and simple to his friends and comrades. He is not ostentatious or overbearing. He can endure hardships, be self-disciplined, likes reading, has ambitions, and yet does not forget to be modest and prudent. These advantages are an advantage for promotion in China, within the party, and especially in the officialdom.

In addition, the General Secretary also has a good father, Comrade Xi Zhongxun, whose lofty prestige directly protects the General Secretary, and his mother, Comrade Qi Xin, is also extraordinary. He dared to send a wreath to Zhao Ziyang, which shows his courage and quality.

In particular, the General Secretary's inaugural speech was refreshing. The sentence "The basic principles of socialism cannot be lost, otherwise it will not be socialism" gave people so much goodwill and hope.

What I said may not be complete. Anyway, when the General Secretary just took over, people saw a lot of good things in him, and it is understandable that they had certain hopes. Besides, it is normal to have a look at a new leader before forming an opinion.

However, at that time, comrades who truly adhered to the viewpoints of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism had a deeper level of view. They had a relatively clear and basic estimate of what would happen after the General Secretary took office.

The actual situation is that before the General Secretary officially took over, as a central leader and the designated successor, he had already clearly shown his political identity. I remember that at that time, in response to the serious mistakes in his report on international and domestic issues made at the Central Party School, I wrote an article entitled "Criticising Xi Jinping" (October 26, 2008, attached).

My attitude was sincere and my criticism was well-intentioned. At the beginning of the article, I stated this:

"I have read several reports by Comrade Xi Jinping in a row, and recently read his report on party building at the Central Party School. I feel disappointed, but also feel that the problem is serious. Just

as we had high hopes for Comrade Hu Jintao, we also have high hopes for Comrade Xi Jinping. Both of you grew up under the red flag and were nurtured by Mao Zedong Thought. Although Comrade Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line is now dominant, can you completely forget Chairman Mao's teachings to them and the teachings of many old comrades? Especially with your special experiences, don't you understand that building socialism and seeking benefits for the working people is unshakable under any circumstances?

"Perhaps it is because the hope is too great that the disappointment is particularly heavy. I simply cannot believe that Comrade Xi Jinping, a doctor²² who studied Marxism at Tsinghua University, can make such a report that goes against Marxism.

"If we do not criticise, it will be irresponsible to the cause of the Party, the country, the people, and Comrade Xi Jinping, because history will ultimately judge Comrade Xi Jinping's merits and demerits. "

My criticism was serious.

I criticised Xi Jinping's report from three aspects.

First, regarding his views on the international situation, after my criticism and debate, I concluded, "No matter how the international situation is described, one thing is clear: when a Communist Party member or a Communist Party analyses the international situation, if he does not talk about capitalism, socialism, or the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, what else can he do but be a thoroughly revisionist view?"

Second, regarding my views on domestic issues, after much analysis, criticism and debate, I concluded that "Comrade Xi Jinping's erroneous exposition on the Party's historical mission is not a general error, but an error of principle. He denied the Party's revolutionary mission in the socialist historical period, and actually turned the central task of developing the economy into the only task, and turned developing the economy into developing a socialist market economy. This is completely contrary to the historical mission of the Communists. This theoretical error is the theoretical manifestation of the errors in practice over the past 30 years. It can also be said that it is another concentrated reflection of the erroneous line that has guided practice over the past 30 years. The root cause is still Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line."

Thirdly, Xi Jinping has made a three-point analysis of his 'understanding of the reasons for his mistakes'.

It can be seen that at that time (that is, in 2008), we already had the feeling that the thinking and worldview of the future successor were still revisionist, and the line to be pursued by him was also still revisionist.

Subsequently, General Secretary Xi Jinping, who had already assumed power, crushed all the good intentions of the good people by what he did, proving beyond any doubt that he was indeed a revisionist, indeed a faithful successor of Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line.

If there is anything that we could not have expected, anything that was out of the blue, it is that we could not have expected it to be this bad!

People often like to quote Lenin's famous saying, "History likes to play tricks on people. You want to walk into this room, but end up walking into another room." Really, history has played a trick on us

²² Xi graduated from the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Tsinghua University where he completed an in-service graduate program in Marxist theory and ideological and political education. He holds a Doctor of Law degree – Trans.

again. Don't blame history, blame us for not understanding history and not remembering Chairman Mao's teachings. Chairman Mao has repeatedly taught us that it is difficult for revisionist leaders to change. He warned us that this is a class struggle, a struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, a struggle between taking the socialist road and taking the capitalist road. As a reflection of this struggle in terms of theory and line, it must be a struggle between Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and revisionism, a struggle between Chairman Mao's revolutionary line of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and Deng Xiaoping's revisionist counter-revolutionary line. We should not have illusions about such class struggle. However, we have not really understood and comprehended these seemingly superficial and dogmatic revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. On the contrary, we have been deeply deceived by the bourgeois theory of human nature introduced from the West and the Confucianism of "benevolence" and "propriety" left by our ancestors. We are always so easily and pitifully deceived, always replacing the brutal and inhumane facts of class oppression and class exploitation with good wishes. We just don't understand the truth repeatedly emphasised by the revolutionary mentors, that revolution is the most authoritative force to promote the advancement of human history, and that rebellion is justified and is the most reliable guarantee for self-liberation. This is our historical limitation. This makes it inevitable that we always walk into the wrong room.

For General Secretary Xi Jinping, who has already been cheered with 'Long live', have we still not got rid of this historical limitation? General Secretary Xi Jinping likes the 'Emperor's New Clothes', do we have to close our eyes and cheer the 'Emperor's New Clothes'?

Therefore, it is necessary to decode Xi Jinping and tell people about the naked, bare-bottomed Xi Jinping. Let people understand what kind of person is the 'fixed' emperor? What is he doing? So that we can decide what we should do and how we should do it.

I. The General Secretary's rise to power is the result of class screening

To interpret Xi Jinping, we must adhere to class analysis. The method of class analysis is the most basic Marxist method of understanding human social history. To interpret Xi Jinping correctly, we must adhere to the method of class analysis.

People are quite complex. In contemporary times, not to mention the distant past, even the complete bad guy, the complete antagonist, did not often 'say all the good things and do all the bad things'. Confucius knew to 'listen to his words and observe his deeds'. Two thousand years later, we should not be even more stupid. We should not just look at one thing at a time, and we should not just scratch the surface, but we should learn a more scientific method of analysis, which is what Marxism-Leninism-Maoism is all about, and this is what class analysis is all about.

Let us try to do this.

First of all, we have to understand what kind of thing it is for Xi Jinping to take over the post of General Secretary and become the supreme leader of the Communist Party of China.

We all know that this is not a trivial matter but a major event. However, as to how we should actually understand this major event and what depth of understanding we should reach, the views of different comrades are not yet unanimous.

I am afraid we can all see that this is the handover and succession of the leaders of the Communist Party of China. However, whether or not we can see that this is an adjustment of the leaders of the regime, the leaders of the state apparatus, and the leaders of the class rule, is not necessarily

something that everyone can see. However, this is the most important and essential issue, an issue that cannot be understood clearly.

Why?

The deputy commander-in-chief who ran away²³ had a famous saying: leadership is political power. The deputy commander-in-chief had a sharp view of problems, had ideas, and had some creativity. This sentence is quite accurate and brilliant. The Communist Party of China is the ruling party, and the party leads everything. In this case, it is reasonable to say that leadership is political power. The general secretary is the highest leader of the entire party, and naturally the highest leader of the whole country. He is the highest controller of the state machinery and the highest embodiment of the will of the ruling class. Perhaps this is how the saying "one person is the supreme leader"²⁴ came about. It can be regarded as telling the truth. After the 19th National Congress, there are many people who say this kind of flattering words, from local governments to the military, such as Cai Qi, secretary of the Beijing Municipal Party Committee, Li Hongzhong, secretary of the Tianjin Municipal Party Committee, Chang Wanquan, Minister of Defense, and Wang Ning, commander of the armed police force. It is okay to say that such people are shameless, but don't forget that this just shows that the change of the general secretary means a transfer of power, and flattery is a keen reflection of this point.

It is from this fact of political struggle and class struggle that Chairman Mao warned us that things are often like this. Once the leader changes, the line changes, and everything changes. Therefore, Chairman Mao raised the issue of cultivating successors of the proletarian revolution. During the Cultural Revolution, from seizing power to the establishment of a new revolutionary committee to the adjustment of the new central leadership team, it was also to solve the problem of leadership, which was actually the problem of political power. As a result, as has happened, there is still a problem. The highest leadership was handed over to a political speculator who seemed honest on the surface but was actually very dishonest. When politics undergoes fundamental changes, the regime also undergoes fundamental changes. Deng Xiaoping came to power, revisionism came to power, and the cause of socialism was destroyed. However, after revisionism came to power, the struggle for the leadership of the party did not end. First, Hua Guofeng was eliminated, then Hu Yaobang was eliminated, and then Zhao Ziyang was eliminated. Even Jiang Zemin, if he had not turned around in time and obeyed orders, would have faced a change of horses. Deng the Great Man made it very clear at the time that those who did not carry out reform and opening up would be replaced. In fact, those who did not implement his revisionist line would be replaced. These facts prove that Chairman Mao's opinions are a summary of the experience of class struggle and are correct.

We should correctly see the historical pattern therein. The change of leaders involves which class holds the power, which class holds the state machinery, and what political line and path will be pursued. This

²³ Lin Biao- Trans.

