

The Voice of Slaves (2)

Criticising Xi Jinping

Written by Xiang Guanqi

Laiyin Publishing House

March 2022

Contents

1. Traitors, you are not qualified to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of China! Page 3
2. What is the original intention, mission and theme of the Communist Party of China?
- Criticism of the "July 1st Speech" (I) Page 32
3. The "July 1st Speech" once again proves that whether to adhere to "class struggle as the key link" is the concentrated embodiment of the struggle between the two lines.
- Criticism of the "July 1st Speech" (II) Page 40
4. A most timely, reliable and illustrative confession.
- Criticism of the Resolution of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee Page 52
5. Why is the 20th National Congress so important to China? Page 146
6. Comrade Xi Jinping should consciously give way to others with more talent. Page 186

Old textual evidence:

1. Interpreting Xi Jinping. - Chapter "Criticism of Xi Jinping's Thought"
2. Xi Jinping is in danger - Comment 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

This is the second set of articles by Comrade Xiang Guanqi in his "The Voice of Slaves" series. Due to constraints on my time, and with the agreement of Comrade Xiang Guanqi, I have translated the most current articles, and have left aside those under the heading "Old textual evidence". They are listed above.

I cannot thank Comrade Xiang Guanqi enough for his analyses of the revisionism of Xi Jinping. The more clarity our movement has on Xi Jinping Thought, and on the nature of Chinese capitalism and social-imperialism, the better for us all.

Nick G.

Traitors, you are not qualified to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of China!

When they see such a title, they will be furious and will immediately call me an "ultra-leftist" and a "remnant of the Cultural Revolution". Moreover, they will definitely put all kinds of bigger, heavier and more terrible political hats on me.

However, I still have to tell them calmly but righteously: I just told the truth.

If I dare not even tell such a truth, I will be sorry for Chairman Mao, the countless revolutionary martyrs who sacrificed their lives to build a socialist new China, and the vast number of working people who are suffering now.

Truth is never complicated. You still hold the banner of Marxism, still hang the sign of socialism, and still call the name of the Communist Party, but you are actually engaging in capitalism, and, as Chairman Mao predicted, you are actually engaging in the worst capitalism of the fascist bourgeois dictatorship. You call yourself a Communist, but you do not engage in socialism, but engage in capitalism. Aren't you a traitor to the Communist Party and a traitor to the proletariat?

You are complete traitors! Real traitors! Traitors who are made of iron! Lenin called Kautsky a traitor to the proletariat, but you have already far surpassed Kautsky. Moreover, according to Chairman Mao's theory, you are the worst and most hateful traitors, because you are extremely deceptive to the broad masses of working people.

We are fighting you with Marxism-Leninism-Maoism in an open and aboveboard manner, but you know you are in the wrong and can only rely on the fascist bourgeois dictatorship, on repression, blockade and shielding. We have enough historical experience and lessons on this point, so we are mentally prepared. Moreover, Chairman Mao's criticism of modern revisionism is still fresh in our minds. You might as well listen to it: "The modern revisionists have three fears: one is imperialism, two is real Marxism-Leninism (that is, what they call 'dogmatism'), and three is the revolutionary people. They are as timid as mice. They dare not let their own people see the counter-criticism made by those they call "dogmatists" against their criticism. They strictly block it out, just like blocking out a "plague". Just from this point, we can judge what kind of days the modern revisionists will have in the future. Real revolutionaries, real proletarian revolutionary fighters, real Marxist-Leninists - militant materialists are fearless, not afraid of isolation, not afraid of the curses of reactionaries and revisionists. "(In November 1963, Chairman Mao added to Zhou Yang's speech "The Combat Tasks of Philosophy and Social Science Workers". This article can be found in the "People's Daily" on December 27, 1963, quoted from "Mao Zedong's Manuscripts Since the Founding of the People's Republic of China" Volume 10, pages 405-408.) Chairman Mao criticised the Khrushchev revisionist group at that time. Now, isn't it very appropriate to use it to criticise you?"

1

Haven't you used this deceptive trick to fool more than a billion Chinese people for more than 40 years?

If you had changed your flag, torn off your disguise, and nakedly declared that you were a bourgeois party serving the bourgeoisie, it might be more conducive to the awakening of the Chinese people, and more conducive to the Chinese people raising the banner of Chairman Mao, rebelling against you, and ending your perverse actions. However, you did not do so. You, the former "old revolutionaries" represented by Deng Xiaoping, have enough political wisdom. You took the revisionist road that is more deceptive and more conducive to your rule, and promoted a revisionist line with Deng Xiaoping

as the banner, and actually practiced bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalism that is worse than European and American capitalism.

Don't be unconvinced. Almost no traitor is willing to admit that he is a traitor. Moreover, some of you were "old comrades" who participated in the revolution for decades under the leadership of Chairman Mao; some of you are a new generation of people who wore red scarves, joined the Communist Youth League, and joined the Communist Party in New China and were nurtured by Mao Zedong Thought. With such a background, you always think, how could we be traitors to the Communist Party and traitors to the working people? You will say, didn't we repeatedly declare that we would resolutely not take the evil path of changing the flag? Are we not without the flag of Marxism, the brand of socialism, and the name of the Communist Party? Haven't we repeatedly told the people that we must not forget our original aspirations, bear in mind our mission, put the people first, and serve the people? In the final analysis, isn't everything we do to build "socialism with Chinese characteristics"? If you connect it to reality, you will say that over the past few decades, hasn't our economy been growing rapidly? Haven't we built China into the world's second largest economy? Can't we also take on projects, rent and buy ports, build roads and bridges around the world, and even plan, lead, and implement the grand plan of the "Belt and Road Initiative", and declare our economic strength everywhere? We have been to the moon and we have arrived on Mars, so you tell the people that under your leadership, "Awesome, my country!"¹

Even if you think and say this "sincerely", as Engels said, sincere opportunism (that is, revisionism) is worse! for it is precisely this "sincerity" that makes it more deceptive and more harmful.

Therefore, at this solemn moment of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of China, we need to once again expose the fundamental manifestations and fundamental reasons why you traitors have become traitors.

It is not to enlighten you. It is not that we have not tried to do so. However, facts have repeatedly taught us that it is wrong to have such illusions. As Chairman Mao taught us, it is difficult to change those who engage in revisionism and are at the head of it. As Chairman Mao also taught us, the ruling class that oppresses and exploits the people has never made concessions, and it is impossible to solve problems by persuading, begging, or complaining (such as petitioning). The only way to carry out class struggle is through a great revolution in which one class overthrows another. We must keep this basic Marxist principle in mind and we must persist to the end.

Today, we are here to expose once again the manifestations and causes of the missteps of you traitors, mainly in order to explain to the people, to tell them that this is a class struggle which did not happen by chance, that it is not primarily a matter of individual negligence or guilt, that individuals naturally have responsibilities, and that in particular, revisionist leaders like Deng Xiaoping, the unrepentant capitalist-roader, are indeed culpable; but that, looking at the problem from the perspective of a deeper social reasons, we can and must see clearly that this is a class struggle, a struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, a struggle between socialism and capitalism. The essence of the traitors, the class essence of the traitors, is that they have surrendered to the bourgeoisie, siding with

¹ "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.

the bourgeoisie and fighting against the proletariat and the mass of the working people; siding with capitalism and fighting against socialism.

Don't cover up and distort the essence of this class struggle, and I oppose you putting random labels on Chairman Mao.

You claim that you "will not follow the old path of closed and rigid development", and your target is Chairman Mao. However, this is not worth refuting. I remember that in the 1980s, Comrade Peng Zhen spat out on TV and said angrily that imperialism did not even recognise our People's Republic of China and blocked us, so how could we open up? Yes, your attack on Chairman Mao's path is "the old path of closed and rigid development", which clearly shows that you have already stood on the side of imperialism that blocked us? Comrade Peng Zhen naturally did not leave Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line, but on this issue, he could always respect the facts and say something fair. We naturally see the truth more clearly and understand it more clearly. The actual real situation is that it is precisely because our party has unswervingly implemented Chairman Mao's proletarian internationalist revolutionary line in diplomacy that we were able to break the imperialist blockade and enter the United Nations around the 1970s, which led to the great changes in the international situation and the establishment of diplomatic relations between China and the United States. This is a major victory of the Chinese people and the international proletariat with great historical significance, and it is Chairman Mao's great contribution to the Chinese people and the people of the world. This is an incredible event and a great achievement. However, today, short-sighted traitors have put a hat on Chairman Mao as a "closed and rigid old road". What else can this do except expose the ignorance and reaction of you traitors? The only function of such lies and fallacies is to prove the correctness and greatness of Chairman Mao.

Another accusation you have thrown is that Chairman Mao only focused on class struggle and not production, which led to "China's economy being on the brink of collapse." When the Cultural Revolution just failed, this accusation had a certain deceptive effect on the Chinese people. However, forty years have passed. The people have long been liberated from this lie. The general line of building socialism with more, faster, better and more economical results was proposed by Chairman Mao; the grand blueprint for achieving China's four modernisations was formulated under the leadership of Chairman Mao; our industrial foundation was laid under the leadership of Chairman Mao; the "two bombs and one satellite" was made by Chairman Mao with determination and national policy to break the monopoly of the two hegemony in heaven and on earth; the determination to work hard and strive to catch up with and surpass the developed Western countries was made by Chairman Mao, and the word "surpass" was specially reminded by Chairman Mao to Premier Zhou to add in the report of the Fourth National People's Congress; now, everyone knows that after ten years of the Cultural Revolution, China's economy is not "on the brink of collapse", but has made tremendous development. The lies in the mouths of traitors can only be shamefully bankrupted in the face of facts.

We have criticised the "traitor philosophy" in the past. The main fallacy of the "traitor philosophy" is that traitors are justified and traitors can be forgiven. Deng Xiaoping and his followers are adhering to and selling this "traitor philosophy", and even added one more point: traitors are meritorious! You slandered Chairman Mao, defamed Chairman Mao, and smeared Chairman Mao, until the Sixth Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee, when you made a "Resolution" that Chairman Mao had made a so-called "mistake".² You only had one purpose, which was to prepare public opinion for

² 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

you to betray Chairman Mao, betray the Communist Party of China, and betray socialism, so as to achieve your counter-revolutionary goal of replacing Chairman Mao's line of socialist continuation of revolution with Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line of restoring capitalism.

You have indeed done so. You have fabricated lies, reversed right and wrong, and wantonly peddled your traitorous philosophy, disguising your naked traitorous behaviour as correcting Chairman Mao's "mistakes" and building "socialism with Chinese characteristics". This is truly a typical shameless traitorous philosophy that traitors are justified and even meritorious! To paraphrase the famous words of the great proletarian revolutionary Dzerzhinsky in the movie "Lenin in 1918": "Traitor, look into my eyes!" At the solemn moment of commemorating the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of China, we have reason to also angrily rebuke: "Traitor, look at the reality of China!"

Any excuses of the traitors are just to cover up their treasonous behaviour and put on a beautiful and deceptive coat for their treasonous behaviour.

The fundamental disagreement between us and the traitors is not whether to reform and open up, nor whether to insist on economic construction as the centre.

The focus of the disagreement is not here. The focus of the disagreement is on how to reform and open up? How to carry out economic construction? In the final analysis, it is on the fundamental question of whether to pursue socialism or capitalism.

For the Communists, this fundamental issue is always manifested through whether or not to adhere to the line of class struggle as the key link. In other words, if we want to build socialism, we must adhere to the line of class struggle as the key link; on the contrary, if we abandon the line of class struggle as the key link, we will inevitably build capitalism.

The focus of the differences and the focus of the struggle are here. For Marxist-Leninist-Maoist and proletarian revolutionaries, it is very important to understand and adhere to this point. This is the crux of all problems and the general principle of class struggle.

Chairman Mao has always adhered to this general principle, firmly grasped this general principle, always grasped this general principle and never let go, and grasped it to the end.

We must learn from Chairman Mao and understand the reason why Chairman Mao did so.

The reason is not complicated. However, it is profound and accurate.

Since the birth of Marxism and the publication of the "Communist Manifesto", the Communists have, on behalf of the proletariat, clearly announced to the world that the historical mission and entire goal of this class is to ultimately achieve, through class struggle, including the indispensable dictatorship of the proletariat in a certain historical period, the complete overthrow and end of the capitalist social system on a global scale, the complete elimination of private ownership, and the gradual establishment of a beautiful society for mankind without private ownership, classes, exploitation and oppression, where "the free development of each is the free development of all" - a communist society.

It is precisely based on this class will and scientific understanding that in order to realise their historical mission and all goals, the Communists must adhere to class struggle as the key link and must adhere to the proletarian revolutionary line with class struggle as the key link. From this perspective, it can be said that the Communist Party is a party that insists on class struggle and a party that insists on the

repudiate the Cultural Revolution, impose revisionism on the Chinese Party and set it firmly on the road to a restoration of capitalism – Trans.

dictatorship of the proletariat. This understanding of Marxism and the understanding of the Communists is based on reality and conforms to social facts.

Under the conditions of capitalist society, the class antagonism between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is an obvious fact and is relatively easy to see. Under such historical conditions, if the proletariat wants to seek liberation, it must take class struggle as the key link, launch class struggle with the bourgeoisie, and finally seize power. Not many people oppose this principle now. However, the history of the international communist movement tells us that it was not that no one opposed this principle in the past, and it was not that no one opposed taking class struggle as the key link. The degenerate Second International was such a representative. There were those who advocated "peaceful growth into socialism"; there were also those who "revised" Marxism, opposed violent revolution, and promoted reformism. So-called revisionism was born in this way. Kautsky, the traitor to the proletariat, was also born in this way. It is neither strange nor mysterious, but there is inevitability in it.

Under the conditions of socialist society, the situation is more complicated and the problem is more serious. As long as class struggle is abandoned, the most direct consequence is that the revisionist line will usurp the dominant position and, under the banner of so-called "reform", gradually eliminate socialism and restore capitalism, and finally degenerate into a bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalist society, a capitalist society that practices fascist bourgeois dictatorship at its worst, as Chairman Mao said. In the Soviet Union, from Khrushchev's "Three Harmonies and Two Perfections" to Gorbachev's "New Thinking", class struggle was abandoned as the key link; in China, Deng Xiaoping and his disciples, from "Three Directives as the Key Link" to "One Centre and Two Basic Points" and "Regardless of Socialism or Capitalism", also abandoned class struggle as the key link. This is their common point. The only difference is that China's revisionist rulers have far surpassed their Soviet revisionist "big brother".

Facts speak louder than words. The fact of capitalist restoration tells us that it is appropriate to say that they are traitors to the communist movement, traitors to the proletariat and the broad masses of working people, and that this does not wrong them at all.

Here, there is an obvious truth and an obvious law. The traitors' missteps and the reason why they betrayed to revisionism are all concentrated in abandoning the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist line of class struggle as the key link. The reason why the traitors embarked on the traitorous path and eventually degenerated into traitors is synchronised with abandoning class struggle as the key link. This is the watershed between a true Marxist-Leninist-Maoist communist and a revisionist traitor who betrayed Marxism-Leninism-Maoism that we must understand today while denouncing the traitors.

If we understand this principle, we will also understand why Chairman Mao, in his later years, when he was fighting against Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line, mainly seized on the key issue of Deng Xiaoping's denial of class struggle as the key link. Chairman Mao's criticism of Deng Xiaoping at that time was all centred around class struggle as the key link. Chairman Mao was completely correct and hit the revisionist traitors directly at their core.

Chairman Mao's theory and practice of struggle against revisionists are the invincible magic weapon that Chairman Mao left us to identify revisionist traitors and to fight against them. At the solemn moment of commemorating the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of China, what is more important and more realistic than other forms of commemoration is to learn, understand and master Chairman Mao's theory and practice of continuing socialist revolution, especially to learn,

understand and master Chairman Mao's line of continuing socialist revolution with class struggle as the key link.

We should link theory with practice, take Deng Xiaoping and his followers as negative examples, and study why they inevitably degenerated into traitors to the Communist Party of China and the Chinese people.

Now we have a very sufficient and strong condition to answer this question, that is, we have the facts, the fact of forty years of capitalist restoration. This is a historical condition that did not exist and could not exist when Chairman Mao led the Cultural Revolution. It is also an important reason why many comrades at that time did not understand and even resented the struggle against the capitalist-roaders led by Chairman Mao. This is what Chairman Mao often said, that people need to receive both positive and negative education. The only value of Deng Xiaoping and his disciples, these traitors to the Communist Party, lies here. Today, one of our very important historical tasks is to find historical lessons from these negative teachers, so as to improve our understanding of the laws of the struggle against revisionist traitors.

The most profound historical lesson and the most essential historical law are: once the line of class struggle as the key link is abandoned, the Marxist line will inevitably be replaced by the revisionist line; it is inevitable that instead of opposing the bourgeoisie, it will capitulate to the bourgeoisie and, in turn, oppose the proletariat and the broad masses of the working people. With this change in line and class standpoint, it is inevitable that socialism will no longer be pursued, but capitalism will be pursued. This is the road that revisionists must take to restore capitalism, and it is also the road that revisionists must degenerate into traitors to the Communist Party and the proletariat.

This historical experience is very valuable. When we call them traitors today, it is based on our own experience and facts. It is scientific, appropriate, and not unfair to them at all.

Deng Xiaoping is the leader of this traitor group and the chief architect of China's socialist tragedy; the so-called Deng Xiaoping Theory, especially the Southern Tour Speech, is the general program for them to sell out socialism and restore capitalism.

The label of traitor is not empty, but always associated with disaster and bloodshed. For a revisionist leader like Deng Xiaoping, the biggest capitalist-roader, the biggest traitor, what he betrayed was not just individual comrades, individual units, or local struggles, but it led to the failure of the entire Chinese socialist cause, the restoration of capitalism, and the return of the working people of the country to the status of being exploited and oppressed slaves, and even led to the decline of the communist movement around the world.

Isn't this the truth?

Politically, do the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship of Chairman Mao's era still exist? Do the people still rule their own country? They no longer exist. What actually exists is the dictatorship over the working class, the peasant class, and the broad working class. Moreover, as Chairman Mao foresaw, it is a fascist bourgeois dictatorship. The Constitution of the People's Republic of China has long been trampled upon. The freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom of association, freedom of publication, and freedom of demonstration stipulated in Article 35 of the Constitution have all been deprived. Not a single freedom is given, not even a little freedom. As long as they don't like what they hear or what they see, they will immediately impose various charges, and at the least detain them, at the most serious, arrest and sentence them. Are there not enough such examples? You are not releasing the comrades who are in prison. Recently, since May 12, you

have brazenly arrested dozens of Communist comrades who insist on practicing true Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. There are always charges. As long as you oppose their revisionism, their restoration of capitalism, their betrayal of the Communist Party, and insist that rebellion against them is justified, then no matter what you say or do, you are guilty and you must be arrested. There is no reason to talk about, no law to follow, and the Constitution has long been trampled under their feet. They are constantly verifying that Chairman Mao's statement that "Hitler is worse than de Gaulle" is correct and in line with reality. The fascist bourgeois dictatorship is worse than the bourgeois democratic republic. The performances of the revisionist traitors have repeatedly and fully verified that this is a fact and a truth.

From an economic point of view, is China's economy still a socialist economy? Is it still a public-owned economy belonging to the working class, the peasant class, and the broad working class? It has long ceased to exist. The private monopoly capitalist economy is, of course, the private economy of the monopoly bourgeoisie; the foreign monopoly capitalist economy is, of course, the private economy of the foreign monopoly bourgeoisie; even the original socialist state-owned economy, not to mention the part of the state-owned economy and the loss of state-owned assets that were stolen by capitalism after the so-called "state retreat and private advancement", even the remaining state-owned economy has long been transformed into a bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalist economy and is privately owned by the bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie. In these three monopoly capitalist economies, the Chinese working class, once the masters of the socialist country and the labourers and creators of the socialist economy, has been forcibly suppressed to become capitalist wage labourers and has to suffer the cruel surplus value exploitation of the monopoly bourgeoisie. They have to suffer not only the exploitation of the Chinese monopoly bourgeoisie, but also the exploitation of the foreign monopoly bourgeoisie. The imperialism that Chairman Mao led the Chinese people to drive away has now been brought back by traitors like Deng Xiaoping, and the Chinese people, who have stood up, have been forced to lie down again and accept the exploitation of imperialism. "Making shirts for another 30 years"³ is the ideological and theoretical reflection of this slave philosophy and slave economy.

This is the current state of China's economy brought about by the traitors, and this is the bloody fact brought about by the traitors' despicable betrayal. No sophistry of the traitors can change this iron fact. The billionaires who have become rich are seen by everyone; the foreign monopoly bourgeoisie has made a lot of profits in China, which is also seen by everyone; the bureaucrats who have sneaked into the party, the government, and the army and have embezzled and accepted bribes worth tens of billions of yuan have been caught one by one, which is even more thrilling. Such facts, and the economic and political relations hidden by such facts, can they be explained by individual phenomena? Isn't this the inevitable manifestation of the class relations that really exist in China now? Doesn't it fully verify what Chairman Mao said, " You are making the socialist revolution, and yet don't know where the bourgeoisie is. It is right in the Communist Party—those in power taking the capitalist road. The capitalist-roaders are still on the capitalist road."

³ Remark made by Co-Chairman of the International Capital Summit, Former Vice Minister of Commerce of China, Former Secretary-General of the Boao Forum for Asia. On the issue of foreign trade, Long Yongtu said: First of all, it is necessary to have a clear understanding of China's national conditions, that is, there are still hundreds of millions of peasants in the rural areas in China, and the level of education is not high. This determines whether China's export products will be in a low value-added stage in the global industrial division of labour for a considerable period of time. Long Yongtu believed that China may have to make shirts for 30 years, which he said was in line with reality and national conditions – Trans.

From the perspective of ideology, culture and social atmosphere, in today's China, from the entire ideology and culture to the entire social atmosphere, there is no trace of socialism. Money worship covers everything; drug abuse and drug trafficking, prostitution and whoring are everywhere; emperors, generals, talented men and beautiful women, martial arts fighting, spy wars and terror are all over the screen and the Internet; the whole society is like a big dye vat, poisoning the younger generation and corroding the whole society. The worst Western capitalist society is no worse than this.

China is engaging in the worst form of capitalism. This is a fact that can be seen not only by the Chinese people but also by people all over the world. Even bourgeois politicians have seen and acknowledged this. Franz Müntefering, chairman of the German Social Democratic Party, once said at a conference in memory of Marx in Trier, Marx's hometown, that if you want to know what cruel capitalist exploitation is, go to China and see it!

In China, because of Chairman Mao's theory of continuing socialist revolution and the "exercise" of the Cultural Revolution conducted under the guidance of this theory, our people were awakened earlier and saw more clearly the issue of capitalist restoration in China.

Faced with the cruel reality that the party has become revisionist and the country has changed colour, when commemorating the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of China, no matter how shamelessly the rulers fabricate things like "socialism has not failed China" and "China has not failed socialism", I would like to ask, does China still have socialism? You have long abandoned socialism, restored capitalism, and tarnished the reputation of socialism. When commemorating the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of China, saying such super nonsense will only arouse the anger and ridicule of the people. Who will be deceived?

What we need to further clarify now is why all this happened? How did all this happen?

It is very simple and clear, because class struggle was abandoned as the key link. Once class struggle is abandoned as the key link, class betrayal and class surrender will inevitably occur, and the Communist Party will degenerate into a revisionist bourgeois party.

This is how the history of more than 40 years has evolved step by step. Deng Xiaoping Theory is such a traitor theory, and Deng Xiaoping's line is such a traitor line.

The so-called "focusing on economic construction" and "reform" in China were all carried out under the banner of "regardless of socialism or capitalism". Moreover, Deng Xiaoping, who was ruling behind the scenes, said during his southern tour: Whoever does not do this will step down. What does this tell us? Is it really "regardless of socialism or capitalism"? No. It is to restrict socialism and encourage capitalism. Whoever does not do this will step down! What a clear position and what a firm attitude! The so-called "development is the hard truth" is actually the development of capitalism is the hard truth!⁴ Didn't China's private monopoly capitalist economy develop by relying on this "hard truth"? Didn't the countless private monopoly bourgeois capitalists who became rich overnight rely on this "hard truth" to be fostered? Isn't this a class surrender to the bourgeoisie? Isn't this the most shameful traitor to the Communists?

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

⁴ 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.

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. Because in the eyes of these bourgeois representatives who have infiltrated the Communist Party, socialism is not effective in developing production, only capitalism is effective, and the best way to develop production is to introduce developed monopoly capitalism from foreign countries. This is a reaction to socialism, but it has also brought about the world's second largest economy. The secret here is not that the capitalist mode of production is superior to the socialist mode of production, but that it was achieved at the expense of China's environment, resources and other conditions, with the blood and sweat of the Chinese working people, who are the best and cheapest labour force in the world. The Chinese working people have created huge excess profits for the monopoly bourgeoisie at home and abroad, and at the same time, they have inevitably brought China into the world's second largest economy. This is a blood and tears account of the Chinese working people under the slavery of capitalism.

Originally, with the correct line, principles and policies for socialist construction formulated by Chairman Mao, and the Chinese people being known for their intelligence, wisdom, diligence and ability, we could have done this faster and better under the conditions of socialism; however, our socialism was betrayed by traitors, and therefore, our country and our people were inevitably betrayed by the traitors. Under such circumstances, in the past forty years, the Chinese people have unfortunately served as workers for the monopoly bourgeoisie at home and abroad, and have become the "coolies" that "socialism with Chinese characteristics in the new era" has offered to international monopoly capitalism.

In May 1963, Chairman Mao wrote a passage for the "Four Cleanups" document, predicting that if class struggle was not grasped: "It would not take a long time, at least a few years, a dozen years, at most several decades, before a nationwide counter-revolutionary restoration was inevitable, and the Marxist-Leninist party would inevitably become a revisionist party, a fascist party, and the whole of China would change colour. Comrades, please think about this: what a dangerous situation this is?" Now, has this danger not only become a reality, but also far exceeded our imagination?

Chairman Mao said: "The line is the key link; once it is grasped, everything falls into place." If we do not listen to Chairman Mao, oppose Chairman Mao, betray Chairman Mao, and do not engage in class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and socialism and capitalism, the result can only be the elimination of socialism and the development of capitalism, and the worst kind of capitalism, the monopoly and autocratic capitalism of the fascist bourgeois dictatorship. The working class, the peasant class and other broad masses of the working people will inevitably lose their historical position as masters of their own affairs under socialist conditions, and return to the status of oppressed and exploited slaves under the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. This is the disaster of capitalist restoration that China and the Chinese people are experiencing, which we must face as we commemorate the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of China.

This historical experience tells us that whether or not to adhere to class struggle as the key link is the watershed between Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and revisionism, the watershed between building socialism or restoring capitalism, the watershed between adhering to the socialist line of continuing revolution and building socialism or promoting the revisionist line and restoring capitalism, and therefore, it is also the watershed between true communists who fight for the proletariat and the broad masses of working people and fake communists who serve the bourgeoisie.

This is the irrefutable truth we have drawn from the difficult journey of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of China and the historical experience and lessons of both positive and negative aspects of the ups and downs of the international communist movement.

2.

Is the Chinese revisionist party represented by Deng Xiaoping and his disciples, who are promoting the revisionist line, only a traitor to the Chinese Communists and the Chinese people? Is it only a traitor to China's socialist cause? No! We must see more deeply from the international perspective of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism that the Chinese revisionist party represented by Deng Xiaoping and his disciples, who are promoting the revisionist line, is still a traitor to the Communists of the world and a traitor to the communist movement of the world.

This is also proved by cruel historical facts.

If we say that in the 1950s the Soviet revisionist party led by the traitorous Khrushchev group betrayed Marxism-Leninism, betrayed the purpose of the Communists, pursued a revisionist line both internally and externally, and surrendered to the bourgeoisie, thus causing revisionism to spread widely in the international communist movement, as Chairman Mao said, most of the more than 100 parties in the world no longer believed in Marxism-Leninism, the Chinese and Soviet parties and countries split, the international communist movement split, and the socialist camp split, which greatly interfered with the proletarian revolutionary movement throughout the world and caused losses that were global, overall, and extremely serious.

Now, then, we can say that the bad effects, the destructiveness of the CCP, led by the Deng Xiaoping group of traitors, which betrays Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, betrays the aims of the Communists, pursues a revisionist line internally and externally, engages in capitalist restoration internally, and surrenders itself externally to imperialism, are also world-wide and global, and, moreover, their gravity far exceeds that of its predecessor.

It was Deng Xiaoping and his disciples and grandchildren who fired the first shot against socialism by overthrowing Chairman Mao and launching the revisionist so-called 'reform and opening up'. As Chairman Mao said, once the door is opened to the denial of Stalin, the spread of revisionism is inevitable. The same is true of the evil consequences brought about by the traitor Deng Xiaoping. The occurrence of revisionism in China was like a shot of drugs to the international revisionists, which made them excited, made them crazy, and made them jump out in droves with impatience. This led to the bourgeois colour revolutions launched by Gorbachev and Yeltsin, traitors to the Communist Party and lackeys of the bourgeoisie, which led to the so-called 'Soviet Revolution', which was essentially a restoration of capitalism.

The two big countries, China and the Soviet Union, together with the former socialist countries of Eastern Europe (which have long since been transformed), have all degenerated into capitalist countries, and China has degenerated into the worst capitalist country of all. Are the consequences of this not serious enough?

It is a colossal failure of socialism on a world scale, and an irreparable and enormous loss to the communist movement throughout the world brought about by the traitors of the Communist Party. Mikhail Gorbachev once shamelessly boasted, 'My greatest contribution in this life was to bury communism'. However, he forgot that Deng Xiaoping was not only a pioneer who preceded him and set an example for him, but also that he had travelled to Beijing to learn from Deng the 'hard truth' of betraying socialism and restoring capitalism. This 'hard truth' is to engage in capitalism under the

banner of socialism; and the slogan to confuse people is 'reform', and the essence of the word 'reform' is 'colour revolution'. As long as one studies the course of Deng Xiaoping's and Mikhail Gorbachev's 'reforms' more or less closely, one can clearly see that their paths to revisionism and capitalist restoration are identical, and that Gorbachev's 'new thinking' is called 'democratic humanitarian socialism'; Deng Xiaoping's 'theory' is called 'socialism with Chinese characteristics'; in fact, they are all the same, all the way to the same thing, all under the deceptive flag and slogan of colour revolution and capitalism. They are all colour revolutions and capitalist 'colour revolutions' under deceptive banners and slogans (in fact, the word 'counter' should be added in the middle and it is only accurate to call it a 'colour counter-revolution').

Therefore, when we scold Gorbachev, Yeltsin and other traitors, we must not forget their teacher, the greater traitor Deng Xiaoping. Of course, it is not Deng Xiaoping's fault alone, there is a traitor group headed by Deng Xiaoping, and, as Chairman Mao predicted in his speech to Comrade Kim Il Sung in 1965, the Chinese Party may become a revisionist party, and Chairman Mao's prediction has unfortunately come true.

The catastrophe we are facing, the catastrophe of revisionism coming to power, the catastrophe of the failure of socialism, and the catastrophe of the restoration of capitalism, is caused by the traitor group of Deng Xiaoping and his followers, and the "Chinese Communist Party" that has become revisionist under the control of this traitor group.

Under such circumstances, what qualifications do you have to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of China?

Traitors, please stop insulting the Communist Party of China! The humiliation suffered by the Communist Party of China because of you is heavy enough.

History always has its own rules, and sometimes there are surprising similarities.

Khrushchev started his revisionism by opposing Stalin; Deng Xiaoping started his revisionism by opposing Chairman Mao. Comrades will surely think that there must be a regularity in this. Chairman Mao once compared Lenin and Stalin to two knives. He said that Stalin's knife had been thrown away by Khrushchev, and Lenin's knife was almost thrown away. What is a knife? It is a weapon, an ideological weapon, a theoretical weapon, and a line weapon. We can understand it by studying Chairman Mao's teachings. The traitors betrayed Lenin, Stalin, and Chairman Mao, and they were against Lenin, Stalin, and Chairman Mao. They wanted to abandon Marxism, socialism, and communism, the purpose of the Communists, and the socialist revolutionary line. In short, they wanted to abandon class struggle as the key link. By throwing away these weapons, the Communists would be deprived of the weapons they had to fight against the bourgeoisie. Then, they would inevitably surrender to the bourgeoisie and restore capitalism.

This is how history unfolded, and history is almost repeating itself. The old traitors and the new traitors are almost the same. If there is any difference, it is that the new traitors go further, get deeper, and do worse. Let us make a brief comparison.

They have all betrayed Marx's theory of capitalism, Lenin's theory of imperialism, and Chairman Mao's theory of the three worlds that have been consistently upheld since Lenin, Stalin, and Chairman Mao, and have all put forward their own revisionist theories that obliterate the essence of contemporary monopoly capitalism, that is, imperialism. The old traitors said that they wanted to build a "three-no world" (a world without weapons, without armies, and without wars), and to achieve "three harmonies and two perfections" (peaceful coexistence, peaceful competition, and peaceful transition,

a state for all the people, and a party for all the people); the new traitors said that "peace and development are the themes of the contemporary world," and that they would "build a community with a shared future for mankind" and "allow capitalists to join the party." To borrow a phrase from the Nine Commentaries,⁵ the traitors' ideas, statements, and practices are "so similar!"

It was under the erroneous guidance of their revisionist line that Khrushchev staged the farce of capitulation and compromise during the Caribbean crisis, which made communists all over the world extremely angry. The Communist Party of China even published articles openly, righteously denouncing Khrushchev and the Soviet revisionist party for bringing great shame and humiliation to communists all over the world!

However, as Lenin said, history sometimes likes to play jokes on people. It is ironic and sad that the Chinese Communist Party, which once criticised Khrushchev, once had its leadership usurped by Deng Xiaoping's revisionist group, actually followed in Khrushchev's footsteps and directed a series of farces of surrender and compromise. The most infuriating and shameful thing is that in the face of the trade war launched by Trump, China has compromised, retreated, and surrendered step by step; especially Vice Premier Liu He in the White House, who was so submissive and servile in the face of Trump's malicious arrangements and arrogance. In order to please the master, he even flattered and said, "I came here under pressure." May I ask, whose pressure and what pressure did you come under?

Obviously, there was an interpreter, but he had to use his own broken English to engage in a dialogue, and as a result, he even made a joke. This farce and scandalous drama has simply disgraced the Chinese communists and the Chinese people. Compared with the year when Khrushchev engaged in capitulationism against American imperialism, which led to that scandalous drama of the Caribbean Sea Crisis, today, Deng Xiaoping and his disciples and grandchildren have long since far surpassed Khrushchev and the CCCP in terms of the strange shame they have brought to the communists.

During the Cultural Revolution, was it wrong to criticise Deng Xiaoping for engaging in foreign slave philosophy and capitulationism? History has given a fair, hard and unshakeable answer.

Chairman Mao teaches us that United States imperialism is the number one enemy of the people of the world, the world hegemon that pursues hegemonism everywhere and bullies the weak and small countries and peoples, the international police that opposes the communist movement and the democratic liberation movement of the peoples and wields a big stick everywhere, and the most reactionary stronghold that represents most centrally and most fully the demands of the economic and political interests of the monopoly bourgeoisie of the whole world.

The May 20 Statement issued by Chairman Mao in 1970 is a correct revolutionary line guiding the communist movement and the democratic liberation of the peoples of the world on the basis of the scientific theories of Marx's theory of capitalism, Lenin's theory of imperialism, and Chairman Mao's theory of the division of the world into three worlds, which are centrally embodied in the May 20 Statement.

The traitors who betrayed Chairman Mao have long since thrown away these theories, lines, guidelines and policies of Chairman Mao on the correct handling of international issues and foreign relations.

⁵ Nine Commentaries on the Communist Party is a series of critical articles published on November 19, 2004 by The Epoch Times, a media outlet founded by the anti-Communist Falun Gong. It is a series of reviews, analyses and criticisms of the history, ideology, and practices of the Communist Party of China, as well as their impact on Chinese culture, values, and Chinese in general – Trans.

One of the simplest facts that everyone can see is that, in their mouths, is there still the concept of 'imperialism'? Is there still the slogan 'against imperialism'? No, not at all. The concept of imperialism has long since been removed from their discourse, indeed from their ideological and theoretical system. Anti-imperialism has long since morphed into pro-imperialism; anti-Americanism, in particular, has long since morphed into pro-Americanism. If we don't talk about imperialism, we don't talk about capitalism; if we don't talk about capitalism, what kind of socialist revolution is there? The reality is that we are not talking about socialist revolution, and, in practice, we are not doing socialist revolution.

What are they talking about? What do they do? They talk about capitalism, they do capitalism and they are in bed with capitalism. There is a Chinese saying that 'no ivory can be spat out of a dog's mouth', and this saying is now aptly applied to the traitors. If you do not believe me, just listen to their confessions.

For decades, they have been saying that the relationship with United States imperialism is a 'strategic partnership'. Not only do they say it, but they also do it, following in the footsteps of the United States empire. Politically and economically, they have obediently tied themselves to US imperialism, and even militarily, they want to tie themselves to the US imperialist chariot. It is the US empire that still has some 'class consciousness' and is still not at ease, which makes the Chinese revisionist traitors a bit disappointed and sad. CPPCC Chairman Wang Yang's 'husband and wife theory of China-US relations' is a typical reflection of this kind of thinking and mentality. When the financial crisis broke out in the United States, Premier Wen Jiabao of China went so far as to say that 'to save the United States is to save China', which really pushed the philosophy of capitulationism to its peak. Since then, a new term has been coined: 'China-United States', which is really a clever and accurate generalisation. Trump has been playing the bully everywhere like that, arousing discontent all over the world, and especially towards China, he is even more overbearing, unreasonable and unscrupulous, so it can be said that he has bullied people too much! However, the traitors who are vicious to the Chinese people and practise fascist bourgeois dictatorship have not only tolerated and compromised with Trump time and again, but also received him in Beijing with ultra-high specifications, and, in the face of Trump's brutality and suppression, they even have the cheek to wag their tails and beg for pity, saying, 'There are a thousand reasons to improve China-United States relations and there is not a single reason to screw up China-United States relations!'

If the leaders of the so-called 'Communist Party' speak and conduct their relations with the imperialist countries in such a way, what else does it mean but that you have degenerated into traitors to the proletariat, traitors to the international communist movement, accomplices and lackeys of imperialism?

Whatever kind of domestic affairs there are, there must be the same kind of foreign affairs. Diplomacy is the continuation of domestic affairs. Class capitulation at home and class capitulation abroad are unified.

Marx's theory of capitalism, Lenin's theory of imperialism, and Chairman Mao's theory of the three worlds are, in simple terms, all theories based on class struggle. However, the traitors denied and betrayed this theory. From Khrushchev to Deng Xiaoping and his followers, all the nonsense and all the so-called "reforms" are in the same tone and on the same path. In the final analysis, it is just one sentence: denying class struggle as the key link, surrendering to the bourgeoisie both internally and externally, and surrendering to capitalism and imperialism. Revisionism and capitulationism are twin brothers. Where there is revisionism, there must be capitulationism.

It is precisely under the guidance of the revisionist diplomatic line that denies class struggle as its key link and takes capitulationism as its soul that they have not only made so many shameless and

traitorous remarks verbally, but their actions have also had even worse impacts, worse consequences and more serious consequences, namely, serious sabotage and betrayal activities against the international communist movement.

In Asia, they willingly acted as allies and even running dogs of imperialism and reactionaries of various countries, abandoned their old comrades and friends in the Communist Parties of Southeast Asian countries who were standing at the forefront of the anti-imperialist struggle and carrying out the new democratic revolution in their own countries, and gave up the selfless support and assistance in all aspects that we had provided to the Communist Parties of these countries under the leadership of Chairman Mao in the spirit of proletarian internationalism. It was this betrayal that directly led to the setbacks and failures of the revolution in these countries and caused the bloodshed and sacrifice of countless outstanding Communists. These countries are our neighbours, and the evil consequences caused by the traitors still directly threaten the security of our country.

The harm caused by the capitulationist diplomatic line of the Chinese revisionist traitors is by no means limited to the countries around us. Not to mention that the direct consequence of Deng Xiaoping's revisionist "reform" was the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe", which was a greater and more serious crime and harm to the communist movement throughout the world.

Deng Xiaoping had a famous saying about betraying the communist movement, which was: "Don't take the lead, don't stick out your head." Deng Xiaoping said this directly to Chairman Mao. Deng Xiaoping couldn't have been unaware that Chairman Mao had said at the Moscow Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties that the international communist movement needed a leader; so many socialist countries also needed a leader, and he publicly expressed his support for the Soviet Party to be the leader. Later, the Soviet Party became revisionist, and the historical responsibility fell on the shoulders of Chairman Mao and the Chinese Communist Party. During that period, our Party and our country had unswervingly supported the communist movement of the world and the national democratic liberation movement of oppressed nations and peoples in all aspects and in all ways, and had won a high reputation in the world. Under the guidance of Chairman Mao, we were very humbly shouldering the internationalist obligations we should bear. Whenever comrades from fraternal parties and friends from Asia, Africa and Latin America visited us and expressed their gratitude to Chairman Mao, our Party and our country, we always expressed Chairman Mao's thought to them: You are standing at the forefront of the anti-imperialist struggle. It is your struggle that has created an environment for peaceful construction for us. We should thank you. We are just fulfilling our internationalist obligations and doing something that should be done. What a firm Marxist-Leninist-Maoist proletarian internationalist line! What a noble proletarian internationalist revolutionary sentiment!

However, all of this has now been betrayed by Deng Xiaoping and his followers who "do not take the lead and do not stick their heads out".

There is no support for the struggles of the people of Asia, Africa and Latin America anymore. They often abstain from voting, probably to show that they "do not stick their heads out". On the contrary, they are very enthusiastic about the capital export of the monopoly capitalist economy, including the so-called "big money" and the so-called "Belt and Road Initiative". Their intentions and practices fully show that the Chinese revisionist party, like the Soviet revisionist party back then, has embarked on the road of no return to social-imperialism.

The Chinese revisionist traitor group no longer has the friendly exchanges with the Communist and Workers' Parties of various countries as in the era of Chairman Mao, let alone supporting the international communist movement, and dare not convene the World Congress of Communist and

Workers' Parties⁶ in Beijing, for fear of provoking the imperialist countries and bringing disaster upon themselves. This is probably what is called "not being the leader". On the contrary, they have frequent exchanges with the leaders of imperialist and capitalist countries, and they are shamelessly trying to squeeze into the "BRIC" club of various monopoly capitalist countries. As for not hesitating to spend a lot of hard-earned money of the working people, in Beijing and other places, they respectfully invite all kinds of bourgeois politicians, economic figures, and even academic and cultural figures to hold various conferences and forums, all for the so-called "connecting with the international community", which is actually to integrate into the international monopoly capitalist world and jointly build a community of shared destiny for the monopoly bourgeoisie.

This comparison makes it very clear. What does "not being the head, not sticking out the head" mean? It just means not being the head of the communist movement, not sticking out the head of the communist movement; rather, it means being the head of monopoly capitalism, sticking out the head of monopoly capitalism. Not only do they want to, but they are also very eager to do so, to the point of disregarding their integrity.

Chairman Mao warned our Party and our people that China would never seek hegemony. "Now that we are not strong enough, we will not seek hegemony; even if we become strong in the future, we will not seek hegemony, and we will never seek hegemony." In 1974, Chairman Mao asked Deng Xiaoping to speak at the UN General Assembly: "If China changes its colour one day and becomes a superpower, and also seeks hegemony in the world, bullies, invades and exploits others everywhere, then the people of the world should label China as a social-imperialist, expose it, oppose it, and, together with the Chinese people, overthrow it." (See "Chairman Mao's Theory of the Three Worlds is a Major Contribution to Marxism-Leninism", p. 45.) However, it is impossible for the revisionist traitors to understand and accept Chairman Mao's teachings, let alone follow Chairman Mao's teachings. On the contrary, since they have led China onto the road of social-imperialism, they cannot get rid of their social-imperialist nature and will inevitably participate in the struggle for hegemony. Moreover, once the time is ripe and the conditions are met, they will inevitably seek hegemony. In them, capitulationism and hegemonism complement each other and are unified. To use a Chinese proverb, it is: "They bully the soft, and are afraid of the strong." This is the characteristic of all revisionism and opportunism.

These facts tell us that Chairman Mao's words to Comrade Kim Il Sung in 1965 are correct. Once the Chinese Communist Party becomes revisionist, it will not only be a traitor to the Chinese Communists, but also a traitor to the Communists of the world, a traitor to the international communist movement of the proletariat of the world, and a traitor to the working people of the world. For such a revisionist party, a traitor party, the responsibility and obligation of the true Communists of all countries is to unite and act according to Chairman Mao's instructions, "expose it, oppose it, and overthrow it together with the Chinese people."

LinHistory has proven that what Chairman Mao said is the truth, a truth of great practical significance. Now all we need is for the broad masses of people to follow the truth that Chairman Mao said, to implement it, to take action, and to launch a socialist revolution!

3.

In the face of the degeneration of the CPC into a revisionist party, which has led to the restoration of capitalism in China and, moreover, to the restoration of a fascist bourgeois dictatorship of the worst

⁶ Also known as the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, this grouping was formed on the initiative of the Communist Party of Greece in 1958.

kind of capitalist society ---- monopoly dictatorship capitalist society. In the face of such a cruel fact, how should we, the vast number of CPC members who are loyal to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and communist beliefs, and the vast number of people who want a revolution in everything, commemorate the 100th anniversary of the birth of the CPC?

As our revolutionary mentors have taught us, the best commemoration than all the high-profile revolutionary words of praise and all the passionate forms of commemorative activities is to inherit the will of the revolutionary martyrs, hold high the red flag of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, ignite the torch of the communist movement, shoulder the historical task entrusted to us by history to oppose the restoration of capitalism by the revisionist party, bravely launch the socialist revolution again, once again win the victory of the socialist revolution on the land of China, rebuild a true Marxist-Leninist-Maoist scientific socialist society, let the red flag of socialism fly high again on the land of China, and let the Chinese revolution once again push the world communist movement from the trough to the climax. This is the glorious historical task we should undertake.

We are facing a class struggle, and a new class struggle under new historical conditions. We must not for a moment forget or obliterate the essence of this class struggle, and we must conduct this struggle on the key link of the class struggle.

We have criticised the mistakes of the revisionist traitors who betrayed the class struggle as a key link, and we must not make such mistakes ourselves.

Just as our revolutionary mentors have taught us, due to the influence of bourgeois, petty-bourgeois, and even feudal ideas, opportunist, or revisionist ideas and actions may also occur in our revolutionary ranks. This is common in the history of the international communist movement and still exists today in our struggle against revisionism and capitalist restoration, and is playing a serious role in undermining and splitting our struggle. The so-called salvationists are such a political faction. Their various erroneous words and deeds are familiar to everyone, so there is no need to repeat them here.

At this solemn moment of commemorating the centenary of the birth of the great Communist Party of China (CPC), in order to clear away the interference of erroneous thinking, to draw a clear line of demarcation once and for all with the group of revisionist traitors, and to safeguard the unity of our Marxist, Leninist, and Maoist revolutionary ranks, it is necessary for us to reiterate, on the basis of Chairman Mao's teaching, a number of important political principles of a correct understanding of the group of revisionist traitors.

1. We must soberly and unshakably realise that the present CPC is already a revisionist party a bourgeois party, a reactionary counter-revolutionary party that has betrayed Chairman Mao, the revolutionary martyrs, the proletariat and the masses of the people.

This is the primary political principle that we must adhere to. This principle does not come out of thin air. First, it comes from facts, and second, it comes from Chairman Mao's teachings. If this political principle cannot stand, then the existence of Maoists in reality will have no basis, no necessity, and no meaning. On this issue, we cannot adopt an eclectic attitude and position. Chairman Mao particularly emphasised that eclecticism is revisionism. This is a correct and profound view. We must keep it in mind and resolutely implement it. We must never engage in eclecticism and completely draw a clear line between ourselves and eclecticism.

The actions of the revisionist traitors over the past forty years have absolutely proven to us that the "socialism with Chinese characteristics" they have been pursuing is actually capitalism with Chinese characteristics, and, as Chairman Mao foresaw, it is the worst kind of capitalism. It is called "the worst"

because this "characteristic" capitalism implements the fascist bourgeois dictatorship in politics, promotes a monopoly and autocratic capitalist economy in economics, and restores the most decadent, backward, and reactionary feudal, capitalist, and revisionist ideology and culture in ideology and culture. Based on this, it is truly "the worst". Precisely because it is "the worst", it is bound to take the road of social-imperialism, and it wants to not only compete for hegemony, but also dominate.

Under such circumstances, if we continue to only look at the signboard of "Communist Party" hung by the traitors, and dare not expose the essence of this party's degeneration, it will be impossible to launch class struggle with the revisionist traitors, and the struggle will be led to an evil path, which is actually cancelling the struggle. The problems that have already occurred in this regard tell us that whether it is intentional or unintentional to adopt a strategy of saving this party, the result will only paralyse and deceive the broad masses of the people, seriously affect, interfere with, and hinder the broad masses of the people from accepting Chairman Mao's theory and line of opposing revisionism and carrying out socialist revolution. In fact, this is to oppose and cancel the socialist re-revolution, to deny and obliterate the historical task of rebuilding scientific socialism, and to make people always hope that the rulers will automatically return to socialism, which is a fantasy that will never happen.

The destructive effect of this interference, which actually exists to this day, cannot be underestimated. This is one of the major reasons why it has not been possible to launch a socialist re-revolution in China for more than four decades.

2. The nature of a political party is determined by the line that it pursues. The metamorphosis of the CPC was due to the fact that after the counter-revolutionary coup of 1976, the CPC began to implement Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line, and it was under the rule of this revisionist line that the political and class nature of the CPC was inevitably altered, and such a party was bound to engage in the restoration of capitalism. The rationale is the same as that of Chairman Mao: whether the ideological and political line is correct or not decides everything. The most important and fundamental way to judge the nature of a party is to see what line it pursues.

Chairman Mao's theory and practice on this issue are very clear. At that time, we characterised the Soviet Communist Party as the revisionist party of the Soviet Communist Party or the Soviet revisionist party for short. As for the Chinese Communist Party, Chairman Mao saw the danger of revisionism and believed that once the revisionists came to power, the Chinese Communist Party would become a revisionist party. In this case, the Communists of the world should unite and overthrow this revisionist party. In 1965, Chairman Mao repeatedly and clearly told Comrade Kim Il Sung and Comrade Ho Chi Minh this.

Chairman Mao was not worrying about the future, but was far-sighted. Comrade Kim Il Sung expressed his incomprehension on the spot after hearing this. Chairman Mao replied that it was possible. History has proved indisputably that Chairman Mao saw the laws of history and made a scientific prediction. Only ordinary people find it difficult to see this and even more difficult to accept it. However, Chairman Mao's prediction came true, and history unfolded in this way, although it was ruthless and cruel, especially what the working people did not want to see and get.

The question before us now is very clear and sharp: whether or not we dare to adhere to Chairman Mao's thought. The question of line is not an empty one, but a real one. It is Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line that has brought about the real evil of capitalist restoration. Is the party that implements such a line not a revisionist party? Is it not a bourgeois party? Shouldn't it be overthrown? Chairman Mao's opinion is there. It depends on whether we believe in it and dare to implement it. When Chairman Mao said goodbye to us, he was worried and repeatedly reminded us that we must make revolution,

dare to make revolution, dare to fight against revisionism and overthrow revisionism. Now, we all say that we love Chairman Mao, support Chairman Mao, and are loyal to Chairman Mao. Whether it is true or false depends on whether we dare to act according to Chairman Mao's last instructions, unite, make revolution, and launch a socialist revolution.

3. Historical changes cannot be attributed simply to the merits or sins of individuals. This is inconsistent with the Marxist view of historical materialism. However, the historical role of the main party leaders cannot be underestimated in this era, especially and specifically in the present political system of the party and the state in China.

In relation to the historical reality of capitalist restoration in China in the past forty years that we are facing, we cannot help but see that the historical culpability of Deng Xiaoping, the head of revisionism, and his successors is first and foremost. It is not at all wrong that the masses of working people particularly hated Deng Xiaoping, whose historical culpability was just greater than that of others.

The line was formulated by the revisionist leaders; the implementation of the line was led and insisted by the revisionist leaders; the revisionist leaders, as their "chief architect" of restoring capitalism, directed this bourgeois colour counter-revolution that took place on the land of China.

Chairman Mao had a profound insight into this. He taught us that "we should not only fight against corrupt officials but also against the emperor", but that we should "catch the leader first". He also set an example for us. The big-character poster "Bombard the Headquarters" was written by Chairman Mao himself; the criticism of Lin, Confucius, and Deng against the rightist reversal of verdicts was led by Chairman Mao himself, and the spearhead of the struggle was directed at the revisionist leaders!

This is the correct proletarian revolutionary strategy that Chairman Mao formulated for us to dare to revolutionise and thoroughly revolutionise. We must hold on to this strategy and not let go, and adhere to this strategy without wavering.

We must never create illusions about the leaders of the revisionist line. What is correcting the direction of "socialism with Chinese characteristics", what is returning to the era of Chairman Mao, or even saying that it is "Mao Zedong II", etc., etc., all these statements are not in line with reality, they are all lies fabricated to deceive the people's support, and they are all tricks to use big flags to protect the autocratic system of "one person in power". Forty years is not a small number. The new democratic revolution lasted only twenty-eight years. In the past forty years, from Deng Xiaoping to the present, which revisionist leader has repented? Which revisionist leader has led the return to socialism? No. Not even a little bit. It is unreliable to write "never overturn the verdict", let alone now that the political power is in hand? Chairman Mao is right, it is difficult for the revisionist leader to change, this is the truth that can stand the test of history.

What we are going to carry out is a serious and brutal class struggle. Chairman Mao emphasised in 1967 that this is a great revolution in which one class overthrows another class. In carrying out such a class struggle and such a revolution, we can only take class struggle and line struggle as the key link. We must not oppose this today and that tomorrow, "rightists fart, leftists put on a show", but dare not touch or oppose the emperor; we must not turn such a profound class struggle into a fragmented political game of petty fights. To do so is directly contrary to Chairman Mao's teachings, and is not in line with the reality of the fascist bourgeois dictatorship that actually exists in China, and is not in line with the law of the specific class struggle against revisionism and capitalist restoration.

In the "Sixteen-Point" programmatic document of the Cultural Revolution, Article 5 stipulates that "the focus of this movement is to rectify those in power within the Party who are taking the capitalist road."

Article 13 stipulates that "the cultural and educational units and party and government leadership organs in large and medium-sized cities are the focus of the current proletarian cultural revolution movement." These two "focus" provisions are still very important and very inspiring today. The focus of our struggle should still be to oppose revisionism, the revisionist line, the capitalist-roaders who formulate and implement the revisionist line, and the revisionist leaders. At the same time, the focus of this struggle should still be on the leading Party and government organs in large and medium-sized cities. If we look at the world and see the various class struggles and political struggles being carried out around the world today, the movements of the masses who have joined the struggle are mainly concentrated in large cities and political centres.

This is an important characteristic and law of contemporary struggles determined by contemporary historical conditions. It is also in line with the teachings of the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist revolutionary mentors. It is a form of struggle with the correct direction and methods that truly rises to the level of class struggle and political struggle.

Sometimes we see some individuals or some people engaging in low-level struggles such as petitions and appeals just for the economic interests of some individuals or some people. Of course, we sympathise with and support these struggles, but we should not forget that, as Lenin said, these forms of struggle are not class struggles, but at most "the embryo of class struggle." As for some people who are used to begging a certain "honest official" somewhere to make decisions for the people, or even begging a revisionist leader to make decisions for the people, this is completely contrary to Chairman Mao's teachings and will never achieve the goal.

It seems to be a question of the strategy and mode of struggle, but, in the final analysis, it is still a question of whether we can or dare to apply the viewpoint of class struggle to understand and deal with the current class struggle, a question of whether we can or dare to understand and deal with the current class struggle on the line of class struggle as the key link.

This is a major question that deserves our serious consideration and study to find out the correct answer. If this question is not resolved, the struggle against revisionism and against the restoration of capitalism can never be talked about at all.

The facts of the past have proved this.

Therefore, next, we still have to talk further about the class struggle point of view and the method of class analysis.

4. In order to correctly understand and correctly carry out the struggle we are facing, we must adhere to the class struggle point of view, the method of class analysis, and only by doing so will we not blur our understanding of the nature of the present struggle, and will we not make the mistakes of opportunism and revisionism on the line and in the strategy.

This is a very important point, a theoretical foundation.

The treasonous behaviour of Deng Xiaoping and his followers is not an individual phenomenon, but a class phenomenon. The power they represent is not an individual power, but a class power. Since it is a class struggle, the class nature of the ruling class will not change. They will neither adopt a policy of concession to the working people and abandon the fascist bourgeois dictatorship; nor will they return to socialism and abandon bureaucratic autocracy and monopoly capitalism; no matter what they say about Chairman Mao, the Cultural Revolution, and the first thirty years (actually twenty-seven years), no matter what slight changes there are in the terms, it is all to deceive the people, and their basic stance and basic views will not change at all.

This is determined by their class nature.

What we are facing is a life-and-death class contradiction and class struggle. This is a contradiction and struggle between the enemy and ourselves, an antagonistic and irreconcilable contradiction and struggle, and is by no means a non-antagonistic contradiction among the people, still less a contradiction of struggle between lines within the Communist Party, because the genuine Marxist-Leninist-Maoist revolutionary Communist Party no longer exists. The concentrated expression of this class struggle is that the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship have been transformed into the dictatorship of the fascist bourgeoisie. The actions of this fascist bourgeois dictatorship over the past few decades have clearly told us that the revisionist rulers and the bureaucratic, autocratic and monopolistic bourgeois rulers treat us, the working people, as class enemies and as objects of dictatorship. This is a fact that cannot be changed by our will.

They abandoned class struggle as the key link, which means they abandoned the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and abandoned the class struggle between socialism and capitalism; however, in fact, they have not and cannot be separated from class struggle, and have not and cannot not take class struggle as the key link, but they take the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat as the key link. In this case, if we still ask the rulers to strictly distinguish between the two types of contradictions of different natures and treat us in the way of handling contradictions among the people, isn't this a very naive, ridiculous and wrong idea and statement?

History is the best textbook. The history of more than 40 years has given us enough experience and lessons. On this issue, we should neither be deceived nor follow their baton to promote and clamour for those deceptive things, saying that "we are returning to Chairman Mao's path" and "quietly returning to socialism". This is all taken for granted. They erected a statue of Deng Xiaoping, presented flowers, bowed, and kept praising Deng Xiaoping's "great achievements". Not only will they not repent, but they are also very determined. The "four confidences" promoted by the traitors are the most reliable confession: confidence in theory, confidence in the system, confidence in the path, and confidence in culture. Where is the meaning of "turning left", "re-entering", "correcting", or "returning"? Since they insist on the "confidence" of all-round capitalism with Chinese characteristics, they not only deny the possibility of reformism, but also deny the possibility of changing their ways and returning to Chairman Mao's revolutionary line and rebuilding scientific socialism. They are "confident" that they can defeat socialism with capitalism and that they can completely persist in the worst capitalism.

Under these circumstances, today, as we commemorate the centenary of the founding of the Communist Party of China, we are doomed to have no choice but to uphold the truth that Chairman Mao has repeatedly taught us: revolution! There is only one way to go! Only by launching a socialist revolution can we rebuild scientific socialism based on Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

5. Like anything else, the socialist revolution of the proletariat is a process. This process is cruel, accompanied by bloodshed and sacrifice, and is tortuous. As Chairman Mao said, it is a process of struggle, failure, struggle again, failure again, and finally victory. Therefore, we must not only adhere to the philosophy of struggle, but also have a correct understanding and grasp of the strategy of struggle.

The occurrence of revolution requires historical conditions. In his famous book "The State and Revolution", Lenin wrote a famous teaching on the conditions for the occurrence of revolution: Revolution is only possible under the historical conditions that the ruling class cannot continue to rule as before and the ruled class does not want to live as before. In the "Introduction" written by Engels

for Marx's "The Class Struggles in France, 1848-1850" in 1895, he summarised the experience and lessons of Marx and his life-long communist movement and reiterated an important theoretical opinion on launching a socialist revolution, that is, only under the historical conditions of an economic crisis will the time for revolution be ripe and come. This opinion is consistent with Lenin's opinion. Because it is when economic and political crises occur that the two conditions required for revolution mentioned by Lenin will mature and it will be possible to launch a revolution.

The teachings of the revolutionary mentors are not outdated, and they are still the theoretical basis for us to formulate the strategy of socialist re-revolution.

The overall situation is clear. Now we do not have the historical conditions required for launching the revolution as Engels and Lenin said. Don't ignore the reality, don't proceed from reality, and make the mistake of left-wing blind activism, which will cause unnecessary sacrifices to the revolutionary forces. However, more importantly, we must not forget the revolution, dare not revolution, give up revolution, and make the mistake of right-wing opportunism, which is actually the mistake of revisionism. The weaknesses of our nation criticised by the first saint Lu Xun (Chairman's words) still exist. Chairman Mao had high hopes for our people. But we failed his hopes. He said that if there was revisionism in the central government, local governments would rebel. This point was not true; in a letter to Jiang Qing, he said, "If an anti-communist rightist coup occurred in China, I am sure they would not be at peace and it would probably be short-lived, because all revolutionaries who represent the interests of more than 90% of the people would not tolerate it. At that time, the rightists might use my words to gain power for a while, but the leftists would definitely use my other words to organize and overthrow the rightists." This point was also not true.

This is certainly not accidental. However, it is not a very simple or easy task to find out the inevitability and to give a scientific explanation for these historical phenomena. So far, we are still basically trapped in blindness.

To answer this question correctly, we still have to rely on the analytical method of historical materialism.

It is the application of the historical materialist viewpoint and method of analysing this question which, we must admit, is inseparable from our national situation. When it comes to the national situation, it is made up of many social conditions, which are quite complex, both the real social conditions, which are the main ones, and the historical legacy conditions, which also have a considerable impact, and which, taken together, constitute the reality of our social existence, a social existence that is the basis for the inevitable historical inevitability of all the social problems that we face.

Some comrades always like to compare certain slogans from the democratic revolution period, thinking that we cannot launch a socialist revolution now because we cannot come up with slogans and strategies like "fight the local tyrants and distribute the land" that are easy for the masses to accept and easy for the masses to launch a revolution. This is a simplistic historical comparison, which is not an accurate understanding of the new democratic revolution, and even less accurate understanding of the socialist revolution, and is not correct in terms of the method of cognition.

The new democratic revolution and the socialist revolution are revolutions of completely different natures and levels. Lenin gave instructions on this issue. In his article "The Third International and Its Place in History", Lenin wrote: "I have repeatedly said that it was easier for the Russians to start the great proletarian revolution than for the advanced countries, but it was more difficult to continue it to the final victory, that is, to fully build a socialist society." Lenin analysed six reasons why the Russian Revolution was easier to start, mainly because Russian society was backward, the starting point of the revolution was relatively low, and the classes participating in the revolution were relatively broad,

making it easier to launch. Finally, he said, "The above is of course incomplete, but it is limited to this for the time being." The basic point of Lenin's analysis is that Russia is backward, and the revolutionary conditions caused by this backwardness are different from those in developed capitalist countries in Western Europe. It is these conditions that determine that it is easier to launch the proletarian socialist revolution in Russia, but it is more difficult to carry this revolution through to the end.

Why?

Lenin repeatedly explained this problem after the founding of the state, mainly because Russia was a backward country, with a vast sea of the petty-bourgeoisie, and under such historical conditions it was quite difficult to bring the socialist revolution in Russia to a conclusion, far more difficult than in the developed capitalist countries of Western Europe.

Lenin therefore always hoped that the proletariat in the developed capitalist countries of Western Europe would be able to launch socialist revolutions so as to complement the socialist revolution in Russia. However, Lenin's hopes were dashed.

Of course, the absence of socialist revolutions in Western Europe does not seem to be a coincidence and has to be explained scientifically.

What we want to emphasize here is that we must learn from Lenin's method of thinking by applying historical materialism to analyse social problems. If we use this method to understand China's national conditions, we must admit that China's national conditions are more backward than Russia's. In such a country, it will certainly be more difficult to carry out the socialist revolution to the end; and if socialism fails and capitalism is restored, it will be even more difficult to launch the socialist revolution again. We are facing such actual difficulties. It is not surprising at all. It is the inevitability of history that is at work.

We have more and better historical conditions than Russia to launch the New Democratic Revolution, although there are also some historical conditions that are not as good as those of Russia. It is these conditions that make it possible for China's New Democratic Revolution to be launched and to succeed.

However, after the victory of the revolution, China also encountered the same problem as Russia, that is, how to carry the socialist revolution through to the end. Moreover, the level of social development in China was lower than that in Russia, and the difficulties were much greater than those in Russia. It was precisely to answer this question and solve this problem that Chairman Mao creatively developed Marxism, put forward the theory of socialist continued revolution, and promoted Marxism and Leninism to a new stage of Maoism.

The history of the Communist Party of China clearly illustrates the process of the birth of Maoism. It was under the correct guidance of Chairman Mao's theory of new democratic revolution that the Chinese revolution won victory after 28 years of hard struggle. Then, Chairman Mao led the people of the whole country to continue the revolution and move forward, and achieved great construction achievements and a great revolutionary theory, namely the theory of socialist continued revolution. The great creation and practice of the theory of new democratic revolution and the theory of socialist continued revolution constitute the main content of Maoism. The birth of Maoism is enough to prove that Chairman Mao is a giant and a great man of this era. It is no exaggeration to say that the glorious history of the Communist Party of China over the past 100 years has been written with Chairman Mao's theory of new democratic revolution and theory of socialist continued revolution; while the shameful history of the Communist Party of China over the past 40 years has been written with the failed pen of traitors by Deng Xiaoping and his disciples. Chairman Mao led and actually pulled the Chinese people

to the forefront of the world's social development level. At that time, a large number of new socialist and communist things were created, which only China had, and no other country had. This is a great social reform that truly promotes the progress of human history, and Chairman Mao is a truly great social reformer.

However, since Chairman Mao led us to build socialism (in a broad sense) for a short time after all, and the inherent national conditions are relatively backward, they are ultimately restricting our social development. First, they restrict the level of consciousness and political level of our party and our people. When Chairman Mao was alive, it was one situation; once Chairman Mao passed away, history would inevitably and helplessly repeat itself. The historical task we are facing now is the socialist re-revolution, but the level of our social development, and the level of development of the people determined by it, still seem to be insufficient. This is the practical difficulty that we will inevitably encounter when we subjectively want to launch the socialist re-revolution.

Looking around the world, developed capitalist countries have never launched a socialist revolution, but the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe" chose to rebuild a capitalist bourgeois democratic republic. It can be seen that there are difficulties everywhere, each with its own difficulties, and they are definitely not accidental. We still need to use the viewpoints of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism to explain, find out the inevitability of history, and find out the lessons of history.

This is history, this is only history, and we don't need to be pessimistic about it.

Comparatively speaking, our people have not only received Chairman Mao's teachings on the theory of continued socialist revolution, but have also participated in the practice of the Cultural Revolution against revisionism and the restoration of capitalism under Chairman Mao, which has enabled our people to have a more sober and fuller understanding of the rise to power of revisionism and the restoration of capitalism. In our country, the existence of a Maoist faction loyal to Chairman Mao and Maoism is unique in the world, and this is the most valuable asset left by Chairman Mao to China. Chairman Mao's red flag, although discarded by the revisionist party, is still held high in the hands of the Chinese people and still flutters in the wind! Chairman Mao's red flag is the power, the magic weapon that will guide us to victory over all revisionist traitors and all bourgeois enemies; where Chairman Mao's red flag is, China's hope is sure to remain. Chairman Mao's flag has always been the flag of victory!

History never really jokes. Even if it seems like a historical joke, it still has historical inevitability and laws. Fundamentally speaking, the movement of history, like the movement of nature, follows certain inevitable laws. Therefore, if we really want to correctly understand history and reality, we must have a scientific method of cognition, just like natural science, and historical materialism provides us with such a scientific method of cognition. We seek the laws and inevitability of history not only to gain a correct understanding of history and reality, but more importantly, we must use these correct understandings to help us more consciously, actively, and correctly participate in the real socialist revolutionary struggle. That is, as we often say, understanding the world is to transform the world.

This is a question involving the method of thinking. Chairman Mao has always attached great importance to the problem of the method of thinking. Therefore, after much consideration, despite the length of the article, I decided to quote another passage from Engels's brilliant discussion on the dialectics of historical movement.

This passage is also in the "Introduction" of the book "The Class Struggles in France, 1840-1850". Engels said: " All revolutions up to the present day have resulted in the displacement of the rule of one class by the rule of another; but all ruling classes up to now have been only small minorities in relation to

the ruled mass of the people. One ruling minority was thus overthrown; another minority seized the helm of state in its stead and refashioned the state institutions to suit its own interests. Thus, on every occasion a minority group was enabled and called upon to rule by the given degree of economic development; and just for that reason, and only for that reason, it happened that the ruled majority either participated in the revolution for the benefit of the former or else simply acquiesced in it. But if we disregard the concrete content in each case, the common form of all these revolutions was that they were minority revolutions. Even when the majority took part, it did so — whether wittingly or not — only in the service of a minority; but because of this, or even simply because of the passive, unresisting attitude of the majority, this minority acquired the appearance of being the representative of the whole people.” As long as we do not treat Engels's discussion with a dogmatic attitude, then the historical dialectics that Engels talked about here has very realistic, important and profound methodological significance for our understanding of Deng Xiaoping's revisionist so-called "reform and opening up". I do not want to elaborate here, but just want to continue to quote another very wonderful discussion by Engels. Engels went on to say: " As a rule, after the first great success, the victorious minority split; one half was satisfied with what had been gained, the other wanted to go still further, and put forward new demands, which, partly at least, were also in the real or apparent interest of the great mass of the people. In isolated cases these more radical demands were actually forced through, but often only for the moment; the more moderate party would regain the upper hand, and what had been won most recently would wholly or partly be lost again; the vanquished would then cry treachery or ascribe their defeat to accident. In reality, however, the truth of the matter was usually this: the achievements of the first victory were only safeguarded by the second victory of the more radical party; this having been attained, and, with it, what was necessary for the moment, the radicals and their achievements vanished once more from the stage. All the revolutions of modern times, from the English Revolution of the seventeenth century onwards, have displayed these characteristics which seem to be inseparable from any revolutionary struggle. It seems that the proletariat's struggle for its own emancipation also has these characteristics..." (Volume 22 of the Complete Works of Marx and Engels, pages 595-596.) Similarly, as long as we do not treat Engels's discussion with a dogmatic attitude, the historical dialectics that Engels talked about here will also have very practical, important and profound methodological significance for us to correctly understand and comprehend the twists and turns that have occurred in contemporary Chinese history. I do not want to elaborate on this here.

The Introduction is the last and most important work that Engels left to the international proletariat in 1895, the year of his death. This work concentrates on explaining the most basic and important experiences and lessons he and Marx gained from their lifelong communist revolutionary movement. Its importance to the revolutionary struggle we are engaged in today cannot be overestimated.

In terms of the fundamental method of thinking, of course, it is a question of adhering to the method of historical materialism. However, once it comes to specific historical issues, there is still a question of the specific development of the method of historical materialism. The opinions expressed in Engels' "Introduction" are the opinions on the specific development of historical materialism. This is most worthy of our study.

Starting from Engels' teachings, we can deeply understand that it is not accidental that revisionism emerged in China; it is not accidental that the Chinese Communist Party became a revisionist party; it is not accidental that capitalism was restored in China; it is not accidental that it has been going on for forty years without encountering strong resistance. And today, it is very difficult to oppose revisionism, oppose the restoration of capitalism, and want to launch a socialist revolution. So far, no results have been seen. Unfortunately, this is not accidental.

It is not because the revisionist party is strong, nor is it because the fascist bourgeois dictatorship is strong. In this world, the most powerful are the people who have awakened and risen up. However, when the people are not awakened and cannot rise up, the reactionaries will naturally appear particularly powerful and can do whatever they want. This is the reality now. If we analyse it from the perspective of historical materialism, we will see that this is not accidental. This current situation, in the final analysis, is still determined by China's national conditions. The so-called national conditions are nothing more than those factors revealed by historical materialism, from productivity to production relations, to the entire economic base, to the huge superstructure, to the entire society, and the people under this social condition. These factors constitute the national conditions of a country. China is no exception. What kind of national conditions there are is what kind of people there are; what kind of people there are is what kind of society there is. Everything we face comes from this, and inevitability is contained in it.

We have to respect this historical inevitability, and we have to start from the reality of this historical inevitability to realise what our present historical task is and to decide on our strategy of struggle accordingly. This is the kind of Marxist-Leninist-Maoist attitude and approach that can avoid left-right leaning errors.

The above list of political principles and their related theoretical foundations may not be comprehensive, but when concentrated to one point, and ultimately realised to one point, it is to adhere to the viewpoint of class struggle, to adhere to the class struggle as the key link, and to adhere to socialist re-revolution.

These political principles are a yardstick for measuring true proletarian revolutionaries, that is, true Maoists. As long as we adhere to these revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism that involve major issues of right and wrong, we can be true proletarian revolutionaries, true Maoists, and we can draw a clear line between ourselves and all kinds of wrong thoughts and practices of salvationism, and the unity of the Maoist team will not be a problem.

In the past, differences and disunity arose on these basic political principles, which only showed that we ourselves sometimes failed to grasp the viewpoint of class struggle well, especially the class struggle as the key link. Many statements and practices were not based on the fact that opposing revisionism and capitalist restoration was a profound and severe class struggle, and were neither in line with the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism nor with the actual situation. They were just some subjective illusions that were fabricated under the influence of various erroneous ideas to mislead people.

Therefore, it is easier to understand and comprehend how the revisionist traitors fell. Adhering to class struggle as the key link seems simple and even superficial, but it is not a simple matter to truly do it, do it well, and implement it in all struggles. Abandoning class struggle as the key link is the fundamental characteristic and the crux of the problem of revisionism as a historical phenomenon, which deserves our serious study, summary, and treatment. In particular, we should not forget that while criticising revisionism for abandoning this key link, we should also often ask ourselves whether we have firmly grasped this key link and raised this key link.

We cannot underestimate this issue or avoid it. It is precisely because we did not hold high the principle of class struggle, and did not effectively resist and fight against the rise of revisionism and the restoration of capitalism, that Deng Xiaoping and his followers, these traitors, easily restored capitalism in China. In the face of the tragic failure of socialism and the renewed suffering of the vast majority of working people, we should naturally denounce the betrayal of Deng Xiaoping and his

followers; however, it is not enough to do so alone. We should also review the reasons for our failure from our own side. The most fundamental reason is that we did not adhere to Chairman Mao's ideological theory and line policy on opposing revisionism, did not recognize that we were facing a cruel and irreconcilable class struggle, did not raise the class struggle as a guideline, and bravely threw ourselves into the class struggle with a militant revolutionary attitude. We mistook illusions for hope and lies for reality. We compromised and gave in again and again, and finally gave up socialism and let capitalism be restored. We must do serious and earnest self-criticism, not perfunctorily.

At this solemn moment of commemorating the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of China, we must have the courage to say to our beloved Chairman Mao and to the revolutionary martyrs who sacrificed their lives for the benefit of the people: We are sorry for you, we have failed your expectations, we have made mistakes, and our mistakes have led to the failure of the socialism you fought for. We feel ashamed, guilty and remorseful at this moment. Chairman Mao once said in his famous report "On the Coalition Government": "As we Chinese Communists, who base all our actions on the highest interests of the broadest masses of the Chinese people and who are fully convinced of the justice of our cause, never balk at any personal sacrifice and are ready at all times to give our lives for the cause, can we be reluctant to discard any idea, viewpoint, opinion or method which is not suited to the needs of the people? Can we be willing to allow political dust and germs to dirty our clean faces or eat into our healthy organism? Countless revolutionary martyrs have laid down their lives in the interests of the people, and our hearts are filled with pain as we the living think of them--can there be any personal interest, then, that we would not sacrifice or any error that we would not discard?" At this moment, when we are celebrating the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of China, Chairman Mao's earnest teachings have special educational significance for us and help us wake up. We deeply feel and realise that the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of China has drawn a line for us. There are life-and-death and irreconcilable class contradictions and class struggles between us and these traitors of the Communist Party of China and these traitors of the communist movement. We can no longer tolerate the interference and sabotage of our revolutionary movement by various erroneous thoughts and practices. We must unwaveringly follow Chairman Mao's teachings, hold high the banner of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism that rebellion is justified, insist on class struggle as the key link, and resolutely and courageously launch a socialist re-revolution against revisionism and the restoration of capitalism.

Chairman Mao said that policies and strategies are the life of the Party. This is what we must always bear in mind and put into practice. Our greatest and most fundamental strategy is to take class struggle as the key link, dare to struggle, and dare to revolutionise. Only if we dare to struggle can we talk about being good at struggle. If we dare not struggle and dare not revolutionise, there is no way to talk about anything. Under the premise of daring to revolutionise, there is indeed a problem of struggle strategy and a problem of being good at struggle. It is always wrong to adopt adventurism and blind activism without starting from reality. In the history of the Party, the mistakes of left-wing adventurism and blind activism have brought huge and painful losses to the Party's revolutionary cause. As latecomers, we must always remember these historical lessons written with the blood of martyrs and take them as a warning.

In the light of the actual state of the situation, where the crisis has not yet arrived and the conditions for revolution are not yet ripe, our basic and main strategy should be to focus on preparatory work.

Briefly speaking, there are four major tasks, all of which are the most important and fundamental for launching a socialist re-revolution. Without these tasks, there is no way to talk about socialist re-revolution.

Because of the brutality of the class struggle, it is not appropriate to go into detail here.