²⁴ “定于一尊” (“dìng yú yīzūn”) is a Chinese idiom taken from the Western Han Dynasty Sima Qian's "Historical Records" . It means that everything is “fixed in one” . In his section on Emperor Qin Shihuang who was the first to unify China, Sima Qian quotes Qin' s prime minister Li Sijin as saying “Now that Qin Shi Huang has unified China, it is up to the emperor to distinguish between right and wrong, black and white, and set the only standard.” He applied the four-character idiom to Qin Shihuang. On July 5, Xinhua News Agency published Xi Jinping's speech at the National Organization Work Conference, stressing that "it is necessary to uphold and strengthen the overall leadership of the Party, resolutely safeguard the authority of the Party Central Committee and centralized and unified leadership, and ensure that the Party Central Committee is determined to be the authority of one and the last word." In July 2018, the top leadership of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China repeatedly mentioned "fixed in one", and the abbreviated expression “Yi Zun” is now commonly used to mean Xi Jinping – Trans.

is the fundamental interest of every class, which every class is bound to fight to the death for, and is therefore the concentrated expression of class struggle.

This is how we must, and can only, recognise the succession of General Secretary Xi Jinping. This brings us to the title of this section: the General Secretary's rise to power is the result of class sifting. Yes, General Secretary Xi Jinping's rise to power is the result of a class screening, which is, and can only be, the result of a screening by the bureaucratic authoritarian monopoly bourgeoisie, as the ruling class, the class in power ----. That much is certain.

The Chinese Communist Party is no longer a Communist Party. It is a fake Communist Party that uses the name of the Communist Party. It is a real revisionist party, a real bourgeois party, and the worst bureaucratic, autocratic, monopolistic bourgeoisie party, a fascist party. As Chairman Mao predicted, this party is already a Hitler, worse than Charles de Gaulle. It is precisely because the Chinese Communist Party has undergone such a transformation that General Secretary Xi Jinping came to power as the highest leader of this bourgeois party, this bureaucratic, autocratic, monopolistic bourgeoisie party, and this fascist party.

As mentioned above, if a leader of a bourgeois party cannot implement the line, principles, and policies of this class, cannot faithfully serve this class, and cannot hold power for this class, then this class will inevitably use various means and methods to remove and replace him. This is common in the history of bourgeois parties, and the resignation of Hua, Hu, and Zhao is a fact that we have witnessed with our own eyes, and it is a good negative teaching material.

If you understand this principle, you will not be puzzled by the performance of the General Secretary since he came to power. Those good wishes, without class analysis, are bound to be disappointed and shattered. On the contrary, at the beginning of this article, we put those hats on the General Secretary, "General Secretary Xi Jinping is currently China's biggest revisionist, the biggest capitalist-roader, and the political representative of China's biggest bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie. When Chairman Mao was alive, the hats and criticisms put on revisionists are now very appropriate for General Secretary Xi Jinping." This opinion is pragmatic, based on reality, and adheres to class analysis. If there is any shortcoming, it is that we should add another hat: the biggest fascist leader.

It is inconceivable that a leader of a bourgeois party will turn into a leader of the proletariat. This has never happened and will never happen. This is not in line with the law of class struggle. We say that the class nature of the exploiting class will not change. The bourgeois party is the political representative of the bourgeoisie. How can the class nature of the leaders of such a party change at will? In particular, how can they turn to the side of the working people? If there is such a foolish fantasy, it can only bring harm to the liberation and revolutionary cause of the working people, and it will always be at the cost of people's heads falling and rivers of blood flowing. When we shed tears while reading history, we must not forget this historical lesson that was paid for with lives, and we must not forget class struggle and class analysis. The cruelty of class struggle cannot be diverted by good wishes.

Apart from other things, General Secretary Xi Jinping has already far surpassed Hu Jintao in implementing a brutal fascist dictatorship. We are being punished for this fact. Shouldn't we still insist on class analysis and see which class the General Secretary is the political representative of? Unrealistic kindness is just another name for ignorance. Slaves who fantasize about their masters showing mercy will degenerate into hopeless slaves.

2 The key is still in the line

We have written eight comments on Xi Jinping Thought. These criticisms focus on one point, which is to show that the key problem of General Secretary Xi Jinping is still the line, or the implementation of Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line. In particular, the eighth commentary, "Two Fundamentally Contradictory Basic Lines", is specifically about the line problem and line struggle.

All the General Secretary's inventions are by no means the so-called "Sinification of Marxism" inventions, let alone the latest development of Marxism. They say so themselves, just to swell their faces, brag, and deceive the people. As long as we analyse the General Secretary's remarks and practices, including the so-called "Xi Jinping Thought", we can see that what the General Secretary says and does runs through a black line - Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line and the line of restoring capitalism.

We criticise Xi Jinping Thought, and we say a thousand things, political problems, economic problems, ideological and cultural problems, all of these problems are based on the line, and are determined by the line. Chairman Mao repeatedly emphasised that the line determines everything, which is absolutely correct. Xi Jinping Thought is wrong in many ways, but it is wrong in the line, and it is wrong in that it still belongs to Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line, and is a continuation and expansion of Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line.

This is the general outline of all the problems of the General Secretary.

We must launch a struggle against revisionism and oppose the capitalist restoration that has already occurred. We must grasp the line as the outline, and use Chairman Mao's Marxist-Leninist-Maoist proletarian revolutionary line to oppose and criticise Deng Xiaoping and his disciples' revisionist bourgeois counter-revolutionary line of capitalist restoration.

This should become the general strategy of our proletarian revolutionaries who adhere to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and socialist revolution.

What is the core problem of Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line that General Secretary Xi Jinping insists on promoting? On the issue of class struggle as the key link. This is the theory and practice left to us by Chairman Mao. Chairman Mao said and did this when he launched the criticism of Deng in the end. At that time, Chairman Mao grasped the core issue of "class struggle as the key link". Chairman Mao grasped the main contradiction of the problem and grasped the key point. In my article "Two Fundamentally Contradictory Basic Lines" in the eighth commentary on Xi Jinping Thought, I specifically wrote about the topic "The key to the line difference lies in whether to adhere to class struggle as the key link." Under this topic, I criticised the problems of this revisionist line from three aspects. We wrote like this: "There are three reasons to tell the General Secretary. First, abandoning class struggle as the key link will inevitably betray the purpose of the Communist Party. ... Second, abandoning class struggle as the key link will inevitably lead to the capitalist road, and capitalist restoration will inevitably occur. ... Third, abandoning class struggle as the key link will inevitably lead to the transformation into social-imperialism. " I will not quote the details here. Comrades who are interested can read the Eight Commentaries. Chairman Mao is right. Once we abandon the key link of class struggle, we will go in the wrong direction and take the wrong path. All kinds of problems will emerge, and capitalist restoration will be inevitable. The political line determines everything. This is not an empty talk. It very practically determines whether to take the socialist road or the capitalist road. Furthermore, it determines the fate of the ruling Communist Party and the fate of socialism being built. If we abandon class struggle as the key link, the Communist Party will inevitably degenerate into a revisionist party, and socialist society will inevitably degenerate into a capitalist society. This is how we have been for nearly 40 years. General Secretary Xi Jinping is still doing this. The General Secretary loves to speak and is good at speaking nice words, including Marxist phrases

and the words of the Communists. But have you noticed that over the years, the General Secretary has never talked about class struggle as the key link, and has never talked about opposing revisionism. On this issue, General Secretary Xi Jinping has a firm position, a clear attitude, and a clear view. He has unequivocally upheld Deng Xiaoping's revisionist counter-revolutionary line and opposed Chairman Mao's Marxist-Leninist-Maoist revolutionary line.

"Class struggle as the key link" is a touchstone. It very scientifically tests the true face of General Secretary Xi Jinping. It is not unfair to put those big hats on him. It is completely correct and appropriate. The General Secretary may not accept it and be unhappy, but his revisionist line has brought suffering and tears to the working people, subversion and destruction to Chinese socialism, and losses and disasters to national resources and the environment. These are all irreversible facts that have already happened. The people are even more unhappy, and they don't even have the right to complain, because that is called "irrelevant discussion" and will be subject to fascist dictatorship. Comrade Xi Zhongxun's son actually played such a historical role. I wonder what Comrade Xi Zhongxun feels, and can he still rest in peace underground?

The revisionist line is the line of developing capitalism, the bourgeois line. This is the essence of this line. In terms of this essence, the revisionist line is no different from the line of the bourgeoisie in any capitalist country. The reason why we still use this label is only because the concocters of this line still claim to be communists, still claim to believe in Marxism, and still claim to be engaged in socialism. This is of course deceptive and false, but it is different from the bourgeois parties in capitalist countries in terms of the form of promoting the line, principles, and policies and actually operating the line, principles, and policies. To fail to see this formal difference, to fail to see that there is still a deception of the people, is unrealistic, is not conducive to the conduct of the struggle, and is not conducive to the launching of a socialist re-revolution.

The problem that exists now is precisely that there are quite a number of people who are still unable to see this deceptive nature of the revisionist line and are still blinded by it. It is precisely for this reason that the revisionist rulers have been able to rule relatively securely for four decades and to implement Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line relatively smoothly. This is a harsh fact that we are facing, and it is an important reason why it has not yet been possible to launch a socialist re-revolution. We cannot ignore this fact. It is an important political task for us to expose and criticise revisionism, to expose and criticise the revisionist line, and to expose and criticise the fact that capitalist restoration has already taken place in China.

Our struggle against General Secretary Xi Jinping must include this political task. We must thoroughly expose and criticise the fact that General Secretary Xi Jinping is still implementing and pursuing Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line, and expose and criticise the fact that this line is actually taking the road of capitalism in every field, in every aspect, and on every issue, that it is engaged in capitalist restoration, and that it is engaged in the worst kind of capitalist restoration. We have to make it clear, together with the broad masses of the people, that it is Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line that is the total root cause of all the present problems in China. The general programme of our struggle remains the key link of class struggle, the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, the struggle of the socialist road against the capitalist road, and, as the concentrated political expression of this struggle, we must insist on Chairman Mao's Marxist-Leninist-Maoist revolutionary line against Deng Xiaoping's revisionist counter-revolutionary line. This is the general direction of our struggle, and we must grasp this general outline and not relax. China's problems are now piling up. In the past, it was said that during Chairman Mao's time, there were so many problems that it was difficult to return to them, but this saying, when applied to the present time, is entirely accurate. Both externally and internally, of course first and foremost internally, the problems created by the reactionary line are endless, and the task of exposing and criticising them is very heavy. But this kind of exposure and criticism cannot just

be a matter of fact, it is superficial, it cannot hit the nail on the head, because it does not grasp the outline, it does not mention the outline, the outline is the class struggle, it is the line struggle, our exposure and criticism must be on the outline, and we have to go straight after the Commanding General, and hit the Commanding General, and hit the emperor who is 'the one thing that everything is fixed on'. It is to grasp General Secretary Xi Jinping and his line without letting go. Keep in mind Chairman Mao's teaching, 'You cannot fight only against corrupt officials but not against the emperor.' That is what it means to carry out class struggle according to the laws of class struggle, to carry out line struggle according to the laws of line struggle, and to carry out anti-revisionist struggle according to the laws of anti-revisionist struggle.

The working people of China are suffering. Whether it is politically, economically, or even ideologically and culturally, they are suffering, which can be described as "bitter and resentful". Politically, they are under the fascist dictatorship; economically, they are squeezed dry to the last drop of blood; even in ideology and culture, they are indoctrinated with feudal, capitalist, and revisionist spiritual garbage. It is no longer a comprehensive dictatorship over the bourgeoisie, but a comprehensive dictatorship by the bourgeoisie. It is really a historical irony, a cruel historical irony. This is the tragic fate of the working people of China under the so-called "people-centred" "socialism with Chinese characteristics". There is no need to complain, cry, or beg. The bureaucratic, autocratic, and monopolistic bourgeoisie represented by General Secretary Xi Jinping will not sympathise with or pity the working people. "Putting people at the centre" is just a lie. All of this is what they created and what they brought to the Chinese working people. How can they repent? Today there is a "significant signal", tomorrow there is a "significant signal", and they always wishfully create the illusion of "returning to socialism". In the end, which "signal" really brings even a little hope for socialism? There will be no such thing!

Looking at the history of human civilization for thousands of years, when has the ruling class, which oppressed and exploited the working people, ever shown kindness to the working people? No, never. This is class struggle, this is the law of class struggle. The first sentence of the Communist Manifesto is that, the history of all hitherto existing human society is the history of class struggle. The Chinese should never forget this sentence. There were the most peasant uprisings in ancient China, which is unique in world history. Why? It's very simple. The ruling class exploited and oppressed the peasants too cruelly. Selling children and daughters, starving people everywhere, there are endless books. They couldn't survive, so they had to rise up and rebel to survive. Hundreds of years ago, missionaries who came to China wrote to the Pope of Rome, lamenting that the labour of Chinese farmers was so heavy and their lives were so hard, often just a bowl of porridge. This was incredible to them. Compared with the lives of European serfs, they were even more puzzled. In connection with today's reality, we can't help but think, no wonder Chairman Mao said that if China wants to engage in capitalism, it will be the worst capitalism. Chairman Mao is well versed in Chinese history. We should learn from Chairman Mao and think about China's current problems based on China's history and reality. I remember Lu Xun also said that he was never afraid to speculate on people with the greatest malice, but in the end, things were worse than he thought. Lu Xun was also well versed in Chinese history. We should also learn from Lu Xun.

The meaning of saying all this is very simple. When we analyse and understand General Secretary Xi Jinping, we must not leave the viewpoints of class and class struggle, and we must not leave the method of class analysis. Class struggle and line struggle are cruel, much crueller than people imagine. Often, human nature is even worse than animal nature. Countless fearless martyrs who were cruelly tortured and finally sacrificed heroically have not only left us heroic examples, but more importantly, they have left us lessons of class struggle. Whether rebellion is unreasonable or reasonable cannot be resolved through debate. Here, reason is class-based and is a manifestation of class struggle.

Chairman Mao criticised Song Jiang²⁵ for only opposing corrupt officials and not the emperor. This was pointed out. This problem still exists today. Some people are not blind to the fact that the problem lies in the line, in the emperor who controls and implements the line, but opposing the emperor is dangerous. Under the current circumstances, opposing the emperor will result in punishment at the lightest level and imprisonment at the worst. There are many examples to prove this. General Secretary Xi Jinping has done this more than once. He told Putin that he is as firm as Putin in character. In the matter of arresting people, the General Secretary surpassed Putin. This fully demonstrates the "characteristics" of "socialism with Chinese characteristics" and fully proves that the revisionist line is the line of fascist dictatorship. From Deng Xiaoping to the General Secretary, since they dared to use the army to suppress on a large scale, then punishing people for their words and imprisoning them for their writings is a piece of cake. Don't underestimate the ferocity of the General Secretary.

In the face of such class struggle, a very practical question is placed before us, that is, do we dare to carry out such class struggle, and do we still want to carry out such class struggle.

From the publication of the Communist Manifesto to the birth of the Internationale, proletarians all over the world have been answering this question. The outstanding sons and daughters of this class have written a great history of the communist movement revolution with blood and fire, not afraid of hardships and difficulties, not afraid of bloodshed and sacrifice. Today, as the descendants of the proletariat, as communists who have accepted Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, of course, we have taken over the revolutionary red flag in the hands of the martyrs and are continuing this great "final struggle"... The Internationale must be realised! We Chinese Communists are also doing this. This is our duty. In particular, this is also our special responsibility. Because we have personally received Chairman Mao's teachings, we have personally followed Chairman Mao through a revolutionary journey that will never be forgotten. We are Chairman Mao's loyal students and fighters. Carrying such a responsibility, we must inherit Chairman Mao's will and unswervingly carry out the anti-revisionist struggle to the end and the socialist revolution to the end.

At any time, the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat requires correct strategies. In the face of the worst fascist bourgeois dictatorship under capitalist conditions, we must pay special attention to the strategy of struggle. The fascist bourgeois dictatorship has a real tiger side and an iron tiger side. This side wants to bite and eat people. We cannot take it lightly and must adopt the correct strategy. We must follow the path of "preserving ourselves and destroying the enemy" as Chairman Mao said, that is, Chairman Mao's great military thought, "You fight your way, I fight mine, if we can win, we fight, if we can't win, we leave." Fighting is a principle; leaving is a strategy. To be firm in principle is to insist on the word "fighting"; to be flexible in strategy is to master the word "leaving".

We will not discuss other forms of struggle here, only what we are doing.

To borrow a phrase from the Cultural Revolution, we are launching a revolutionary critique of the emperor and the revisionist line he promotes. We must criticise the emperor and the revisionist line to the ground, and perhaps we can add a sentence: put one foot on it and make it unable to stand up forever.²⁶ This is not a joke, it is a necessity of the revolutionary theoretical struggle. Once the theory

²⁵ The leader of a peasant rebellion in the novel *Water Margin* – Trans.

²⁶ "Putting a foot on it", or "keeping it underfoot", was a four-character expression used several times by Mao Zedong in his "Report on an Investigation of the Peasant Movement in Hunan". For example, he wrote: "Leadership by the poor peasants is absolutely necessary. Without the poor peasants there would be no revolution. To deny their role is to deny the revolution. To attack them is to attack the revolution. They have never been wrong on the general direction of the revolution. They have discredited the local tyrants and evil gentry. They have beaten down the local tyrants and evil gentry, big and small, and kept them underfoot." The phrase was popular with the rebels during the Cultural Revolution – Trans.

arms the revolutionary masses, it will turn spirit into matter and become a huge material force for the socialist revolution.

We must firmly grasp the emperor, grasp the line, and hold on to it. Chairman Mao said that if we do not grasp it tightly, it is the same as not grasping it at all. Chairman Mao's big-character poster, "Bombard the Headquarters", not only set an example for us, but also left us with valuable principles and strategies for struggle. Chairman Mao bombarded the headquarters, bombarded the emperor, and bombarded the line. Today, we fight against revisionism and General Secretary Xi Jinping, and we must follow Chairman Mao and act in accordance with Chairman Mao's theory and practice.

We pointed out that General Secretary Xi Jinping is still promoting Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line in order to find the right target for comrades so that all cannons can bombard this bourgeois headquarters.

Which class holds the power determines everything. Whether the ideological and political line is correct or not determines everything. Class struggle is the key, and the rest are details. The line is the key, and the all the rest falls into place²⁷. These words, due to different historical conditions, are said differently, but they all speak of the same truth, the unified truth, which is the truth of class struggle. We must act and practice according to these truths.