First, we should do a good job in mobilising the masses. First, we should mobilise all forces demanding revolution from all classes and strata with the broad masses of working people as the main body, enthusiastically propagate Marxism-Leninism-Maoism to them, mainly Chairman Mao's theory of continuing socialist revolution, support them in all forms of struggle, and help them gradually raise the struggles that have been launched to the level of class struggle and political struggle; second, we should pay special attention to the work of youth and college students; third, we should focus on large and medium-sized cities as political centres.

Secondly, we should do a good job of theoretical criticism and theoretical research. Systematically criticise the revisionist theory of socialism with Chinese characteristics, thoroughly expose the bourgeois nature of this theory of the restoration of capitalism, thoroughly refute all kinds of bizarre theories of this theory, and thoroughly peel off the skin of this theory that deceives the people.

At the same time, the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist theory of scientific socialism should be seriously studied, especially the historical reasons for the setbacks and failures of socialism, so as to make theoretical preparations for the reconstruction of scientific socialism in the future and to avoid the repetition of the mistakes of the past.

Third, make good organisational preparations. Everyone knows Lenin's famous saying: "In the struggle for power, the proletariat has no other weapon except organisation." (Lenin: One Step Forward, Two Steps Back, Selected Works of Lenin, Vol. 1, p. 510, 1972 edition) Chairman Mao also clearly said that if we want revolution, we must have a revolutionary party and a Communist Party guided by Marxism-Leninism. It was the birth of the Communist Party of China a hundred years ago that opened a new era of the Chinese revolution. However, under the conditions we are in now, especially the lessons learned from the arrests and sentencing of several comrades who requested to form a party, we know that it is not feasible to organise a party now, whether it is open or secret. If we insist on doing it, it will only bring losses to the revolutionary forces. We must face this fact and learn this lesson. This is a difficulty that must be solved. The wisdom of the masses is endless. High technology provides a variety of means for people to communicate today. The open and covert organisational work in those days was carried out with the means that could be used in those days. The current historical conditions provide new possibilities for new means of communication and new organisational forms. We believe in the creativity of the masses.

Fourthly, we should make the fight for democracy the main task of the current struggle and, at the same time, support all forms of struggle.

Theoretically, the revolutionary teachers have taught us time and again that dictatorship is a very backward and reactionary form of government, which completely binds and restricts the proletariat and the masses of the working people from taking to the arena of political struggle and waging class struggle. Therefore, where dictatorship exists, the proletariat and the masses must first break through it.

The opinions of the revolutionary mentors are based on reality and are entirely correct. The reality we have encountered fully proves this. For more than four decades, under the dictatorship of the fascist bourgeoisie, the Chinese proletariat and the rest of the working masses have been deprived of all their original and constitutionally stipulated democratic rights, and the people have been deprived of all their rights and freedoms, and have been reduced to the status of deprived slaves. Under such political rule, the proletariat and the rest of the working class are simply unable to engage in political struggle or class struggle. The harsh realities of life repeatedly tell us that there is indeed a need to first break

through dictatorship and fight for democracy, even if it is bourgeois democracy. Only when this is achieved can the proletariat and the mass of the people as a class engage in political life, political struggle and class struggle. As Lenin said, it is only by fighting for democracy that the proletariat has an arena in which to wage class struggle. Similarly, also in the Introduction, Engels teaches us that 'The Communist Manifesto has long declared that the struggle for universal suffrage, for democracy, is one of the first tasks of the fighting proletariat.' Our historical task now is to follow the teachings of our revolutionary mentors and wage the struggle for democracy, which is 'one of the first tasks'.

For a long time, many comrades have had such and such vague or erroneous understandings of the issue of democracy. It is now time for them to correct these erroneous ideas in the light of the teachings of their revolutionary mentors, and to devote themselves to the struggle for democracy.

The struggle for democracy can be at any level. Even the lowest level of the struggle for democracy is a class struggle, a political struggle, and its significance is far greater than that of an ordinary economic struggle. In the face of a powerful fascist bourgeois dictatorship, we can start at the lowest level, which is to fight for the implementation of the democratic rights of citizens as stipulated in Article 35 of the Constitution. Using the Constitution as a basis for legitimate struggle should be an operable, easier and safer strategy of struggle. In the past, we have published such an initiative, but so far it has not yet resulted in an effective struggle on a certain scale, and naturally it has not yet been possible to achieve the objective of implementing article 35 of the Constitution.

We should continue our efforts and struggle for this.

These four tasks of struggle are our understanding of some of the most important and basic preparations that should be made at this time to launch a socialist re-revolution. We believe in the wisdom of the masses and in the saying that as long as there is no slippage in thinking, there are always more solutions than difficulties.

There is a well-known Chinese poem that says, 'Whenever there is a festive season, we miss our relatives twice as much'!

Whenever we usher in the festivals of the Party and the country, we are infinitely nostalgic for the revolutionary martyrs. In Chairman Mao's time, we would always be grateful to the revolutionary martyrs when we commemorated these festivals. But today, on the solemn occasion of the 100th anniversary of the birth of the Communist Party of China, naturally, we are still full of nostalgia for the revolutionary martyrs as a matter of course; but, unlike in Chairman Mao's time, we cannot help but be filled with an extra sense of grief, a sense of shame, and a sense of pain, for the new China and socialism, which the revolutionary martyrs had sacrificed so much of their blood for, have been betrayed by the group of revisionist traitors. Capitalism has been restored on the soil of China. What was often said in the past that the labouring people would 'suffer twice as much' has turned out to be a cruel reality. The fruits of the revolution, which the martyrs of the revolution had won with their great and difficult struggles, which were so beautiful to watch and so shocking to see, have gone down the drain in this way. In the face of this cruel and dark but real reality, in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of the Communist Party of China, can we not feel a great deal of grief, can we not shed tears?

We don't need to recall all the more than 20 million revolutionary martyrs who heroically sacrificed their lives. Just thinking of the heroic deeds of any one of them that are recorded in history will make

us feel extremely sad and we can't help crying for them. They are all such outstanding sons and daughters of China!

Remembering the martyrs, we feel ashamed at the same time, because we have not done enough to fight against the traitorous behaviour of the revisionist group of traitors, which has led to such a situation in China now.

Remembering the martyrs, we also feel angry, and we feel a strong class hatred towards the revisionist traitors who still wear the garb of communists but betray the aims of the communists, the revolutionary martyrs and the cause of socialism.

On the occasion of the commemoration of the centenary of the birth of the Communist Party of China (CPC), they should give thanks to the revolutionary martyrs, Chairman Mao, the CPC, the Chinese people and the people of the world! They have single-handedly caused the tragedy of socialism in China and the misfortunes and sufferings of the Chinese people. It is in the face of this fact that we cannot but cry out angrily towards them: Traitors, you are not qualified to commemorate the centenary of the birth of the CPC! You should only be denounced and reviled by the masses of Communists and the masses of the people throughout China and indeed throughout the world!

Instead, we have to turn our anger into strength, listen to Chairman MAO's words and resolutely launch a great socialist re-revolution against the rise to power of revisionism and the restoration of capitalism.

On 24 April 1945, at the end of his report 'On Coalition Government' at the historically significant Seventh National Congress of the Communist Party of China, Chairman Mao issued a great appeal to the whole Party and the whole nation: "Thousands upon thousands of martyrs have heroically laid down their lives for the people; let us hold their banner high and march ahead along the path crimson with their blood!"

At this moment, to express our love for the great Communist Party of China, our love for Chairman Mao, and to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the birth of the Communist Party of China, we swear to Chairman Mao and the revolutionary martyrs: We must raise Chairman Mao's great banner again, march ahead along the path crimson with the blood of the martyrs, and bravely move forward, forward, forward to win the great victory of the socialist revolution, and rebuild the scientific socialism of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism on the land of China!

July 1, 2021

What is the original intention, mission and theme of the Communist Party of China?

Criticism of the "July 1st Speech" (I)

On July 1, 2021, the CPC Central Committee held a grand meeting in Tiananmen Square, Beijing, to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of China. At this meeting, Xi Jinping, General Secretary of the CPC Central Committee, delivered a speech, which we call the "July 1st Speech". At such a solemn moment, the speech delivered by the General Secretary of the CPC Central Committee is of course very important, of a declarative nature, and of programmatic significance.

Therefore, we must take this speech seriously. Party newspapers and journals are publishing articles on studying this speech. We are also studying, and we are studying hard, but we are studying it as a negative example.

Before July 1, we published an article with good intentions, telling them: "Traitors, you are not qualified to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of China." Of course, this is just an attitude we should take, and we know that they will not listen. Therefore, we clearly wrote in the article: This article is mainly written for the people.

We have not forgotten the teachings of our revolutionary mentors. The best way to commemorate the revolutionary festival is to continue to persevere in the unfinished revolutionary cause. Our article studies the historical law that the old and new revisionists will inevitably betray socialism and restore capitalism, and exposes and criticises the great historical setback and the disaster that will inevitably be brought about by the restoration of capitalism. This is a punitive manifesto issued by a true Chinese Communist Party member to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of China against the revisionist traitors.

The "July 1st Speech" proves that our article was not wrong and our condemnation was justified. Now, it is absolutely necessary for us to use this latest negative teaching material to further criticise the theory and line of the revisionist rulers. We learn from the writing style of Marx's "Critique of the Gotha Program" and Engels' "Critique of the Erfurt Program", and use the attitude of presenting facts and reasoning, quoting their original words, to launch our criticism.

We will not be like them, who fear our writings and treat them like a scourge, immediately resorting to all sorts of ways to suppress us and, in the scientific words of Chairman Mao, 'impose a fascist bourgeois dictatorship' on us. However, they forget that the history of the Party has repeatedly told people that Communists are fearless. At the solemn moment of commemorating the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of China, the heroic deeds and fearless spirit of countless revolutionary martyrs have once again ignited the revolutionary anger in our hearts, inspiring us to follow their example and resolutely throw ourselves into the current great struggle against revisionism and the restoration of capitalism.

This article is the first one to criticise this speech. It is mainly to debate with them: what is the original intention, mission and theme of the Communist Party of China? This is the core issue of the "July 1st Speech" and can also be said to be the general outline of the "July 1st Speech". Therefore, our criticism starts from this general outline.

At the beginning of his "speech", the General Secretary clearly stated his views. He said: "Since its birth, the Communist Party of China has established the pursuit of happiness for the Chinese people and the

rejuvenation of the Chinese nation as its original mission. Over the past 100 years, all the struggles, sacrifices and creations made by the Communist Party of China in uniting and leading the Chinese people can be summed up in one theme: realising the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation."

Is this statement, this view, right? We think it is wrong. In my superficial opinion, there are at least four issues worth discussing.

First, even elementary school students know that the Communist Party is a proletarian party that strives to realise communism throughout the world. The Communist Manifesto, the first programmatic document of the Communist Party, and the party programs of the Communist Party of various countries, including the Communist Party of China, are all written in this way, all of which take overthrowing the capitalist social system and establishing a communist society without exploitation, oppression, and private ownership as their highest program. If we talk about the original intention, mission, and theme, this is the original intention, mission, and theme of the Communists.

In the more than 170 years of the international communist movement, no real communist party has ever taken national rejuvenation as its original intention, mission or theme.

This is a despicable tampering of the communist party's program, or purpose, or even the original intention, mission and theme.

The books of Marx, Lenin and Mao are here, and the revolutionary practices of the Communist parties of various countries, including the Communist Party of China, are here. How can the General Secretary disregard the facts and brazenly abandon the highest political principles of the Communist Party? He is so bold and at the same time so stupid. The General Secretary does not know that this blind and stupid arrogance is wrong in theory, harmful in practice, and will be laughed at by future generations in history.

Second, since it is the commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of China, and the General Secretary has led his subordinates to solemnly recite the oath of joining the Communist Party of China since its establishment many times, has the General Secretary forgotten that the oath clearly states that members who voluntarily join the Communist Party of China are to "struggle for the complete liberation of all mankind" and "struggle for communism" for their entire lives, and there is no such statement that they must struggle for their entire lives to "realise the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation." This makes us wonder whether the General Secretary is truly prepared to practice when he raises his right hand and recites the oath of joining the party, or is it to gain political capital. They say they are commemorating the birthday of the Communist Party of China, but they abandon the oath of the Communist Party members and put in their own private goods without blushing. How can this be commemorating the birthday of the Communist Party of China? It is more likely that they want to advertise their "So-and-so's Thought on Socialism with Chinese Characteristics for a New Era" and prepare public opinion for themselves to break the political rule of two terms and be re-elected.⁷ It is not accidental that they have this ambition. The general secretary has performed enough.

⁷ In March 2018, the National People's Congress removed the two-term limit on the presidency, effectively allowing Xi Jinping to remain in power for life – Trans.

Third, the slogan of "realising the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation" is not a slogan of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism at all, nor is it a slogan of socialism or communist revolution. It is a slogan of the bourgeoisie, and it can even be said to be a slogan of feudal emperors.

First of all, the communist movement of the Communists has always been an international communist movement, a communist movement of the proletariat of the world. Since the publication of the Communist Manifesto, "Workers of the world, unite!" has always been the banner for the common struggle of the proletariat of the world. The Internationale also sings this truth: " Arise ye workers from your slumbers, Arise ye prisoners of want...Servile masses, arise, arise..." We want to be the masters of the world, and international communism must be realised.

This involves one of the most basic and important principles of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and of the Communists. Although nations and countries still exist in real life, from the perspective of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, the Communists have a deeper understanding that the proletariat of the world is a class, a class oppressed and exploited by the bourgeoisie. Therefore, the common enemy of this class is the bourgeoisie. If the proletariat wants to be liberated, it must overthrow the rule of the bourgeoisie, liberate the entire human race from the capitalist system, and realise communism. This is what Chairman Mao emphasised in his letter to young students in 1966: Only by liberating all mankind can the proletariat finally liberate itself. Today, as the world becomes more integrated, there is no doubt that we should adhere to this principle even more. The communist movement is not a nationalist movement, but an internationalist movement. It is by no means an isolated movement of the proletariat of any country, but a common movement of the proletariat of the whole world. To tamper with the international communist cause of the proletariat of the whole world into the so-called "great rejuvenation" of a nation is a gross distortion of the fundamental principles of the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist communist movement.

Communists who truly adhere to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism will not simply understand history in a dogmatic way. The development of world history is uneven. This is also true in the current era of imperialism. There is an imbalance between developed imperialist countries and underdeveloped, backward and poor countries. From old colonialism to new colonialism, the exploitation and bullying of backward countries by imperialist countries have always existed. The development levels among imperialist countries are also uneven. This not only determines the inevitable competition and even war among these imperialist countries; it also determines the existence of hegemony of imperialist powers under certain conditions. It is precisely from these facts that Lenin's theory of imperialism and Chairman Mao's theory of the three worlds, which further developed Marxism, were theoretically developed. To adapt to this international situation, under the leadership of Chairman Mao, our party formulated the general line of the international communist movement: "Proletarians of the world unite, proletarians of the world unite with the oppressed people and oppressed nations, oppose imperialism and reactionaries in all countries, strive for world peace, national liberation, people's democracy and socialism, consolidate and strengthen the socialist camp, gradually achieve the complete victory of the proletarian world revolution, and build a new world without imperialism, capitalism and exploitation." (See "Proposal on the General Line of the International Communist Movement", People's Publishing House, October 1963) This is a truly Marxist-Leninist-Maoist general line of the international communist movement.

This general line is based on the reality of current world history and reflects the inevitable requirements of history and the inevitable steps of historical progress. In relatively developed capitalist countries, socialist revolution led by the proletariat is carried out; in relatively backward countries, the first step is to carry out the proletarian democratic revolution led by the proletariat for national independence and people's democracy. On the basis of seizing power and winning the victory of the

revolution, the second step is to transform to socialist revolution under the leadership of the proletariat in a way that meets the requirements of historical development.

Under the guidance of Chairman Mao's correct line, the Communist Party of China led the Chinese people in this way, first winning the victory of the New Democratic Revolution, then insisting on continuing the revolution without stopping, and winning the victory of the socialist revolution in a peaceful transformation method that conforms to China's historical reality. Moreover, according to Chairman Mao's opinion, it is necessary to insist on continuing the revolution under socialist conditions. It was only because Chairman Mao died and the revisionist traitors staged a coup and came to power that the process of this revolution was interrupted.

Historical experience tells us that no matter whether it is a one-step or two-step process, the historical mission of the Communist Party as the vanguard of the proletariat can only be to lead the working people in their struggle to ultimately realise socialism and communism.

This great, arduous and glorious historical mission cannot be replaced by any "great historical mission of national rejuvenation".

We are not generally opposed to patriotism, but we believe that patriotism or nationalism should be analysed historically and from a class perspective. In different historical periods and for different classes, the content of patriotism or nationalism is completely different. In his famous article "In Memory of Norman Bethune", Chairman Mao emphasized that "We must unite with the proletariat of all capitalist countries, with the proletariat of Japan, Britain, the United States, Germany, Italy and all capitalist countries, in order to defeat imperialism, liberate our nation and people, and liberate the nations and peoples of the world. This is our internationalism, and this is the internationalism we use to oppose narrow nationalism and narrow patriotism." Communism is unified with internationalism. Only under the guidance of the general program of communism can patriotism or nationalism have its correct meaning. For contemporary true communists, in the struggle for national liberation, state independence and people's democracy in this historical stage, communists can and should raise the banner of patriotism or nationalism; similarly, in the struggle against imperialist hegemony and bullying of the weak, communists can and should raise the banner of patriotism or nationalism. However, such struggles cannot be understood as the narrow patriotism or narrow nationalism of the bourgeoisie or other exploiting classes. From the perspective of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, the two struggles led by the Communist Party are, in the final analysis, class struggles, struggles against the bourgeoisie and imperialism, and the future of these struggles is to strive for socialism and communism, and not just to strive for national liberation, national independence, and to achieve the so-called "great national rejuvenation."

The practice of the Communist Party of China in leading the War of Resistance Against Japanese Aggression and the War to Resist U.S. Aggression and Aid Korea is a shining example of the correct handling of the combination and unity of patriotism and communism. The bourgeoisie can say this, and even the feudal princes and nobles can say this, but the Communists cannot say this as their original intention, mission or theme. Because saying this is contrary to the historical mission of the Communist Party guided by Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. As the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, using such a slogan as the original intention, mission or theme of the Communist Party of China is actually a trick of trying to cover up his own revisionism and restoration of capitalism with the slogan of narrow nationalism that seduce people's hearts. But it is this wrong slogan that clearly exposes the serious problem of the General Secretary's betrayal of the program, line and purpose of the Communist Party.

Fourth, when we talk about "realising the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation", people naturally ask, what is this "great rejuvenation" about?

China is an ancient and great country with a 5,000-year-old civilization that has been passed down from generation to generation without interruption. This is unique in world history. The splendid ancient civilization has always been the pride of our Chinese nation and a great legacy that our Chinese nation must critically inherit.

However, from the perspective of the great historical task of striving to realise communism that we Communists face today, it cannot and will not be reflected by the statement of "realising the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation".

The communist society is a new and advanced social form that has never existed in human history. How can this great ideal be realised by "rejuvenation"? Even if we add ten "great" words, it is impossible to "rejuvenate" a new communist social form that has never existed in history.

The General Secretary's statement of "realising the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation" completely violates the basic theory of Marxist historical materialism and the basic theory of Marxist historical dialectics. This is really a common sense mistake that should not be made, a childish mistake.

A fundamental theory of historical materialism is that human society, based on production activities, gradually evolves from a lower social form to a higher social form. This is a historical development process full of contingency and inevitability. This process is certainly not a rigid and dogmatic development process, but a development process full of historical dialectics. There are steady advances, leaps, and temporary setbacks, which is what we often say, that the road of historical progress is tortuous and uneven. However, one thing is certain, as Marx said, history, like anything else, always contains a negative understanding of existing things in the affirmative understanding of existing things, that is, an understanding of the inevitable demise of existing things. Chairman Mao further elaborated on this principle, and he understood it as the law of affirmation and negation of dialectics. This tells us that if we look at things from the perspective of Marxist historical materialism, the development of history follows certain laws, and it always develops from a low level to a high level in the basic form of social formation. This is also the historical basis for the inevitable replacement of capitalist society by communist society. No matter how tortuous the path of history may be, the general trend of the inevitable advancement of history cannot be changed, because it is determined by the basic law of historical development. It is precisely based on this principle that the Communists emphasise that our pursuit of communism is based on the theory of scientific communism. Engels' famous work "Socialism: Utopian and Scientific" clearly illustrates this point.

This is to respect the dialectics of history, respect the laws of history, find the right direction of history, look forward, and be a promoter of history. But how can we now put forward a backward-looking slogan of "realising the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation" as the original intention, mission, and theme of the Chinese Communists? Obviously, this runs counter to the direction of historical development, is a reaction to history, and is a reversal of history. It is ridiculous and absurd.

The creation of history is of course unified with the inheritance of history. The creation of history always unfolds on the basis of the given history, which cannot but include the inheritance of history. Critically inheriting the historical heritage is an unavoidable task for making new historical creations. Chairman Mao is a model of respecting history. Chairman Mao's teachings on respecting history and studying history seriously are numerous and worthy of our careful study. In his famous book On New Democracy, Chairman Mao once taught us: "A splendid old culture was created during the long period of Chinese feudal society. To study the development of this old culture, to reject its feudal dross and

assimilate its democratic essence is a necessary condition for developing our new national culture and increasing our national self-confidence, but we should never swallow anything and everything uncritically. It is imperative to separate the fine old culture of the people which had a more or less democratic and revolutionary character from all the decadence of the old feudal ruling class. China's present new politics and new economy have developed out of her old politics and old economy, and her present new culture, too, has developed out of her old culture; therefore, we must respect our own history and must not lop it off. However, respect for history means giving it its proper place as a science, respecting its dialectical development, and not eulogizing the past at the expense of the present or praising every drop of feudal poison. As far as the masses and the young students are concerned, the essential thing is to guide them to look forward and not backward." Chairman Mao's remarks are very profound and comprehensive, and we do not need to explain them here. I just want to emphasise that Chairman Mao's last words are not to guide people to look back, and the so-called "realising the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation" is to guide people to look back.

We must distinguish the dross from the essence of historical heritage, and our main goal is to critically inherit the essence. In his famous article "Serve the People", Chairman Mao quoted a passage from the great historian Sima Qian, "All men must die, but death can vary in its significance. The ancient Chinese writer Sima Qian said, "Though death befalls all men alike, it may be weightier than Mount Tai or lighter than a feather." However, Chairman Mao gave this passage a new ideological content, which is: "To die for the people is weightier than Mount Tai, but to work for the fascists and die for the exploiters and oppressors is lighter than a feather. Comrade Zhang Side died for the people, and his death is indeed weightier than Mount Tai." Wen Tianxiang's⁸ two lines of poetry are well-known in China, "Since ancient times, everyone has to die, but I will leave my loyalty to shine in history." This heroism was not only inherited but also further sublimated by the revolutionary martyrs of the Chinese Communists: "It doesn't matter if you are beheaded, as long as the doctrine is true. Kill Xia Minghan, and there will be successors."⁹ Communists are not historical nihilists. On the contrary, Communists attach the most importance to history and the inheritance of history. However, true Communists will never put forward slogans such as "realising the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation" that are full of narrow nationalism. The actual result can only be to "revive" feudal dregs and "revive" bourgeois ideological garbage. It is true to say that "spiritual pollution" is happening; and all this is happening under the cover of "rejuvenation". There are many essences in ancient China, but there are also many dregs. Now the proliferation of dregs has reached a shocking level. There is no need to list them in detail here.

There was a "Renaissance" in Europe, which was inseparable from the initial sweep of classical ancient civilization by the European Middle Ages. It cannot be used as a simple historical comparison. Moreover, it is more important to have a correct understanding of the European Renaissance. Engels made a scientific statement in his book "The Peasant War in Germany": "The Middle Ages developed from a barbaric primitive state. It swept away ancient civilization, ancient philosophy, politics and law,

⁸ Wen Tianxiang (1236-1283) was an outstanding scholar and military strategist of the Southern Song Dynasty. He fought against the encroachment of the Mongols and was imprisoned for three years in the Yuan Dynasty capital of Dadu (now Beijing). Rather than agree to announce his surrender, he took his own life. His poetry was an inspiration for his people – Trans.

⁹ Xia Minghan (1900-1928) joined Party in 1921 and worked closely with Mao Zedong in organising self-study classes for revolutionary youth. He was appointed to the Hunan Provincial Committee of the CCP in 1924. In the spring of 1927, he was appointed secretary general of the All-China Peasant Association and secretary of the Wuhan Central Peasant Movement Training Institute. At the beginning of 1928, he was arrested by the enemy and killed on March 20, 1928. His defiance in the face of death was an inspiration to other Communists and earned him a place in the 100 Martyrs of the Chinese Revolution – Trans.

so that everything could be started from scratch. The only thing it inherited from the fallen ancient world was Christianity and some incomplete and civilization-lost cities. As a result, just as in all primitive development stages, monks gained a monopoly on knowledge and education, and education itself was permeated with the nature of theology. Politics and law were in the hands of monks, and like all other sciences, they became branches of theology, and everything was handled according to the principles prevailing in theology." (Volume 7 of the Complete Works of Marx and Engels, page 400, People's Publishing House, 1959 edition). In this historical context, it is completely understandable to raise the banner of the so-called "Renaissance" of classical ancient Greek and Roman culture. Moreover, the most important thing here that must be seen is that this "Renaissance" movement is not mainly a revival of classical ancient Greek and Roman culture, but the creation of new bourgeois ideology and culture. Engels once commented in his book "Dialectics of Nature": "This era, we Germans called it the Reformation because of the national misfortune we encountered at that time, the French called it the Renaissance, and the Italians called it the Five Hundred Years, but none of these names can fully express this era." "This is the greatest and most progressive revolution that mankind has ever experienced. It is an era that needs giants and produces giants - giants in terms of thinking ability, enthusiasm and character, versatility and profound knowledge. The people who laid the foundation for modern bourgeois rule were by no means limited by the bourgeoisie." (Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Volume 3, Pages 444-445. People's Publishing House, 1972 edition.) Engels's opinion is very correct and important. First, it tells us that the term "Renaissance" does not "fully express this era"; second, it tells us that "this is the greatest and most progressive revolution that mankind has ever experienced" and is a revolution that "laid the foundation for modern bourgeois rule." Engels' meaning is very clear. A revolution with such great historical significance cannot be summarised by the word "renaissance". It is based on the same reasoning that the communist revolution with even greater historical significance that the Communists are engaged in cannot be summarised by the word "renaissance", even if the word "great" is added.

In short, the phrase "realising the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation" is really unreliable and does not rely on Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

If the general outline is wrong, then the rest is bound to be nonsense. The history of the Chinese Communist Party over a hundred years has been misrepresented by the General Secretary as a history of "struggling to realise the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation."

The Communist Party of China was established to "realise the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation."

The new democratic revolution and its great victory were carried out in order to "realise the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation."

The socialist revolution and continued revolution were also carried out in order to "realise the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation."

Even the reform and opening up that pursued revisionism and capitalist restoration were also carried out in order to "realise the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation."

Even the "great achievements" of "socialism with Chinese characteristics entering a new era" led by the General Secretary himself were all carried out in order to "realise the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation."

Just like the saying goes, "the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation" has become a basket that can hold anything.

How can this be a commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of China? This is a distortion of the party's history, a vilification of the party's history, and an insult to the martyrs who sacrificed their lives for the struggle for communism!

"Realising the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation" is a narrow nationalist slogan of the bourgeoisie that is anti-Marxist-Leninist-Maoist. It is wrong in theory and harmful in practice. We must criticise this slogan, oppose this slogan, and draw a clear line with this slogan. At the solemn moment of commemorating the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of China, we must reiterate in the name of revolution: Chinese Communists, in the past, present and future, will firmly take the realisation of the great ideal of communism as our highest program. In order to strive for this beautiful future to come one day earlier, we will fight for it all our lives, even at the cost of our lives!

As we celebrate the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of China, we deeply miss the Communists who sacrificed their lives for the communist revolution over the past 100 years, especially those who sacrificed their lives for opposing revisionism. We still have to overcome all obstacles. We are full of confidence and strength. Failures and setbacks cannot stop us from moving forward. We hold high the banner of communism dyed red with the blood of revolutionary martyrs, sing the tragic "Internationale", and under the guidance of the theory of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, persist in the revolution and continue the revolution. We will surely move from victory to victory and let the red flag of communism fly all over the world!

Long live the victory of communism throughout the world!

July 1, 2021

The "July 1st Speech" once again proves that whether to adhere to "class struggle as the key link" is the concentrated embodiment of the struggle between the two lines.

Criticism of the "July 1st Speech" (II)

As the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, Xi Jinping delivered a solemn speech to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of China. He spoke more than 7,000 words in a grand manner. However, he did not mention class struggle at all, let alone "class struggle as the key link". Doesn't this make people feel a little strange and a little difficult to understand?

No, it is not strange at all, and it is very easy to understand. This fact once again proves that whether to adhere to "class struggle as the key link" is a concentrated manifestation of the differences and struggles between the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist line and the revisionist line.

Those who engage in revisionism always want to deny class struggle, especially "class struggle as the key link". Back then, Chairman Mao grasped this key point and fought against Deng Xiaoping's line, which was in line with reality and correct.

This fact has left us a valuable historical experience and lesson. That is, the fundamental difference between the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist line and the revisionist line is concentrated on the issue of whether to adhere to "class struggle as the key link". It can be said that this is a watershed and a touchstone.

Now, the serious problem is that some comrades always think that the General Secretary is "returning" to Chairman Mao's revolutionary line and "returning" to the true socialist road. However, the "July 1st Speech" once again shattered this fantasy. The key point of the "July 1st Speech" is to adhere to the revisionist line, which is mainly manifested in not mentioning "class struggle as the key link", obliterating "class struggle as the key link", and denying "class struggle as the key link".

Please look at the facts.

The "July 1st Speech" is said to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of China, but it has crudely distorted the great struggle of the Chinese people under the leadership of the Communist Party of China.

At the beginning of his speech, the General Secretary actually said: "On behalf of the Party and the people, I solemnly declare that after the continuous struggle of the whole Party and the people of all ethnic groups across the country, we have achieved the first centenary goal, built a moderately prosperous society in all respects on the land of China, and historically solved the problem of absolute poverty."

I don't need to criticize it, everyone will see that this is a completely wrong statement.

Saying that the "goal" of the Chinese Communists for 100 years is to build a "moderately prosperous society" and solve the problem of absolute poverty is a fundamental distortion of the goal of the Chinese Communists and the Chinese people.

This statement can only express the "goal" of revisionist leaders like Deng Xiaoping (which is also actually a lie), but it is definitely not the goal of the real Chinese Communists. In my book "A Criticism of Xi Jinping's Thought", there is an article titled "'Well-off Society' is not a Marxist Scientific Concept".

From the perspective of Marxism, the concept of "well-off society" has no specific scientific meaning. This concept cannot explain the nature of the socio-economic form and social form of this society, including the class nature of this social form. This is also the fact. The so-called "well-off society" built by Deng Xiaoping and others is actually a bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalist society, which is what Chairman Mao called "the worst capitalist society". Such a society is not only impossible to "solve the problem of absolute poverty", but can only cause the disaster of absolute poverty.

Like all revisionist leaders, they want to tamper with Marxism and deceive the proletariat and the broad masses of working people. Therefore, they always have to make up some attractive above-class words to replace the scientific concepts of Marxism. Now there is a fashionable saying about this issue, saying that this is a different "discourse system". It seems that this is a problem of "discourse system". However, in the final analysis, to put it bluntly, the essence is not a problem of "discourse system", but a problem of what doctrine to practice and what path to take. Specifically, it is a problem of whether to practice Marxism or revisionism, and whether to take the socialist road or the capitalist road.

The "July 1st Speech" still inherited Deng Xiaoping's legacy and tampered with the goal of the Chinese Communists' struggle for 100 years from building communism to building a "moderately prosperous society." This trick of stealing concepts is a consistent method of tampering with Marxism into revisionism.

After this tampering, the Marxist line was replaced by the revisionist line. To implement the Marxist line, we must pursue communism, and to pursue communism, we must pursue socialism, and we must inevitably engage in class struggle and the dictatorship of the proletariat, because only through class struggle and the dictatorship of the proletariat can we overthrow capitalism and replace capitalism with communism. To implement the revisionist line and to build the so-called "moderately prosperous society", of course, we must not engage in the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, but must abolish the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, and especially abolish the continuation of class struggle under the dictatorship of the proletariat. The reason is very simple and clear. Building a "moderately prosperous society" does not include the Marxist theory of class struggle. From this perspective, it is very normal and completely understandable that the "July 1st Speech" does not include Marxist principles such as class struggle, class struggle as the key link, and proletarian dictatorship. This fact once again proves that the General Secretary still wants to follow Deng Xiaoping and unswervingly implement Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line, and is very "confident", "confident" to the point of surpassing Deng Xiaoping, being more revisionist and more bourgeois. To use a fashionable term, it is simply Deng Xiaoping 2.0.

It is from such a revisionist point of view that the history of the revolution and class struggle of the Communist Party of China was completely distorted by the General Secretary's "July 1st Speech". The "July 1st Speech" describes our history of being bullied for nearly a hundred years: "The Chinese nation is a great nation in the world, with a long history of civilization of more than 5,000 years, and has made indelible contributions to the progress of human civilization. After the Opium War in 1840, China gradually became a semi-colonial and semi-feudal society. The country was humiliated, the people suffered, and the civilization was covered in dust. The Chinese nation suffered an unprecedented disaster. Since then, realizing the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation has become the greatest dream of the Chinese people and the Chinese nation.

"In order to save the nation from peril, the Chinese people rose up in resistance, and people of lofty ideals shouted out. The Taiping Rebellion, the Hundred Days' Reform, the Boxer Rebellion, and the Xinhai Revolution arose one after another. Various plans to save the nation were introduced one after

another, but all ended in failure. China urgently needs new ideas to lead the national salvation movement and new organizations to gather revolutionary forces. "

At first glance, this seems to be right. However, the class essence of this painful history of our country and our nation, which has been bullied for a hundred years, has been covered up and obliterated by the "July 1st Speech".

This is actually very clear, and it is also known and often talked about by the whole party and the people of the country. The essence of the disaster suffered by our country and our nation is the invasion of China and the Chinese people by foreign capitalism, foreign bourgeoisie, and monopoly bourgeoisie. This is a class struggle disguised in the form of national struggle. All the resistance struggles of the Chinese people since the Opium War were formally for national salvation, but in essence, they were all class struggles, and they were all struggles of the Chinese people to bravely resist the foreign bourgeoisie that invaded China. However, the "July 1st Speech" used such intolerable contemptuous tones as "one after another" and "all ended in failure" to describe the heroic and unyielding great struggle of the martyrs; the more serious problem is that these statements have obliterated the essence of China's history over the past century and obliterated the fact that, in the final analysis, this is a history of class struggle.

Next, the description of the significance of the birth of the Communist Party of China in the "July 1st Speech" is also a way of selling its own revisionist black goods by replacing the original with the original.

The "July 1st Speech" says: "The October Revolution brought Marxism-Leninism to China. In the great awakening of the Chinese people and the Chinese nation, and in the close combination of Marxism-Leninism and the Chinese workers' movement, the Communist Party of China came into being. The birth of the Communist Party of China is a great event that has profoundly changed the direction and process of the development of the Chinese nation in modern times, the future and destiny of the Chinese people and the Chinese nation, and the trend and pattern of world development.

"Since its birth, the Communist Party of China has established the pursuit of happiness for the Chinese people and rejuvenation for the Chinese nation as its original mission. Over the past 100 years, all the struggles, sacrifices and creations made by the Communist Party of China in uniting and leading the Chinese people can be summed up in one theme: realising the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation."

This description is completely the discourse system of "Xi Jinping Thought". In my previous article "What is the original intention, mission and theme of the Communist Party of China?", I have already criticised the "original intention, mission and theme" described by the General Secretary. I will not repeat what I said there. I just want to make a little criticism from the issue to be discussed in this article.

Here they are talking about the birth of the Communist Party of China, which "profoundly changed the direction and process of the development of the Chinese nation in modern times, the future and destiny of the Chinese people and the Chinese nation, and the trend and pattern of world development." This is typical vague bourgeois nonsense and typical revisionist nonsense that deceives people. What "direction and process"? What "future and destiny"? What "trend and pattern"? These are all coy excuses. The general secretary changed the subject and gave the answer: the birth of the Communist Party of China was to "realise the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation."

This is of course nonsense, the General Secretary's consistent nonsense, and it is nonsense written into "Xi Jinping Thought". In the article "What is the original intention, mission and theme of the

Communist Party of China?", I have criticised the absurdity of the statement "realising the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation", and I will not repeat it here. I just want to emphasise one more point. The most fundamental essence and the most fundamental soul of Marxism, Leninism, and the later born Maoism are to persist in the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, that is, to persist in the dictatorship of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie. During the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, there was a quotation from Chairman Mao that resounded throughout the country and was sung throughout the country, which was: " Marxism consists of thousands of truths, but they all boil down to one sentence: It is right to rebel. According to this principle, therefore, we resist, we struggle, and we do socialism." Chairman Mao spoke the truth of Marxism from beginning to end. The revolutionary history of the Communist Party of China has verified this truth. From the first day of its founding, the Communist Party of China, under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism (and later Maoism), led the working class, the peasant class and the broad masses of the people across the country to rise up against the oppression and exploitation of the three mountains of feudalism, imperialism and bureaucratic capitalism, and launched a vigorous and magnificent class struggle, and even developed it to the highest form of class struggle, armed class struggle. It was through such cruel and long-term class struggle that the people's democratic dictatorship and the dictatorship of the proletariat were finally realised, and the great victory of the socialist revolution was won.

The General Secretary's father and mother were both glorious revolutionary fighters and outstanding members of the Communist Party of China who participated in this great struggle. What a pity! How come the General Secretary has forgotten all of this and distorted it all? He even refused to talk about class struggle, "class struggle as the key link", the dictatorship of the proletariat, or the socialist revolution. He also tampered with the goal, original intention, mission, and theme of the Chinese Communist Party into building a "well-off society" in China and realizing the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation in China. Excuse me, what do these words have in common with Marxism-Leninism-Maoism? What do they have in common with the party constitution, program, and oath of joining the party of the Communist Party of China? It's all nonsense. With such nonsense, he insisted on wearing the crown of "Xi Jinping Thought". Is this beautifying himself or vilifying himself? Ambition makes people stupid, and stupidity has no bottom line.

In the eyes of us true Chinese Communists, in the 100 years since the founding of the Communist Party of China, the Chinese Communists have carried out two great revolutionary struggles under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, and the history of the Communist Party of China should be divided into two periods.

The first was that the Chinese Communists, under the leadership of Chairman Mao, carried out the great new democratic revolution and the great socialist revolution. Not only did they seize power and establish the People's Republic of China, but they also continuously transformed from the new democratic revolution to the socialist revolution, and insisted on continuing the socialist revolution and the struggle against revisionism at home and abroad.

The second was that after Chairman Mao's death, revisionism came to power, the Chinese Communist Party degenerated, and capitalism was restored. However, the true Chinese Communists did not succumb or fall, but under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, especially Maoism they began to carry out a great and arduous struggle under new and special historical conditions, resolutely opposing the revisionism of the Chinese Communist Party and the degeneration of the Chinese Communist Party, which was under the banner of socialism but actually restoring capitalism.

Today, it is and can only be the genuine Chinese Communists and all the Chinese people who persist in and hold high the red flag of Chairman Mao's thought who are qualified to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the founding of the great Communist Party of China.

It is very clear that the two great revolutionary struggles that the Chinese Communists engaged in during these two historical stages were both class struggles. First, it was the class struggle against China's feudal landlord class, against the monopoly bourgeoisie of the imperialist countries that invaded China, and against China's bureaucratic comprador bourgeoisie; then it was the class struggle against the bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie represented by the capitalist-roaders, that is, the representatives of the bourgeoisie who had infiltrated the Party, that is, the representatives of revisionism, the new private monopoly bourgeoisie, and the foreign monopoly bourgeoisie.

It is also very clear that under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, and first of all Mao Zedong Thought, and under the personal leadership of Chairman Mao or under the banner of Chairman Mao, all the struggles of the Chinese Communists over the past 100 years can be said to be revolutionary struggles launched with "class struggle as the key link", and are class struggles launched to eliminate the bourgeoisie and all exploiting classes and realise the great ideal of communism. This includes the struggle against the bourgeoisie and revisionism within the Party that runs through the Party's history.

It can be said very clearly that the history of the Communist Party of China over the past 100 years is a history of class struggle. It is just that the situation, content, essence and form of class struggle are different in different historical periods. This is the essence of the continuous struggle of the real Chinese Communists over the past 100 years.

The "July 1st Speech", standing on the revisionist and bourgeois standpoint, of course cannot correctly explain the development and changes of the actual process of the 100-year history of the Communist Party of China and the development and changes of the nature of the struggle. It can only be a crude tampering and distortion of the 100-year party history.

What we should pay attention to and study here is why the struggle between the Marxist revolutionary line and the revisionist counter-revolutionary line is always concentrated on the most fundamental, most crucial, most concentrated and most acute question of whether to uphold class struggle or to obliterate class struggle, and whether to uphold the dictatorship of the proletariat or to obliterate the dictatorship of the proletariat.

This is very clear from the history of the international communist movement. This was the case with the struggle between Marx and Engels and revisionism, the struggle between Lenin and Stalin and revisionism, and even more so with the struggle between Chairman Mao and revisionism.

Why do Communists engage in revisionism? Why do Communists become representatives of the bourgeoisie? And they are all big figures, not just one or two, but a group, a group, a stratum, or even a class. Moreover, this struggle is not temporary or short-lived, but long-term and runs through the entire historical process of the communist movement. This was true before we gained power, and it was also true after we gained power, and even more so.

This is a cruel fact that has happened and has happened repeatedly before us Communists. This cruelty is not that a particular Communist paid the price of his life, but that the cause of communism for which all Communists shed blood and sacrificed their lives has suffered a tragic failure as a whole. As people often say, a fortress is most easily breached from within. The revisionist traitors did what the bourgeois enemies wanted to do but did not do. This is an extremely serious issue that history has raised for the Communists, and the Communists must answer: Why is this happening?

In fact, this issue has already attracted the attention of communists around the world, especially the Chinese Communists led by Chairman Mao, since the CPSU became revisionist and the Soviet Union changed its colour. And the Chinese people, after experiencing the repeated tempering of the Cultural Revolution, especially after experiencing the cruel reality of Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line coming to power and the restoration of capitalism in China, almost all true Chinese Communists and true loyal fighters of Chairman Mao are thinking hard about this issue.

Firstly, the heads of opportunism and revisionism, the representatives of the bourgeoisie, and the capitalists, all have a bourgeois view of the world. Viewing the world from a bourgeois worldview, it is of course impossible to understand correctly the historical role played by class and class struggle in the history of human civilisation; on the contrary, they inevitably dislike class struggle, deny it and even hate it. This is mainly a question of worldview determined by class position.

Second, the opportunist and revisionist leaders, the representatives of the bourgeoisie, and the capitalist-roaders all have a common problem as Chairman Mao said, that is, they are "big party bosses who don't read books or newspapers" and "don't understand Marxism-Leninism."

This is of course a historical necessity that is consistent with the bourgeois worldview. A person who adheres to the bourgeois worldview and whose head is full of bourgeois ideas cannot understand Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

Although it is generally believed that the bourgeoisie can also recognise and acknowledge class struggle, people with a bourgeois worldview cannot recognise or even realise that they can carry the view of class struggle through to the end, especially recognise the role of the class struggle of the working people in promoting the progress of history, recognise that the working people must seize power, establish the dictatorship of the proletariat, and gradually realise that the working people manage the state machinery, control the state machinery, and truly become the masters of the country through continuing revolution. This problem is more prominent under the specific historical conditions of the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat (or its special form, the people's democratic dictatorship). The old bourgeois worldview and the special status of the new ruling clique in power make it even more impossible and more fearful for these people to recognise classes and class struggle. This is also the important reason why they stopped in the face of the continued socialist revolution and opposed the continued socialist revolution, as Chairman Mao revealed. Just as the landlords and capitalists will not recognise the existence of class oppression and class exploitation, and will not recognise that "rebellion is justified", the capitalist-roaders will certainly not recognise the existence of classes and class struggle under the conditions where they are in power, let alone recognise that "rebellion is justified" against them. The law here is exactly the same and is very easy to understand.

Since Deng Xiaoping came to power, all the party leaders have shown this basic characteristic. They have repeatedly said that "it is not clear what socialism is." This sentence may be true, but it is precisely this sentence that shows that they are simply unable to realise that there are still classes and class struggles in socialist society. As the ruling Communist Party, it must still adhere to "class struggle as the key link." Why? Because they do not understand what socialism is. Lenin has a very scientific definition of socialism, that is, "socialism is the elimination of classes." Lenin's scientific definition of socialism contains all the theoretical content of Marxism on socialism, and is also the theoretical basis of the revolutionary line of "class struggle as the key link". Since Deng Xiaoping and others did not understand what socialism is, they certainly did not understand that socialism is to eliminate classes, and of course they did not understand why socialism is to eliminate classes. This is determined by the class limitations of these bourgeois representatives and by their "ignorance of Marxism-Leninism". General Secretary Xi Jinping has not deviated from this law.

Third, the opportunist and revisionist leaders, representatives of the bourgeoisie, and capitalist-roaders have another common characteristic, which is to replace and oppose the theory of class struggle with the theory of "productive forces only".

Under the historical conditions of not seizing power, the revisionist leaders have already put forward a theory of "peaceful growth into socialism", which was denounced by Engels. The basic point of this fallacy is to advocate that with the high development of productivity, capitalist production relations can inevitably be peacefully transformed into socialist production relations, and capitalist society will inevitably "peacefully grow into socialist society".

This absurd theory has been proven wrong by history again and again, and it is not the focus of discussion here.

What we want to focus on here is that the contemporary revisionist leaders represented by Deng Xiaoping are consistent with their so-called ignorance of what socialism is. In their eyes, the historical task of socialism is to develop production.

"One centre, two basic points" (i.e., taking production and construction as the centre, adhering to reform and opening up, and adhering to the four basic principles) is the reflection of this idea in terms of the line. It is the same as Deng Xiaoping's "Three Directives as the Key Link"¹⁰ that was severely criticized by Chairman Mao. It can be said that it is a replica of the "Three Directives as the Guidelines" under new historical conditions.

History has proven that Chairman Mao's criticism was not wrong, but Deng Xiaoping was wrong. "One centre, two basic points" was nothing more than a return to past mistakes and continued adherence to them after they usurped the party and seized power.

Like "peaceful growth into socialism", this is a "productive forces theory" that is against the basic viewpoints of Marxist historical materialism.

Socialism must develop productivity, of course. Only by developing productivity can the historical premise for establishing socialist production relations be created. This is the basic principle of Marxism. However, the next is also the basic principle of Marxism, that is, under what kind of social production relations should social productivity be developed under socialist conditions. Deng Xiaoping's revisionist answer is very simple, "It doesn't matter whether the cat is black or white," "It doesn't matter whether it is Marxism or imperialism," and developing productivity "is the hard truth." This is the famous "cat theory."

As everyone knows, this theory is wrong. Under the conditions of socialist society, because there is a struggle between socialism and capitalism, and between the socialist road and the capitalist road, there are two possibilities for developing productivity: one is to develop productivity along the socialist road, and the other is to develop productivity along the capitalist road. "It doesn't matter whether the cat is black or white," "it doesn't matter whether it's socialist or capitalist," it's actually impossible to ignore it. It's either "socialist" or "capitalist," one of the two is necessary. As a result, everyone knows and has seen that the result of "not caring" is actually not taking the socialist road, but the capitalist

¹⁰ The "Three Directives" as the key link were Deng Xiaoping's distortion of Chairman Mao's instructions by putting his directives on promoting stability and unity and on pushing the national economy forward on a par with the directive on studying the theory of the proletarian dictatorship and combating and preventing revisionism, describing all three as "the key link for all work." Chairman Mao criticised Deng's "Three Directives", reaffirming class struggle as the key link – Trans.

road. Social productivity has had a certain, not ideal development. What's worse, a bureaucratic, autocratic, monopolistic capitalist society has developed.

This is the danger of Deng Xiaoping's 'cat theory' of 'productivity-only theory', which is essentially the danger of the revisionist line.

Now, however, we are very sorry to see that Deng Xiaoping's 'cat theory' and 'productivity-only theory' are actually the ideological and political line that runs through the 'July 1 Speech'.

An important manifestation of the adherence to this erroneous ideological and political line in the '1 July speech' is that it confines the goal of the Chinese Communists to 'solving the problem of absolute poverty'.

The revisionist chiefs always put a label on Chairman Mao, saying that he only grasps the class struggle but not production. Such a false accusation is not worth refuting. From the proposal of the general line of socialist construction to the formulation of the grand objectives of catching up with and surpassing the economic level of the developed countries of the world and realising the four modernisations, as well as the great achievements of socialist construction under Chairman Mao's leadership, it is sufficient to prove that Chairman Mao not only attaches importance to the development of socialist production, but is also adept at leading the development of socialist production in a correct manner. The rights and wrongs of this issue are clear to all, so there is no need to go into more arguments.

The differences that exist here centre on how exactly socialist production should be developed.

It is often said that socialism is the liberation of the productive forces. This proposition, however, is often misunderstood to mean that socialism is the development of production. These two propositions have completely different meanings and cannot be equated, let alone interchanged.

The fundamental meaning of the proposition that socialism is the emancipation of the productive forces is that socialism is the emancipation of the most active and fundamental element of the productive forces of society ---- labour producers.

There is a world of difference in the productivity created by workers as masters or as hired slaves. It is precisely because socialism is the liberation of social productive workers that we can say that socialism is the liberation of social productivity. It is this liberation that makes it possible for socialism to create much higher social productivity than capitalism. The superiority of socialism over capitalism is fully reflected here.

Socialism must solve the problem of absolute poverty, that is, it must develop social productivity and social economy. This is certain. However, in order to achieve this goal, socialism must persist in socialism, so as to fully mobilise the production enthusiasm of workers through socialism, that is, to fully liberate the social productivity with workers as the main body, so that social production can develop at a high speed and high quality, and achieve the goal of solving absolute poverty. This is what we often say, the significance of persisting in the socialist road.

The "July 1st Speech" violates this principle, adding the pursuit of a "moderately prosperous society" but abandoning the basic principle that Communists must adhere to, which is to follow the socialist road. It seems that Communists only want to solve the problem of developing production and the economy, and only want to solve the problem of no longer having absolute poverty. This is a betrayal of the principles and purposes that Communists must adhere to. If it is just about solving the problem of absolute poverty, the bourgeoisie can also say so and even do so. Some developed capitalist countries, especially the Nordic capitalist countries, have done well in this regard. However, this is not

the Marxist scientific socialism that real communists want to achieve. Whether in terms of theory or practice, the Marxist scientific socialist social form is far superior to the Nordic capitalist social form.

The basic truths about the development of the socialist economy have been repeated from Lenin to Chairman Mao. When politics is compared with the economy, politics cannot fail to take precedence. Politics is the commander-in-chief and the soul. The reasoning of our mentors tells us that it is not true that we should not develop the economy; of course we should develop the economy, and it can be said that socialism pays more attention to the development of the economy.

From Lenin, through Stalin, to Chairman Mao, they led the socialist economy to develop at a fairly fast pace and at a fairly high quality. The facts are there, and no matter how much they are smeared, they cannot be erased.

Of course, because of inexperience, there were setbacks and mistakes made in the course of development, which we not only do not deny, but have always attached sufficient importance to and seriously summarised. However, compared with the great successes achieved, this is, after all, secondary and, more importantly, can be avoided in the future.

This truth and fact tell us that the "July 1st Speech" only talks about solving the problem of absolute poverty, but does not talk about under what political conditions and what production methods to solve the problem of absolute poverty, and does not talk about the struggle of direction and path in the process of developing production. In a word, there will be class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. This completely violates the basic principles and principles of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, and is a typical revisionist theory and principle that castrates the soul of Marxism.

There is a revisionist tail, but it is always unwilling to tuck its tail between its legs and behave itself. It only wants to cover up and deceive, and when it encounters practical problems, it will always show it at all times, in all matters, and everywhere. This low-level and clumsy performance is really ridiculous and pathetic!

Fourth, the opportunist and revisionist leaders, representatives of the bourgeoisie, and capitalist-roaders have another common and basic problem, which is the problem of class standpoint.

The emergence and existence of opportunism and revisionism is not an individual phenomenon, but a class phenomenon. In the absence of seizing power, the class basis of this trend of thought and this line in the workers' party is the "labor aristocracy." In the case of seizing power, the class basis of this trend of thought and this line in the Communist Party is the privileged class. Regarding the former situation, the revolutionary mentor Lenin talked more; regarding the latter situation, the revolutionary mentor Chairman Mao talked more. What they said is the truth that conforms to the actual situation.

As for the revisionist leaders and capitalist-roaders, there is another issue that can profoundly reflect their class standpoint and must be given full attention.

Everyone knows that the line determines everything. What does it determine? It determines whether to take the socialist road or the capitalist road, and thus it is also a question of whether it is beneficial to the fate of the proletariat and the broad masses of working people or to the fate of the bourgeoisie. It can be seen that the line is always a class line, and the class nature of the line is very clear. What kind of line is formulated and implemented is always related to and unified with which class is beneficial.

From this perspective, it is easy to understand that the struggle over lines is actually a class struggle, and it will ultimately show which class is in favour.

If we connect this with some historical facts, it may be easier to understand this principle.

At the beginning of the founding of the People's Republic of China, Chairman Mao did not agree with the idea of "consolidating the new democratic order". In view of the situation in the countryside, although the problem of private ownership of land by landlords was solved through the reform of the land system, Chairman Mao immediately thought of a new problem, that is, under the situation of private ownership of land by individual farmers, polarisation would occur, on the one hand, a new rich peasant exploiting class would be generated, and on the other hand, an exploited poor peasant class would be generated. It was precisely because Chairman Mao thought of and saw the danger of this tendency that was already happening, and looked at the problem from the standpoint of the vast majority of working peasants, he strongly advocated that the peasants should take the road of collectivisation, and formulated corresponding lines, principles, and policies for the Party. It is clear that Chairman Mao's firm proletarian stand determined the emergence of the proletarian socialist revolutionary line on the rural issue.

By 1962, mainly due to the mistakes we made and natural disasters, the rural situation was very difficult. Under such circumstances, there was a serious trend of thought from top to bottom in the party, demanding that the land be divided and people work independently for a while. Chen Yun was such a representative. He talked to Chairman Mao for several hours, explaining why the land should be divided and people work independently. Chairman Mao later talked about this period of history, saying that there was great pressure to implement the land division and people work independently at that time. He said that fortunately a few of us resisted. In fact, it was Chairman Mao who resisted alone. Chairman Mao raised the issue very sharply. First, he said that for thousands of years, small-scale peasant production had always been practiced, and this mode of production was always in turmoil, repeatedly bringing endless disasters to Chinese farmers and wars to Chinese society. Second, he said that once the land was divided and people worked alone, there would be an immediate bipolar class differentiation, and all kinds of bad things would come out. It is very clear that the reason why Chairman Mao looked at the issue this way and did not agree with the land division and working alone was mainly a question of class standpoint. Chairman Mao placed the basis for measuring the importance and right and wrong of an issue on the fundamental issue of whether it was beneficial or detrimental to the working people. Therefore, Chairman Mao insisted on the line, principle, and policy of public ownership of "three-level ownership, with the team as the basis" in rural areas, which soon brought about an improvement in the rural situation. Chen Yun had no choice but to find Chairman Mao to review himself.¹¹ Later, there was a reversal because historical conditions had changed.

Subsequently, at the 10th Plenary Session of the 8th Central Committee, Chairman Mao reintroduced the issue of class and class struggle, and carried out a socialist education campaign in the countryside, referred to as the 'Four Clean-ups Campaign', and then, immediately after that, he broke his cauldron and burnt his ship¹² by personally launching and leading the Cultural Revolution, which, through the practice of these revolutions, ultimately led to the founding of the theory of continued socialist revolution.

Even some people who opposed Chairman Mao and the Cultural Revolution and held revisionist views but still had some respect for facts could not help but acknowledge Chairman Mao's motive, the so-called "hard exploration."

¹¹ The author uses the term "review" which was synonymous with "self-criticism" – Trans.

¹² In Chinese, this is a four-character idiom which is a metaphor for leaving no way out and doing things decisively. It was first recorded in the Western Han Dynasty's "Xiang Yu Benji" which recounts the great peasant uprising at the end of the Qin Dynasty and the dispute between the states of Chu and Han.

This was not Chairman Mao's kind personal motive, but a reflection of Chairman Mao's firm proletarian class stand. Chairman Mao never had an individual in mind, but always had the people, the country, and the cause of communism in mind.

It was this proletarian standpoint that determined that Chairman Mao's line was always the proletarian socialist revolution line.

In contrast to Chairman Mao, when the revisionist leaders represented by Deng Xiaoping formulated their lines, principles, and policies, did they ever consider the interests of the people? Did they ever consider what consequences these lines, principles, and policies would bring to the working people? No matter how nice their words may be, the evil consequences brought to China by the restoration of capitalism and the suffering brought to the Chinese working people are ironclad facts, and only a very small number of bureaucratic monopoly bourgeoisie and private monopoly bourgeoisie have benefited.

This fact tells us that the revisionist leaders' pursuit of the revisionist line and capitalist restoration is not a temporary misstep, but a full expression of their class standpoint.

It is precisely based on this understanding that the "July 1st Speech" denies class struggle as the key link and insists on Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line, which are inevitable manifestations of General Secretary Xi Jinping's bourgeois class standpoint.

The "July 1st Speech" only proves once again that the problem of the revisionist leaders is, after all, a class problem, and the struggle with them can only be a life-and-death class struggle. There is no room for reconciliation in such a class struggle. In the face of such a class struggle, we must not be deceived by their Communist Party members' cloaks, nor be deceived by their flowery words. We must remember that revisionists and the bourgeoisie are synonymous.

Class struggle is an objective existence. The essence of all supra-class statements is to cover up the class struggle that actually exists. As long as we face the reality, we can clearly see that the bourgeoisie is carrying out class struggle every day and implementing bourgeois dictatorship every day, and it is a fascist bourgeois dictatorship. The reason why the bourgeoisie opposes the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist theory of class struggle is that it is only against the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie. On the contrary, this is precisely to maintain the class struggle of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat and to maintain the class dictatorship of the bourgeoisie over the proletariat. As Chairman Mao said, for thousands of years, people have always said that oppression is justified, exploitation is justified, and rebellion is unjustified. Since the emergence of Marxism, this old case has been turned over, and it is said that the working people's rebellion is justified. Now, under the conditions of capitalist restoration, this old case has been turned over again, and rebellion is unjustified. The class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie is rebellion. In the eyes of the revisionist rulers and the bourgeois rulers, this kind of rebellion is of course unreasonable and not allowed. Therefore, we must oppose the Marxist theory of class struggle, and we must oppose "class struggle as the key link". The fundamental reason and fundamental class stand for the General Secretary's "July 1st Speech" to abandon "class struggle as the key link" is here. Look at the fascist bourgeois dictatorship implemented by the General Secretary. Under his rule, it has reached the most severe level in the past forty years. Even speaking on the Internet is within the scope of his dictatorship.

This is exactly class struggle, but it is the class struggle of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat; this is also class struggle as the key link, but it is the class struggle of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat as the key link. One is positive and the other is negative, the class standpoints are different, the goals are different, but the principle is the same, both are class struggle.

This is the significance of the negative teaching material of the "July 1st Speech". It has once again deepened our understanding of why the revisionist rulers oppose class struggle and oppose class struggle as the key link, and has given us a further and deeper understanding.

From this we can see more clearly that we must support everything that the enemy opposes, and we must raise the banner of class struggle as the key link, correctly understand and treat the class struggle against the restoration of capitalism that we face, discard illusions, fight resolutely, and unswervingly follow the path of launching a socialist revolution, smash the state apparatus of the fascist bourgeois dictatorship, and rebuild the socialist people's democratic republic.

This is our righteous path in the world. We firmly believe that as long as we raise the hammer of class struggle, we can create a red new socialist world!

This is the great final struggle, and the day when the proletariat of the world unites to achieve the great victory of socialism and communism in the world is not far away!

July 23, 2021, in the hometown of Marx

A most timely, reliable and explanatory confession

Comments on the Resolution of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 19th CPC Central Committee

The 6th Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee, which has attracted the attention of the whole party and the people of the whole country, has been held, and the "Resolution" has also been released.

Chairman Mao has repeatedly taught us that a person and a political party not only need revolutionary mentors like Marx, Lenin, and Mao to give positive education; but also need bourgeois representatives and revisionist leaders like Bernstein, Kautsky, Khrushchev, and Deng Xiaoping to give negative education.

This time, our dear General Secretary has played the role of such a negative teacher again. The "Resolution" is such a negative teaching material.

The General Secretary, as the repeatedly emphasised core of the Party Central Committee and the core of the whole Party, is naturally the planner, leader and main author of the 36,000-word Resolution. The imperial pen, including Wang Huning,¹³ the Politburo Standing Committee member in charge of ideology, is just a tool to follow orders. Li Zhanshu, Chairman of the National People's Congress, has long said that the General Secretary should be "fixed in one person".¹⁴ Therefore, we must first understand and remember that this "Resolution" is actually the General Secretary's "Resolution", which can be referred to as "Xi Jinping's "Resolution"". It is from this perspective that I regard the "Resolution" as the most timely, reliable and illustrative confession of the General Secretary.

It is timely because there are still many comrades who cannot see the true face of the General Secretary. This time, the General Secretary's confession is a naked display of himself. Some of our comrades should finally wake up. It is reliable because it is the General Secretary's own confession, which does not contain any water, let alone imposed on him by others. It can be said to be ironclad evidence. It is the most illustrative because the General Secretary's confession tells the whole party and the people of the whole country exactly what the General Secretary's thoughts, theories, world outlook and the lines, principles and policies he promotes are. It clearly explains what kind of goods "Xi Jinping Thought" is, and thus clarifies the nature of the class struggle that we true Chinese

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 “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.

Communists are currently facing, the objects of the class struggle, and the correct proletarian class struggle line that we should implement.

We must study the "Resolution" carefully. Studying the "Resolution" carefully is equivalent to studying the General Secretary carefully, and we can draw scientific conclusions about what kind of person the General Secretary is, what he can do, what he is doing, and what he will do.

I will try to make some suggestions here.

- 1.

Some kindhearted people always have high hopes for the General Secretary because he always speaks pleasant words. After reading the "Resolution" this time, I cannot understand or accept it. I feel the contrast is too great and I am very disappointed. Some comrades made videos and repeatedly said that the "Resolution" made people feel "your own people are sad and the enemies are happy". There should be no hope, and there will be no disappointment. There should be no misalignment between loved ones and enemies, and there will be no feeling of "your own people are sad and the enemies are happy".¹⁵

A fact that should never be blurred again is that the General Secretary resolutely followed Deng Xiaoping and resolutely opposed Chairman Mao.

This is not a question of any individual, but a question of line, a question of class, that is, a question of class standpoint. Who is Deng Xiaoping? Deng Xiaoping is a representative of the bourgeoisie, a revisionist leader, and the chief culprit in the restoration of capitalism in China. The history of China in the past 40 years is ironclad evidence of this conclusion. Who are the leaders who followed Deng Xiaoping? Similarly, they can only be representatives of the bourgeoisie and revisionist leaders. The practice of the general secretary in the past two terms in power is ironclad evidence of this conclusion. The "Resolution" is just the latest ironclad evidence of this conclusion. Moreover, if he refuses to hand over the post in disregard of "political rules", this will continue to prove this point.

Don't say such stupid things as "the second Mao Zedong" anymore. If you say "the second Deng Xiaoping", maybe it's almost the same. I say "almost the same" because the General Secretary went further and did it more thoroughly than Deng Xiaoping, and therefore it's worse. The "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee, in a nutshell, is a "Resolution" that opposes Chairman Mao and Chairman Mao's line.

The "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee adheres to the position and viewpoints of the "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 11th Central Committee that negated and opposed Chairman Mao, and in the so-called "clarification" and "correction", it has become more revisionist, more bourgeois, and therefore more backward.

If we say that forty years ago, the old comrades were angry because they had been impacted by the Cultural Revolution, this was "understandable" as Chairman Mao said; however, they did not see the problems in their own world outlook, did not see that they had not figured out how to adhere to a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist line of continuing the socialist revolution under the conditions of socialist legalism, and instead thought that Chairman Mao was wrong and that Chairman Mao's theory of continuing revolution under socialist conditions was wrong. As a result, they followed Deng Xiaoping and supported the erroneous and reactionary "Resolution" made at the Sixth Plenary Session of the

¹⁵ In Chinese, a six-character expression that refers to a certain action that is only beneficial to the enemy and not to oneself Trans.

Eleventh Central Committee. This was completely understandable at the time; but it was wrong, and a mistake upon a mistake, and they completely failed to live up to Chairman Mao's kind help and earnest teachings during his lifetime.

Facts speak louder than words. Forty years later, under the rule of Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line, Chairman Mao's prediction has come true: China has experienced a capitalist restoration and has transformed into a worst-case capitalist society under a fascist bourgeois dictatorship.

There is no conscious and true Communist who does not acknowledge this ironclad fact. Even Comrade Wang Guangmei,¹⁶ who once had great dissatisfaction with Chairman Mao, later answered the interviewer's question on a TV program after serious reflection, and clearly said: Judging from the current situation of Chinese society, Chairman Mao is right. This is actually the common view of many old comrades who have changed their positions and ideological understandings. Many old comrades, such as Li Erzong,¹⁷ Ma Bin¹⁸, Wei Wei,¹⁹ etc., have resolutely thrown themselves into the struggle against revisionism.

¹⁶ Wife of Liu Shaoqi – Trans.

¹⁷ Li Erzong (January 21, 1914 - December 26, 2009) was born in a peasant family in Fengrun County, Hebei Province. In the autumn of 1929, he joined the Communist Youth League. He took part in the student movement and eventually entered the Party's leadership on Hebei Province. During the early stages of the Cultural Revolution he was imprisoned, and released on May 1, 1971. His son Li Weimin (literally "for the people"), said of his father: "My father had firm beliefs all his life, was loyal to Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought all his life, and sought happiness for the toiling people all his life. Whether he was in prison, facing the smoke of gunfire, or being in a high position, father's faith has never changed. Therefore, in his later years, my father was extremely disgusted by the corruption that existed in the party. July 2005 was the most painful day for my father, when his daughter had just passed away. At such a time, on July 23, 2005, my father made a special statement to General Secretary Hu Jintao and the Party Central Committee on the elimination of corruption in the party. In the letter, my father exclaimed: "The law cannot stand on its own, the class cannot act alone, those who gain it will survive, and those who lose it will forget." "The party does not dare to operate on itself, and does not dare to bear the pain of cutting the skin of cancer, so it can only suffer the pain of extinction." "If the Communist Party adheres to socialism, the world will be right" - Trans.

¹⁸ Ma Bin (1913-March 27, 2017), joined the Communist Party of China in 1932. He was arrested as a 17-year old for boycotting Japanese goods and reading progressive books. He joined the New Fourth Army After the founding of the People's Republic of China, he successively served as the general manager and chief engineer of Anshan Iron and Steel Company. Vice Minister of the Ministry of Metallurgical Industry, Deputy Director General of the State Import and Export Commission, Deputy Director-General of the Economic Research Centre of the State Council, etc. In 1968 he was subjected to criticism and not released from jail until 1975 when he resumed work in the steel industry. According to Ren Zhongjie, Ma Lao ("Lao" is an honorific showing great respect) was treated unfairly during the Cultural Revolution and even lost his personal freedom for a long time, but he kept in mind Chairman Mao's teaching that "believe in the masses and believe in the party", and did not hate the Cultural Revolution because of his own grievances like some people, especially when he saw the social chaos brought about by the complete negation of the Cultural Revolution, such as privatisation, everything looking at money, and the proliferation of private ownership, which made him realise the correctness of the general direction of the Cultural Revolution. After the Cultural Revolution, he returned to work and actively devoted himself to the exploration of reform and opening up, but when he found that reform and opening up had been led by some people to the evil path of revisionism, he stepped forward again and fought tenaciously against these evil forces. He took a clear-cut stand against neoliberal economic theory, against the evil tide of privatisation, against historical nihilism, against bourgeois universal value theory, against revisionism, and against capitalist roaders. He became the standard-bearer and model for continuing the revolution in the new period, and became a model for communists who did not forget their original aspirations – Trans.

¹⁹ Wei Wei (March 6, 1920 - August 24, 2008) After the outbreak of the Anti-Japanese War, Wei Wei went to Yan'an to study at the Anti-Japanese Military and Political University. He joined the Eighth Route Army and fought the Japanese invaders. In 1950, he went to North Korea for the first time to investigate the situation of American prisoners of war, and then stayed in the field to report on the troops. Ma Zedong highly evaluated a

However, it is regrettable and infuriating that today, 40 years later, when the tragedy of "the party becoming revisionist and the country changing colour" has occurred in China and China has once again fallen into the suffering brought about by the restoration of capitalism, the General Secretary's "Resolution" actually copied the erroneous and reactionary "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee, and still put one so-called "mistake" hat after another on our beloved Chairman Mao, denying Chairman Mao, opposing Chairman Mao, and overthrowing Chairman Mao. This is truly "how poisonous!"

This is a blatant challenge to the true Chinese Communists and the Chinese working people! This is something that the true Chinese Communists and the Chinese working people will never tolerate or agree to!

Chairman Mao is a great leader that we Chinese Communists and the Chinese people will always love, respect, and follow for generations and generations. This is the firm will of the Chinese Communists and the Chinese people that cannot be shaken by any storm or force. We must still abide by the creed that was supported by the entire party and the people of the country during the Cultural Revolution: Whoever opposes Chairman Mao will be overthrown!

The reason why the majority of our party members and the majority of the people must support Chairman Mao, safeguard Chairman Mao, and not allow class enemies to slander Chairman Mao is not because of personal superstition or personality cult, but because Chairman Mao has always represented the broad masses of the working people, represented the correct line of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, and represented the correct path and direction of socialism. Chairman Mao is the revolutionary leader that our party and our working people need.

Chairman Mao and the people are connected by heart, by blood, and by flesh. Chairman Mao and the people have become one. Whoever denies or opposes Chairman Mao denies or opposes us, the working people, and is our class enemy. Isn't the bloody history of forty years, which has made us, the working people, suffer twice as much, sufficient to fully prove this point?

book he wrote on the Chinese People's Volunteers and ordered it be printed and distributed to the whole army. It remained a secondary school text book until 2007. He was subjected to criticism as an "advocate of the bourgeois theory of human nature" during the Cultural Revolution and struggled against 23 times. After the Cultural Revolution he resumed writing novels and established a literary journal insisting that "to continue the revolution, it is necessary to criticize revisionism". Later, Wei Wei successively wrote articles such as "Vigilance Against the Danger of the 'Four Modernizations'—— Speech at the Symposium on the 10th Anniversary of the Founding of Zhongliu", "Nuwa Mends the Sky", and "On the Threshold of the New Century," which attracted the attention of ideological and theoretical circles. He shouted "anti-revisionism, anti-revisionism, anti-revisionism". In July 2001, Wei Wei, Lin Mohan and others submitted a letter to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China (CPC) entitled "The 1 July Speech is an Extremely Serious Political Error" in the name of "a group of Communist Party members", opposing Jiang Zemin's 1 July speech and questioning, "Who does the general secretary of the Communist Party represent?" He accused the "1 July" speech of "violating the basic principles and regulations of the party constitution" and that "allowing private entrepreneurs to join the party is taking the lead in undermining the party's regulations." In a Political Testament posted to the internet just before his death in 2008, he said: "...capitalism has been basically restored.... Now the dictatorship of the proletariat no longer exists, so it is not a continuation of the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat, but a continuation of the revolution under the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The road is hard and winding... the object of the revolution is the capitalist roaders within the party and the revisionist traitor clique that has usurped the party and seized power..."

The two "resolutions" shot many poisonous arrows at Chairman Mao, among which the most concentrated and vicious attack on Chairman Mao was that Chairman Mao's theory of continuing revolution under socialist conditions was wrong.

Applying Chairman Mao's instruction to "support whatever the enemy opposes," the fact that the "resolution" prepared by the revisionist leaders focuses on attacking Chairman Mao's theory of continuing revolution under socialist conditions is in itself a counter-proof that Chairman Mao's theory of continuing revolution under socialist conditions is correct and hits the vital point of the bourgeois enemy. Chairman Mao also said that "being attacked by the enemy is a good thing, not a bad thing". "I hold that it is bad as far as we are concerned if a person, a political party, an army or a school is not attacked by the enemy, for in that case it would definitely mean that we have sunk to the level of the enemy. It is good if we are attacked by the enemy, since it proves that we have drawn a clear line of demarcation between the enemy and ourselves. It is still better if the enemy attacks us wildly and paints us as utterly black and without a single virtue; it demonstrates that we have not only drawn a clear line of demarcation between the enemy and ourselves but achieved a great deal in our work." This is what we are facing now.

Chairman Mao made great contributions throughout his life. Chairman Mao himself attached great importance to the two major contributions of the theory and practice of the new democratic revolution and the theory and practice of the socialist continuing revolution.

Chairman Mao has repeatedly told his comrades who work with him that he mainly did these two things in his life: the new democratic revolution and the socialist continuing revolution. The theory and practice of these two revolutions are Chairman Mao's major contributions to the development of Marxism and are also the two main contents of Maoism. Around these two major contributions, Chairman Mao has many major theoretical and practical creations in various fields.

Regarding Chairman Mao's first great contribution, the "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee did not explicitly deny it, but "amended" it to include the so-called "Mao Zedong Thought is the crystallization of collective wisdom."

This is really an absurd "invention" that makes people laugh.

Engels's great contribution to the creation of Marxism is well known to everyone, but Engels repeatedly said that Marx could easily have done the small part of the work he created independently without him. Marx is a genius, and we are at most capable. While affirming Engels' great contribution, Lenin also said that, generally speaking, it is fair to name Marxism after Marx. Stalin was not only Lenin's close comrade-in-arms, assisting Lenin in leading the Bolshevik Party and the Russian proletariat to win the victory of the October Revolution, but also, after Lenin's death, correctly expounded and elaborated Leninism, faithfully inherited Lenin, defended Lenin, and led the Soviet Union's socialist cause from victory to victory. Although there were mistakes and detours in the middle, the achievements were major and huge. It was under Stalin's leadership that the Soviet Union became a socialist power that could compete with imperialism, leading and supporting the communist movement throughout the world. Comrade Stalin became the universally recognised revolutionary mentor of the proletariat of the world at that time. However, in the face of such achievements and honours, Stalin always modestly stated that he was only a student of Lenin, and always regarded upholding Leninism as his lifelong duty. He never said that Leninism was the "crystallisation of collective wisdom" of the leaders of the Bolshevik Party, let alone included himself in it. "Mao Zedong Thought is the crystallisation of collective wisdom" can be regarded as a unique "invention" in the

history of the communist movement, and it is a "characteristic" creation of Deng Xiaoping's revisionist group. Want to know the exact meaning of "shameless"? This is really a good example.

The second great contribution of Chairman Mao was that revisionists and capitalist-roaders like Deng Xiaoping were once the targets of struggle and revolution in the proletarian Cultural Revolution. Their class status, class attributes, and their status and experience at the time determined that they would inevitably have deep hatred for the Cultural Revolution and Chairman Mao, and would inevitably launch a crazy counterattack against Chairman Mao and the revolutionary masses who had rebelled against them.

We have all experienced this historical scene personally, so there is no need to discuss it here.

The great achievements of socialist construction during Chairman Mao's era, especially the general line of socialist construction formulated by Chairman Mao and the Great Leap Forward and the people's communes that followed, were also distorted and attacked by the Resolution. Chairman Mao repeatedly said that our "mistakes are inevitable". Mistakes always exist and are inevitable. The fundamental difference is not whether there are mistakes or not. The fundamental difference is whether achievements are the mainstream or mistakes are the mainstream. The great achievements of socialist construction left by the Mao Zedong era are there, especially some of Chairman Mao's original and brilliant ideas on socialist economic construction will always be our precious theoretical wealth. The people can see these clearly, and we are not willing to debate this issue here.

Here we will focus on the issue of Chairman Mao's theory of continuing socialist revolution, which has been slandered by the two resolutions. This is because it is the focus and crux of the struggle. Compared with the resolution of the 19th Central Committee, the resolution of the 6th Plenary Session of the 11th Central Committee used more specific and more words to distort and slander Chairman Mao's so-called "mistakes".

To pick out the main points, there are some statements:

"At the Tenth Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee in September 1962, Comrade Mao Zedong exaggerated and absolutised the class struggle that existed within a certain scope in socialist society, and developed the view that the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie was still the principal contradiction in our society, which he had put forward after the anti-rightist struggle in 1957. He further asserted that the bourgeoisie would exist and attempt to restore itself throughout the socialist historical stage and would become the root cause of revisionism in the Party."

"In early 1965, he erroneously proposed that the focus of the movement was to rectify the so-called "capitalist roaders in power within the Party."

"During this period, Comrade Mao Zedong's errors in the theory and practice of class struggle in socialist society became increasingly serious, his personal arbitrary style gradually undermined the party's democratic centralism, and the phenomenon of personality cult gradually developed."