The key to General Secretary Xi Jinping lies in the line, and the root of all his problems lies in the line. Only by grasping the line can we see the class nature of the General Secretary through those beautiful words, understand what kind of person the General Secretary is, and fundamentally criticise and denounce (please forgive me, the remnants of the Cultural Revolution have borrowed the language of the Cultural Revolution again) this contemporary Deng Xiaoping II.

3. Analysing the ideological roots of the General Secretary

When studying any historical figure, the question of the ideological roots is often mentioned. This question can be explored from two aspects. One aspect is to explore from the perspective of class roots, and the other aspect is to explore from the perspective of ideological methods. If we want to correctly understand General Secretary Xi Jinping, we must also do such an exploration.

Our party used to have a consistent policy on the issue of family background, which was: there is a theory of class background, but it is not the only one. The emphasis is on political performance. During the Cultural Revolution, several central leaders repeatedly reiterated this policy, opposing, resisting and criticising the reactionary "bloodline theory". This is completely correct. It is precisely because of the "emphasis on political performance" that General Secretary Xi Jinping is no longer a "second-generation red" and has transformed into a political representative of the bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie. This is the class standpoint and class root of General Secretary Xi Jinping. Chairman Mao pointed out that the capitalist roaders are the bourgeoisie within the party. This principle is completely suitable for General Secretary Xi Jinping. The history of the General Secretary's political career is the history of taking the capitalist road, and the history of his transformation into a

²⁷ The reference to "different historical conditions" in the next sentence is to an ancient four-character idiom best translated into contemporary usage apart from its literal meaning. It comes from the Warring States period and Lü Buwei's *Spring and Autumn Annals: The People*. Chairman Mao used it in his *Talk on Mutual Aid and Co-operation in Agriculture* of November 1953, giving its literal meaning and then explaining its significance. He said: "As an old saying goes, 'Once the headrope of a fishing net is pulled up, all its meshes open.' It is only by taking hold of the key link that everything else will fall into its proper place. The key link means the main theme. The contradiction between socialism and capitalism and the gradual resolution of this contradiction -- that is the main theme, the key link. Grasp this key link, and all kinds of political and economic work to help the peasants will fall under it" – Trans.

representative of the bourgeoisie. In the past seven years, as the top leader of the Chinese Communist Party, the General Secretary has shown his class nature of bureaucratic autocracy and monopoly bourgeoisie more blatantly and thoroughly through his various perverse actions in his "new era" and "new strategy".

This is the class root of General Secretary Xi Jinping's thought. It is based on the reality of Chinese society. This is not difficult to understand and is clearly seen by most people. This is naturally the degeneration of individuals, but it is also the result of changes in classes and class relations. Chairman Mao said: This is the class root of General Secretary Xi Jinping's thought. It is based on the reality of Chinese society. This is not difficult to understand and is clearly seen by most people. This is naturally the degeneration of individuals, but it is also the result of changes in classes and class relations. Chairman Mao said: "To carry out socialist revolution, if you don't know where the bourgeoisie is, it is in the Communist Party, the ruling clique in the party that is taking the capitalist road. The capitalist roaders are still on the road." In the past, old comrades always felt that Chairman Mao's words were too heavy and did not want to accept them. Deng Xiaoping and his gang made a wrong "Resolution" about Chairman Mao, overturning Chairman Mao's thought and Chairman Mao's theory of continuing revolution under socialist conditions."

Who was wrong? More than 40 years of history have made an irrefutable conclusion.

Chairman Mao was right, and the mistakes were made by Deng Xiaoping and other capitalist-roaders and revisionist leaders. They not only degenerated into the bourgeoisie, but also degenerated into the worst bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie, the fascist bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie. This class relied on the blood and sweat of the Chinese working people to quickly accumulate huge wealth and quickly expand into a monopoly bourgeoisie riding on the heads of the working people.

In his comments and annotations on Chen Zhengren's report on the situation of the socialist education on the spot and Bo Yibo's letter on the matter on December 12, 1964 and January 15, 1965, Chairman Mao pointed out sharply that "the bureaucrat class and the working class and the poor and lower-middle peasants are two sharply opposed classes." "These people have become or are becoming bourgeois elements who suck the blood of the workers." "Then 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 bourgeois."²⁸ After the test of the ten-year Cultural Revolution, Chairman Mao adhered to this view, developed this view, and put forward the theory of socialist continued revolution, which became the second contribution of Mao Zedong Thought. The history of nearly forty years has once again verified Chairman Mao's theory of socialist continued revolution.

Practice is better than rhetoric. Repeated practice has repeatedly proved that Chairman Mao's theory of continuing socialist revolution is a correct and scientific theory. This argument is cruel and is paid for with the blood and tears of the Chinese working people. As Chairman Mao said, China's monopoly bourgeoisie "has become or is becoming a bourgeois element that sucks the blood of workers." This class relationship, as Chairman Mao also said, "is in a state of acute class struggle with the working class." The actual situation is even worse, far beyond Chairman Mao's foresight.

Now, General Secretary Xi Jinping is playing such a historical role. General Secretary Xi Jinping has long since degenerated into a political representative of China's monopoly bourgeoisie, and has long been

²⁸ Chen Zhengren was minister of the Eighth Ministry of Machinery Industry at the time, and was "squatting" or staying for a period of investigation at the Louyang Tractor Factory, from where he reported to CC member Bo Yibo on growing gaps between specialists and workers. Mao read the report and Bo's reply and wrote the reported comments on copies of the documents – Trans.

"in a state of acute class struggle" with China's working class, peasant class, and other broad working people. To use an old saying from the Cultural Revolution, the General Secretary has become a "class enemy" of the broad working people of China. This is not an infinite exaggeration, the outline is there. Chairman Mao has repeatedly warned you since the 1960s, who told you not to listen?!

The General Secretary is no longer the revolutionary youth who went to the countryside, nor is he the Party branch secretary of the brigade who practices the "three samenesses" with the poor and lower-middle peasants. The General Secretary has completed his self-transformation in accordance with the requirements of Deng Xiaoping's revisionist organizational line. When the General Secretary invited Li Rui, the anti-Mao pioneer who promoted him, to dinner, he said to Li Rui, "You can play the edge ball, but I dare not." This means that the General Secretary is cautious, careful, and honest in walking the revisionist officialdom. The General Secretary's step-by-step promotion is a process of step-by-step transformation. This is a major feature of the revisionist officialdom's selection of officials, and it is also a major feature of the cultivation and production of revisionist bureaucrats. This is a political phenomenon that does not exist in general capitalist countries. It is a bit like cultivating traitors. Please look at history, from Khrushchev to revisionist leaders like Deng Xiaoping, which one was originally a bad guy? Not only that, but they are all old revolutionaries, and have done some work for the revolution to a greater or lesser extent. However, under the push of the revisionist trend, they have degenerated, become revisionists, and become representatives of the bourgeoisie. At most, they are representatives of the bourgeoisie with "characteristics". First, the "characteristics" are to engage in revisionism, and second, the "characteristics" are to engage in the worst capitalism and fascist bourgeois dictatorship. They are Hitler, worse than Charles de Gaulle.

It is this class status that is the class root of General Secretary Xi Jinping's ideological and political lines. In this class background, it is not accidental but inevitable that General Secretary Xi Jinping observes and handles all problems with the bourgeois worldview. It is also inevitable that he continues to promote Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line. The inevitability here is a class issue, a class root issue. It is precisely from this very realistic reality that we must insist on class analysis of General Secretary Xi Jinping. Only in this way can we understand the General Secretary more deeply and correctly, and not be deceived by those superficial phenomena and pleasant words.

To analyse the ideological roots of the General Secretary is to analyse the class roots of the General Secretary. There is nothing particularly profound about it. Social existence determines social consciousness. Class position determines class thought. As the saying goes, 'Whatever the class is, is whatever they say.' The General Secretary has not, and cannot, go against this law.

Having analysed the class roots of the General Secretary's thought, we have to further analyse the General Secretary's method of thought.

Any person's theory of thought is always linked to his certain method of thought, and General Secretary Xi Jinping is no exception.

The most important characteristic of General Secretary Xi Jinping's method of thought is to engage in eclecticism.

Chairman Mao said in 1960 that eclecticism is revisionism. This is the truth. If we look at the method of thought, this statement can also be said to mean that revisionism is eclecticism. Specifically, those who engage in revisionism, in terms of their method of thought, always engage in eclecticism. Revisionism and eclecticism are twins; wherever there is revisionism, there is eclecticism.

The old revisionists are like this, the new revisionists are still like this, and so is General Secretary Xi Jinping. On 14 April 2014, I published an article entitled 'Eclecticism is Revisionism ---- Critique of Jinping's Political Science'.

At the beginning of the article, there is this quote, which can also be quoted here.

"This is a sister article to 'A Critique of Keqiang's Economics', which was mainly a critique of the economic line there, and a critique of the political line here. Both study, analyse and criticise the revisionist line, and both criticise the 'Chinese Dream'. I follow Chairman Mao's instructions and grasp the line without relaxing. The line is the key link, and the rest is the aim.

"Such a critique is necessary. The basis is the political practice that has embodied the political line of those in power for more than a year, that is, their words and their deeds.