"This 'Cultural Revolution' was initiated and led by Comrade Mao Zedong. His main argument was that a large number of representatives of the bourgeoisie and counter-revolutionary revisionists had infiltrated the Party, the government, the army and all walks of life in the cultural field, and that the leadership of a considerable majority of units was no longer in the hands of Marxists and the masses. The ruling clique in the Party taking the capitalist road had formed a bourgeois headquarters in the Central Committee, which had a revisionist political and organisational line and had agents in all provinces, municipalities, autonomous regions and central departments. All previous struggles could not solve the problem. Only by carrying out the Cultural Revolution and mobilizing the masses openly,

comprehensively and from bottom to top to expose the above-mentioned dark side could the power usurped by the capitalist-roaders be regained. This was essentially a great political revolution in which one class overthrew another, and it would be repeated many times in the future. These arguments mainly appeared in the May 16th Notice, which was the programmatic document of the Cultural Revolution, and in the political report of the Ninth National Congress of the Party, and were summarised as the so-called "theory of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat", thus giving the phrase "continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat" a specific meaning. These leftist erroneous arguments that Comrade Mao Zedong used to launch the Cultural Revolution clearly deviated from the path of Mao Zedong Thought, which is the combination of the universal principles of Marxism-Leninism and the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution. They must be completely distinguished from Mao Zedong Thought. "

"The history of the 'Cultural Revolution' proves that Comrade Mao Zedong's main arguments for launching the 'Cultural Revolution' were neither in line with Marxism-Leninism nor in line with China's reality. These arguments were completely wrong in their assessment of the class situation in China at that time and the political situation of the Party and the country."

"The 'Cultural Revolution' is said to be a struggle against the revisionist line or the capitalist road. This statement has no factual basis at all and confuses right and wrong on a series of major theoretical and policy issues."

"There is no so-called 'bourgeois headquarters' headed by Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping in the Party."

"In China, after the establishment of the state power of the people's democratic dictatorship, especially after the socialist transformation was basically completed and the exploiting class as a class was eliminated, although the tasks of the socialist revolution have not yet been finally completed, the content and methods of the revolution have been fundamentally different from those in the past. Of course, it is necessary to make a proper assessment of certain dark sides that do exist in the body of the Party and the state and to use correct measures that conform to the Constitution, laws and the Party Constitution to resolve them, but the theories and methods of the 'Cultural Revolution' should never be adopted. Under socialist conditions, a political revolution called "one class overthrowing another class" has neither an economic nor a political basis. It will inevitably fail to put forward any constructive program, but will only cause serious chaos, destruction and regression. History has proven that the "Cultural Revolution" was a serious internal turmoil that was wrongly launched by the leaders and exploited by the counter-revolutionary group to the party, the country and the people of all ethnic groups."

Comrades who are interested in research can naturally reread the "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee to more fully understand how this "Resolution" attacks Chairman Mao and his theory of continuing socialist revolution. However, based on the above points alone, it is already clear enough to fully and accurately see the fundamental differences between Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line and Chairman Mao's Marxist line in terms of the understanding, theory and practice of socialist society.

Now, the acute problem we are facing is that the General Secretary's Resolution of the 19th Central Committee's Sixth Plenary Session completely inherits the basic viewpoints of the Resolution of the 11th Central Committee's Sixth Plenary Session, which negates, opposes, and attacks Chairman Mao. The language used is almost a copy of the Resolution of the 11th Central Committee's Sixth Plenary Session.

Please see what the Resolution of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee says: "Comrade Mao Zedong's errors in the theory and practice of class struggle in socialist society became increasingly serious, and the Party Central Committee failed to correct these errors in a timely manner. Comrade Mao Zedong made a completely wrong assessment of the class situation in our country at that time and the political situation of the Party and the country, and launched and led the 'Cultural Revolution'. The two counter-revolutionary groups of Lin Biao and Jiang Qing took advantage of Comrade Mao Zedong's mistakes and carried out a large number of criminal activities that harmed the country and the people, causing a decade of civil strife, which caused the Party, the country, and the people to suffer the most serious setbacks and losses since the founding of New China. The lesson was extremely painful. In October 1976, the Political Bureau of the Central Committee implemented the will of the Party and the people, resolutely smashed the 'Gang of Four', and ended the disaster of the 'Cultural Revolution'."

Comrades, please take a look. Isn't this just a copy of the "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 11th Central Committee?

Don't think that this is just a mistake of "plagiarism". It is not. This is the inheritance of thought, theory, and line. In terms of its class basis, it is the inheritance of class. To put it more figuratively, Xi Jinping inherited Deng Xiaoping. To put it more fashionable, Xi Jinping is the 2.0 version of Deng Xiaoping.

The basis for the "confession" is here, its essence is here, and its value is here. Good people, don't believe in the deceptive compromising nonsense of "the two should not negate each other". Compromise is not compromise. Compromise is to cover up the tendency and essence with "compromise", so Chairman Mao said "compromise is revisionism."

Now, we have to debate with them, is Chairman Mao wrong, or are you revisionist leaders wrong? !

Their opinions boil down to two points. One is that Chairman Mao made a "completely wrong assessment of the class situation in our country at that time and the political situation of the party and the country"; the other is that Chairman Mao's "theory and practice of class struggle in socialist society" was wrong.

Let's discuss the first point first.

Social practice is the only criterion for testing whether it is truth. Let's look at social practice.

The Soviet Union and Eastern European socialist countries first "changed the party to revisionism and caused the country to change colour". In the late 1980s and early 1990s, the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe" occurred, and all of them were transformed into capitalist countries without a single one left.

If we say that in socialist society there are no classes, class struggles, and no danger of capitalist restoration, then what is the basis for the capitalist restoration that we have witnessed, which is mainly caused by internal rather than external interference? From Khrushchev to Gorbachev and Yeltsin, these leaders who are engaged in capitalist restoration in the guise of Communist Party members, are they capitalist roaders? Are they representatives of the bourgeoisie? Are they revisionist leaders? Is it the revisionist line they formulated and promoted that led to the "Party changes to revisionism and the change of colour of the country" in the Soviet Union and finally to the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe"?

This real, brutal and heartbreaking social practice of the Communists and the general revolutionary people has most reliably and accurately and fully tested in whose hands the truth lies.

As the saying goes, don't be a crow on a pig's butt²⁰, seeing only others but not ourselves. Our own affairs are worse and more evil than those of the Soviet Union. Everything is just as Chairman Mao predicted, if once revisionism comes to power, they are going to have a fascist bourgeois dictatorship, they are going to have the worst kind of capitalism. What is happening in China has completely verified Chairman Mao's foresight in no small measure.

In the Soviet Union, the 'dramatic changes' were synchronised with the great revolt against Lenin and Stalin; in China, the rise to power of revisionism and the restoration of capitalism were synchronised with the great revolt against Chairman Mao. The Resolution of the Sixth Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee is the heaviest shot at Chairman Mao. They also meant to bombard the headquarters! Afterwards, the discussion of the "standard of truth", the criticism of the "two whatevers",²¹ the "ideological enlightenment movement", etc., etc., were all aimed at implementing Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line and restoring capitalism, creating public opinion and paving the way. In their view, Chairman Mao was a god that was difficult to bypass and had to be overthrown on their road to restoring capitalism. Therefore, they concentrated their firepower and first had to overthrow Chairman Mao's authority and the authority of Maoism. Their wishful thinking was very clear: only by doing so could they implement Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line unimpeded and restore capitalism in China unimpeded.

That's how history goes.

They triumphed.

They succeeded in restoring capitalism in China. More than four decades have passed, and China has metamorphosed into a bureaucratic authoritarian monopoly capitalist society under the dictatorship of the fascist bourgeoisie with a strong feudal character, making good on Chairman Mao's words that it is a capitalist society of the worst kind.

In the face of this ironclad fact, can we say that there are no classes or class struggles in socialist society? Can we say that there are no capitalist-roaders, representatives of the bourgeoisie, or leaders of revisionism? Can we say that there is no bourgeois headquarters? From Deng Xiaoping to the General Secretary, aren't they typical figures of this kind? Whether it is the nine members of the Politburo Standing Committee or the seven members of the Politburo Standing Committee, aren't they all bourgeois headquarters?

The "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee distorted and denied a passage in the "May 16 Notice" that Chairman Mao personally added. Chairman Mao's original words were: "The representatives of the bourgeoisie who have infiltrated the Party, the government, the army and various cultural circles are a group of counter-revolutionary revisionists. Once the time is ripe, they will seize power and turn the dictatorship of the proletariat into the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie." However, although the writers of the "Resolution" were all famous scholars and writers

²⁰ This is a Chinese folk saying about a crow that flew onto the back of a black pig, seeing only the colour of the pig, but not its own. It's meaning is that it is not hard to know others, but it's hard to know yourself – Trans.

²¹ The "two whatevers" refers to the statement that "We will resolutely uphold whatever policy decisions Chairman Mao made, and unswervingly follow whatever instructions Chairman Mao gave" proposed by Hua Guofeng. This statement was contained in a joint editorial, entitled "Study the Documents Well and Grasp the Key Link", printed on 7 February 1977 in People's Daily, the journal Red Flag and the PLA Daily. By May 1978, Deng Xiaoping was openly attacking the "two whatevers" as "anti-Marxist" and by 1980 was in a position to have Hua Guofeng removed from the leadership. Hua's supporters Wang Dongxing, Ji Dengkui, Wu De, and Chen Xilian, were relieved of all their Party and state posts during the 5th Plenum of the 11th Central Committee of the CCP, 23–29 February 1980 – Trans.

in the Party, they openly tampered with Chairman Mao's words to read: "A large number of representatives of the bourgeoisie and counter-revolutionary revisionists have infiltrated the Party, the government, the army and various cultural circles." Do these two passages have the same meaning? When did Chairman Mao use the concept of "a large number of bourgeois representatives"? As we all know, the concept of "a small handful of capitalist-roaders" and bourgeois representatives was used repeatedly during the Cultural Revolution. Once they are corrupted, they will inevitably resort to any means. Of course, this is just a trick. The more important, fundamental and substantive question is: Isn't it the fact that we are seeing now that there are bourgeois representatives and counter-revolutionary revisionists who have infiltrated the party, the government, the army and various cultural circles?

Whether in the Soviet Union or Eastern Europe or in China, such a great change in class relations and political relations has occurred, from the dictatorship of the proletariat to the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. To say that there are no classes and class struggles is nothing but a lie made by revisionist traitors who have betrayed Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and communism without regard to facts.

History has eloquently proved that Chairman Mao's assessment of "the class situation in our country and the political situation of the party and the country" was completely correct, and truly realised the combination of Marxism with the reality of socialist society, adhered to and developed Marxism, and advanced Marxism to the stage of Maoism.

From the perspective of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and the standpoint of the working people, Chairman Mao's observation and assessment of socialist society were correct. What was really wrong was Deng Xiaoping's "Resolution" and the General Secretary's "Resolution".

Of course, the understanding and grasp of truth is class-based. The two "Resolutions" stood on the wrong class standpoint, raised the wrong banner of ideology, and came to such a wrong conclusion. It is completely understandable and normal to put such a big hat on Chairman Mao for reversing right and wrong. It is a manifestation of their class nature. When we debated with them, we never wanted to convince them, but only to expose them so that the broad masses of people can see them more clearly.

Let's discuss the second point, which is that Chairman Mao's "theory and practice of class struggle in socialist society" is wrong.

Before getting to the point, let me make two comments.

One point is that they want to criticise Chairman Mao in theory, which is like an ant trying to shake a tree. They do not know their own strength. To use a common saying, they do not know how high the sky is and how deep the earth is. Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao are all time-tested revolutionary mentors of the proletariat all over the world, and they are all masters of Marxist theory at a very high level. Engels was very modest in front of Marx, Stalin was very modest in front of Lenin, and Chairman Mao was very modest in front of Marx and Lenin. Chairman Mao repeatedly warned the whole party and the people of the whole country to read the books of Marx and Lenin seriously and to understand and master Marxism-Leninism until his death. And frankly speaking, not many people in our party really understand Marxism-Leninism. Perhaps it was hatred that brought courage, Deng Xiaoping and Chen Yun, with a few showmen, chanting the mantra 'Chairman Mao is a man, not a god', had the guts to criticise Chairman Mao, to overthrow Chairman Mao, to criticise Chairman Mao's theory of continued socialist revolution, and to overthrow Chairman Mao's theory of continued socialist revolution, but it was doomed to be a farce, a scandal!

Another point is that on the surface it looks as if they are coming for Chairman Mao alone, but in reality, they are coming for Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, because the theory of continued socialist revolution is not the sole creation of Chairman Mao alone, but the consistent theoretical thinking of the Marxist revolutionary mentors.

In his 1850 book, *The Class Struggle in France from 1848 to 1850*, Marx famously left this quote, 'This socialism is the proclamation of constant revolution, the class dictatorship of the proletariat, which is the inevitable transitional stage for the attainment of the elimination of all class distinctions, of all the relations of production from which these distinctions derive, to the elimination of all the social relations which correspond to these relations, and to the inevitable transitional stage of changing all the ideas which arise from these social relations.'

In the *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, written in 1875, it is also clearly written that 'between capitalist society and communist society there is a period of revolutionary transition from the former to the latter. Accompanying this period there is also a period of political transition, a period in which the state can only be the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.' And criticising the Gotha Programme, "'The elimination of all social and political inequalities', this unclear statement should be replaced by the following: 'with the elimination of class distinctions, all social and political inequalities arising from these distinctions disappear of their own accord.'"

It can be seen that, as anyone with more or less general knowledge of Marxist theory knows, the theory of continued socialist revolution, that is, the theory of continuing socialist revolution, is an important theoretical principle that has been included in Marxism from the day of its creation.

Through his leadership of the October Revolution and the creation of the Soviet Socialist Republic, Lenin not only completely and accurately inherited the Marxist theory of continuing socialist revolution, but also greatly developed the Marxist theory of continuing socialist revolution, advancing Marxism to a new stage of Leninism. Many years ago, I wrote an article proposing that Leninism is composed of two contributions. One is the theory, line, and strategy of the proletarian revolution, which Stalin explained clearly in his works such as the *Foundations of Leninism*; the other one was not mentioned by Stalin, but was mentioned by Chairman Mao, which is the theory, line, and strategy of continuing socialist revolution.

Leninism's theory on the continued socialist revolution is very rich. Lenin said that "socialism is the abolition of classes"; he also said that socialism is the historical period of contradiction and struggle between growing communism and declining capitalism; he also said that the dictatorship of the proletariat is the continuation of class struggle under the conditions of the proletariat ruling. Regarding the construction of the political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the socialist economic construction, especially the proposal of the "New Economic Policy", etc., Lenin has left us many brilliant and wonderful theoretical thoughts and corresponding famous sayings on the continued socialist revolution, which are the precious wealth of Leninism's theory on the continued socialist revolution.

In the past, when we were promoting Chairman Mao's theory of continuing socialist revolution, we did not pay enough attention to the relationship between Maoism and Marxism and Leninism on this issue, and we did not study it enough. We thought that the idea of continuing socialist revolution started with Chairman Mao. This is a misunderstanding. The fact is that Chairman Mao first inherited and then developed it, a great development. In his later years, Chairman Mao repeatedly taught us to read Marxism-Leninism and to understand why Lenin said that we should exercise dictatorship over the bourgeoisie. This issue must be clarified. If we do not clarify it, revisionism will emerge. Chairman

Mao's teachings clearly show that the great development of Maoism in the theory of continuing socialist revolution has its source and inheritance, that is, it inherits the precious theoretical legacy left by Marxism and Leninism on this issue.

This shows that we still have limitations and deficiencies in our understanding of this theoretical issue, and we need to study further.

However, the "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 11th Central Committee and the "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee are not such an issue of understanding.

They want to attack Chairman Mao and his theory of continuing socialist revolution. However, they do not know that by doing so, they are actually also attacking Marx and Lenin. As long as they deny the theory of continuing socialist revolution, they will not only deny Maoism, but will inevitably deny Marxism and Leninism. This fact exposes their revisionist nature of opposing Marxism, Leninism and Maoism. This fact also fully proves that revisionism is not "revision" of Marxism, but opposition to Marxism and betrayal of Marxism. From Deng Xiaoping to the General Secretary, no one has violated this law.

Because both resolutions are directed at Chairman Mao, we will mainly discuss how they distorted and slandered Chairman Mao's theory of continuing socialist revolution. We will not go into too much theoretical discussion of Marxism and Leninism on this issue. We will just tell you that there is such a problem, but due to space limitations, we will not include this issue in the focus of discussion.

Let's get to the point.

Although the authors of the two resolutions loudly claimed to criticise Chairman Mao's theory and practice of class struggle in socialist society, they actually had no idea what Chairman Mao's theory of class struggle in socialist society, especially his theory of continuing revolution under socialist conditions, was all about.

This is a bit ironic. However, it is true. None of the organizers and drafters of the "Resolution" understood the cornerstone of Chairman Mao's theory of continuing revolution. The most they saw was the "May 16 Notice" and the "Political Report of the Ninth National Congress", nothing more. As for the second contribution of real Mao Zedong Thought, Chairman Mao's "Important Instructions"²² in his later years, they did not understand it at all. This may be related to their position in the Cultural Revolution. It is still what Chairman Mao said about them, "If you don't know about the Han Dynasty, how can you talk about the Wei and Jin Dynasties?" We can understand.

Ten years ago, I criticised the "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee in an article. Today, the criticisms written at that time are still not outdated, and the positive explanation of Chairman Mao's theory may still have a certain reference value for our comrades today, so I will excerpt a part of it here regardless of the length.

Chairman Mao's theory of continuing socialist revolution was not easy to come by.

Just like understanding anything else, understanding revisionism and the issues of class and class struggle in socialist society also requires a process. Moreover, this process is full of hardships and costs.

²² See: [ChairmanMao'sPrimaryDirectives-CCP-CC-1976-Doc4-EngWithNotes.pdf](#) – Trans.

From the initial Soviet Union's continuous raising of the issue of bureaucracy within the party, to the emergence of the "new class" theory in Yugoslavia, to the democratic movements in East Germany in 1953, Poland and Hungary in 1956, and Czechoslovakia in 1968, they are actually closely related to the existence of classes and class struggle in socialist society, and the problems of autocratic rule.

Initially, Stalin put the hat of "revisionism" on the head of the disobedient Tito; then, Khrushchev, who was very anti-Stalin, took off the hat from Tito, but Chairman Mao put it on Khrushchev's head again.

In this complex struggle process where different tendencies intersect, a problem has been raised by history: the party is degenerating, the party is detached from the masses, and the bureaucratic group within the party is in sharp opposition to the masses. The so-called "riots" in China are also a manifestation of this historical phenomenon. Chairman Mao also talked about this issue many times from the perspective of opposing bureaucracy.

The debate with the revisionist trends of the Soviet revisionists and the Communist Party that followed the Soviet revisionists promoted the understanding of revisionism by the real Communists. For a time, Khrushchev became synonymous with revisionism and careerism. As for the theoretical understanding of revisionism, it was seen at that time: theoretically, it betrayed Marxism-Leninism and practiced revisionism; politically, the revisionist representatives implemented autocratic rule; ideologically, bourgeois ideology and culture were rampant; the class root was the emergence of a privileged stratum, or a privileged class, a bureaucratic privileged monopoly bourgeoisie.

Chairman Mao said that Khrushchev-like figures are sleeping beside us, which is a reflection of this understanding at that time. In the anti-revisionist struggle of the international communist movement at that time, Chairman Mao and the Communist Party of China played the role of anti-revisionist leaders and main forces. However, as Chairman Mao said, "more than a hundred parties no longer believe in Marxism-Leninism." Revisionism actually prevailed. This is of course related to the historical status of the Soviet Party as a party created by Lenin, and more importantly, it is related to the fact that the Communist Parties in those satellite countries are undergoing degeneration. These "brother parties" did not buy Chairman Mao's account, thinking that "backward" China could not produce Marxism-Leninism, and that the Soviet Communist Party was the boss, the baton, and the authentic one.

As to why revisionism occurred, a famous saying was summarised at that time: the influence of bourgeois ideology is the domestic root of revisionism; succumbing to imperialist pressure is the international root of revisionism.

The issue of the privileged class has been raised, and the issue of revisionism and bourgeois representatives has been raised, but the social system reasons for the emergence of the privileged class and its representatives have not attracted people's attention, let alone scientific analysis.

The correct understanding of revisionism by Chairman Mao criticised in the "Resolution" was the highest level of understanding of revisionism that people had reached in the 1960s. Based on this understanding, Chairman Mao launched the Cultural Revolution. The Cultural Revolution, as Chairman Mao himself said, was not just a Cultural Revolution, but "a great political revolution of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie and all other exploiting classes under socialist conditions."

The Cultural Revolution was launched under the guidance of such a theory. However, the final establishment of the theory of the Cultural Revolution was after ten years of practice.

This is in line with the epistemological law that theory comes from practice. The price paid for the Cultural Revolution was huge, but the theory of socialist continued revolution obtained by the Cultural

Revolution was great. From any perspective, we should cherish this theoretical achievement today, rather than abandon it.

Chairman Mao's second contribution, the second content of Maoism, is mainly reflected in Chairman Mao's "Important Instructions" published in the "CPC Central Committee Document No. 4" in March 1976. This is a compilation of Chairman Mao's many important speeches from October 1975 to January 1976. In these "Important Instructions", the "Theoretical Instructions" of December 1974 were also reiterated.

On December 26, 1974, Chairman Mao invited Premier Zhou to Changsha and had a long talk with him all night. One of the two important contents of this conversation was about theoretical issues. This was the theoretical result of Chairman Mao's careful thinking and research in Changsha for more than 100 days.

On the same day ten years ago, on December 26, 1965, Chairman Mao invited model workers and peasants, famous scientists and central leaders to his home for dinner and expressed his determination to continue the revolution and carry out the Cultural Revolution.

Ten years later, on his birthday, Chairman Mao specifically talked about theoretical issues about the Cultural Revolution, which was of extraordinary significance. Comrades must not underestimate it.

Chairman Mao not only talked with Premier Zhou, but also with the Prime Minister of Denmark. He still talked with them in 1976. It can be seen that it was important and well-thought-out. Unfortunately, Chairman Mao was old and had no energy to write books anymore. He could only say to Premier Zhou, "Ask Chunqiao to write an article." This shows how much he valued Comrade Zhang Chunqiao in theory.

Then, there was a struggle over the line with Deng Xiaoping, which once again promoted Chairman Mao's theoretical understanding. So, there was the "Central Document No. 4" in March 1976. How much Chairman Mao valued this document can be seen from the form of his comments. Chairman Mao not only wrote the word "agree", but also specially wrote "March 3, 6 o'clock". This is rare in Chairman Mao's comments.

It can be seen that from 1974 to 1976, Chairman Mao, on the basis of the complex and tortuous struggle practice of the Cultural Revolution, carried out arduous theoretical thinking, pushed Maoism to a new peak, and basically completed the theoretical creation of the theory of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat, that is, the theory of socialist revolution, and answered the question of "Why did Lenin say dictatorship over the bourgeoisie" that the international communist movement had never solved.

Chairman Mao is truly a great man. At the age of over 80, he still walked in the forefront of the people of the country and led us to explore the laws of development of socialist society. We have come from that era. At that time, we deeply felt that Chairman Mao's theoretical instructions really touched our hearts. Facing repeated struggles with the capitalist-roaders, we were also thinking about why class struggle and capitalist-roaders occurred and how to solve them. Chairman Mao's theoretical instructions were the scientific answers to the questions we were also thinking about. As soon as Chairman Mao's theoretical instructions were announced, we could imagine how excited we were. Comrades who have not had this experience now find it difficult to appreciate this difficult theoretical exploration process.

It is based on this experience and understanding that I say that if you don't understand Chairman Mao in 1976, you don't understand Chairman Mao's second contribution. This is indeed the case. The "Resolution" does not understand. These theories of Chairman Mao are completely beyond the vision

of the authors of the "Resolution" and are not even mentioned. Even now, whether they can correctly understand this theory again is also a problem. There are both class limitations, which is the main thing; there are also limitations in level, which exist. I don't have too high hopes whether they can listen to my opinions.

Today, we should say that we have more adequate conditions to re-understand Chairman Mao's theory of socialist revolution than we did more than 30 years ago. This is because there are two shocking negative lessons.

One is the failure of "socialism" in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. The clearest and simplest truth that can be drawn directly from this failure is that it is the victory of Maoism. In 1990, when the events were roughly clear, I clearly put forward this point in a "Political Correspondence".

The Sino-Soviet debate in the 1960s was by no means what the ignorant Deng Xiaoping said: "Both sides spoke a lot of empty words." This negative evaluation is wrong. What was said back then was not "empty words" but the truth, the truth proven by the bitter facts. It was Chairman Mao who first pointed out that these countries were practicing revisionism and secondly pointed out that such revisionism would sooner or later collapse.

The Soviet Union and Eastern Europe are a textbook of negative examples. This textbook provides sufficient verification of Chairman Mao's theories. Are there any bourgeois representatives or capitalist-roaders? Yes. Are there any privileged groups, privileged strata, or privileged classes? Yes. Are there any revisionist lines? Yes. Are there any fascist revisionist parties that practice despotic rule? Yes. Is there the possibility and fact that a socialist society will degenerate into a fake socialism that is politically despotic, economically stagnant, and ideologically repressive? Yes. Will such a fake socialism eventually be abandoned by the people and collapse? Yes.

History is ruthless. History has ruthlessly verified Chairman Mao's theory. Chairman Mao repeatedly raised the dangers of revisionism coming to power and capitalist restoration. Even in 1975, he emphasized to Pol Pot, who was visiting, that there are two possibilities for socialism. One is the possibility of revisionism coming to power. Of course, in the end, we still have to return to Marxism-Leninism. It can be said that he was earnest in his words.

Gentlemen who acknowledge that "social practice is the only criterion for testing truth", do you have the courage to admit the results of social practice this time? Do you have the courage to face the results of social practice and give another explanation for the right and wrong of Chairman Mao's theory? When you denounce Gorbachev and Yeltsin as traitors to the communist movement, have you forgotten that they are not the personal careerists and conspirators like Khrushchev that Chairman Mao told us to prevent long ago? Aren't they typical capitalist roaders on the way out?

If the revisionism and drastic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe are about others, then shouldn't our own affairs make us feel more deeply?

History is so ironic.

While we were still cursing Gorbachev and Yeltsin, our steps to restore capitalism had already gone far ahead of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. So much so that the former chairman of the German Social Democratic Party (Franz Müntefering) made a famous remark in a speech at a rally in Trier to commemorate Marx: "Do you want to know what cruel capitalism is? Please go to China and see it." The cruelty of Chinese capitalism has become famous all over the world.

China has become more revisionist than the Soviet Union. The Chinese Party has become more revisionist than the Soviet Party. The Soviet Communist Party did not dare to sell state-owned enterprises or divide up farms until its collapse. In the former Soviet Union, before the failure of socialism, a capitalist economy based on private ownership had not developed, nor had a new bourgeoisie adapted to this economy. The Soviet Union's revisionism only produced a privileged class, because the Party's line degenerated into a revisionist line, the Party became a revisionist party, and the Communist Party was no longer a revolutionary party that continued the revolution, but a privileged party that parasitized on the people. This is the typical social state of revisionism in power discussed by Chairman Mao.

Gorbachev's reforms were revisionist reforms, but they were mainly confined to the political level, engaging in liberalisation, opening the way for the bourgeoisie, and creating the conditions for the Yeltsin-type bourgeois representatives to come to power, leading to regime change and the disintegration of the Soviet Union. Gorbachev has always berated Yeltsin and regretted that he read that Yeltsin note. In fact, Gorbachev did not understand that there was a historical inevitability here, that is, he 'lifted a stone and dropped it on his own foot'. The bourgeois trend was led by Mikhail Gorbachev, and it did not matter which person was the leader.

The Soviet Union truly developed capitalism in the process of "dramatic changes" in various countries after its disintegration. Russia started with Yeltsin. From the so-called "shock therapy", it was not smooth sailing.

China's "revisionism" was more severe. China "achieved success in one battle".

China not only did what Gorbachev did, replacing Marxism-Leninism-Maoism with revisionism, but also did what Yeltsin did, replacing socialism with capitalism. Deng Xiaoping and his ilk were "smart". Under the cover of "characteristics", they did not engage in "dramatic changes" but "evolution", turning left and turning right, which was more deceptive and worse. It was so bad that it could hardly be any worse today. Chiang Kai-shek failed to defeat the Communist Party, but Deng Xiaoping actually brought it down. Li Zicheng entered Beijing in a cloth shirt and straw sandals, spotless, but was eventually brought down by his degenerate comrades.²³ Chairman Mao clearly warned the whole party to take this as a lesson. However, history has its own laws. The revisionists came to power and succeeded for a while, which was inevitable. Chairman Mao, who struggled to his last breath, was ultimately unable to save those stubborn and unrepentant capitalist-roaders with his good wishes. It was these former "comrades-in-arms" who betrayed him and sold out the great socialist cause he had fought for all his life, and restored capitalism in China, and the worst capitalism.

All this cruelly verifies the correctness of Chairman Mao's theory of continuing socialist revolution.

If today's Chinese rulers still refuse to admit it, then please answer: Aren't the leaders who developed capitalism in this way representatives of the bourgeoisie and capitalist-roaders? Isn't the line that guides this path a revisionist line? As the inevitable result of this line ruling China for 30 years, isn't

²³ Li Zicheng (1606-1645), led a peasant uprising at the end of the Ming Dynasty. After Li entered Beijing at the head of a victorious army, he ordered "Those who dare to hurt people and plunder people's property and women will be killed." However, the peasant army began to torture and plunder Ming officials, and raid homes everywhere. His generals were arrogant, "killing people in vain, and most of the soldiers plundered the people's property." Surrounded by the Qing army, Li Zicheng left Beijing and was killed in battle. Chairman Mao said: "... Li Zicheng represents the interests of the peasants. However, their actions, mostly riots, were the main reason for their failure... Our rebel leaders have always been corrupted, and it is not good for them to be emperors, but Li Zicheng has always been good, and the common people have praised him because he rebelled against the landlord class on behalf of the interests of the peasants" – Trans.

China's bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie a real objective existence? Isn't China's new bourgeoisie a real objective existence? Does anyone still doubt that China's socialism has degenerated?

Chairman Mao's repeated warnings about the possibility of revisionism coming to power in China from 1965 to 1976 all came true. The only inaccuracy was his over-optimistic estimate of the left-wingers uniting to rebel if a right-wing coup occurred and the emergence of Sun Wukong²⁴ in the local areas. He overestimated the consciousness of his beloved people, the party and the army. We have also failed his trust and expectations.

It should not be difficult to re-recognise the correctness of this theory today. The reason is concentrated in Chairman Mao's "important instructions" announced in the "Central Document No. 4" in 1976. These "important instructions" include the "theoretical instructions" of 1974 and have been further developed. As long as we carefully study and understand these "important instructions", we can understand the second main content of Maoism and its development of Marxism-Leninism.

Chairman Mao established and developed the theory of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism in the struggle to criticize Deng Xiaoping's revisionist erroneous views. We might as well follow Chairman Mao's thinking to study and research Chairman Mao's theoretical system.

Chairman Mao first criticised the "theory of the dying out of class struggle" that denied the existence of classes and class struggle in socialist society. There are several paragraphs on this issue in the "Important Instructions".

Whether there are classes and class struggle in socialist society, and why there are classes and class struggle, this is the first issue where Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and revisionism diverge, and it is also the basis and premise of other differences.

Our party's understanding of this issue has a process. Chairman Mao said, "In 1949, it was proposed that the main contradiction in the country was the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Thirteen years later, the issue of class struggle was raised again, and the situation began to improve." Chairman Mao's words contain a historical summary...the summary of our party's understanding of the issue of class struggle after entering the socialist historical period over the past thirteen years.

The historical situation before and after the completion of the socialist ownership transformation in 1956 was different, and can generally be divided into two periods. However, Chairman Mao did not mention it here, and particularly emphasised that "thirteen years later", that is, in 1962, the class struggle issue was raised again. This shows that Chairman Mao had a new understanding of the class struggle issue in the socialist historical period by this time. This is because after thirteen years of class struggle practice, including international anti-revisionism, and especially after three years of domestic difficulties, class contradictions were exposed more fully, so it was possible to "raise it again." "Re-raising" is not a simple repetition, but an innovation, a theoretical leap. It can be said that "re-raising" is Chairman Mao's fundamental theoretical breakthrough on the existence of classes and class struggle under socialist conditions and the need to continue the revolution.

Since the "re-emphasis" in 1962, the subsequent "socialist education", and especially the ten-year Cultural Revolution, people's understanding of socialist society and class struggle in socialist society has been greatly promoted. Chairman Mao is the epitome of this understanding, a brilliant

²⁴ Sun Wukong, the monkey king, was one of the main characters in the 16th-century Chinese novel Journey to the West. He uses his magic powers to rebel against Heaven and create havoc. His rebellious spirit was held in high esteem by Mao Zedong – Trans.

representative, and a mentor in the work of theoretical crystallisation. This is the "theoretical instruction" in 1974 and the "important instruction" in 1976.

Chairman Mao answered this question like this. "Is there class struggle in socialist society? What is the 'Three Directives as the key link'? Stability and unity do not mean no class struggle. Class struggle is the key link, and the rest are the details. Stalin made a big mistake on this issue. Lenin was different. He said that small-scale production produces capitalism every day and every hour. Lenin said that building a bourgeois state without capitalists is to protect bourgeois right. We have built such a country ourselves, which is similar to the old society, divided into classes, with eight levels of wages, distribution according to work, and equal exchange. You have to pay to buy rice, coal, oil, and vegetables, and the eight levels of wages are available, regardless of whether you are a few or a lot of people." He also said: "Lenin said, 'Small production is constantly, every day, every hour, spontaneously, and in large numbers, giving rise to capitalism and the bourgeoisie.' This situation also exists among a part of the working class and a part of the party members. Among the proletariat and among the staff of government agencies, there are people who have developed a bourgeois lifestyle."

Chairman Mao's words are very profound and have a strong theoretical nature. However, because he only talked about the main points and did not fully elaborate on them, it is not easy to understand, let alone to read them a few times. Based on my repeated study at that time and now, I feel that this is the first time in the history of the communist movement that the drawbacks of the socialist social distribution form that cannot transcend bourgeois right are linked to the existence of classes. And it is pointed out that such institutional drawbacks that cannot be avoided but can only be restricted will lead to "If Lin Biao and his kind come to power, it will be easy to establish a capitalist system."

Chairman Mao further analysed, "Why do some people not see clearly the contradictions in socialist society? Doesn't the old bourgeoisie still exist? Aren't there a large number of petty bourgeoisie? Aren't there a large number of intellectuals who have not been reformed? Aren't there the influence of small-scale production, corruption, and speculation everywhere? Aren't the anti-Party groups such as Liu and Lin frightening? The problem is that they belong to the petty bourgeoisie and their thinking easily tends to the right. They represent the bourgeoisie, but they say they can't see clearly the class contradictions."

These words were Chairman Mao's profound exposition of the inevitable class struggle in a socialist society and, at the time, a scientific critique of the erroneous thinking of Deng Xiaoping and other old comrades. This critique, in today's view, not only applies to the Resolution, but is also the most accurate. It is precisely because the Resolution 'represents the bourgeoisie but says that the class contradiction is no longer clear.'

Chairman Mao not only scientifically explained that class struggle is inevitable in socialist society, but also scientifically explained that there must be those in power within the party who take the capitalist road, so that the bourgeoisie "is within the Communist Party". Chairman Mao expounded it in this way: "Why didn't Lenin stop? After the democratic revolution, the workers and poor and lower-middle peasants did not stop, they wanted to revolt. But some party members did not want to move forward, some retreated and opposed the revolution. Why? They became high-ranking officials and had to protect the interests of high-ranking officials. They had a good house, a car, a high salary, and waiters, which was more powerful than the capitalists. The socialist revolution came to them. During the collectivization, some people in the party opposed it. They were disgusted by the criticism of bourgeois right. In carrying out the socialist revolution, they did not know where the bourgeoisie was. It was within the Communist Party, the people in power within the party who took the capitalist road. The

capitalist roaders are still on the road." This passage is really worth a thousand words. We must understand it again and again.

This passage starts with analysing the privileges of senior officials and reveals how the privileged class in the party came into being.

This passage also analyses that some senior officials "want to protect the interests of senior officials", so they oppose the socialist revolution and become the ruling clique in the party that takes the capitalist road.

This passage also tells us, "You are carrying out the socialist revolution, yet you don't know where the bourgeoisie is, it is in the Communist Party, the ruling clique in the party that takes the capitalist road. The capitalist-roaders are still on the capitalist road."

Chairman Mao also used Lin Biao and Deng Xiaoping as examples to explain what a capitalist-roader and a representative of the bourgeoisie is. Chairman Mao said: "class struggle did not die out for him." "Lin Biao wanted to overthrow the proletariat and stage a coup. Did it die out?" "Deng Xiaoping proposed the 'Three Directives as the key link' without discussing it with the Politburo, nor did he discuss it with the State Council, nor did he report it to me. He just said it. He was not a person who paid attention to class struggle and never mentioned this guideline. It was still 'white cat, black cat', regardless of imperialism or Marxism." Chairman Mao's words were so accurate!

We have criticised revisionism and the privileged class for many years, and during the Cultural Revolution we arrested capitalist-roaders everywhere. However, the reasons why this special phenomenon of the emergence of a new bourgeoisie under socialist conditions occurred and what its root causes were have never been uncovered.

Now, Chairman Mao has revealed it. The big officials have a series of privileges, "more powerful than the capitalists." This is an economic structure, a political structure, a social foundation. It is on this basis that a privileged class will emerge, there will be representatives of this class, and there will be revisionist thoughts and lines that represent the interests of this class.

In our theoretical struggle to criticise Soviet revisionism, we pointed out the problem of the privileged class in their country and linked it with their move towards revisionism. This is undoubtedly correct. However, at that time, we did not reveal how this privileged class came into being and what the reasons were in terms of social foundation. At that time, we had not yet found the reasons from the institutional shortcomings of the socialist society we established.

Now Chairman Mao has found it. This is a major theoretical breakthrough. Chairman Mao himself also attached great importance to it. He not only talked about it domestically, but also when Nixon's daughter came, Chairman Mao also told her that it was the same as talking about theoretical issues to the Danish Prime Minister. He did not talk to them personally, but to the international community, and wanted to spread this theory through this channel. It shows that Chairman Mao himself also attached great importance to it.

Chairman Mao, who had a higher level of thinking than others, had already tried to look at the problem from this perspective. When he was still reading the Soviet political economics textbook in 1959, he had already criticised the shortcomings of our socialist system. Chairman Mao said: "The bourgeois right that exists in the mutual relations between people must be broken. For example, strict hierarchy, condescending, divorced from the masses, not treating people equally, not relying on work ability to make a living, but relying on qualifications and power, and the cat-and-mouse relationship and father-son relationship between cadres and the masses, and between superiors and subordinates."

What the Chairman criticised here was mainly privilege, not the bourgeois right of equal exchange in distribution that uses formal equality to cover up actual inequality. What is emphasised here is the inequality of power. This is consistent with the idea of emphasising "power holders". The capitalist roaders are the power holders. The power holders have special power in the management of the state and production. Once this power loses its checks and balances, it will become privilege, and there is the possibility and danger of taking the capitalist road.

The fact is that in all countries where socialism has been established, this power has lost its checks and balances. Precisely because of this situation, the Chairman's worries are not redundant. It is not an empty talk to say that if Lin Biao and others come to power, it will be easy to establish a capitalist system. The fact is that the wolf has really come.

In fact, the problem is not whether it is a "big official" or a "small official", but whether the "official" can become an old-style bureaucrat. The original meaning of the dictatorship of the proletariat can only be proletarian democracy, and the entire proletariat is in power, that is, it is the master of the house. The idea of the party ruling is itself a problem. Once the party ruling is implemented as the party is separated from the people and is only in power, this will definitely violate the original meaning of the dictatorship of the proletariat. All the major decisions we see are not from the National People's Congress or the standing body of this congress, but from the Party Committee. This is indeed the party ruling, and this kind of party ruling is precisely not the dictatorship of the proletariat. Chairman Mao denounced the revisionism more than once, saying that it would inevitably implement fascist bourgeois autocracy when it came to power. This was both a statement in the face of the facts of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, and a theoretical summary of the facts.

Chairman Mao's profound final reflections on revisionism completed a theoretical system, thus completing the creation of the second theoretical contribution of Maoism.

Chairman Mao was not speaking from an abstract socialist model, but from the socialist model we have actually built. The socialist model in the strict theoretical sense is the socialist model envisioned by Marx in "Critique of the Gotha Program". However, the subsequent socialist practice basically did not build such a "standard" socialist model. But this does not prove that Marx's exploration is meaningless in theory. It also does not prove that once developed capitalist countries transform into socialism in the future, they are destined not to build such socialism. We can only say that due to historical conditions, we have no possibility of building the strict socialism envisioned by Marx, even after the ownership reform is completed. Not to mention the society like today. This is easy to understand. Real life is not a textbook. The creation of real life and the writing of textbooks are not the same thing.

On October 1, 1949, the People's Republic of China was founded, the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of the people's democratic dictatorship was established, and the historical period of socialist revolution began.

After the socialist transformation of ownership was completed, the socialist revolution will continue. The reason is that class struggle still exists in this society, the struggle between revisionism and Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, and the struggle between the socialist road and the revisionist and capitalist roads.

This struggle has its inevitable social reasons and basis.

The encirclement of the entire capitalist world, the widespread influence of bourgeois ideology, the large-scale existence of the petty bourgeoisie, the existence of the old exploiting class, etc., etc., these

were mentioned by Lenin and can be seen in a large number of facts. People generally acknowledge them.

Chairman Mao made further discoveries.

Chairman Mao saw that even if the ownership system had changed, the principles of bourgeois right were still being implemented in the field of distribution. This formal equality (the so-called universal "fairness and justice" that is popular now) conceals actual inequality. This principle not only protects the private ownership of the means of subsistence, but also protects the inequality in the possession of the means of subsistence. Under the current historical conditions, the dictatorship of the proletariat can only restrict this, but cannot eliminate it. This is the economic and social basis for people to have the concept of private ownership and accept bourgeois ideas.

Chairman Mao also saw that even if "ownership has changed", the high officials still enjoy privileges. Privileges are inequality that transcends formal equality. From a historicist perspective, this is a more backward form of pre-capitalism. Such privileges will breed privileged groups or classes, as well as the representatives of these groups or classes, the capitalist-roaders.

Chairman Mao also saw that the state apparatus of the dictatorship of the proletariat must be "partially improved" in the continuation of the revolution. In political relations and interpersonal relations, there are still the drawbacks of the old state, old politics, and old bureaucracy. These drawbacks are the institutional reasons for the existence of privileges. Such a political system will inevitably degenerate into a fascist bourgeois autocracy.

Based on the above scientific analysis, Chairman Mao dared to point out that " You are making the socialist revolution, and yet don't know where the bourgeoisie is. It is right in the Communist Party—those in power taking the capitalist road. The capitalist-roaders are still on the capitalist road."

Chairman Mao's scientific expositions constitute a complete theoretical system. This theoretical system is a reliable and solid theoretical basis for opposing revisionism, the revisionist line, and the revisionist leaders.

Chairman Mao mercilessly dissected the socialist society he established, revealing the economic, political, and ideological social reasons why classes and class struggle exist in this society. These social reasons are the inevitable existence of history that cannot be changed by human will. It is on the basis of this theoretical understanding that a complete theoretical system was created that requires the continuation of revolution under socialist conditions and under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat. At the same time, based on this theoretical system, it was proposed that the Communist Party must adhere to the basic line of "class struggle is the key link, and the rest are the details."

Obviously, this is a scientifically based Marxist-Leninist-Maoist line. From the perspective of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, we can say that class struggle, continued revolution, proletarian dictatorship, and proletarian democracy are the same thing.

Unfortunately, the drafters and adopters of the "Resolution" did not study, understand, or recognize all of this. All they had was blind emotional denial and even hatred.

Why did Chairman Mao have such a profound understanding of the laws of socialist society that was higher than that of ordinary people? In addition to his firm proletarian revolutionary stand, from an epistemological point of view, it is also inseparable from his adherence to the Marxist materialist conception of history.

Everyone remembers that during the anti-revisionist debate, our party emphasised the need to observe socialist society from the perspective of the unity of opposites. This is correct. However, how can we truly find the basic contradictions of socialist society? Only by relying on the materialist conception of history and dissecting the economic structure, political structure, class structure, and social structure of socialist society layer by layer according to the method of the materialist conception of history can we understand and explain this society clearly. Chairman Mao did this. From a methodological point of view, this is also the most worthy of our study.

The above was written ten years ago, through the study, research and elaboration of Chairman Mao's theory of continuing revolution under socialist conditions, and in combination with the fact that capitalism has been restored in China in the thirty years since the publication of the Resolution of the Sixth Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee in 1981, to criticise and refute the ignorance and mistakes of the Resolution of the Sixth Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee. In a popular phrase at the time, this was to "set things right and correct the mistakes" against their fallacies.

Today, it seems that these criticisms are also applicable to the "Resolution" of the 6th Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee. Because the "Resolution" of the 6th Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee is just a copy of the "Resolution" of the 6th Plenary Session of the 11th Central Committee, and it inherits and persists in the so-called "mistakes" made by the "Resolution" of the 6th Plenary Session of the 11th Central Committee in slandering and attacking Chairman Mao.

It can be said that distorting, slandering, attacking, and overthrowing Chairman Mao are the common main characteristics and fundamental essence of the "Resolution" of the 6th Plenary Session of the 11th Central Committee and the "Resolution" of the 6th Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee.

This characteristic, this essence, clearly and fully tells us that their distortion, slander, attack and overthrow of Chairman Mao is not a matter of general misunderstanding, but a class struggle and a struggle over the line that concerns the overall situation and the major issues of right and wrong.

We must make full use of the "confession" as a very good and typical negative teaching material, and through careful analysis and research, find out the historical inevitability and historical laws in it, so as to improve our level of understanding of the specific class struggle and line struggle that we will inevitably encounter under the current specific historical conditions.

Perhaps, only by doing this well can we live up to the teachings left to us by the positive teachers and the lessons left to us by the negative teachers.

2.

The 100-year history of the Party has left us with three "Resolutions". There is a basic core clue running through these three "Resolutions", which is: class struggle and line struggle.

To correctly understand this, the ideological method must be correct and the theoretical method must also be correct. Class struggle and line struggle cannot be simply understood mechanically and metaphysically, but should be understood according to the ideological method and theoretical method taught to us by Chairman Mao.

Chairman Mao said: "You are making the socialist revolution, and yet don't know where the bourgeoisie is. It is right in the Communist Party—those in power taking the capitalist road. The capitalist-roaders are still on the capitalist road."

Chairman Mao raised the issue very sharply. Some people, especially the capitalist-roaders, naturally did not understand or accept it, and even thought that Chairman Mao was wrong, as written in the "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee and the "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the Nineteenth Central Committee.

This error in understanding and comprehension is naturally rooted in class standpoint, but it is also related to ideological methods.

By 'bourgeoisie' Chairman Mao does not mean, of course, that there are capitalists within the Party who own private enterprises and are engaged in surplus-value exploitation; that is to say, the 'bourgeoisie' referred to by Chairman Mao cannot be measured and understood simply by applying Lenin's definition of class. '

Here we are confronted with a special historical phenomenon, that is, there are bourgeois representatives in the Communist Party, which is the vanguard of the proletariat.

This is a seemingly contradictory but real fact. Moreover, it is not a problem that exists only within the Chinese Communist Party; it exists within all other Communist Parties.

The Marxist revolutionary mentors also had a great deal of criticism to make about the existence of this problem; it can even be said that fighting against the ideas, tactics and lines of the opportunist and revisionist representatives within the Communist Party (despite the various names of the Party) has always been a lifelong combat task for the revolutionary mentors.

The ideas, tactics and lines of opportunism and revisionism are the ideas, tactics and lines of the bourgeoisie; the representatives of opportunism and revisionism are the representatives of the bourgeoisie. This is the view that the Marxist revolutionary mentors have always adhered to. Lenin's famous work "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky" unambiguously called Kautsky a traitor. Where did he betray? Of course, he betrayed to the side of the bourgeoisie, and of course, he inevitably betrayed and became a representative of the bourgeoisie. Kautsky is not qualified to be called a capitalist-roader because he is not in power.

It can be seen that the phenomenon of "the bourgeoisie is within the Communist Party" does not only exist in the Communist Party that has already taken power under socialist conditions. In fact, this problem also exists in the Communist Party that has not taken power. Moreover, historical experience tells us that this is not simply an individual phenomenon. If it were only an individual phenomenon, it would not exist as a line or line struggle. When we say "representative", we always represent certain political forces and class forces within the party. There is always a market for wrong lines within the party, and there will always be a part of people who want to follow the wrong line. This is the seriousness of the problem.

From the perspective of Marxist historical materialism, this is of course due to class, historical and social reasons, and it is not accidental.

Real social conditions constrain everyone. A person who joins the party in organization and has the determination to fight for communism for life is a basic requirement that is not too difficult to achieve. However, if a party leader wants to truly master Marxism, he needs to have various conditions. It is not easy and rare for these conditions to be concentrated in one person.

Chairman Mao, with his rich experience and deep Marxist insight, saw the seriousness of the problem, which is why he left behind that remark: 'Not many in our party really understand Marx and Lenin.'

Chairman Mao saw the severity of this problem with his rich experience and profound Marxist insight, so he left that word: "Not many people in our party really understand Marxism-Leninism".

It seems a bit unreasonable and difficult for people to understand that a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist Communist Party does not have many members who really understand Marxism-Leninism, but this is a fact determined by historical conditions. History has verified that what Chairman Mao said is right and in line with reality.

It's just that we don't understand it very well yet, and we have to continue to study and research seriously. It is precisely such realistic historical conditions that determine that the bourgeoisie is inevitable in the Communist Party, and the class struggle and line struggle in the party are also inevitable.

In the Communist Party that had not seized power, as Lenin correctly pointed out, there was a problem of the worker aristocracy, which was the class basis of the opportunist and revisionist line; another problem was that the party leaders had inadequate ideological viewpoints and methods of thinking, or, in the words of Chairman Mao, they did not understand Marxism-Leninism, and as a result, they became the makers and promoters of the opportunist and revisionist line. In the final analysis, this was a historical necessity determined by the social and historical conditions at the time and the overall level of the party.

In the entire capitalist world at that time, there existed the proletariat, the bourgeoisie and other classes. The ideas of these classes, especially the bourgeoisie, still had a profound influence, which would inevitably be reflected profoundly in the Communist Party, leading to the inevitable class struggle within the party. The most acute, profound and core manifestation of this class struggle within the Communist Party was the struggle over lines - the struggle between the Marxist proletarian line and the revisionist bourgeois line.

It can be seen that the essence of the line struggle has always been class struggle, which is a concentrated reflection of class struggle within the party. The class basis of this class struggle and line struggle is the bourgeoisie within the Communist Party.

This has been verified by history. The historical experience and lessons of the international communist movement have repeatedly told us that there will always be representatives of the bourgeoisie in the Communist Party, and there will always be opportunistic, that is, revisionist bourgeois lines formulated and promoted by these bourgeois representatives. Therefore, class struggle and line struggle arising from this will always inevitably exist within the party.

It can be seen that Chairman Mao's statement that "the bourgeoisie is right within the Communist Party" is in line with the general law of the development of the Communist Party. However, Chairman Mao said this in response to the new historical issue that the ruling Communist Party under the new socialist conditions may have revisionism coming to power and capitalism restored, revealing and reminding us of this law. Therefore, this is a new great contribution and great development to Marxism.

It is very important to understand this truth. If you understand this, you can understand why the three different essential "resolutions" of the party are all permeated with the basic thread of class struggle and line struggle.

Making a "resolution" is to make a "resolution" for class struggle and line struggle. It is to affirm the results of class struggle and line struggle in the form of a "resolution", that is, in the form of a law. The "resolution" is always written by the victors. The "resolution" of the Seventh Plenary Session of the Sixth Central Committee was written under the leadership of Chairman Mao; the "resolution" of the

Sixth Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee was written under the leadership of Deng Xiaoping; the "resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the Nineteenth Central Committee was written under the leadership of Xi Jinping. What is written? It is about class struggle and line struggle, but it is written in accordance with the thoughts, views, and requirements of the victors.

Isn't the "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee written in this way? Isn't this how we should know and understand the "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee?

This is a specific form of class struggle and line struggle. Denying, slandering and attacking Chairman Mao is just an organic part of this class struggle and line struggle. Any conscious comrade can see clearly that the "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 11th Central Committee denied Chairman Mao only to affirm Deng Xiaoping; the "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee denied Chairman Mao only to affirm the General Secretary.

However, as we have said above, this is completely wrong; as we have said above, this is something that we true Communists will never agree to, and it is something that the broad masses of working people will never agree to. We have the responsibility and determination to defend Chairman Mao, defend Chairman Mao's line, expose their traitorous faces, and criticise their traitorous line - the revisionist line, the line of restoring capitalism.

From Chairman Mao's point of view, the "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee is nothing more than a "Resolution" that continues to adhere to the revisionist line.

The main basis for this conclusion is that this "resolution" once again negates and abandons "class struggle as the key link". Although the "resolution" has 36,000 words, it does not mention class struggle, class struggle as the key link, or the dictatorship of the proletariat. On the contrary, it negates class struggle, class struggle as the key link, and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Whoever abandons class struggle as the key link will inevitably engage in revisionism. This truth is a summary of the historical experience of the international communist movement, a very important truth, and a truth that Chairman Mao has repeatedly emphasised.

The title of the second article in my series of articles criticizing the General Secretary's "July 1st Speech" is "The "July 1st Speech" once again proves that whether to adhere to class struggle as the key link is the concentrated embodiment of the struggle between the two lines." The main content of the article is to publicise this principle that Chairman Mao said and use this principle to criticise the "July 1st Speech." The same must be done with the "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee. Doing so itself is a requirement to take class struggle as the key link, that is, it is necessary to analyse and understand the "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee from the perspective of class struggle and line struggle.

They abandoned the principle of class struggle, but we must firmly grasp the principle of class struggle.

The "Resolution" completely copied the "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee, and completely negated Chairman Mao's theory that there are classes and class struggles in socialist society, and therefore we must adhere to "taking class struggle as the key link" to carry out the socialist revolution. This "complete negation" also completely confirmed that the "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the Nineteenth Central Committee is a thorough revisionist "Resolution".

This is very clear when you open the 36,000-word "Xi Jinping's Resolution".

The Communist Party is the vanguard of the proletariat, and is the party that leads the proletariat and the broad masses of working people to carry out class struggle against the bourgeoisie and the first class, to seize power, establish the dictatorship of the proletariat, realise socialism, and continue the revolution until the ultimate realisation of communism.

In 1848, the two revolutionary mentors wrote the Communist Manifesto to establish such a proletarian party. This purpose and theory were clearly stated. The Communist Manifesto is a declaration of class struggle, a declaration of the dictatorship of the proletariat, a declaration of class struggle as the key link, and a declaration of socialist revolution and continued revolution to ultimately realize communism. Now, the Resolution denies class struggle, denies the dictatorship of the proletariat, denies taking class struggle as the key link, denies socialist revolution and continued revolution, and denies the communist ideal. How can it still be a Communist Party? It is impossible. It can only be a revisionist party or a bourgeois party that has a set of revisionist theories and lines.

In today's world, there are many such social democratic parties, some of which have held or are holding political power. However, none of these parties is a true party of the working class. Their common characteristic is that they deny class struggle and class struggle as the key link. Therefore, they will inevitably degenerate into bourgeois parties and naturally will no longer serve the proletariat, but can only betray and serve the bourgeoisie. They will no longer engage in socialism, but can only engage in capitalism. The "Resolution" of the Ninth Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee abandoned class struggle as the key link, but once again proved that the Communist Party of China is following in the footsteps of these revisionist parties, and has surpassed them, worthy of being the latecomer "revisionist".

If the proletariat abandons class struggle as the key link before it seizes power, the natural result will be to abandon the seizure of power and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the ultimate result will be to abandon the socialist revolution. The reasoning here is very simple, and the historical facts and lessons that have occurred in the international communist movement are very clear. Without class struggle and without class struggle as the key link, even in the face of the best historical opportunities, it is impossible to achieve the goal of overthrowing the rule of the bourgeoisie, seizing power, and establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat, and it is even more impossible to realise the great ideal of the Communists, which is to replace capitalism with socialism.

Under the historical conditions that the proletariat has seized power and established a socialist society, if the ruling Communist Party abandons class struggle as the key link, as Chairman Mao said and Deng Xiaoping did, revisionism will inevitably come to power and capitalism will be restored. A positive teacher and a negative teacher have repeatedly taught the Chinese people political lessons for more than half a century. The "serious practice" of the ten-year vigorous and tortuous Cultural Revolution was mainly positive education; the cruel reality of "returning to the pre-liberation era overnight" under the restoration of capitalism for more than 40 years, which has plunged the working people into heavy suffering, is mainly negative education. Both positive and negative education have forced us to deeply realise that whether or not to adhere to class struggle as the key link will indeed determine the fate of socialism.

Chairman Mao seized on Deng Xiaoping's denial of class struggle as a key link because he saw through that "he never mentioned class struggle as a key link" and wanted to engage in revisionism and promote a revisionist line, which would inevitably lead to the restoration of capitalism. More than 40 years of history have cruelly but accurately verified that Chairman Mao was right and accurate in his grasp.

This is a precious ideological weapon that Chairman Mao left us. We must unswervingly use Chairman Mao's theoretical viewpoint and ideological weapon to understand Deng Xiaoping, the General Secretary, and the Resolution of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee.

It can be concluded that since it insists on denying the existence of classes and class struggle in socialism, denying the theory of continuing socialist revolution, and denying taking class struggle as the key link, then this "Resolution" can only be a revisionist "Resolution" and the line that the "Resolution" insists on can only be a revisionist line.

The Communist Manifesto states at the outset that the history of all societies up to now is the history of class struggle. Chairman Mao used even more vivid language to tell people that some classes have triumphed, and some have been eliminated. This is history, this is the history of civilization for thousands of years. However, a 36,000-word "Resolution" of the "Communist Party", a "Resolution" that claims to be a summary of the 100-year historical experience of the Chinese Communist Party, repeatedly mentions "realising the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation" at least 20 times, but the word "class struggle" is not mentioned in the entire text, and class struggle is not taken as the key link.

Dear General Secretary, just like all bourgeois politicians, regards the words "class struggle" as a scourge. With such a mentality, such thoughts, and such theories, can a "resolution" be made for a real Communist Party? This is impossible. This is exactly the fact. The "resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee is not and cannot be a correct "resolution" on the history of the 100th anniversary of the Communist Party of China. It can only distort the history of the Communist Party of China, insult the history of the Communist Party of China, and vilify the history of the Communist Party of China. For a Communist Party of China that has become revisionist, isn't this a very natural, normal, and easy to understand historical necessity? !

Let us link the specific content of the "Resolution" to prove the correctness of this conclusion.

The "Resolution" replaced the Communist Party of China's program for realising communism with the revisionist bourgeois program of "realising the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation."

"Realising the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation" is the general outline of "Xi Jinping Thought" and also the general outline of this "Xi Jinping's Resolution."

In fact, Chairman Mao had a comprehensive and scientific exposition of the nature, line, principles, and policies of the new democratic revolution in his works such as The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party, On New Democracy, and On the Coalition Government. There is no need to repeat them here.

However, the Resolution forcibly inserted the General Secretary's black stuff into it. It actually wrote: "During the period of the New Democratic Revolution, the main task facing the Party is to oppose imperialism, feudalism, and bureaucratic capitalism, strive for national independence and people's liberation, and create fundamental social conditions for the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation." It also wrote: The Party deeply realized that "to achieve the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation, it is necessary to carry out anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggles."

When did Chairman Mao say, when did the Party's documents write that the New Democratic Revolution is ultimately "to create fundamental social conditions for the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation"; it is in order to "realize the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation" that "it is necessary to carry out anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggles."

This is clearly a smear of the bourgeois slogan of the General Secretary's so-called "realising the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation", which is obviously a distortion and tampering of the theory of the new democratic revolution.

Chairman Mao's theory, the theory of the Communist Party of China, is that China's revolution must be carried out in two steps. The first step is to complete the new democratic revolution and establish a new China; then, the second step is to transition to a socialist society through socialist revolution. It has never been regarded as the fundamental historical task of the Communist Party of China to "realise the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation."

Regarding the socialist revolution and socialist construction led by Chairman Mao, the Resolution also completely tampered with the line, principles, and policies formulated by Chairman Mao for our party, and even negated Chairman Mao's theory on the continued socialist revolution. It also inserted the General Secretary's black stuff, saying: "During the period of socialist revolution and construction, the main tasks facing the Party are to achieve the transition from new democracy to socialism, carry out socialist revolution, promote socialist construction, and lay the fundamental political premise and institutional foundation for realising the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation."

Even when it comes to reform and opening up under the leadership of Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line, and the "historical achievements" of the Deng, Jiang, and Hu eras, the resolution still focuses on "realizing the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation." The resolution reads: "In the new era of reform and opening up and socialist modernisation, the main tasks facing the Party are to continue to explore the correct path for building socialism in China, liberate and develop social productive forces, lift the people out of poverty and make them rich as soon as possible, and provide a new and vibrant institutional guarantee and material conditions for rapid development for the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation."

Finally, when it comes to the "new era" of our own, we must of course talk a lot about "realising the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation." Please see:

"Since the 18th National Congress of the Communist Party of China, socialism with Chinese characteristics has entered a new era. The main tasks facing the Party are to achieve the first centenary goal, embark on a new journey to achieve the second centenary goal, and continue to move forward towards the grand goal of realising the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation."

"The Party Central Committee with Comrade Xi Jinping as the core has comprehensively grasped the overall strategic picture of the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation and the great changes in the world that have not been seen in a century. It has emphasised that the new era of socialism with Chinese characteristics is an era of inheriting the past, carrying forward the tradition, and continuing to win the great victory of socialism with Chinese characteristics under new historical conditions. It is an era of decisive victory in building a moderately prosperous society in all respects and then building a socialist modern power in all respects. It is an era in which people of all ethnic groups in the country unite and strive to continuously create a better life and gradually realise common prosperity for all people. It is an era in which all Chinese people work together to strive to realise the Chinese dream of the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation, and it is an era in which our country continues to make greater contributions to mankind. The new era of socialism with Chinese characteristics is a new historical orientation for our country's development."

"It is clear that we must uphold and develop socialism with Chinese characteristics. The overall task is to achieve socialist modernisation and the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation. On the basis of building a moderately prosperous society in all respects, we will proceed in two steps to build a

prosperous, strong, democratic, civilized, harmonious and beautiful modern socialist country by the middle of this century, and promote the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation with Chinese-style modernisation."

The final call of the resolution is: "The whole Party, the whole army and the people of all ethnic groups across the country should unite more closely around the Party Central Committee with Comrade Xi Jinping as the core, comprehensively implement Xi Jinping Thought on Socialism with Chinese Characteristics for a New Era, vigorously carry forward the great spirit of Party building, remember the hardships and glory of yesterday, live up to the mission and responsibility of today, and live up to the great dream of tomorrow. We should learn from history, create the future, work hard, and move forward courageously to achieve the second centenary goal and realise the Chinese dream of the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation and work tirelessly."

These repeated fallacies in the "Resolution" fully demonstrate that the General Secretary's "Resolution" is to describe the 100-year history of the Communist Party of China as a history of struggle for "realising the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation".

It can be seen that when we say that the slogan of "realising the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation" is the general outline of "Xi Jinping Thought" and the general outline of "Xi Jinping's "Resolution", it is in line with the facts and grasps the crux of the problem.

Let us calmly and seriously discuss this "old problem" of the General Secretary.

In the first of my series of articles criticising the General Secretary's "July 1st Speech", "What is the original intention, mission and theme of the Communist Party of China?", I specifically criticised "realising the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation" as a bourgeois slogan. This is recent writing, not outdated, and I quote it here²⁵.

The above is my criticism of the general secretary's "July 1st speech" so-called "realising the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation" program. It may not be comprehensive, but the basic principles are generally correct. Now, it can also be applied to the criticism of the "Resolution", so there is no need to add more.

Here, I just want to emphasise again that this is not a small matter, but a big matter, a big matter related to the program of the Communist Party of China, a matter of right and wrong, a matter of principle, and it must be discussed clearly.

Taking "realising the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation" as the key link, denying "taking class struggle as the key link", denying socialism and communism as the key link, the result, its essence is to deny the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, to deny the victory of socialism over capitalism, to deny the proletarian revolutionary line of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, and to inevitably pursue the revisionist bourgeois narrow nationalist line.

²⁵ See this volume from p.32 "At the beginning of his "speech", the General Secretary clearly stated his views." to p. 38 "Chinese Communists, in the past, present and future, will firmly take the realisation of the great ideal of communism as our highest program. In order to strive for this beautiful future to come one day earlier, we will fight for it all our lives, even at the cost of our lives!"

This shows that using "realising the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation" to cover up and cancel "struggling for the realisation of communism" is essentially a fundamental distortion of the nature and tasks of the party.

This itself is a reflection of the class struggle and line struggle within the party.

The meaning of denying "taking class struggle as the key link" and affirming "realising the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation" as the key link are the same. They are just different expressions of the same revisionist line in terms of what to deny and what to affirm.

The program of "realising the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation" is a complete and thorough bourgeois narrow nationalist program. Any bourgeois party can raise such a program. If the so-called "governance" of China is handled according to this program, it will inevitably lead the Chinese nation in the direction of bourgeois narrow nationalism and social-imperialism, and one day it will inevitably bring unprecedented disaster to the Chinese nation.

We can already see the signs of this danger!

"Realising the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation" is the program of "Xi Jinping's Resolution" and the key to "Xi Jinping's Resolution". The program determines the line. The fact that "taking class struggle as the key link" is replaced by "realising the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation" fully proves that "Xi Jinping's Resolution", like "Deng Xiaoping's Resolution", is a "resolution" that wants to overthrow Chairman Mao's Marxist-Leninist-Maoist line with the revisionist line. It is a typical revisionist "resolution". However, it can also be seen that "Xi Jinping's Resolution" uses the narrow bourgeois slogan of "realising the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation" to deepen the bourgeoisification of the revisionist line, and it is the most backward and worst bourgeoisification, and therefore more dangerous. This is what we must recognise.

"The line is a guideline, and the guideline is the key to everything." This has the same meaning for the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. The entire 36,000-word content of "Xi Jinping's Resolution" is "opened" under the leadership of this revisionist "guideline."

The specific characteristics of "Xi Jinping's Resolution" can be further analysed in detail.

3.

As mentioned above, a notable feature of the Resolution of the 6th Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee is that it is a Resolution with strong Xi Jinping "characteristics". It is worthy of the name "Xi Jinping Resolution".

This Resolution, in its essence, as analysed above, is a thoroughgoing revisionist Resolution, just like the Resolution of the 6th Plenary Session of the 11th Central Committee. However, once the essence is unfolded, it always has its special content and form, that is, it always has its characteristics.

The "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee is 36,000 words long. The "Resolution" covers the first 90 years of the Party's history for 100 years, with 10,000 words; and 26,000 words are used to write about the General Secretary's nearly 10 years. Among them, 16,000 words are used to write about the General Secretary's "new era", and another 10,000 words are used to write about the General Secretary's summary of the historical significance and historical experience of the 100 years of Party history and the historical arrangements for the future "realisation of the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation".

This arrangement of the number of words makes anyone who has read the "Resolution" immediately feel that this "Resolution" is indeed "Xi Jinping's Resolution", which fully demonstrates Xi Jinping's arrogant and self-centred superhuman "confidence".

However, what is more important and more telling is the content. The entire "Resolution", especially the part about the General Secretary, proves irrefutably that General Secretary Xi Jinping not only adheres to Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line and inherits Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line, but also further "corrects" Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line and adds "Xi Jinping Thought" to it, making it more revisionist and more bourgeois. It can be said that it is a re-transformation and re-escalation from Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line to Xi Jinping's revisionist line, which has deeply marked Chinese revisionism with Xi Jinping's imprint.

Perhaps General Secretary Xi Jinping is proud of himself and thinks that he has finally left a strong mark in the history of the Communist Party of China. However, for the Communist Party of China, which celebrates its 100th anniversary, this is not the glory of the party, but the misfortune and shame of the party. The "Xi Jinping Resolution" has many mistakes, and it is not worth listing them one by one. Here I will only briefly cite a few examples of Xi Jinping surpassing Deng Xiaoping and "correcting" to be more backward and more wrong, and make some preliminary criticisms.

Example 1:

In order to brag about Xi Jinping, Xi Jinping's historical status, and the historical status of "Xi Jinping Thought", I don't know whether it was Xi Jinping himself or Wang Huning,²⁶ the "three-generation trumpeter", who forcibly fabricated the concept of "new era". Therefore, "Xi Jinping Thought" was defined as "Xi Jinping Thought on Socialism with Chinese Characteristics for a New Era".

As usual, this sentence is not fluent from the perspective of Chinese grammar. No matter how you read it, people can't figure out what it means. Wang Huning's style has always been like this. From Jiang Zemin's "July 1st Speech", people found so many grammatical errors. Until now, there has been no improvement, and together with the General Secretary, they are a perfect pair.

Let's not talk about this.

The most fundamental problem is that the concept of "new era" is used incorrectly.

From the perspective of Marxist historical materialism, the concept of era is unified with the socio-economic and social forms. Such as the primitive public ownership era, slavery era, landlord era, capitalist era, socialist era, etc. However, the so-called "new era" in the "Resolution" specifically refers to "the new era of socialism with Chinese characteristics since the 18th National Congress of the Communist Party of China." In other words, in the nearly ten years since Xi Jinping came to power, socialism with Chinese characteristics has entered a "new era." To be more thorough, the "new era" specifically refers to the "Xi Jinping era."

However, this is absurd nonsense, and it is completely contrary to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. Anyone with a little common sense of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism knows that our current era is still the era of imperialism and proletarian socialist revolution, which Lenin and Stalin had already scientifically discussed.

If the "Resolution" disagrees with Lenin's theory and wants to put forward a new theory, it must provide scientific arguments. However, we do not see such arguments.

²⁶ See note p. 52 – Trans.

All we see is this paragraph: "The Party Central Committee with Comrade Xi Jinping as the core has comprehensively grasped the overall strategic picture of the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation and the great changes in the world that have not been seen in a century. It emphasises that the new era of socialism with Chinese characteristics is an era of inheriting the past, carrying forward the tradition, and continuing to win the great victory of socialism with Chinese characteristics under new historical conditions. It is an era of decisive victory in building a moderately prosperous society in all respects and then building a socialist modern power in all respects. It is an era in which people of all ethnic groups in the country unite and strive to continuously create a better life and gradually realise common prosperity for all people. It is an era in which all Chinese people work together to strive to realise the Chinese dream of the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation, and an era in which our country continues to make greater contributions to mankind. The new era of socialism with Chinese characteristics is a new historical orientation for our country's development."

After saying so much nonsense, can we tell from this passage that this is the "historical orientation" of a "new era"? No. What we see is only "carrying on the past and ushering in the future", "continue to seize" and other expressions of the General Secretary's inheritance from Deng, Jiang and Hu, without any "innovation" at all. And the old sayings such as "moderately prosperous society", "modernised powerful country" and "common prosperity" that have worn out our ears have no meaning of a "new era". It seems that the General Secretary, including Wang Huning, only cares about self-praise and ignores science, and really can't tell what is "new" in the "new era".

This is not surprising, because there is no "new era" of the General Secretary, and it is very difficult to create one.

To be fair, the era that is qualified to be called a "new era" is still the "Deng Xiaoping era". The "new era" of the General Secretary is just a continuation of the "Deng Xiaoping era" and a part of the "Deng Xiaoping era".

Deng Xiaoping created the "Deng Xiaoping era". Deng Xiaoping's "creation" was mainly to replace Chairman Mao's Marxist-Leninist-Maoist socialist continued revolution line with Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line, and to replace the socialist road with the capitalist road. He gradually restored capitalism in China, and socialist China was restored to capitalist China, and the worst capitalist China. The socialist era of China led by Chairman Mao was restored to the capitalist era of China led by Deng Xiaoping, which was called the "socialism with Chinese characteristics" era.

This is the "new era" of the Chinese revisionist traitors - the era of bureaucratic autocracy and monopoly capitalism.

This is certainly not a "new era" in the scientific sense. In the scientific sense, it is nothing more than a restoration of the "old era", the restoration of the old era of capitalism. The entire content of the "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee once again proves that the General Secretary's "new era" is still such an "old era" of Deng Xiaoping's restoration of capitalism. Since we still have to adhere to Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line and since we still have to carry out "socialism with Chinese characteristics", then no matter how many "new" characters are added, the essence of this era of restoration of capitalism cannot be changed.

"Xi Jinping's Resolution" actually makes this point very clear: "The Party Central Committee with Comrade Xi Jinping as the core, with great historical initiative, great political courage, and strong sense of responsibility, coordinates the domestic and international situations, implements the Party's basic theory, basic line, and basic strategy, and takes charge of the great struggle, great project, great cause, and great dream. It adheres to the general tone of work of seeking progress while maintaining stability,

and has issued a series of major policies and guidelines, launched a series of major measures, promoted a series of major work, and overcome a series of major risks and challenges." Excluding nonsense, the key point of this passage is that the General Secretary is adhering to Deng Xiaoping's revisionist "basic theory, basic line, and basic strategy." Chairman Mao said, "The correctness of the ideological and political line determines everything." It is precisely because of adhering to Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line and insisting on carrying out "socialism with Chinese characteristics" under the guidance of this line that no matter how many "greatness" one boasts, it is impossible to separate the "Xi Jinping New Era" from the "Deng Xiaoping Era."

Moreover, the fact is that we not only did not see a "new era" that "corrected" the "Deng era", but on the contrary, we saw the "Xi era" that was even older, more backward, and more regressive than the "Deng era".

Example 2:

In the comparison of the two "resolutions", we can clearly see the regression of "Xi Jinping's "resolution"".

The Resolution of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 11th Central Committee has this passage: "In order to correctly implement the policy of emancipating the mind, the Party has timely reiterated that it must adhere to the socialist path, adhere to the people's democratic dictatorship, that is, the dictatorship of the proletariat, adhere to the leadership of the Communist Party, and adhere to the four basic principles of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought." However, in the 26,000-word section of the Resolution of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee on the General Secretary's "new era", whether it is talking about the leadership of the Party, political construction, rule of law construction, or other things, no one talks about the "four basic principles", especially the people's democratic dictatorship and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Even when discussing the "Deng Xiaoping era," the phrase "upholding the four basic principles" was categorically deleted. The resolution reads: "After the Third Plenary Session of the 11th Central Committee of the Party, the Chinese Communists, with Comrade Deng Xiaoping as their main representative, united and led the entire Party and the people of all ethnic groups in the country to deeply summarise the positive and negative experiences since the founding of New China, and around the fundamental question of what socialism is and how to build socialism, drawing on the historical experience of world socialism, created Deng Xiaoping Theory, emancipated their minds, sought truth from facts, and made the historic decision to shift the focus of the Party and the country's work to economic construction and implement reform and opening up. They profoundly revealed the essence of socialism, established the basic line for the primary stage of socialism, and clearly proposed to take our own path and build socialism with Chinese characteristics. They scientifically answered a series of basic questions about building socialism with Chinese characteristics, formulated a development strategy of three steps to basically achieve socialist modernisation by the middle of the 21st century, and successfully pioneered socialism with Chinese characteristics."

This passage is worth pondering. The original explanation of Deng Xiaoping's basic line always said: take economic construction as the centre, adhere to reform and opening up, adhere to the four basic principles, the so-called "one centre, two basic points". I often say that this is a replica of "three directives as the key link". Now, there is only one of the two basic points. This is certainly not an oversight by the author. On the contrary, it was done intentionally with brains - to delete "adhering to the four basic principles". This is where "Xi Jinping's "Resolution"" "corrected" "Deng Xiaoping's

"Resolution", and did what Deng Xiaoping and the great scholar who wrote "Deng Xiaoping's "Resolution"" did not dare to do.

It is from here that we can see that "Xi Jinping's Resolution" is more backward and reactionary than "Deng Xiaoping's Resolution"; moreover, we can also more clearly recognize the nature of the class forces represented by General Secretary Xi Jinping - how much they hate the "Four Cardinal Principles", even if it is just a fig leaf, it is not tolerated.

Comrades who know this period of history know that the proposal of the "Four Cardinal Principles" is not accidental, it is the product of class struggle and intra-party struggle at that time. At that time, as the anti-Mao, anti-Cultural Revolution, anti-communism, and anti-socialism intensified, this not only aroused opposition from some old comrades in the party represented by Comrade Huang Kecheng²⁷ (although their understanding was still limited), but also Deng Xiaoping and his gang felt that it was impacting the legitimacy of their rule, so there was the so-called "upholding the Four Cardinal Principles."

Of course, it is impossible for Deng Xiaoping and his gang to really adhere to the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist 'four basic principles'. These revisionist old men are just trying to be pragmatic, and once they feel that their power is under attack, the 'dictatorship of the proletariat' ---- which is actually the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, becomes the most suitable excuse for them to use violence against the revolutionary masses.

After the counter-revolutionary coup d'état of 1976, have we seen fewer facts of this fascist bourgeois dictatorship using violence?

This is what Chairman Mao predicted and foretold long ago. Now this violent fascist bourgeois dictatorship not only continues, but has been newly strengthened in the 'new era'. It is under these circumstances that Xi Jinping still finds the phrase 'adherence to the four basic principles' objectionable, and especially the phrase and theory of the people's democratic dictatorship and the dictatorship of the proletariat, and so he will never allow it to appear in the 26,000 words in which he touts himself. As Marx said, the hatred of interests and the hatred of classes will always be brought into theory.

This is Xi Jinping's so-called "correction" of Deng, Jiang, and Hu's succession. The result is more retrogression, more backwardness, and therefore more reactionary.

The same problem is also reflected in the treatment of the theory of class struggle.