"On the one hand, it is said that "the basic principles of socialism cannot be abandoned, otherwise it will not be socialism." It is said that there are "three confidences", "confidence in the path, confidence in theory and confidence in the system." The 120th anniversary of Chairman Mao's birth was solemnly commemorated, and the Politburo Standing Committee members went to Chairman Mao's Memorial Hall together. However, on the other hand, it is emphasized that the so-called "three confidences" are confidence in the path, theory and system of "socialism with Chinese characteristics", that is, adhering to the line of "socialism with Chinese characteristics", that is, adhering to the revisionist line of Deng Xiaoping.

"Isn't this a contradiction? Talking about Chairman Mao and Deng Xiaoping, talking about Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and revisionism, talking about socialism and characteristic capitalism, isn't this a contradiction? From the perspective of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, it is a contradiction. However, from the perspective of revisionism, it is not a contradiction. The philosophical method of reconciling the two is eclecticism.

"This is a basic characteristic of revisionism. Lenin once criticised Bukharin for his eclecticism, always using the eclectic thinking method of "on the one hand, on the other hand", negating the essence and main tendency of things, and denying the dialectics of things. Chairman Mao had the same opinion. In the 1960s, when criticising revisionism, Chairman Mao particularly emphasised the need to criticise eclecticism, pointing out that those who engaged in revisionism at that time always engaged in eclecticism, using eclecticism to oppose the leadership of politics and the emphasis on politics, and "pretending to obey" and "disobeying" the emphasis on politics, which was a dangerous tendency, and clearly pointed out that "eclecticism is revisionism." Chairman Mao later criticised Deng Xiaoping's "Three Directives as the Guideline", which was actually a criticism of the eclecticism of putting the "Three Directives" in parallel. These historical experiences left by the revolutionary mentors are worthy of our attention, learning and inheritance.

"The current saying of "two things that cannot be denied" is also a compromise way of thinking. It seems fair and impartial. The thirty years of leadership under Chairman Mao's line cannot be denied, and the thirty years of leadership under Deng Xiaoping's line cannot be denied. However, this is a typical compromise, a typical "on the one hand, on the other hand", which is to reconcile the contradictions between the fundamentally opposing Marxist-Leninist-Maoist line and the revisionist line. In fact, it is not fair, but Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line is still used to impact and replace Chairman Mao's Marxist-Leninist-Maoist line.

"This is what Chairman Mao called "pretending to obey but secretly disobeying". No matter what the revisionists' subjective wishes are, the result is always like this, always going down the slope of opposing Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and the proletarian revolution.

"Isn't this the fact?

"It is. This is a theoretical and practical issue that deserves serious study. "

Today, my criticism is based on facts, serious and pertinent. I have attached this article to the end of this article, and I will not repeat the principles there. Six years have passed, and I should add some new ideas.

I have repeatedly wondered why revisionists always compromise. I found the answer from Chairman Mao's teachings, which is the words "obey in public but violate in private". "Obey in public" is one aspect; "violation in private" is another aspect. The unity of the two is compromise, that is, revisionism. Revisionism is to obey Marxism in public but violate it in private. As the saying goes, say one thing and do another. Saying one thing is "obey in public"; doing another is "violation in private". This is exactly the characteristic of revisionism. Obeying in public but violating in private is actually a "fake" word, fake Marxism, real revisionism.

Chairman Mao told visiting bourgeois right-wing politicians from the West more than once that he liked the right wing and disliked the so-called "left-wing" Social Democratic Parties, because they cheated, lied, and were fake leftists. We all know that the Social Democratic Parties Chairman Mao was referring to here were those revisionist parties that have long betrayed Marxism and the working class. One of the characteristics of these revisionist parties is that they sell dog meat disguised as sheep, engage in fake Marxism, and the form is eclecticism.

Chairman Mao's analysis is the key to unlocking eclecticism. The reason why revisionism is always linked to eclecticism is determined by the characteristics of revisionism. Revisionism is false Marxism and true capitalism. One is false and the other is true. This inevitably leads to a two-sided eclectic thinking method of "on the one hand, on the other hand", "both this and that". This is of course not in line with dialectics. Dialectics is about both the two-point theory and the emphasis theory. One is divided into two, and the two are not parallel, but have emphasis, and have the main aspects of the contradiction, which determines the nature of the "one". It is precisely from this sense that Lenin criticized Bukharin in his last letter to the party, the so-called "political testament", for "never understanding dialectics". Lenin had a keen insight into problems, and he saw the problem with a sharp eye. Several revolutionary mentors had this ability. Chairman Mao also saw compromise. The term "compromise is revisionism" exposed the essence of compromise with a sharp eye. Compromise serves the essence of revisionism. The bourgeoisie sells dog meat and directly calls it dog meat. Revisionism also sells dog meat, but it has to put it in a sheep's head and claims to sell "special" mutton. Of course, they are the same, all dog meat, but revisionist dog meat is worse, the worst rotten and smelly dog meat. From Deng Xiaoping, through to Jiang Zemin, Hu Jintao, to the General Secretary, they have always been selling dog meat in a sheep's head, selling the worst dog meat, which has harmed the Chinese working people.

This way of thinking, to put it mildly, often reflects the shallowness of understanding and the stupidity of thinking. For example, Proudhon criticised by Marx, Dühring criticised by Engels, and Bukharin criticised by Lenin all had this stupidity. But for revisionism, it is more of a deception. The proposal and practice of "socialism with Chinese characteristics" is such a typical example. If we "listen to what he says and watch what he does" about General Secretary Xi Jinping, he is also such a typical negative teacher. We simply cannot believe that the good words of the General Secretary are true, because the

General Secretary has repeatedly and "confidently" resolutely implemented the revisionist line that removed "class struggle as the key link", which ultimately brought capitalist disasters to China and the Chinese people. We can only use practice to test the "original intention" of the General Secretary.

These common facts tell us that there is no absolute compromise in the world. There is always a compromise that is not in the middle. There is always a tendency, there is always an emphasis, and there is always one side of the contradiction that dominates. China has been talking about the "golden mean" for thousands of years. Is there such a thing? No. What is there is the cruel oppression and exploitation of the peasant class by the ruling landlord class for thousands of years.

We must not be fooled by this again. Chairman Mao said that compromise is revisionism, and revisionism is capitalism. Compromise is just a manifestation of the cunning of the ruling class. Compromise is both a way of thinking and a method of deception. Using compromise as a means to actually engage in revisionism and capitalism, from Deng Xiaoping to the General Secretary, they have all done this. It is clearly capitalism with Chinese characteristics, but it is called "socialism with Chinese characteristics". The entire operation is full of compromise and is a typical example of compromise. They say the Communist Party leads, but in reality it is a fascist bourgeois dictatorship; they say socialism is the main form of public ownership, with multiple economic sectors coexisting, but in reality it is developing a capitalist economy, and a monopoly capitalist economy; they say they promote socialist ideology and culture, but in reality they are promoting bourgeois culture plus revisionist culture plus the reactionary and decadent authoritarian culture of the ancient Middle Ages. Eclecticism is like a blender, and the word "characteristics" is like a basket, into which all the worst and most reactionary things can be put, and then a "socialism with Chinese characteristics" can be blended. General Secretary Xi Jinping plays the role of a blender.

For revisionists, compromise is a trick. Perhaps it is sincere for General Secretary Xi Jinping's subjective wishes, but even so, it can only be understood as a split in the General Secretary's personality, a game of compromise between a false General Secretary and another real General Secretary.

4. The biggest weakness is ambition

The brilliance of history lies in the fact that it always goes beyond people's imagination and expectations. Great deeds that shake the world make people admire them; despicable and clumsy deeds make people angry. The noble and great sacrifices make future generations always respect them; the ridiculous and petty tricks make future generations sneer at them. Greatness and pettiness, merits and sins, heroes and clowns, essence and dregs, positive history teachers and negative history teachers, just like this, naturally and lawfully unified into a magnificent and incomparably wonderful human history.

It is often said that history is a mirror and that reading history makes one wise. This truth, however, does not apply to those who have fallen into blindness. People with inflated egos, people overwhelmed by selfish desires, cannot possibly recognise and respect the lessons that history has left behind. Perhaps, this is exactly where history plays tricks on people, where history deliberately jokes with people and allows clowns to perform extremely well in order to give people who have laboured so hard to create human history a chance to laugh with ease.

This time, General Secretary Xi Jinping, has given us such a rare opportunity.

The poem says that Wang Mang was humble before he usurped the throne.²⁹ This is often interpreted as human cunning and the sinister nature of the human heart, but the truth is that it is a phenomenon not uncommon under authoritarian politics, and is the result of authoritarianism's moulding of people.

General Secretary Xi Jinping is one such product. When he did not have the supreme power, he was 'humble', as he himself put it, and did not dare to play even an edge ball. However, once he has usurped the supreme power, his original form is revealed and his ambition is so great that he dares to risk universal condemnation by trampling on the Constitution and vowing to be an emperor for life.

For a while, it was like a bolt from the blue to the whole nation. People could not have imagined that in the 21st century, there is still someone who dares to follow in the footsteps of Yuan Shikai and become the supreme emperor of our time. The magnitude of ambition is staggering.

But this is a fact, and as long as it is a fact, there must be inevitability present in it. This is what we have to study.

If we do a little analytical study of General Secretary Xi Jinping's view of history, it is not difficult to find that the General Secretary believes in a heroic view of history.