The Resolution of the Sixth Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee left a tail of compromise, saying that "the exploiting class as a class has been eliminated, but the basic fact is that class struggle continues to exist within a certain scope." It also said that "due to domestic factors and international influences, class struggle will continue to exist within a certain scope for a long time and may intensify

²⁷ Huang Kecheng (October 1, 1902 – December 28, 1986), was born in a poor peasant family in Yongxing County, Hunan Province. He joined the Communist Party of China in 1925, and participated in the 1926 Northern Expedition. During the Agrarian Revolution and the War of Resistance Against Japan he served in various roles as a military leader and political commissar. He was denounced as a Rightist along with Peng Dehuai at the 1959 Lushan Conference, and criticised and imprisoned during the Cultural Revolution. After the end of the Cultural Revolution, there was a group in the party wanting to blame Chairman Mao for alleged "mistakes" during the period of socialist construction. Huang Kecheng refused to join them and, whilst not disputing their allegations of "mistakes", said the responsibilities should be shared and Chairman Mao's reputation protected. He was executive secretary of the Central Commission for Discipline Inspection at the time.

under certain conditions. We must oppose both the view that class struggle is expanded and the view that class struggle has been extinguished. We must remain highly vigilant and conduct effective struggles against all kinds of sabotage activities carried out by elements hostile to socialism in politics, economy, ideology, culture, and social life."

However, Xi Jinping's Resolution simply "corrected" this eclectic tail. Throughout the Resolution, there is no longer any talk of "class struggle still exists", let alone "opposing the view that class struggle has been extinguished". This fact fully proves that Xi Jinping's Resolution has more thoroughly abandoned the theory of class struggle than Deng Xiaoping's Resolution, abandoned class struggle as the key link, abandoned the people's democratic dictatorship and the dictatorship of the proletariat, that is, abandoned the so-called "upholding the four basic principles".

It is precisely from this fact that it is not entirely true to say that "Xi Jinping's resolution" merely copied the nonsense in "Deng Xiaoping's resolution" that negated Chairman Mao and Chairman Mao's theory of continuing socialist revolution. The fact is that General Secretary Xi Jinping's "correction" is not just copying and inheriting Deng Xiaoping, but adding his own black goods to Deng Xiaoping's revisionist theory, line, and path, going further and more thoroughly, and thus becoming more retrogressive, worse, and more reactionary.

We do not need to criticise this regression. The "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee said that this is "not allowed": "The fundamental purpose of summing up the historical experience of the 32 years since the founding of the People's Republic of China is to further concentrate the will and strength of the whole party, the whole army and the people of all ethnic groups in the country on the great goal of building a socialist modern power on the basis of adhering to the socialist road, adhering to the people's democratic dictatorship, that is, the dictatorship of the proletariat, adhering to the leadership of the Communist Party, and adhering to Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought. The Four Cardinal Principles are the common political foundation for the unity of the whole party and the unity of the people of all ethnic groups in the country, and are also the fundamental guarantee for the smooth progress of the socialist modernization cause. All speeches and actions that deviate from the Four Cardinal Principles are wrong, and all speeches and actions that deny and undermine the Four Cardinal Principles are not allowed."

Is it serious and severe enough? Shouldn't General Secretary Xi Jinping reread the "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 11th Central Committee? Unfortunately, once you engage in revisionism, once you embark on the road of no return to revisionism, it is impossible to turn back. That is what Chairman Mao said, it is difficult for those who engage in revisionism, especially those who are the leaders, to change, and they always go further and further, more and more thoroughly, and finally become completely bourgeois, and the worst kind of bourgeois. This is a law that we must not forget or ignore when we fight revisionism.

Xi Jinping made a resolution that Deng Xiaoping's resolution "could not allow", and he even boasted that "Comrade Xi Jinping has conducted profound thinking and scientific judgment on a series of major theoretical and practical issues related to the development of the party and state in the new era. He has put forward a series of original new concepts, ideas and strategies for governing the country on major contemporary issues such as what kind of socialism with Chinese characteristics should be upheld and developed in the new era, how to uphold and develop socialism with Chinese characteristics, what kind of socialist modern power should be built, how to build a socialist modern power, what kind of long-term ruling Marxist party should be built, and how to build a long-term ruling Marxist party. He is the main founder of Xi Jinping Thought on Socialism with Chinese Characteristics

for a New Era. Xi Jinping Thought on Socialism with Chinese Characteristics for a New Era is contemporary Chinese Marxism, Marxism of the 21st century, and the essence of the Chinese culture and spirit of the times. It has achieved a new leap in the sinicization of Marxism.”

To what extent has Xi Jinping been praised? ! In fact, through these empty and deceptive super nonsense, we see that "Xi Jinping's Resolution" has regressed further; as for the conclusion, it should be changed. Xi Jinping's "creation" of "a series of original new concepts, new ideas, and new strategies for governing the country" - "Xi Jinping Thought", which has removed the soul of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, such as class struggle and proletarian dictatorship, can only be the revisionism of contemporary China, the revisionism of the 21st century, and the new garbage of the Chinese version of revisionism. This is a conclusion based on seeking truth from facts.

Example 3,

By comparing the two revisionist resolutions, we can further study how revisionism becomes more regressive, more revisionist, and more bourgeois as it is “corrected”. There is a pattern to be found here.

The regression of this kind of revisionism after coming to power is generally along the two paths foreseen by Chairman Mao: one is towards fascist bourgeois dictatorship; the other is towards the worst capitalism.

The "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee fully reflects this point.

Let us first look at how "Xi Jinping's Resolution" reflects the further strengthening of the fascist bourgeois dictatorship.

Although the Resolution of the Sixth Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee always looks at issues from the standpoint of negating Chairman Mao and the Cultural Revolution, it cannot but admit that "gradually building a highly democratic socialist political system is one of the fundamental tasks of the socialist revolution." "It is necessary to strengthen the construction of state organs at all levels in accordance with the principle of democratic centralism, so that people's congresses at all levels and their permanent institutions become authoritative organs of people's power, and gradually realise the direct democracy of the people in grassroots political power and grassroots social life, and especially focus on developing the democratic management of enterprise affairs by the working people in urban and rural enterprises."

In the decades since then, demands for political system reform have been constantly raised by people of all classes and strata. For the broad masses of working people, the central issue of political system reform is the issue of a socialist democratic system, that is, how to organically unify people's democracy and people's democratic dictatorship in the system, how to organically unify proletarian democracy and proletarian dictatorship in the system. In short, it is a question of how to truly realize the people's mastery of their own affairs. This reflects the demands and calls of the broad masses of the Chinese people.

This demand and call has always existed in the three generations of Deng, Jiang, and Hu, and has been suppressed. Until Hu Jintao came to power, Wen Jiabao mentioned the need for political system reform eight times from the perspective of his understanding of "universal values". It can be seen that this issue has always been widely concerned at the time, but it has never been resolved.

Why?

It's very simple. When the capitalist-roaders were persecuted, they thought of the constitution, the democratic system, and democratic rights; however, once they came back to power, they no longer needed a democratic system, but a more authoritarian system. Authoritarianism and democracy are opposites. Authoritarianism and privilege are unified. Only authoritarianism can bring privileges; privileges need authoritarian protection. Therefore, the historical task of political system reform is impossible for the revisionist authorities to solve.

Not only is it impossible to solve, the "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee tells us that history is regressing, and is regressing even more to the fascist bourgeois autocracy foreseen by Chairman Mao.

In my humble opinion, there are two most prominent points.

First, the essential characteristics of socialism are distorted into the leadership of the Communist Party, and then the leadership of the Communist Party is distorted into a one-party autocracy that is above the country and the people.

Second, what is more characteristic of "Xi Jinping's Resolution" is that it not only wants to establish a one-party dictatorship, but also an individual dictatorship, thus pushing the fascist bourgeois dictatorship to the extreme.

The resolution reads: "The Chinese Communists, with Comrade Xi Jinping as the main representative, have profoundly summarised and fully utilised the historical experience since the founding of the Party, and created Xi Jinping Thought on Socialism with Chinese Characteristics for a New Era based on the new reality, clarifying that the most essential feature of socialism with Chinese characteristics is the leadership of the Communist Party of China, the greatest advantage of the socialist system with Chinese characteristics is the leadership of the Communist Party of China, and the Communist Party of China is the highest political leadership force. The whole party must strengthen the 'four consciousnesses', strengthen the 'four self-confidences', and achieve the 'two safeguards'."

Describing the leadership of the CPC as 'the most essential feature' and 'the greatest advantage' of socialism with Chinese characteristics is a 'new invention' of General Secretary Xi Jinping, and probably falls into the category of 'correcting' Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line.

However, this "correction" is wrong and is another step backwards.

The sixth comment of my book "Criticism of Xi Jinping's Thought" is "What is the most essential feature of socialist society?", which specifically criticises General Secretary Xi Jinping's erroneous view, which can be fully applied to the current criticism of "Xi Jinping's Resolution". I quote the relevant paragraphs here.

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?

"Xi Jinping's Resolution" once again proves that the above criticisms are appropriate, correct and necessary.

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? Does socialism not 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?

"Xi Jinping's Resolution" answers this question: "Improve the system of the party leading the National People's Congress, the government, the CPPCC, the supervisory organs, the judicial organs, the procuratorate, the armed forces, the people's groups, enterprises and institutions, grassroots mass autonomous organisations, and social organisations, and ensure that the party plays a leading role in various organisations."

This is a typical statement that the party is above the National People's Congress, the state, and the people. This is exactly what I criticised next in the six-commentary article, and I also quote it here.

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'.

It can be seen that the above criticisms have been verified to be correct by "Xi Jinping's Resolution".

Real life tells us that this is no longer a simple theoretical debate. Since General Secretary Xi Jinping came to power, the fascist bourgeois dictatorship has deepened step by step. Now a so-called "full-process democracy" has been invented. This new invention is nothing but a joke and empty talk that makes people laugh. Let alone the "full process", even if it is just a step towards democracy, have we ever seen it?

The resolution states: "The Party Central Committee emphasizes that we must uphold the people's dominant position and ensure that the people carry out democratic elections, democratic consultations, democratic decision-making, democratic management, and democratic supervision in accordance with the law. The Party upholds and improves the people's congress system, supports and ensures that the people exercise state power through the people's congresses, supports and ensures that the people's congresses exercise their legislative, supervisory, decision-making, and appointment and removal powers in accordance with the law, resolutely investigates and punishes cases of vote-buying and election bribery, safeguards the authority and dignity of the people's congress system, and gives full play to the fundamental political system role of the people's congress system."

This statement, which tries to sound as good as possible, precisely reflects the fact that General Secretary Xi Jinping's so-called strengthening of the Party's leadership is actually still an attempt to put the Party above the democratic system and above the people, and that all the democratic processes mentioned here are carried out under the 'Party's adherence to and improvement of the Party', 'Party's support and guarantee', 'Party's maintenance', and 'giving full play to the Party', which is actually nothing more than the operation of one-party dictatorship. Party leadership should never be interpreted as party autocracy, and Communist Party leadership is by no means equivalent to Communist Party dictatorship. Once the leadership of the Communist Party is alienated into Communist autocracy, or even Communist dictatorship, it means that the Party has already undergone a metamorphosis into a revisionist Party, a bourgeois Party, and a fascist bourgeois Party at that.

The absurdity of theory will inevitably lead to the absurdity of practice. Our real life is the most accurate touchstone of the deceptive empty words here. Not only in the real world, the fascist bourgeois dictatorship is being implemented everywhere; even in the virtual network world, the fascist bourgeois dictatorship is also being implemented. Recently, even anyone who wants to "climb over the wall" will be arrested and sentenced. There is no "full-process democracy", only full-process despotism.

Such reality of life cannot but remind us of Chairman Mao's warning back then: "If we proceed in this way, it won't take a long time, at least a few years, at most more than ten years, for a nationwide counter-revolutionary restoration to inevitably occur. The Marxist-Leninist party will certainly become

a revisionist party, a fascist party, and the whole of China will change colour. Comrades, please think about this, what a terrible scenario this is!" Yes, it is too terrible, and the Chinese people have deeply experienced it.

This is an extreme form of fascist bourgeois dictatorship. A large country with 9.6 million square kilometres of land and 1.4 billion people does not allow the broad masses of the people to care about politics. Anyone who cares about politics and makes a few comments will be convicted of "making irresponsible comments on the central government". Whether they are party members, senior officials, or ordinary people, they will be punished. Under the heavens, is it the party's land or Xi's land? Everyone has the surname "Party" or "Xi", and everyone has to follow the general secretary to speak the "party's" words and sing the "Xi's" songs. Is "Xi Dada"²⁸ really going to surpass "Niang Xipi"?²⁹ The "freedom of speech" written in the Constitution of the People's Republic of China has only been implemented for Xi Jinping.

No matter whether it is good words or bad words, empty words, clichés, nonsense, or bullshit, only Xi Jinping fully enjoys "freedom of speech"; while the hundreds of millions of "fart people", regarded and called "low-end population" by the party, can only shut up and not speak, or speak nonsense and drunken words praising Xi Dada. This is the "four consciousnesses" and "two safeguards" required by "Xi Jinping's Resolution" - "resolutely safeguard General Secretary Xi Jinping's core position in the Party Central Committee and the core position of the entire Party, and resolutely safeguard the authority of the Party Central Committee and its centralised and unified leadership." In fact, the essence is to safeguard the fascist personal autocracy and dictatorship of the "core" General Secretary Xi Jinping. What a sad page of great regression in Chinese history.

No wonder a famous writer sighed before his death: "Democracy is not getting closer to us, but getting farther away from us." "Xi Jinping's Resolution" once again confirmed this cruel fact.

The Resolution of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 11th Central Committee once wrote: "The power of the party is overly concentrated in individuals, and the phenomenon of individual dictatorship and personality cult in the party has grown." Isn't this sentence appropriate to be used on the general secretary now? This also fully reflects that the Resolution of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee is more regressive, more backward, and therefore more reactionary than the Resolution of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 11th Central Committee.

No wonder a famous writer³⁰ sighed before his death: "Democracy is not getting closer to us, but getting farther away from us." "Xi Jinping's Resolution" once again confirmed this cruel fact. The Resolution of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 11th Central Committee once wrote: "The power of the party is overly concentrated in individuals, and the phenomenon of individual dictatorship and personality cult in the party has grown." Isn't this sentence appropriate to be used on the general secretary now? This also fully reflects that the Resolution of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 19th

²⁸ Xi Dada comprises Xi Jinping's surname, followed by the word "great" twice. Xi Jinping is a native of Shaanxi, and in Shaanxi, many people use "great" to show respect when referring to their father, or men of the same generation as their father – Trans.

²⁹ Niang Xipi is a slang term in the Fenghua dialect of Ningbo. According to Zhou Zhifeng, a scholar who studies the Ningbo dialect, the word "Xipi" is a very vulgar swear in the Ningbo dialect, referring to female genitalia and sexual intercourse. "Niang" can be used variously for Mother, woman and young woman. The first time "Niang Xipi" was widely known to the Chinese people was through a movie: "Xi'an Incident" filmed in 1981. In order to create a fuller characterisation of Chiang Kai-shek, Sun Feihu, who played Chiang Kai-shek, said "Niang Xipi" loudly, and since then, this vivid three-character curse has become known and used nationally – Trans.

³⁰ The famous writer is the influential right-wing advocate of constitutional democracy Chu Jiangxiong. The quoted words are from his "The Chinese dream" without democratic constitutionalism is a nightmare – Trans.

Central Committee is more backward, more backward, and therefore more reactionary than the Resolution of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 11th Central Committee.

This historical fact fully proves that Chairman Mao's statement that once revisionism comes to power, it will establish a fascist bourgeois dictatorship is a law that conforms to historical reality and is a truth tested by social practice.

However, we can have a deeper understanding of Chairman Mao's theory.

First of all, this is not a question of personal sin or personal good or bad. Individuals are of course responsible. However, the reason why individuals can move towards and achieve personal dictatorship and personal autocracy is because the overall level of this revisionist party and the party system play a fundamental role. The overall level of the party and the party system complement each other and are unified. The overall level of the party determines the party system and the party's political life.

It is the inadequacy of the overall level of the party that determines the lack of inner-party democracy and the implementation of one-party dictatorship. This is a common problem of all revisionist parties from the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe to China; it is also an important reason for the dramatic changes and restorations from the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe to China. Looking at the facts, it is very clear. It was like this when Khrushchev and others were born and it worked; it was like this when Deng Xiaoping and others were born and it worked; it was like this when it developed to general secretaries and it worked.

Chairman Mao said that if Lin Biao and others came to power, it would be easy to establish a capitalist system. These are two important reasons why it is "very easy"; and they are also two important reasons why it is "very difficult" to re-launch the socialist revolution.

It is precisely such historical conditions that determine that in public opinion and theory, the socialist theory of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism must be distorted, and one-party dictatorship and personal dictatorship must be advocated. It is precisely from this point of view that it is not surprising that "Xi Jinping's Resolution" repeatedly creates theoretical basis for Xi Jinping's personal autocracy and personal dictatorship. This is just a "workable" and "easy" historical inevitability.

Moreover, from "Xi Jinping's Resolution", we can also see that the inevitable development trend of the fascist bourgeois dictatorship after the revisionists came to power is to become more and more severe and more and more authoritarian.

This is also an inevitable law. From the "Resolution", we can understand Chairman Mao's teaching that the revisionists will engage in fascist bourgeois dictatorship when they come to power more deeply and accurately.

Next, let's look at how the "Resolution" reflects Chairman Mao's statement that when revisionism comes to power, it will engage in capitalism, and the worst kind of capitalism.

"Socialism with Chinese characteristics" is the worst kind of capitalism. These two concepts are consistent, and they describe the same thing and the same fact. The former is a revisionist statement that deceives people, while the latter is Chairman Mao's statement that reveals the essence.

Of course, Chairman Mao's statement makes sense. This has been verified by the fact that capitalism has been restored in China for more than 40 years since revisionism came to power.

The concept of "revisionism" is worthy of its name. This is both the self-definition of revisionists and the source of their "confidence". The theoretical basis for revisionists to engage in revisionism has

always been this. They always say that Marxism is "outdated" and needs to be "revised" based on new and existing facts. From Bernstein and his ilk, to Khrushchev and his ilk, to Deng Xiaoping and his ilk, and up to the current general secretary, they are all like this, all wanting to "revise" the "outdated" Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

This is a deceptive magic trick, a fig leaf to cover up ugliness.

"Xi Jinping's Resolution" is also playing this trick, and it is exaggerated and scary.

The Resolution positions itself as revisionist in this way: "It emphasizes that reform and opening up is a great awakening of the Party and a great revolution in the history of development of the Chinese people and the Chinese nation."

This statement is much higher than the usual "revision", and it is also what the Resolution of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 11th Central Committee dared not say, which is "a great awakening of the Party" and "a great revolution."

Comrades, please take this sentence seriously and study it carefully.

In my opinion, it is very clear that this sentence is aimed at Chairman Mao, Chairman Mao's thoughts, and Chairman Mao's line. In Xi Jinping's view, what these revisionist leaders think and do, their theories, and their lines are "a great awakening" and "a great revolution" against Chairman Mao.

This is by no means an empty talk, but a real statement. For forty years, they have done this, and this is how they have revolutionized Chairman Mao's life, the life of socialism, and thus the people's life.

Xi Jinping's words are a blow to the fantasies of 'returning to Chairman Mao' and 'returning to socialism', which should hurt, sober up, and make comrades who hold such fantasies understand.

Xi Jinping's 'Resolution' tells us very clearly that they want to completely abandon the Marxist scientific socialism developed by Chairman Mao, as the Resolution says: "The Chinese Communists, with Comrade Deng Xiaoping as their main representative, have united and led the whole Party and the whole nation to profoundly summarise the positive and negative experiences since the founding of New China and to draw on the historical experience of world socialism to create the Deng Xiaoping Theory'. The Chinese Communist Party, mainly represented by Comrade Deng Xiaoping, united and led the whole Party and the people of all nationalities, profoundly summed up the positive and negative experiences since the founding of New China, centred on the fundamental question of what socialism is and how to build socialism, and drew on the world's socialist history to create Deng Xiaoping Theory." That is to say, Deng, Jiang and Hu are going to adopt a different revisionist approach to the fundamental question of what socialism is and how it should be built.

Any line needs a theoretical foundation and theoretical support, and so does the revisionist line, which is emphasised in the Resolution, and that is how 'theoretical self-confidence' came about.

Xi Jinping is, of course, the successor of Deng Xiaoping's theory. However, Xi is not satisfied with this, but has to create his own. The so-called 'Great Awakening' and 'Great Revolution' are Xi Jinping's 'creations', alarmist 'creations', but this is not enough. It's just high sounding, it needs content, and so the 'Xi Jinping Resolutions' are especially filled with such content.

The resolution states: "Comrade Xi Jinping has conducted profound thinking and scientific judgment on a series of major theoretical and practical issues related to the development of the party and state in the new era. He has put forward a series of original new concepts, new ideas and new strategies for governing the country on major issues of the times, such as what kind of socialism with Chinese

characteristics should be upheld and developed in the new era, how to uphold and develop socialism with Chinese characteristics, what kind of socialist modern power should be built, how to build a socialist modern power, what kind of long-term ruling Marxist party should be built, and how to build a long-term ruling Marxist party. He is the main founder of Xi Jinping Thought on Socialism with Chinese Characteristics for a New Era."

This passage clearly tells us that "Xi Jinping Thought" is not limited to the inheritance of "Deng and the three theories"³¹, but through the so-called "correction", it develops the revisionist thought of "Deng and the three theories" into Xi Jinping's revisionist thought of the "new era". This thought was independently created by Xi Jinping and is original. The "Resolution" is to affirm this "historical achievement". Theory always comes first. The "Resolution" is not made in vain, it must be implemented. Xi Jinping's "theoretical creation", implemented in practice, is to develop China's current worst capitalism to the new stage of Xi Jinping's "new era".

This shows us a historical law. When revisionism comes to power and engages in capitalism, the worst kind of capitalism, it always has to create public opinion first. The "Resolution" and the criticism of the "Two Whatever's" and the "Discussion on the Criterion of Truth" were all public opinion work done to negate Chairman Mao's line of continuing the socialist revolution; the current "Resolution" has the same meaning. In order to engage in revisionism and the worst kind of capitalism, it is necessary to create public opinion. "Xi Jinping's "Resolution" is to create such public opinion. Moreover, this "Resolution" goes a step further than the "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee. It is to fundamentally negate the socialist theory of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism on fundamental issues such as "what is socialism, what kind of socialism to build, and how to build socialism", and replace it with the revisionist theory with Chinese characteristics, especially Xi Jinping's revisionist theory.

It is very important to understand this point. That is to say, the fundamental purpose of making this "Xi Jinping's Resolution" is to further promote capitalism in China, to promote the worst capitalism, and to continue to promote the worst capitalism, to make it worse and worse, to make revisionism and bourgeoisification more thorough.

Of course, the historical facts of the past forty years have always been like this. The "Resolution" is a summary of historical facts. The regression of the "Resolution" is just a reflection of the regression of historical facts. Aren't the historical facts of the past forty years a process of deepening revisionism and capitalist restoration? Isn't the historical fact of Xi Jinping's "new era" in the past decade a process of deepening revisionism and capitalist restoration? "Xi Jinping's Resolution" is just following this process, reflecting and summarising this process.

From this perspective, "Xi Jinping's Resolution" is an inevitable product of history.

³¹ "Deng and the three theories" is a loose translation of an abbreviated three-character phrase in Chinese, and refers to the theories of Marx, Mao and Deng Xiaoping. Increasingly, these three are being pushed aside while Xi Jinping Thought is being elevated in importance. For example, the March 2023 changes to the General Provisions of the Work Rules of the State Council placed Xi Jinping Thought above Marx, Mao and Deng, emphasising "the authority of the Party Central Committee and centralised and unified leadership". Some netizens attributed this to the influence of Wang Huning (see footnote p. 52) with one saying that "Wang Huning's thought contains the important ideas of 1) three represents, 2) the scientific outlook on development, and 3) Xi Jinping Thought on Socialism with Chinese Characteristics for a New Era. In fact, everything that has changed is inseparable from its origin, and it is all a variant of Wang Huning's thought in different periods" - Trans.

This also determines that "Xi Jinping's Resolution" is definitely more backward and reactionary than "Deng Xiaoping's Resolution". This shows that after revisionism comes to power, it will only go further and further and more thoroughly to restore capitalism. This is the inevitable law of its development determined by the nature of revisionism. It is this law that determines that "Xi Jinping's Resolution" can only be a more thorough revisionist program and a capitalist program.

It is this law that determines that Chairman Mao's statement that once revisionism comes to power, it will engage in the worst capitalism is an irrefutable truth.

Let's look at some proofs of "the worst capitalism".

The political fascist bourgeois dictatorship, as a major feature of revisionism after it came to power as pointed out by Chairman Mao, has been discussed before, so I won't repeat it here.

Since such a major and serious historical topic as "what is socialism, what kind of socialism to build, and how to build socialism" has been raised, let's start with this issue.

The "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee answered this question in this way: "State-owned economy and collective economy are the basic economic forms of our country, and a certain range of individual economy of workers is a necessary supplement to the public ownership economy. Specific management and distribution systems suitable for various economic components must be implemented. It is necessary to implement a planned economy on the basis of public ownership, while giving play to the auxiliary role of market regulation."

However, the answer to this question in the "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee became this: "China's reform has taken the lead in implementing the household contract responsibility system in rural areas, gradually shifted to urban economic system reform and rolled it out in an all-round way, established the reform direction of the socialist market economy, played a fundamental role of the market in resource allocation to a greater extent and in a wider range, and adhered to and improved the basic economic system and distribution system."

"The reform goals and basic framework of the socialist market economic system have been established, and the basic economic system with public ownership as the main body and the common development of multiple ownership economies in the primary stage of socialism and the distribution system with distribution according to work as the main body and multiple distribution methods coexisting have been established."

"It is clear that we must adhere to and improve the basic socialist economic system and enable the market to play a decisive role in resource allocation."

"The Party will unswervingly consolidate and develop the public economy, unswervingly encourage, support and guide the development of the non-public economy, support the strengthening, optimization and expansion of state-owned capital and state-owned enterprises, establish a modern enterprise system with Chinese characteristics, enhance the competitiveness, innovation, control, influence and risk resistance of the state-owned economy; build a close and clean relationship between government and business, and promote the healthy development of the non-public economy and the healthy growth of non-public economic personnel."

Any historical thing exists as a process. In China, the rise of revisionism and the restoration of capitalism are also a historical process. Forty years have passed, one at the beginning and the other at the end. If we make a serious comparative study of the two resolutions, we can clearly see the historical trajectory of this process and recognize many laws of this process.

"Deng Xiaoping's Resolution" said in the past that what we should do is "socialist planned economy"; "Xi Jinping's Resolution" now says that what we should do is "socialist market economy".

"Deng Xiaoping's Resolution" used to say that "state-owned economy and collective economy are the basic economic forms of our country, and individual economy of workers within a certain scope is a necessary supplement to the economy of public ownership". "Xi Jinping's Resolution" now says that "the basic economic system with public ownership as the main body and the common development of multiple ownership economies and the distribution system with distribution according to work as the main body and multiple distribution methods coexisting in the primary stage of socialism have been established".

"Deng Xiaoping's Resolution" used to say that "it is necessary to implement a planned economy on the basis of public ownership, while giving play to the auxiliary role of market regulation". "Xi Jinping's Resolution" now says that "the reform direction of the socialist market economy has been established, and the fundamental role of the market in resource allocation has been given play to a greater extent and in a wider range". Entering the "new era", it is even more said that "it is necessary to adhere to and improve the basic socialist economic system so that the market plays a decisive role in resource allocation".

Deng Xiaoping's Resolution used to say, "It is necessary to implement specific management and distribution systems suitable for various economic elements." Xi Jinping's Resolution now says, "The Party will unswervingly consolidate and develop the public economy, unswervingly encourage, support and guide the development of the non-public economy, support the strengthening, optimization and expansion of state-owned capital and state-owned enterprises, establish a modern enterprise system with Chinese characteristics, enhance the competitiveness, innovation, control, influence and risk resistance of the state-owned economy; build a close and clean relationship between government and business, and promote the healthy development of the non-public economy and the healthy growth of non-public economic personnel."

In this comparison, the difference between the two resolutions is immediately revealed to us. What does this difference indicate? It is clear that it actually indicates that during these forty years, Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line has been deepening step by step, and with it, the restoration of capitalism in China has been deepening step by step. The resolution is nothing more than a reflection of this process.

This is a cruel process of deprivation. Through the beautiful words of the "Resolution", we see the despicable collusion of power and money, the crazy theft of state-owned assets, the deprivation of the working class from the masters of enterprises to the slaves of enterprises, and the ultimate replacement of socialist public ownership by capitalist private ownership in the blood and tears of the working people. The problems of the "Lenovo Group"³² that were recently exposed are a typical example of such theft of state-owned assets. Moreover, this is just the tip of the iceberg, because this is a class phenomenon, a phenomenon of the bourgeoisie depriving the proletariat, which is forcibly

³² Lenovo Group Limited had its origins at Legend in mainland China, starting as a personal computer (PC) importer in 1984. After becoming China's largest PC manufacturer, it purchased IBM's PC business in 2005. It successfully evolved into a multinational corporation and a global leader in the PC market. But by 2018 it had been beset with major problems, with the counterattack of HP and Dell in overseas markets, as well as the entry of more product-thinking competitors such as Xiaomi and Huawei in the domestic market. On May Fourth Youth Day, 2018, Lenovo was kicked out of the constituent stocks of the Hang Seng Index and from 2013 to 2018, Lenovo's market value had evaporated by nearly 60%, and it was rated as the worst technology stock by non-Chinese media – Trans.

realised under the protection of the worst bourgeois violent state machine under the banner of "Communist Party" and "Socialism".

This process fully illustrates that the so-called "We will neither follow the old path of closed-door and rigid development nor the evil path of changing flags and banners, but will unswervingly follow the path of socialism with Chinese characteristics" reiterated in the "Resolution" is nothing more than "unswervingly" following the worst path of bureaucratic autocracy and monopoly capitalism, which is neither the path of true Marxist scientific socialism led by Chairman Mao nor the path of bourgeois democracy in developed Western capitalist countries.

This process has not stopped, will not stop, and will not turn back. It will only continue, getting worse and worse, and going backwards, until it is finally negated and eliminated by history.

We should also pay special attention to the fact that Xi Jinping's "new era" is "new" in that it is the worst "historical orientation" that this restoration process can currently achieve. Regarding this point, the latest materials have a best explanation. It is the so-called "56789".

In my recent article "56789 is too telling", I briefly explained this issue:

According to the information provided by the 21st Century Business Herald: On September 6, 2021, the "2021 China International Digital Economy Expo" opened in Shijiazhuang. Liu He, member of the Political Bureau of the CPC Central Committee and Vice Premier of the State Council, attended and delivered a speech via video.

This is more than a month later. After Liu He expressed his firm support for the development of small and medium-sized enterprises at the "National Specialized, Special and New Small and Medium Enterprises Summit Forum", he once again expressed his strong support for the development of the private economy.

In his speech, Vice Premier Liu He provided us with a very important set of information. He said: "The private economy contributes more than 50% of tax revenue, more than 60% of GDP, more than 70% of technological innovation, more than 80% of urban employment, and more than 90% of the number of market entities. This is also the typical feature of 56789 for small and medium-sized enterprises."

The data and information provided by Vice Premier Liu He in formal occasions and formal speeches are very reliable, very authoritative, and naturally very important. In my opinion, it is this 56789 that gives an accurate answer to the current problems in China. So I said that this set of figures "is very telling."

Of course, those who advocate that only capitalism can save China and only capitalism can develop China also attach great importance to this set of figures. Because in their view, it is this set of figures that fully demonstrates that the "miracle" of China's economic development is achieved by developing private enterprises, that is, private capitalist enterprises.

This is precisely the fundamental difference in understanding China's current problems. This is a difference in ideological and political lines. To use the term "four self-confidences", this is a difference in theory, a difference in path, and a difference in system. In other words, is this "economic miracle" a socialist "economic miracle" or a capitalist "economic miracle"? Does this "economic miracle" belong to the working people and bring economic benefits to the

working people, or does it belong to the bourgeoisie and bring economic benefits to the bourgeoisie? This is a question of right and wrong that must be distinguished.

We cannot be blinded by the words "economic miracle" and forget how this "economic miracle" was achieved and whose "economic miracle" it is? We cannot be confused and follow the crowd, especially we cannot be wrapped up in the broken flag of the bourgeois narrow patriotism and forget that we, the working people, are in a miserable situation of being exploited and oppressed under the heavy pressure of the three mountains. We must see the essence of the "economic miracle" and make a class analysis of the "economic miracle". Now, the "5 6 7 8 9" thrown out by Vice Premier Liu He provides us with the most reliable and convincing evidence for such a class analysis. We are here to do some such analysis.

Mr. Liu He is a member of the "top design" group, and a very important member. In the words of the General Secretary, "He is very important to me." Therefore, we naturally think that Mr. Liu He is not speaking on his own behalf, but on behalf of the Party, the Party Central Committee, and the General Secretary. When we analyse the problems reflected in this set of figures, they are naturally not Mr. Liu He's personal problems, but problems of the Party, especially the Party Central Committee and the General Secretary. This is the fundamental reason why we attach importance to this set of figures.

Mr. Liu He naturally talked about the "56789" from the perspective of the importance of developing private enterprises for "socialism with Chinese characteristics". However, this just illustrates the essential connection between private enterprises that have achieved "56789" and "socialism with Chinese characteristics". It is from this set of figures that we have a profound understanding that saying that capitalism has been restored in China and that China has become a bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalist society is in line with China's actual conditions and is a scientific and reliable conclusion. The "56789" set of figures provided by Mr. Liu He once again provides a solid and unshakable basis for this conclusion.

Socialism is the first stage of communism. It can be called the lower stage or the primary stage. However, no matter whether it is the first stage, the lower stage or the primary stage, one thing must be met, that is, the socialist economy must be a public ownership economy in essence, otherwise it will not be qualified to be a stage of communist society.

Of course, due to specific historical conditions, the initial form of socialist public ownership could not be a completely pure form of public ownership. This has been proven by the practice of socialist revolution from Lenin to Chairman Mao. It is not impossible to say that the public ownership economy is the main body and dominant, and multiple economic elements coexist. In Lenin's time, as he himself said many times, under the dominance of socialist state ownership, there were five economic elements coexisting. As for the "New Economic Policy", it was even more under the control of the proletarian state, allowing the existence and development of domestic and foreign capitalist economies. In the era of Chairman Mao, after the founding of New China in 1949, the economic relations at that time were similar to those in Lenin's era. Even after the socialist transformation in 1956, it was not yet a completely and thoroughly socialist public ownership economy. Capitalists still received fixed interest, and there were private plots in rural areas. Even the collective economy of the three levels was not yet a public ownership economy. However, in the era of Lenin, including the era of Stalin, and in the era of Chairman Mao, the public ownership economy was the main body and dominated. This is clear. It is true that it was a socialist economy at that time.

However, the figures of "56789" tell us that China's current economic situation is no longer dominated by public ownership, but by capitalist economy.

The concept of "private economy" is nothing but a revisionist trick. Private economy is capitalist economy, and the "people" here are not the working people, but the capitalists.

In the past, there was a saying that "private economy has occupied half of the country". The fact now is that it is more than half of the country. Private economy, that is, capitalist economy, has become the main body of China's economy and has occupied a dominant position.

It is said that more than 50% of taxes come from the private capitalist economy. Profits are definitely higher than taxes. Then, the profits brought by the capitalist economy, which are far higher than 50%, naturally belong to the capitalists, that is, the bourgeoisie. Under such economic relations, can there be no polarization between the rich and the poor? Can there be no differentiation and confrontation between the working class and the bourgeoisie?

It is said that more than 60% of GDP comes from the private capitalist economy. This tells us that China's economy is now supported by the capitalist economy. The so-called China is already the second largest economy in the world, which is mainly achieved by the capitalist economy. In this case, China, the second largest economy in the world, is certainly not a socialist economy, but a capitalist economy. How can such an economy be the economic foundation of a socialist society? It can only bring about a capitalist society, and this is actually the case. The restoration of capitalism refers to this fact.

It is said that more than 70% of technological innovations come from the private capitalist economy. This is really a shocking figure. The symbol of productivity is the means of production, and the means of production are the result of scientific and technological innovation. It can be said that science and technology are the core of productivity. Deng Xiaoping said that science and technology are the primary productive forces. This statement is unscientific and incorrect. There is no question of first or second in the relationship between science and technology and productivity. The matter is very clear. Whoever is at the forefront of scientific and technological innovation has mastered advanced productivity and the advanced production level of this era. After understanding this truth, the danger of more than 70% of technological innovations coming from the private capitalist economy is also clear. This means that China's science and technology, China's level of productivity development, is basically in the hands of the bourgeoisie. A country where more than 70% of technological innovations fall into the hands of capitalists, and then claims to be a socialist country, isn't that a lie?

It is said that more than 80% of the urban population is employed in the private capitalist economy. This figure is more important because it reflects not only economic relations, but also class relations. It tells us that more than 80% of the urban population have become wage labourers in the private capitalist economy; this means that more than 80% of the urban population are no longer workers in socialist enterprises, and no longer masters of socialist enterprises. This is a major change in class relations. The Chinese working class has been "reformed" from the former masters of the country to wage labourers who create surplus value for private capitalism. From the masters of the socialist country, they have fallen into the slaves of the capitalists. This figure is very convincing. To see whether capitalism is restored, we can get the correct answer by analysing this set of figures; what kind of reform is the so-called "reform" implemented from Deng Xiaoping to the present? What kind of society should Chinese be reformed into? Analysing this set of figures can also give the correct answer.

It is said that more than 90% of the market players come from the private capitalist economy. This tells us that the so-called socialist market economy is nothing but empty talk, and what is actually practiced is the capitalist market economy. Since more than 90% of the market players come from private capitalism, how can it still be called a socialist market economy?

There is a Chinese saying that goes, "If you don't fight, you will confess." We don't need to criticise him. Mr. Liu He has used the sufficiently reliable and convincing data of "56789" (with an "above") to tell us convincingly that the result of their resolute implementation of Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line is to restore capitalism in China. The so-called "socialism with Chinese characteristics" is actually capitalism with Chinese characteristics. The word "socialism" is for the people to hear; doing capitalism is their real purpose, and, as Chairman Mao correctly predicted, they are doing the "worst capitalism": bureaucratic autocracy and monopoly capitalism. "5 6 7 8 9" is the best footnote to Chairman Mao's instructions.

Based on this profound and accurate foresight, do you think Chairman Mao was great? !

Of course, Mr. Liu He's announcement of this set of figures is not a confession, but as the saying goes, they are "taking what is not right as a reason". In their view, this "56789" is very good, this is their "achievement", and this is exactly what they want. That's why they brazenly declared it to the world and the people at the conference. This is not surprising at all. This is precisely from their "confidence". The General Secretary emphasised the "four confidences", which, in the final analysis, is the "confidence" in adhering to Chinese-style capitalism. Mr. Liu He's confident talk about this "56789" once again illustrates this point. As the General Secretary's right-hand man, Mr. Liu He's thoughts are certainly not his personal thoughts, but the General Secretary's "New Era Socialism with Chinese Characteristics". So the root is not here with Mr. Liu He, but with the General Secretary.