The General Secretary has, on more than one occasion, shown the list of books he has read. It is very scary, all-encompassing, ancient and modern, Chinese and foreign, like an entire library, which has moved into his mind, and it is probably not enough to describe him as "well-read". Li Rui³⁰ in his video vilified the General Secretary as having the level of a primary school student, which is a malicious attack. However, reading can make a hungry person go crazy and be even more afraid that their stance is wrong, their direction is wrong, their method is wrong, and the end result is the opposite of what was intended. I see that the General Secretary has such a problem when reading. In the General Secretary, there are words and sentences from Marxism-Leninism and Maoism, but more of them are a hodgepodge of old dregs of feudalism, capitalism, and revisionism. Too many and too mixed old ideas have a great influence on the General Secretary. Don't forget Lu Xun's teachings. We are a great country with at least 5,000 years of ancient civilization. While giving our nation a brilliant cultural essence, it also puts a heavy burden on our nation. Under thousands of years of autocratic rule, the theory and preaching of the sanctification of royal power and imperial power is a big burden on our nation,

²⁹ The poet was Bai Juyi of the Tang Dynasty. In Five Songs: Part Three he said that Wang Mang was humble and before he usurped the throne. Bai Juyi and his friend Yuan Zhen had been unjustly demoted, but he said they could stand the test of time. He said that time was needed to test all things: jade needed three days to test its authenticity, wooden materials needed seven years to test their suitability. Then he mentioned Wang Meng (45BC to 23AD), an early emperor who in his early years was frugal, diligent and erudite, filial to his mother, and known for his virtue. All of this changed once he became Emperor – he was eventually revealed as a cruel, vicious ruler. The parallel with Xi Jinping is clear – Trans.

³⁰ Li Rui (1917 - 2019) was a student activist who joined the Party in 1937. In 1959, at the Lushan Conference, he was designated as a "member of Peng Dehuai's anti-party group", was branded as a "right-leaning opportunist", removed from all positions, expelled from the party in March 1960, and sent to work in the Great Northern Wilderness together with the rightists in May. During the Cultural Revolution, he was detained in Qincheng Prison on November 11, 1967 and released on 30 May 1975. After 1989 he spent time on the lecture circuit of foreign universities, including in the US and Australia. Li Rui was a close friend of Xi Zhongxun, a veteran of the Chinese Communist Party, and he always praised Xi Zhongxun's character, but in his later years, he publicly claimed that his son Xi Jinping's education level was actually only at the elementary school level, and after becoming general secretary, he was stubborn and did not listen to the advice of others. Li Rui also criticised Xi Jinping for overthrowing Deng Xiaoping's proposal to abolish the lifelong system of cadre leadership positions, and establishing a cult of personality. He became an advocate of a bourgeois system of constitutional government - Trans.

distorting our national personality and suppressing and hindering our nation's free development. The majestic heaven, the holy lord and the wise minister, the great master of heaven, this kind of spiritual lock that maintains the royal power and autocracy has firmly locked our nation. The General Secretary does not accept the progressive tradition of the May Fourth Movement's New Culture Movement.³¹ He likes the old cultural tradition, likes to respect Confucius and read the classics, and likes the imperial autocracy. The General Secretary's opposition to historical nihilism is to return to the era of imperial autocracy. He does not want to throw away the decadent, backward, reactionary spiritual burden that weighs on our nation. On the contrary, he wants to use this burden to make our nation bear it more heavily, so as to facilitate his path of imperial autocracy. Since the May Fourth Movement, the struggle between criticising Confucius and respecting Confucius is essentially the struggle between democracy and autocracy. The General Secretary likes Confucius, Confucianism, and likes to respect Confucius. I don't know if he understands it, but I know that what he actually likes is the monarch-monarch relationship, the minister-minister relationship³², the Three Bonds and the Five Constant Virtues,³³ which is imperial autocracy. Imperial autocracy is one of the highest and most thorough forms of realising personal ambitions.

The imperial view of history is the heroic view of history. The heroic view of history is the idealist view of history. Superstitious worship of heroes, exaggeration of heroes, only seeing heroes create history, and not seeing the historical role of the masses, this is the common problem of the idealist view of history for thousands of years. Why does the General Secretary accept the heroic view of history and the idealist view of history? Even when talking about his father, Comrade Xi Zhongxun, he did not forget to call him a "great hero." In fact, the General Secretary does not know that this is not a glorification of the proletarian revolutionary leader, but a vilification. As the child of a high-ranking official and a second-generation red, General Secretary Xi Jinping is deeply influenced by the reactionary "bloodline theory" and has a heroic complex, the so-called "a hero father makes a hero son." However, this is the thought of the old exploiting class, not the thought of the Communists, and not the Marxist view of history. Don't forget that personal heroism is a bridge to ambition.

Marxism has always said that "the liberation of the working class is the business of the working class itself." The Internationale is sung well, correctly, and in the spirit of Marxism: "There has never been any savior, nor do we rely on gods or emperors. To create human happiness, we must rely on ourselves! The old world will be shattered to pieces. Slaves, rise up, rise up! Do not say that we have nothing. We want to be the masters of the world!" Chairman Mao praised the Internationale and asked us to sing it. Not only should we sing it, but we should also follow it. This is because the Internationale sings the principles of Marxism, the principles of true historical materialism. However, General Secretary Xi Jinping does not understand this truth, does not believe in this truth, does not adhere to this truth, and does not act according to this truth. Instead, he believes in and practices the idealist view of history, thinking that he is a "great hero" and wants to be a "great hero" who creates history. How sad. The General Secretary does not know that this is stupid, foolish, ignorant of the immensity of heaven and

³¹ The New Culture Movement advocated Mr Science and Mr Democracy in opposition to Confucianism. It advocated replacing the turgid and hard-to-understand classical democracy with literature written in baihua or the colloquial expressions of everyday speech – Trans.

³² Qi Jingong asked Confucius how to govern the country. Confucius said, "The monarch should be like the monarch, the minister should be like the minister, the father should be like the father, and the son should be like the son." The notion of hierarchy is inherent in Confucian thought – Trans.

³³ The Three Bonds are those stated as the king is the minister, the father is the son, and the husband is the wife. The Five Constant Virtues are the five permanent human natures: benevolence, righteousness, courtesy, wisdom, and faith – Trans.

earth, and runs counter to the progress of history. Anyone who takes this path will inevitably fall to pieces, become a historical clown, and leave behind a historical joke.

General Secretary, why do you want to take this path? What can we say about you? This will be infamous for thousands of years! Not to mention, this is a betrayal of the communist faith.

A true Marxist would not think or act this way. The revolutionary mentor is the best example in this regard. Let's not talk about the distant past, the struggle between Chairman Mao and Lin Biao, which we personally experienced, is the most convincing.

Chairman Mao did not approve of the "genius theory" and "super-genius theory" in theory, and was even more determined to oppose careerists. At the Second Plenary Session of the Ninth Central Committee held in Lushan, Chairman Mao wrote the famous "My Opinion" in response to Lin Biao and Chen Boda's "genius theory" and political ambitions. He clearly pointed out that "this issue that historians and philosophers have been arguing about endlessly, that is, as is usually said, whether heroes create history or slaves create history, whether human knowledge (talent also belongs to the category of knowledge) is innate or acquired, whether it is the idealist a priori theory or the materialist reflection theory, we can only stand on the position of Marxism-Leninism, and must not be mixed up with Chen Boda's rumours and sophistry." "This time, he cooperated very well, launched a surprise attack, fanned the flames, and was afraid that the world would not be in chaos. He was about to blow up Mount Lushan and stop the rotation of the earth. These words of mine are nothing more than describing the broadness of the heart of our genius theorist (I don't know what kind of heart it is, probably conscience, but definitely not ambition)." Chairman Mao's opinion is completely correct. Chairman Mao was not generally opposed to the role of individuals in history. Chairman Mao also specifically said that genius is nothing more than being a little more intelligent. The fundamental error of the "genius theory" is that it infinitely exaggerates the role of individuals in history and denies the role of the masses in history. There are only heroes, no people, which is a fundamental reversal of human historical creation activities. This is indeed a major issue that historians, philosophers, theorists, thinkers, and even politicians, writers and artists have been arguing about for thousands of years. Generally speaking, the heroic view of history prevails, which is not surprising. The exploiting class is in a dominant position. In such a class position, it is inevitable and understandable to despise the exploited class. In order to maintain the stable rule of this class, it is inevitable and understandable to sanctify the regime and the rulers. Since the emergence of Marxism, this old case has been scientifically and thoroughly turned over. On the banner of the working people, it was written for the first time: History is created by the masses. At this time, the awakened working people sang the Internationale for the first time: Who created the human world? It is us, the working people! Chairman Mao firmly stood on the side of the people and firmly defended the materialist conception of history. He clearly expressed his dislike for Lin Biao's "four greats" - great mentor, great leader, great commander, and great helmsman. When he heard the staff around him talking about the "loyalty dance"³⁴, he directly expressed his anger. This is completely understandable. This is a major issue of principle. A true Marxist, a true Communist, cannot but firmly oppose the heroic conception of history and cannot but firmly oppose personal ambition.

Based on these principles, and in connection with what General Secretary Xi Jinping pursues and does, it is easy to see that General Secretary Xi Jinping's view of history is a heroic view of history, a common

³⁴ The loyalty dance was a collective dance usually performed in public places like parks and squares, or during parades in the Cultural Revolution. It was performed with simple movement based on extending one's arms towards a portrait of Chairman Mao, or towards the sun, often to the red songs of the era. It was performed almost daily in the late 60s, but not so much in the 70s – Trans.

idealist view of history. This is a kind of backwardness, ignorance, and overestimation of one's own capabilities in terms of ideological understanding. Holding such a view of history will inevitably lead to personal ambition. The two are unified. The General Secretary likes to talk about "governing the country", which is a theoretical thought that is opposite to the Marxist dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship. This actually reflects that the General Secretary always thinks that he is above the people and "governs the country" for the people of the world. This is definitely not the idea of the people being the masters of the country. This is another way of saying imperial despotism, a manifestation of personal ambition, and a posture of a contemporary "great hero". The General Secretary admires "great heroes" and naturally wants to be a "great hero". Little do they know that the historical dialectics here is precisely that he seems to be playing the role of a "great hero", but in fact he is playing the role of a historical clown.

General Secretary Xi Jinping is playing this role, playing it hard, wearing the beautiful "Emperor's New Clothes".

In the history of the Communist Party, pursuing personal ambitions will not end well, and will be recorded in history as infamous. The General Secretary loves to talk about the political rules and organisational discipline of the Communist Party. The General Secretary's pursuit of personal ambitions violates the political rules and organisational discipline of the Communist Party.

After the General Secretary came to power, the first step he seriously pursued was to monopolise power and strive to be the "core".

The General Secretary disdains the Constitution, political rules, and organisational discipline. He reaches out everywhere and grabs power everywhere. He has set up at least 13 so-called "groups" and appointed himself as the "group leader". In fact, he has usurped all powers in his own hands. The General Secretary has the ability to scheme and is bold enough to be compared with the thieves who stole the country in history.

The General Secretary can be said to be a typical example of forming a clique for personal gain. He appoints people based on personal connections and loyalty. After several years of painstaking efforts, he finally holds the power of the party, government, and military in the hands of the General Secretary alone. In this regard, the General Secretary is absolutely not as kind as Comrade Xi Zhongxun, but only as domineering as Deng Xiaoping.

The convening of the 19th National Congress signalled the culmination of the General Secretary's ambitions. The entire top leadership of the Communist Party of China (CPC), especially the Politburo, has virtually become the Xi family's army and General Secretary Xi Jinping's obedient team.

Perhaps, the General Secretary thought that he had already assumed sole control of the power and accomplished a great deal, so he went so far as to disregard the fact that the old leaders were still alive and well, disregarded the fact that the people of the whole country would oppose it, and amended the constitution by his own will to remove the tenure of office of the President, so as to roll out the red carpet for himself as the emperor.

As the saying goes, profit makes the wise faint. With this move, the General Secretary, it seems, ascended to the pinnacle and was very pleased with himself. However, he was blinded by the lust for power and he could not see that what awaited him was an abyss of ten thousand fathoms.

The General Secretary has centralised power, and it has gone well all the way to his oblivion. It is natural that this revisionist party, with its incorrect party culture and the overall corruption and weakness of

the party, has given the General Secretary an opportunity. But he has also forgotten that by going too far and too fast, he is destined to fall. If you don't believe me, walk and watch.

We have already seen that at the 19th Congress, the small gestures of some veteran leaders, seemingly accidental, actually have a deep meaning, and that is a form of expressing dissatisfaction. In my article 'Xi Jinping is in danger', I wrote: "How can you be so unintelligent? The old people are all alive and still on the podium, and you treat them like this, your ambition is so inflated that you have gone crazy, right? Let me tell you, this is why Jiang Zemin looked at his watch nine times, why Zhu Rongji refused to applaud, and why Liu Yunshan slept soundly. This is a political statement, and the best is yet to come!" Now it seems that this is exactly what happened.

Once a person is ambitious, he cannot stop the car. Immediately after the General Secretary took over the reins of power, he took the second step of establishing his own absolute authority and launching the god-making campaign of the 'Great Leader'.

'Xi Jinping Thought on Socialism with Chinese Characteristics for a New Era' is the general title of the monument to himself. Not only does it dominate the political report of the 19th National Congress, but it has also been written into the constitution and the party constitution in order to legally establish its own place in history, alongside Deng Xiaoping and other revisionist greats.

What goes up must come down. A horrible and ridiculous god-making campaign was immediately launched on the Chinese soil under the orders of Wang Huning, a member of the Standing Committee in charge of propaganda work.

I also criticised this in Xi Jinping in Peril, and I will quote a paragraph from it here.

"It is not accidental that the nonsense of 'great leader' has come out. The 19th National Congress' political report was full of boasting. Then, the Politburo Standing Committee, the committee members, and the delegates all boasted. The People's Daily and CCTV took the lead in boasting. It was simply a boasting competition. It was in this absurd and erroneous trend of flattery that Guizhou's Qianxinan Daily went a step further and simply took the lead in claiming the title of 'great leader'. If there were a little bit of awareness and self-knowledge, and if we knew that we should oppose the idealist historical view that violates the historical materialism of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and exaggerates the role of individuals, and if we knew that we should oppose the personality cult that violates the principles and disciplines of the Communist Party, then we should have stood up and criticised these erroneous flatteries long ago. However, no, we just let it go, which may be very comfortable to listen to, and it may even be what we need."

"The smooth convening of the 19th National Congress has made Xi Jinping completely blind and his personal ambitions exposed. In line with this ambition, we have seen the overwhelming flattery. The flattery of party, government and military officials and the media represented by the People's Daily and Xinhua News Agency has reached the point of shamelessness.

"Let us cite only a few examples:

"First, listen to the nonsense of Cai Qi, the secretary of the Beijing Municipal Party Committee: "The reason why such a historic change has taken place in the cause of the Party and the country is that there is a strong leadership core, General Secretary Xi Jinping, at the helm of the whole Party. General Secretary Xi Jinping has the great talent, foresight and firm conviction of a Marxist politician, thinker, theorist and strategist. He stands at the high point of history and skillfully uses Marxist positions, viewpoints and methods to guide us in carrying out great struggles, building great projects, advancing great undertakings and realising great dreams. He has won the heartfelt love of the whole party, the

whole army and the people of all ethnic groups across the country. He is worthy of being a wise leader, worthy of being the chief architect of reform, opening up and modernisation in the new era, and worthy of being the new generation of the Party's core. We must resolutely safeguard the authority and centralised and unified leadership of the Party Central Committee with Comrade Xi Jinping as the core at all times and under all circumstances. '

"Listen to the nonsense of Defense Minister Chang Wanquan again: 'President Xi's historical responsibility is the great dream, his great talent leads the way forward, his revolutionary spirit is fascinating, his earth-shaking innovation and strengthening have created great changes, and his touching leadership sentiments show his boundless love '

"Listen to the nonsense of Armed Police Force Commander Wang Ning again: 'President Xi saved the party and the army at a critical moment', and we must 'firmly trust and support Chairman Xi sincerely, and truly obey him exclusively, thoroughly, unconditionally, without any impurities, and without any watering down.'

"Let's take a look at the article "The Leader of the New Era" written by Xinhua News Agency and reprinted by all media. Just look at the title of this article, and you will know to what extent Xi Jinping is praised: '1. A pioneering leader; 2. The core of the party formed in the great struggle; 3. A servant who seeks happiness for the people; 4. A responsible national reform and development strategist; 5. A commander who reshapes the army and national defence; 6. A leader of a major country on the international stage; 7. The chief architect of modernisation in the new era.'

"According to this tone, the People's Daily said: 'With Comrade Xi Jinping as the core, the whole party, the whole army and the people of all ethnic groups in the country have a commander, leader and guide on the new historical journey.' Xinhua News Agency called Xi Jinping 'the core of the party, the commander of the army and the leader of the people.' Li Hongzhong, the secretary of the Tianjin Municipal Party Committee who is notorious for snatching the recorder from the reporter, not only shouted about the core the earliest, but now raised the tone even higher: 'The core is the banner, the direction, the confidence and the strength.'

"The army also rushed to show its sincerity, shouting out the 'three everything's': 'All major matters will be decided by President Xi, all work will be responsible to President Xi, and all actions will be under President Xi's command'. Three things': 'resolutely respond to what President Xi advocates, resolutely implement what President Xi decides, and resolutely refrain from doing what President Xi forbids'.

"It is in such an atmosphere that it is very logical for Guizhou's Qianxinan Daily to engage in the 'Great Leader' routine.

"The logic is that Xi Jinping is ambitious and Xi Jinping needs to do this.

"Some people are now trying to defend Xi Jinping as if all this was not Xi's will. This defence is weak and even more deceitful. The facts are all there, and it is not something that happened suddenly in one day, but a process that has been going on for a long time. The process is most telling, for the process is but the unfolding of the essence. Specific to the issue here, the above facts are the continuous unfolding of Xi Jinping's ambitions in process.

"Plainly, there is no solution."

Isn't this a reprint of what Lin Biao did? When criticizing Yang Chengwu's article "promoting absolute authority", Chairman Mao once said a Marxist principle: authority is not artificially established, but gradually formed in the struggle. Authority is always relative. Where is absolute authority? Lin Biao's

practice is idealistic, anti-scientific, and anti-Marxist. The final outcome proved that Lin Biao did not really support Chairman Mao. His excessive "nice words" were just an improper political means. Later facts proved that this was their conspiracy. When Chairman Mao toured the south in 1971, he spoke of the "three musts and three don'ts" directed at the Lin Biao group. Among them, "be open and aboveboard and don't intrigue and conspire" sharply exposed the double-dealing tactics of the Lin Biao group. How can General Secretary Xi Jinping forget this historical lesson and repeat the mistakes made by Lin Biao? Moreover, the General Secretary took the lead in praising himself and leading the deification. Isn't this an even more serious mistake? Looking at the ridiculous remarks made by the members of the Central Political Bureau to flatter the General Secretary, who dares to believe that they are not a group of bad people who are well versed in conspiracy and intrigue? The general secretary's gang-building can only further fascistise and gangsterise the party. Looking at the history of modern China, which individual ambitionist is not walking this path?! This is terrifying, but also inevitable, and will eventually fail.

The consequences of General Secretary Xi Jinping's personal ambition will be immeasurable.

First, it will eventually push the already terminally ill revisionist party to death.

No matter what kind of party it is, if it is shaped according to the needs of personal ambition and made into a "family empire" of one's own, then this party cannot be a class party, and at most can only be a fascist party loyal to an individual. Hitler did this, Chiang Kai-shek did this, and they turned it into a close party, a mafia, and reversed history, and ultimately there was only one way to failure and destruction.

General Secretary Xi Jinping is doing this.

Politically, the entire party, and even the entire nation, must be loyal to the supreme leader, the General Secretary. What "four safeguards", what "consciousness of following suit", etc., etc., are all to create such public opinion, to create such "political rules", and to "establish the General Secretary as the only one". The Chairman of the National People's Congress has taken the lead in saying this, so what kind of people's congress is there? There is only "one honourable father", "great leader", "the great Xi"!

With such a political standard, the party's organisational construction can only be a party for private interests, turning the party into a party of Xi's family. The pattern of the party's top-level organisation after the 19th National Congress is a pattern of Xi's party. The remarks made by these people after the 19th National Congress are to offer their heart and soul to General Secretary Xi Jinping, showing that the Xi's party is already a die-hard party that is only loyal to, defends and aligns itself with Xi Jinping. Such a performance has never been seen since the founding of the CPC. It is evident that the General Secretary is ambitious and impatient.

Under such circumstances, what purposes of the Communist Party can be said to exist, what party spirit of the Communist Party can be said to exist, what democratic centralism of the Communist Party can be said to exist, and what political rules and organisational discipline of the Communist Party can be said to exist, all of which have long since been devoured by General Secretary Xi Jinping's 'vast' ambitions.

What anti-corruption? This is the biggest corruption, the biggest political corruption, the biggest corruption of the party organism. This kind of corruption will fundamentally and ultimately destroy this revisionist party, which is already very sick.

Secondly, the realisation of personal ambition is parallel to the realisation of personal autocracy, and they complement each other and are mutually reinforcing. If General Secretary Xi Jinping wants to realise his personal ambition, he must inevitably strengthen fascist autocracy.

This is the most significant, biggest, and most powerful political achievement of General Secretary Xi Jinping in the five years since he took office. He has left his predecessor far behind. He does not allow any different voices to exist at all. Everyone must "maintain consistency" with the General Secretary. Anyone who dares to be inconsistent will have their website and group immediately blocked, and those who dare to speak out will be immediately arrested. This fully demonstrates General Secretary Xi Jinping's iron fist and the ferocity of fascist dictatorship. Many gentlemen and comrades are still in prison. No need for any crime, no need for any reason, I will arrest anyone who challenges my ambition, this is my reason, this is my politics. Didn't I say that to Putin? He has a stubborn character! If you want to challenge, just try. This is General Secretary Xi Jinping's philosophy. What philosophy? It is not the philosophy of the Communists, it is not the philosophy of the people being the masters of the country, but the philosophy of fascist despotism.

Also in the article Xi Jinping at Risk, I wrote this:

“So there were all sorts of familiar cries for greater centralisation of power. What ‘sense of alignment’, what ‘maintaining consistency’, what ‘obeying the core’, etc., etc., etc., etc., up to ‘wise leader’ , ‘Great Leader’, ‘Xi Jinping Thought’.

“Thus, there is also a strange theory that is new and different and creates an aura for itself. What ‘Chinese dream’, what ‘great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation’, what ‘not forgetting the original heart’, what ‘new era’, etc, etc, etc, etc. ', and so on, and so on, and even ‘top-level design’, ‘low-end population’ which is a whole lot of ridiculous slogans that fool the people and flood the media.

“And so, too, there is an unprecedented fascist dictatorship adapted to the needs of this centralised power. There is no ‘freedom of speech’, all progressive websites are closed, mobile phone group chats are closely monitored, and people are ‘teared up’ and detained at every turn. Freedom of association' has even been completely banned. Comrade Mao Jidong, who organised the People's Party for the Defence of Mao Zedong, and Wang Zheng, who organised the Party of the Constitution, have been arrested since last year, but have not been sentenced nor released. There was even a ‘709’ mass arrest of lawyers.³⁵ Autocracy is strengthening and democracy is retrogressing. The Constitution is being trampled on in the worst way. Wen Jiabao has at last spoken eight times about the need to reform the political system, but now this intention has long been thrown out of the window. What Chairman Mao said about revisionism coming to power is fascist dictatorship coming to power, and it has reached its fullest expression in the hands of Xi Jinping.”

Are these words correct?

China is now in the most severe period of fascist dictatorship in the past 40 years.

Why? Not to mention all the reasons, at least one important reason is because General Secretary Xi Jinping pursues personal dictatorship and autocracy. Since he wants to pursue personal dictatorship and autocracy, what constitution, what party spirit, what organisational discipline, what democratic centralism, what people's democratic dictatorship or dictatorship of the proletariat, no matter how

³⁵ China's 709 Large-scale Arrest of Human Rights Lawyers refers to the large-scale arrest, summons, criminal detention, takeaway, and disappearance of hundreds of lawyers and non-governmental rights defenders interviewed by the public security authorities of the People's Republic of China in as many as 23 provinces since July 9, 2015. The whereabouts of some of the petitioners and their relatives are unknown – Trans.

well or how much they are talked about, are anything but bullshit, none of them are going to be practised, and all of them are a deception of the people.

Third, personal ambition is contrary to the will of the Party and the people. Pursuing personal ambition, pursuing personal dictatorship, and wanting to be a contemporary emperor is contrary to the development of history and is unpopular. The final result can only be one word: collapse.

As history develops to this day, it is inevitable and a law of history to move towards people's democracy. Anyone who resists this law can only be crushed by the wheels of history. It is from this point of view that Xi Jinping's current actions are the final efforts to create sufficient conditions for the collapse of the Communist Party and the subversion of the socialist regime with Chinese characteristics. The General Secretary's regime often accuses people with different opinions of "subverting the state power." In fact, the real owner of this hat should be General Secretary Xi Jinping.

General Secretary Xi Jinping, like Gorbachev and Yeltsin, did what Western imperialism could not do.

Engels said in his famous book, *Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy*, that people's motives are often hidden behind what they think are their motives, and that is the real motive. Perhaps, General Secretary Xi Jinping's subjective desire is not to subvert the party or the country, which is possible, and by all accounts, it is possible, but, after all, this is the superficial motive, and it is personal ambition, which is the real motive hidden behind this subjective desire. Personal ambition is the real motive behind this subjective wish. This real motive has brought about the wrong and even reactionary behaviour of the General Secretary in all aspects. The ultimate consequence can only be the collapse of the party and the upheaval of the regime, or, as it is often called, a drastic change.

The historical positioning of General Secretary Xi Jinping will thus be written in the annals of history. There is no need to say anything here; we trust in the wisdom and correctness of future generations.

China is bound to move towards democracy, which is the inevitable requirement of historical development to this day. Personal ambition, personal dictatorship, is only the catalyst for this requirement of historical development. Yuan Shikai and Chiang Kai-shek are figures in this category, and their only historical role was perhaps to catalyse the arrival of democracy. Is General Secretary Xi Jinping going to follow their example?

We have seen the dawn of democracy, and China will move towards democracy. This historical trend is becoming increasingly clear. There is no doubt that the Chinese nation of 1.4 billion people has experienced countless storms, hardships, twists and turns, and tests in thousands of years of civilization, and has sufficient intelligence and wisdom. Under the impetus of highly developed science and technology in contemporary times, people in all countries around the world have already obtained basic democracy. Can we still tolerate autocracy in China and democracy as just an empty talk? That is impossible, and that would underestimate the Chinese nation.

It is from this reason that I remind General Secretary Xi Jinping that your biggest weakness is that you do not understand that the tide of democracy has arrived, surging and unstoppable, but you are enthusiastic about personal ambitions and go against the tide of history. How can you not be eliminated by history? Individuals are always small and always have limitations, so you must be cautious and have self-knowledge, especially not forget yourself, expand infinitely, be ambitious, and blindly compete for supremacy. This is the greatest stupidity, the most ridiculous stupidity, and the most tragic stupidity, because the fate of such people is always contrary to their ambitions and wishes, and they will eventually be swept into the garbage dump of history.

General Secretary, be careful!

Let me end with a quote from Marx: I said, I saved my soul.

March 23, 2018