The above-mentioned principles are based on the current economic facts of China reflected by "56789". They are the "truth" obtained from these facts, and therefore they are correct. These principles are completely applicable to interpreting the false and empty words in "Xi Jinping's Resolution" about "what is socialism, how to build socialism, and what kind of socialism to build". These principles simply reveal that the so-called "socialism with Chinese characteristics" is actually China's bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalism. This also implements what Chairman Mao said that once revisionism comes to power, it will engage in capitalism, and the worst capitalism, which is an irrefutable truth.

Example 4:

"Xi Jinping's Resolution" is a signpost towards social-imperialism.

"Xi Jinping's Resolution" reads: "Strengthen the top-level design of foreign affairs, make strategic plans for China's major power diplomacy with Chinese characteristics, promote the construction of a new type of international relations, promote the building of a community with a shared future for mankind, promote the common values of peace, development, fairness, justice, democracy and freedom for all mankind, and lead the trend of human progress."

It also wrote: "The Party grasps the overall situation of diplomatic work in the new era, adheres to the main line of serving national rejuvenation and promoting human progress, holds high the banner of peace, development, cooperation and win-win, promotes and improves the all-round, multi-level and

three-dimensional diplomatic layout, and actively develops global partnerships. We manage major power relations and promote major power coordination and cooperation."

This is a more retrogressive and revisionist diplomatic line than the "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 11th Central Committee.

The resolution of the Sixth Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee also said: "Under international conditions where the danger of war still exists, it is necessary to strengthen the modernization of national defence construction." "In foreign relations, we must continue to oppose imperialism, hegemonism, colonialism and racism and safeguard world peace. On the basis of the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence, we must actively develop relations and economic and cultural exchanges with countries around the world. We must adhere to proletarian internationalism and support the liberation of oppressed nations, the construction of newly independent countries and the just struggles of peoples of all countries."

However, it is very obvious that the "Resolution" of the 6th Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee has made further revisionist "corrections" to the line, principles and policies of the "Resolution" of the 6th Plenary Session of the 11th Central Committee on foreign relations. It is a further concretisation, systematisation and line-oriented revisionist view of Deng Xiaoping that "peace and development are the themes of the contemporary world", which has far exceeded Khrushchev's revisionist line of building a "three-no world".

In the seventh comment of "Critique of Xi Jinping's Thought" "Building a 'Community of Shared Future for Mankind'" is a revisionist diplomatic line", I have made a relatively comprehensive criticism of Xi Jinping's foreign affairs thinking reflected in the "19th National Congress Political Report", which is also applicable to the current "Resolution". I will quote part of it here:

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 hegemonies 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',³³ 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

³³ 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.

worried that he said, 'To save the United States is to save China',³⁴ 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 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.

³⁴ 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.

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'³⁵, 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

³⁵ "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.

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. 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.

These criticisms are very pertinent, appropriate, and hit the nail on the head, and they have the same significance for "Xi Jinping's Resolution".

If we use the above analysis to criticize "Xi Jinping's Resolution", we can clearly see that the main problems of Xi Jinping's revisionist foreign affairs line are at least the following:

1. His assessment of the era we are in is revisionist, and he dares not even use the concept of imperialism.
2. The provisions on the Communist Party's foreign affairs line are revisionist.

This has two aspects. First, it abandons the Communist Party's historical mission of opposing capitalism and imperialism and carrying out the proletarian revolution throughout the world. Second, under the guidance of the above-mentioned wrong line, the entire "Resolution" is full of "bourgeois empty words" that the revolutionary mentors have repeatedly criticized, saying: "Hold high the banner of peace, development, cooperation, and win-win", "Promote the common values of peace, development, fairness, justice, democracy, and freedom for all mankind".

3. Completely incorporate China's foreign relations strategy into the international relations system of the capitalist world, and become a captive, running dog, and accomplice of the bourgeoisie. For example, it is said that: "my country actively participates in the reform and construction of the global governance system, maintains the international system with the United Nations at its core, the international order based on international law, and the basic norms of international relations based on the purposes and principles of the UN Charter". "Actively promote economic globalisation in the direction of greater openness, inclusiveness, universal benefits, balance, and win-win."

4. The so-called "great power diplomacy", "powerful power diplomacy", "standing up, getting rich, and becoming strong", "showing the image of a responsible great power", "China is awesome", etc., are all against Chairman Mao's way. They are by no means the thoughts, mentality, views and lines of the Communists. Instead, they are the inevitable reflection that "socialism with Chinese characteristics" has embarked on the road of social imperialism, the inevitable reflection of great power chauvinism, and the inevitable reflection of the transformation from keeping a low profile to striving for power and hegemony.

Diplomacy is the continuation of domestic affairs, and diplomacy and domestic affairs are unified. Whether it is domestic affairs or diplomacy reflected in the "Resolution", they fully prove Chairman

Mao's scientific conclusion: once revisionism comes to power, it will establish a fascist bourgeois dictatorship and capitalism, and the worst capitalism.

As I said, the 'Xi Jinping Resolution' is full of mistakes, and in my own capacity I can only give examples to criticise it. Even so, through the above four examples, we can clearly see that the Resolution of the Sixth Plenary Session of the Nineteenth Central Committee, that is, the Xi Jinping Resolution, is much more reactionary than the Resolution of the Sixth Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee, which is much more reactionary than the Resolution of the Sixth Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee.

This is neither surprising nor coincidental. Once revisionism comes to power, once the revisionist line is implemented, it can only be like this. The so-called 'reform and opening up' is to implement the revisionist line, to take the road of capitalism, and to engage in the restoration of capitalism, which is the essence of the so-called 'reform and opening up', the essence of the so-called 'reform and opening up'.

This is a road of no return with no bottom line and no end in sight. The history of capitalist restoration over the past four decades has come this way. The Resolution of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee is but a concentrated reflection and complete record of this historical process. In this sense, it is realistic and appropriate to label it a 'confession'.

4.

The last part of "Xi Jinping's Resolution" summarizes the history of the Communist Party of China over the past 100 years, with two titles, "Historical Significance" and "Historical Experience".

However, in our opinion, this is irrelevant.

Because the 100-year history of the Party, generally speaking, should be divided into two historical stages of fundamentally different natures.

The Communist Party of China in the first historical stage was a truly revolutionary Communist Party under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism; the Communist Party of China in the second historical stage was a fake Communist Party and a true revisionist party under the guidance of Deng Xiaoping's revisionism.

In the previous historical stage, although there were interferences from the erroneous lines of left and right deviations, the erroneous lines were eventually overcome, and Chairman Mao's correct revolutionary line dominated, thus winning the victory of the new democratic revolution and the socialist revolution.

In the latter historical stage, although there were still struggles within the party, Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line always dominated, leading to the failure of China's socialist revolution and the restoration of capitalism, and the restoration of the worst capitalism.

The name of the Communist Party of China has been used for a hundred years, but there are two fundamentally different historical stages: one worthy of the name and the other unworthy of the name. This is a basic historical fact. Under such circumstances, it is obviously wrong to summarise the party's history of the past hundred years in a general way, and it is impossible to conform to historical facts. "Xi Jinping's Resolution" made such a principled mistake of confusing right and wrong.

I would like to make some corrections here to the five so-called "historical experiences" summarised in the "Resolution" to set things right.

The "Resolution" says: "(1) The Party's century-long struggle has fundamentally changed the future and destiny of the Chinese people." And so on.

If this statement is used in the era of Chairman Mao, it is generally acceptable. However, if it is used in the passage from "Deng Xiaoping era" to "Xi Jinping's new era", it should be revised as follows: Since Deng Xiaoping's revisionism came to power, Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line has become the guiding line of the Communist Party of China, and the revolutionary Communist Party of China has irreversibly transformed into a counter-revolutionary revisionist party. Under such historical conditions, "the future and destiny of the Chinese people have been fundamentally changed", and the Chinese people have completely returned to "the destiny of being bullied, oppressed, and enslaved", and are no longer "the masters of the country, society, and their own destiny", and "the Chinese people's yearning for a better life has continuously" turned into fantasy. "Today, the Chinese people" have completely lost the "historical initiative and historical creation spirit" of the era of Chairman Mao, and are painfully "writing the tragic history of the Chinese people in the 'new era'".

The resolution says: "(2) The Party's century-long struggle has opened up the correct path to realise the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation." And so on.

This passage should also be amended: under the leadership of the revisionist party, since it embarked on the evil path of restoring capitalism, capitalism, which had been eliminated by peaceful socialist transformation under the leadership of Chairman Mao, was swiftly reborn again on the soil of China through the trading of power and money and the theft of state assets, and overnight tens of thousands of private capitalists with billions of dollars of wealth in their hands became the new oppressors and exploiters riding on the heads of the Chinese working class.

It is under the historical conditions of the restoration of capitalism that "it took only a few decades to complete the (capitalist) industrialization process that (capitalist) developed countries have gone through for hundreds of years, creating two miracles of rapid (capitalist) economic development and long-term (capitalist) social stability."

These are the essence of realising the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation.

The resolution states: "(3) The Party persists in writing Marxism on its banner, constantly advancing the Sinicization and modernisation of Marxism, absorbing all the outstanding achievements of human civilization with a broad mind, and guiding the great practice with the scientific theory of the Sinicization of Marxism. The scientific nature and truthfulness of Marxism have been fully tested in China, the people-oriented nature and practicality of Marxism have been fully implemented in China, and the openness and timeliness of Marxism have been fully demonstrated in China. The Sinicization and modernisation of Marxism have achieved continuous success, presenting Marxism to the world in a new image, and bringing about a major transformation in the historical evolution and competition between the two ideologies and two social systems of socialism and capitalism in the world that is in favour of socialism."

This passage contains many typical and erroneous statements, which fully demonstrate the characteristics of revisionism and deserve a few more comments.

It is true that revisionism always "writes Marxism on its own banner", but it only "writes it on its own banner" and does not really formulate its own line in accordance with Marxism to carry out the socialist revolutionary movement.

The "Sinicization and modernisation", "openness and timeliness", "the people-oriented nature of Marxism", and "presenting Marxism to the world in a brand-new form" mentioned here are actually all intended to tamper with Marxism into revisionist super-class rhetoric, all in order to castrate the soul of Marxism - the theory of class struggle and the theory of proletarian dictatorship, and to turn Marxism and socialism into a "brand-new image" that can be accepted by the domestic and international bourgeoisie.

The so-called "causing a major change in the historical evolution and contest between the two ideologies and social systems of socialism and capitalism to benefit socialism" is a synonym for revisionist capitulationism. It is completely deceptive to describe the struggle between socialism and capitalism, that is, the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, as "historical evolution and contest", or even to say that "a major change has taken place in favour of socialism". The fact of "historical evolution and contest" is that socialism has been destroyed, socialism has been betrayed, capitalism has been restored, and capitalism has been surrendered. How can this be considered a major change in favour of socialism? What we have actually seen is a major change in favour of capitalism!

As Chairman Mao particularly hated, a major characteristic of the revisionist party is that, although it has clearly degenerated into a bourgeois party, it does not openly declare itself a bourgeois party like other bourgeois parties, nor dare to express its bourgeois standpoint and viewpoints nakedly. Instead, it always claims to be a "communist party" belonging to the proletariat, and even raises the flag of "Marxism" and hangs the sign of "socialism". Chairman Mao has said many times, not only within the party but also to international friends, that he hates the deception of such revisionist parties and prefers naked bourgeois parties.

Our dear General Secretary is playing such a role again. The Resolution of the 6th Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee, which he presided over, once again played this revisionist deception trick. He clearly has betrayed Marxism and continues to betray it, but he insists that "the scientific nature and truthfulness of Marxism have been fully tested in China, the people-oriented and practical nature of Marxism have been fully implemented in China, and the openness and timeliness of Marxism have been fully demonstrated in China", and "the Sinicization and timeliness of Marxism have been continuously successful". These words sound very nice, but they hide a revisionist method of castrating the soul of Marxism, which requires us to do some analysis.

He says "Marxism's people-oriented nature" is a new term, but it is incorrect.

The revolutionary mentors have repeatedly taught us that the concept of the people has different meanings in different historical periods; moreover, it is not a concept of a single class, but always contains the composition of multiple classes. For example, in the process of the new democratic revolution in our country, the national bourgeoisie who were willing to accept the leadership of the Communist Party of China and actively participated in the new democratic revolution belonged to the class within the scope of the people until after liberation. However, everyone knows that even in this case, it cannot be said that this is the people-oriented nature of Marxism, because that is equivalent to saying that Marxism also contains the attributes of the national bourgeoisie, which is obviously wrong.

Common sense tells us that Marxism, as a revolutionary theory, has a distinct class nature. In other words, it is often said that Marxism is the revolutionary theory of the proletariat. Only by understanding it in this way can we correctly understand the basic theoretical thought of Marxism, the revolutionary nature of Marxism, and the unity of Marxism and communism. The concept of people-

orientedness cannot reflect this point. There are different classes among the people, and these different classes have different political demands and different ideological theories. Marxism can only reflect the demands of the proletariat, not the demands of other classes. For example, the theory of Marxism is to eliminate private ownership and realise communism. Even the bourgeoisie, which belongs to the people for a period of time, cannot agree with such theoretical requirements. Even farmers and small producers, as private owners, are not the natural recipients of this theory.

Of course, the history of the Party tells us that in different historical stages and periods, under the guidance of Marxism and based on specific historical realities, when formulating the Communist Party's lines, principles, and policies for that historical stage, we can and should reflect the historical demands of the entire revolutionary people and unite all the revolutionary people to complete the historical tasks of that historical stage. This has been proven by the historical experience of our Party under the leadership of Chairman Mao, and the magic weapon of the united front came into being in this way. This is not only not proof that Marxism is popular, but it proves that only by adhering to its proletarian nature can Marxism truly represent the interests of the broad masses of the people, first of all the working people, establish a broad people's united front, and win the victory of revolution and construction. This can only be said that under certain specific historical conditions, the proletarian revolutionary line, principles, and policies under the guidance of Marxism have broad popular nature, represent the historical demands of the broad masses of progressive and revolutionary people in this historical period and historical stage, and thus promote the progress of history. However, this cannot be said to be a manifestation of the "popular nature of Marxism". The fact is the opposite. It is precisely because of adhering to the proletarian nature of Marxism that the interests of the broad masses of the people can be truly and well represented and guided from victory to victory.

The historical experience of the international communist movement and the historical experience of the Communist Party of China tell us that the representatives of the right opportunist line, because they did not understand this point, gave up the independence of the proletariat, gave up the leadership of the proletariat in the people's revolutionary movement, and even succumbed to and surrendered to the bourgeoisie, which led to the failure of the revolution and left a bloody lesson. For example, the failure of the Great Revolution in 1927 is such a typical example.

The revolutionary mentors of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism have a lot of profound theoretical discussions and strategic teachings on this issue. Lenin, Stalin and Chairman Mao are shining examples of adhering to a correct Marxist proletarian revolutionary line and leading the great victory of the proletarian people's democratic revolution and the proletarian socialist revolution.

The expression of "the people's nature of Marxism" in the "Resolution" is nothing more than the reappearance of the erroneous theory of revisionism today, and it is the theoretical expression of General Secretary Xi Jinping's adherence to Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line and the class capitulation of the bourgeoisie.

"Sinification of Marxism" is another erroneous term used in the "Resolution".

This term appeared in the Yan'an era and was also used by Chairman Mao. However, later, this term was abandoned by Chairman Mao. This term was not used in the officially published Selected Works of Mao Zedong. Chairman Mao's handling of this was not accidental, and there must be a reason. Simply put, it was because this term was unscientific.

First of all, this term is not rigorous enough.

The basic principles of Marxism are universal truths that can and should be applied flexibly from a practical point of view in the light of the specific conditions of different countries. However, this cannot be said to be a nationalisation of Marxism, because the basic principles of Marxism do not undergo any nationalisation in the process of their application, but only various changes in the form in which the basic principles of Marxism are unfolded. This is just like the theorems or formulas of the natural sciences, which, when applied in different countries and on different occasions, are subject to many variations, but everyone knows that such variations are not the nationalisation of the theorems or formulas, but only changes in the form of their application in accordance with the objects to which they are applied.

As for some specific opinions arising in the process of Marxism's application, they will develop, change or even be abandoned with the changes in different countries, historical periods and conditions, which of course cannot be interpreted as the nationalisation of Marxism.

The more important drawback of this formulation is that it regards the concrete application of Marxism as a process of nationalisation only, and denies that the concrete application of Marxism is always united with the development of Marxism, which is by no means only of nationalised significance, but more importantly of international and universal significance.

The Resolution's description of Mao Zedong Thought as a product of the Sinification of Marxism is clearly flawed in this way. To make a brief point.

For example, the New Democratic Revolution, although there were valuable ideological materials left by the revolutionary mentors before, this complete theoretical system was mainly created by Chairman Mao, and it cannot be said to be original to Marxism, so it is difficult to say that it is the product of the Sinification of Marxism. Our party has always said that Mao Zedong Thought is the product of the combination of Marxism-Leninism and the reality of the Chinese revolution. This makes sense, that is, under the guidance of the basic principles of Marxism, combined with the reality of the Chinese revolution, and in the process of solving the practical problems of the Chinese revolution, Mao Zedong Thought was produced. The theory of the New Democratic Revolution is not only of Chinese significance, it has the universal guiding significance of Marxism for the democratic revolution of all countries with similar national conditions to China. Therefore, it can be said that this is the development of Marxism, the first important content of Maoism, and the first great contribution.

Another example is Chairman Mao's theory of continuing socialist revolution. Of course, there are also valuable ideological materials left by revolutionary mentors. However, as is generally recognised by the world, this is another theoretical creation of Chairman Mao on the need to continue revolution in the socialist historical stage. This cannot be said to be original to Marxism, and no one has ever said that this is the product of the Sinification of Marxism.

The important significance of this theory is that it is not only applicable to China, but also has theoretical guiding significance for all countries that have entered socialist society through socialist revolution. This significance, of course, cannot be summarized or explained by the word "Sinification"; it is precisely the international and universal significance of this theory that can be said to be the development of Marxism, the second important content of Maoism, and the second great contribution.

Similarly, Chairman Mao's "Three Worlds Theory" based on Lenin's theory of imperialism is not the "Sinification" of Marxism. Chairman Mao's contributions to Marxist philosophy, such as his philosophical works such as *On Contradiction* and *On Practice*, are not products of nationalisation and cannot be summarised as "Sinification of Marxism". These great contributions are all for the development of Marxism and have universal significance for the whole world.

It can be seen that using "Marxism in China" to summarise Mao Zedong Thought cannot correctly explain the theoretical significance and theoretical status of Mao Zedong Thought. Limiting the development of Marxism to a certain country is not in line with the law of the development of Marxism, nor can it explain the universal theoretical significance of the development of Marxism in the world. The development of Marxism has never been based on individual countries, but on the entire human world.

The emergence of the term Leninism also proves that what I am talking about here is correct.

No one has ever said that Lenin's theory of imperialism, the theory and practice of the Russian socialist revolution and socialist construction created under Lenin's leadership, are the Russification of Marxism. The proposal of Leninism and the universal theoretical significance of Leninism have been verified by history; to this day, the theoretical and practical significance of Leninism and its guiding role in the international communist movement are still not outdated from a global perspective. If Leninism is said to be the Russification of Marxism, it is actually belittling the great guiding role of Leninism in the communist movement throughout the world.

The inappropriateness of the term "Sinification of Marxism" lies in the failure to understand that Marxism is a doctrine of the liberation of mankind all over the world. This doctrine looks at problems from the perspective of the universal and inevitable laws of the development of human history all over the world. Limiting the theory and development of Marxism to a certain country or a certain nation is inconsistent with the essential meaning of Marxism and is inaccurate and unscientific. Defining Mao Zedong Thought as the Sinification of Marxism has such a defect. At first glance, it seems to make sense, but if you think deeply, it does not stand up to scrutiny. Therefore, Chairman Mao used this term at first, but never used it again.

Now, the Chinese revisionists have revived this concept, especially the repeated use of this concept in the Resolution, describing all these revisionist rubbish fallacies of 'Deng and the three theories, and Xi' as 'the Sinification of Marxism', which is of course not a mistake of understanding, let alone an accidental oversight. This is certainly not a mistake in understanding, let alone an accidental oversight, but has a political purpose. In short, it is to create a theoretical basis for their revisionism, to put on the legitimate garb of Marxism and to cover up their shameful crime of betraying Marxism.

In their 'Sinification', the first major thing they did was to 'Sinify' Chairman Mao and Maoism, and then to 'Sinify' the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist doctrines of class struggle and dictatorship of the proletariat, and to 'Sinify' Marxism-Leninism-Maoism into revisionism.

In their 'Sinification', they have 'Sinified' the socialist society that Chairman Mao has led us to establish, 'Sinified' the people's democratic dictatorship, and 'Sinified' the socialist communal ownership. They have 'Sinified' our socialist society under Chairman Mao's leadership, 'Sinified' the people's democratic dictatorship, 'Sinified' the socialist system of public ownership, and 'Sinified' a fascist bourgeois dictatorship of capitalist society, the worst kind of capitalist society.

Here lies the essence of their 'Sinification of Marxism', which is to deceive the people, and in the course of the deception, to openly and thoroughly implement their revisionist line, to deepen the restoration of capitalism step by step, and to push the worst of capitalism step by step into an even worse state.

If we conduct a theoretical discussion, we can also say that revisionism is not nationalised, but internationalised, and always has global significance. Looking at the history of the development of international revisionism over the past 100 years, isn't this the case? The current set of practices of the Chinese revisionists is, in the near term, the same as that of Khrushchev, and in the long term, the

same as that of Bernstein and Kautsky. Its essence, and even its manifestation, is not nationalised, but international. In the same way, any specific revisionism has its "characteristics", but its essence is consistent and common. For example, they all abandon class struggle as the key link, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship, and socialism. The only difference is in the specific form of development.

The "Xi Jinping's Resolution" repeatedly advocates "the sinification of Marxism" for the General Secretary's special personal reasons. It is mainly to promote the General Secretary's "Xi Jinping Thought on Socialism with Chinese Characteristics for a New Era".

To be frank and to make the General Secretary angry, in my opinion, although Deng, Jiang, Hu and Xi are all revisionists, in comparison, among these four leaders, the General Secretary has the lowest level and the greatest ambition.

I am not making accusations. The facts are there. The "Resolution" summarises the so-called three leaps in the sinification of Marxism. The first one mentioned Chairman Mao's contribution, the second one mentioned Deng Xiaoping's contribution, and the third one bluntly said it was Xi Jinping's contribution. Moreover, Xi Jinping's contribution is the creation of "Xi Jinping Thought". Deng Xiaoping was just a "theory", Jiang Zemin was just the "Three Represents", and Hu Jintao was just the "Scientific Outlook on Development". Xi Jinping's "Xi Jinping Thought on Socialism with Chinese Characteristics for a New Era", or simply "Xi Jinping Thought", has obviously overwhelmed Deng, Jiang, and Hu and is on par with Mao Zedong Thought. In China, if one dares to be on the same level as Chairman Mao, even if he is drunk, he would not say such drunken words. The ambition of General Secretary Xi Jinping is obvious. I have no ill intentions, I just speak the truth. If I don't say it, future generations will say it. It is precisely to create a theoretical basis for the "originality" of "Xi Jinping Thought" and to put on the beautiful emperor's new clothes. This is the fundamental reason why the "Sinification of Marxism" is repeatedly advocated in the "Resolution".

As Lenin said, history always likes to play jokes on people. But the Resolution is playing a very serious joke on us involving important political principles. This is why I have to criticize it at length.

Let me briefly say a few words about openness and timeliness.

The Resolution boasts that "the continuous success of the sinification and timeliness of Marxism has made Marxism present to the world in a new image" and "the openness and timeliness of Marxism have been fully demonstrated in China."

Here, people are asked about the methodological issue of the so-called "openness and timeliness of Marxism."

Generally speaking, Marxism is open and contemporary, which is self-evident from a methodological point of view. The emergence, application and development of Marxism are sufficient to prove this point.

However, there are prerequisites for how to realise the openness and timeliness of Marxism. If we ignore these conditions, erase these conditions, and talk about "openness and timeliness" in an abstract and general way, the result can only be the opposite. Instead of realising the openness and timeliness of Marxism, we will realise the openness and timeliness of revisionism.

"Xi Jinping Thought on Socialism with Chinese Characteristics for a New Era" is an excellent example of this kind of revisionist openness and timeliness. It is this example that clearly tells us what kind of prerequisites and conditions are needed to realise the openness and timeliness of Marxism.

First, we must have the standpoint, viewpoint and method of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, especially, the most basic requirement is to master the class analysis method of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

Marxism must develop with the development of the times, but in order to achieve this and do it well, a minimum requirement is to have a correct understanding of the times, which is inseparable from the standpoint, viewpoint and method of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, especially the class analysis method.

The problem with revisionism with Chinese characteristics, including this "Resolution", is precisely that they have departed from and betrayed the basic viewpoints of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. The first and foremost problem is that they do not have a correct understanding of the times. From Deng Xiaoping's "peace and development are the themes of today's world" to Xi Jinping's "building a community with a shared future for mankind", it is this problem that has abandoned and betrayed Lenin and Chairman Mao's scientific analysis that we are in an era of imperialism and proletarian revolution, and have made wrong and absurd judgments on the nature of the era and the historical tasks of the Communists. The major premise is wrong and anti-Marxist, so how can there be a development of Marxism in the era? The result can only be one, that is, the negation and betrayal of Marxism. From Deng Xiaoping to Xi Jinping, the capitulationist line of foreign affairs formulated and promoted, such as "saving the United States is saving China", "China-US husband and wife theory", "there are a thousand reasons to improve China-US relations and not a single reason to ruin China-US relations", etc., are they not the inevitable consequences of the revisionist erroneous understanding of the times?

Don't forget that this is a common feature of revisionism – betrayal of the basic principles of Marxism, especially the Marxist theory of class struggle and class analysis, and tampering with Marxism into a revisionist fake that is acceptable to the bourgeoisie. This is the case with both old and new revisionists. This is their common problem, and the same is true of the Resolution. The "contemporaneity of Marxism" or "the modernisation of Marxism" are all under the banner of Marxism, and they all sound good, but in fact they are just excuses for their revisionism.

The same is true for how to understand the "openness of Marxism" proposed in the "Resolution".

As we all know, although Marxism was born mainly on the basis of the historical conditions of that era, especially on the basis of the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie of that era, as the founder of Marxism himself explained, the birth of Marxism also includes the critical inheritance of the excellent cultural heritage of mankind. That is to say, Marxism has been an open ideological theory and revolutionary doctrine from the very beginning. It can be said that openness is an inherent attribute of Marxist doctrine. It can also be said that there is no doctrine in the world that is more broad-minded than Marxism and more open to accepting all scientific, progressive and excellent human ideological and cultural achievements. So, like the "contemporaneity of Marxism", the term "openness of Marxism" itself is not wrong. For the "Resolution" and for revisionism with Chinese characteristics, the problem lies not in the term itself, but in the specific application of the term.

The fact we see is that, as criticised during the Cultural Revolution, revisionism with Chinese characteristics is always and only "open" to "feudalism, capitalism, and revisionism". As for Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, it is not only not open, but also opposed, abandoned, and betrayed, because the essential requirement of this "opening up" is to "open up" socialism and "open up" capitalism. The revisionist openness here and the revisionist "reform and opening up" are essentially the same thing and have the same essence. If we connect it with the living history of the past forty years, the essence of the "openness" of this revisionism with Chinese characteristics can be seen more clearly.

The "opening up" in the ideological field was the first to take the lead, and its class nature and political purpose were clearly manifested. The most prominent example was the so-called "ideological enlightenment movement" launched in the 1980s by a group of intellectuals who adhered to the bourgeois standpoint and worldview with the support of the Chinese revisionism that had already come to power. This was a reactionary "ideological movement" to cooperate with the counterattack in the ideological field, to promote Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line in China, and to restore capitalism.

At that time, in the ideological field, with the so-called "question of the standard of truth" as a breakthrough point, a comprehensive counterattack had begun against the ideological propaganda, ideological criticism, ideological transformation, and ideological struggle of socialism and communism that criticized the bourgeoisie and the feudal landlord class in various ideological and theoretical fields, cultural and educational fields under the leadership of Chairman Mao. Philosophy, economics, history, culture and art, and other fields all opposed the proletarian thought of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism that Chairman Mao insisted on, and opposed the revolutionary line in the ideological and cultural fields that Chairman Mao insisted on. In the past, we lacked personal experience and perceptual understanding of what 'counter-attack' means. The storm of ideas before us has made clear to us what is meant by the 'counter-attack' of the 'Homecoming Group'³⁶; what is meant by a hundredfold class hatred and a thousandfold class insanity, all demonstrated to us clearly through this wonderful performance.

But the arrogant bourgeois masters may feel that this is not enough, especially that they may feel that their words are hurtful and are not enough to win people's hearts, so they have to repeat the old tricks, waving the banner of "openness", bringing out the so-called "masters", "authorities" and "experts" of the Western bourgeoisie, bringing out those labelled "famous doctrines" and "famous theories" but in fact they are just some old and rotten sesame seeds, all of which have long been criticised by Marxist revolutionary mentors, and introducing these ideological "drugs" that were strictly prohibited in the era of Chairman Mao into China. They write books, translate books, publish periodicals, hold academic conferences, and organise lectures, with great fanfare and excitement, and create overwhelming public opinion. With their coaxing, our college students after the 1977 class, who lacked the basic literacy and basic training of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, were considerably bewitched and poisoned. It is no exaggeration to say that it was the political, ideological and cultural environment they created that deeply poisoned that generation of young college students. For example, our Vice President Wang Qishan is an editorial board member of the "Towards the Future Series"³⁷ and a capable person who advocated bourgeois liberalisation at the time. Our Vice Premier Liu He is a college student of the 1979 class who accepted these bourgeois economic theories, and our Premier Li Keqiang is a college student of the 1978 class and a doctoral student of Li Yining, who specializes in bourgeois economics.

Speaking of this, I would like to refute some people's criticism of Chairman Mao on the issue of education.

³⁶ The "Homecoming Group" refers to landlord armed forces organised by the Kuomintang. These were unrepentant bullies and reactionaries recruited by the KMT from Communist-controlled liberated areas who, together with the Kuomintang troops, attacked the liberated areas, looting, burning, and killing everywhere. The author applies this label to the bourgeois rightists who provided ideological support to revisionism – Trans.

³⁷ A series of books published by the Sichuan People's Publishing House which began in 1984 and ended in 1988, a span of five years. The series involves social science and many aspects of the natural sciences, including translations and original works in foreign languages. The "Towards the Future" series planned to produce 100 titles, and by 1988 a total of 74 titles had been published. The publishers of the "Towards the Future" series gathered a group of influential intellectuals in China in the 80s, representing the forefront of thinking about China's repudiation of Marxism-Leninism at that time – Trans.

As we all know, Chairman Mao has a famous "July 21 Directive": "Universities should still be run. What I am mainly talking about here is that universities of science and engineering should still be run, but the school system should be shortened, education should be revolutionary, and proletarian politics should be in command. We should follow the path of the Shanghai Machine Tool Factory and train technicians from workers. We should select students from workers and farmers with practical experience to go to school, and return to production practice after studying for a few years." Chairman Mao's opinions generally have the following meanings: First, universities should still be run, especially universities of science and engineering; later in a conversation, Chairman Mao also said, I did not say that liberal arts should not be run. Second, the school system should be shortened, education should be revolutionary, and proletarian politics should be in command. Third, it is emphasised that students should be selected from workers and peasants with practical experience, and after graduation, they should return to production practice.

Some people completely deny these opinions of Chairman Mao, and regard the restoration of the college entrance examination³⁸ and the restoration of the old education system as a rectification of Chairman Mao's "mistakes".

This is incorrect. We need to analyse the college entrance examination. Examination-oriented education is not the right choice. Moreover, there are still a large number of people who cannot pass the college entrance examination or cannot take the college entrance examination due to various conditions. When considering education issues, we must not forget the majority. Moreover, the college entrance examination is not necessarily the only or the best education system. In Germany, where I live, education cannot be said to be backward, but there is no college entrance examination. As long as you graduate from high school and pass the exam, you can go to college. Moreover, their universities require about one year of internship in each subject. Germany's vocational education is famous all over the world and provides a high-level labour force for the high-level development of industry. It can be seen that the method of education, the form of education, the system of education, and even the route of education are still a problem that can be studied today. A key and prominent issue here is: should education be combined with productive labour? Education should be combined with productive labour. This is not Chairman Mao's personal opinion, but the common opinion of all revolutionary mentors since Marx.

Chairman Mao has always been dissatisfied with our education system and education line. He proposed that education should be revolutionised and that proletarian politics should be in command. Is that right? I think history has proved and continues to prove that Chairman Mao is right. This historical fact is that since the resumption of the college entrance examination, the situation of the students we have trained is the best answer. The worst is the liberal arts, which has trained a large number of children with good family backgrounds and smart people into "experts", "scholars", "celebrities", and "authorities" who wave the flag and shout for the restoration of capitalism, and even become capitalist-roaders who are engaged in capitalist restoration and wantonly embezzle and accept bribes. It is precisely based on the profound understanding of the harmfulness of the old education system that Chairman Mao repeatedly lamented on different occasions: This education system kills people, which is similar to Lu Xun's call: Save the children!³⁹

³⁸ The *gaokao* or national college entrance exam was reintroduced in 1977 by Deng Xiaoping, cancelling Mao's policy of making education more accessible to the children of worker and peasant families – Trans.

³⁹ First published in 1918, Lu Xun's "Diary of a Madman", the first vernacular novel in the history of modern Chinese literature, issued the cry of "save the children". Lu Xun sought to break the patriarchal hierarchy of

This cruel and true fact clearly tells us that on the education front, there is an issue of education system and education line. On this issue, the struggle between Chairman Mao's Marxist-Leninist-Maoist proletarian education line and Deng Xiaoping's revisionist bourgeois education line is an objective fact, and the right and wrong of these two lines are also clear and difficult to doubt. So, I will just stop here.

The "openness" in the field of ideology and theory was extended to the "openness" in the field of economy, that is, from theory to practice, everything was done completely in accordance with the bourgeois political economics. Some bourgeois economists who were originally criticised were regarded as their mentors and became very popular. The overwhelming bourgeois political economics theories such as "a market", "a stock" and "a bankruptcy" were used to overthrow and replace Chairman Mao's socialist political economics theory. Chairman Mao's "On the Ten Major Relationships" and a series of socialist political economics works were denied and closed. The "Anshan Constitution", "Daqing Spirit" and "Iron Man Spirit" were denied and closed. After such a cruel counterattack in theory and practice, the so-called "openness" and its inevitable "closedness" on the other hand, the capitalist market economy line replaced the socialist planned economy line, and the capitalist private economy replaced the socialist public ownership economy. The essence and outcome of this "openness" is the restoration of capitalism, and the worst capitalism.

The resolution states: "(4) The Party's century-long struggle has profoundly influenced the course of world history. The cause of the Party and the people is an important part of the cause of human progress. Over the past 100 years, the Party has worked for the happiness of the Chinese people, the rejuvenation of the Chinese nation, the progress of mankind, and world harmony. Its unremitting struggle has profoundly changed the trend and pattern of world development. The Party has led the people to successfully embark on the path of Chinese-style modernisation, created a new form of human civilization, expanded the path for developing countries to modernise, and provided a new choice for those countries and nations in the world that want to accelerate development and maintain their independence. The Party has promoted the building of a community with a shared future for mankind, contributed Chinese wisdom, Chinese solutions, and Chinese strength to solving major human problems and building a world of lasting peace, universal security, common prosperity, openness, inclusiveness, cleanliness, and beauty, and has become an important force in promoting human development and progress."

This passage talks about the influence of the Chinese Party on the course of world history.

However, whether it is used on the Chinese Communist Party in the era of Chairman Mao or the Chinese Communist Party in the era of Deng Xiaoping, it is inaccurate, and can even be said to be a complete reversal of right and wrong.

The great contribution of the Chinese Communist Party in the era of Chairman Mao to the international communist movement and the national democratic liberation movement, and its profound influence on the course of world history, are obvious to all and well known. These words written in the "Resolution" do not reflect this historical fact at all, but rather obliterate and distort this historical fact. In China, the people have a clear and proud memory of the great contribution made by the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese people to the advancement of world revolution during this period of history. In order to save space, we will omit it here.

Confucianism which passed on the man-eating attributes of traditional Chinese culture through the family – Trans.

We only talk about the "profound impact" of the Deng Xiaoping era, including the "new era" of the General Secretary, on the "process of world history".

First,

The Khrushchev group's revisionism began with the anti-Stalin movement. They threw away the knife of Stalin and then the knife of Lenin, thus destroying the prestige of Marxism-Leninism in the world, splitting the unity of the international communist movement, and causing the socialist camp to cease to exist; and leading the Soviet and Eastern socialist countries to embark on the road of revisionism, degenerating into bureaucratic autocratic privileged societies, until the "dramatic changes in the Soviet and Eastern Europe" finally occurred, transforming them into capitalist countries under the form of bourgeois democratic republics.

Deng Xiaoping's group started its revisionism by opposing Chairman Mao. They threw away Chairman Mao's knife, Chairman Mao's Marxist-Leninist-Maoist theory of continuing socialist revolution, and replaced Chairman Mao's Marxist-Leninist-Maoist socialist revolutionary line with Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line of restoring capitalism. This has once again severely damaged the prestige of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism in the world and seriously undermined the development of the international communist movement in various countries.

The revisionist traitorous behaviour of the Deng Xiaoping group is similar to that of the Khrushchev group, but in terms of the degree of damage it has caused, it has far exceeded that of the Khrushchev group. In the past, although the Soviet Party became revisionist, under the leadership of Chairman Mao, the Chinese Party bravely continued to raise the banner of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, shouldered the historical task of opposing revisionism, and actually led the international communist movement. However, it is different now. The direct consequence of the Chinese Communist Party's transformation into a revisionist party is that the communist movement has fallen into a trough worldwide, socialism has failed in the "dramatic changes", capitalism has made a comeback in the "dramatic changes", and the triumphant advance of "the east wind prevailing over the west wind" has turned into a steady retreat of "the west wind prevailing over the east wind".

Second, we must further see that in terms of revisionism and capitalist restoration, the Deng Xiaoping group went much further and more thoroughly than the Khrushchev group. There are two points worth pondering.

First, in the Soviet Union, from Khrushchev to Gorbachev and the disintegration of the Soviet Union, they practiced revisionism and caused socialism to degenerate, but in the end, they only ended up in a bureaucratic autocratic privileged society, and did not restore a naked capitalist society based on private ownership and with the possession of surplus value as its basic characteristics.

However, in China, it is completely different. Since Deng Xiaoping, through the so-called "reform and opening up" of several generations of revisionist rulers, the socialist public ownership has been brutally and violently deprived, and capitalist private ownership has been nakedly rebuilt, step by step restoring China into a bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalist society, a "worst capitalist society" as Chairman Mao said.

Second, everyone always refers to the failure of socialism and the restoration of capitalism as "dramatic changes", and always thinks that it is the work of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. In fact, this understanding of the problem is not accurate.

"Dramatic changes" started in China. The coup on October 6, 1976 was a decisive step for the bourgeoisie to seize power by force and begin to implement the fascist bourgeois dictatorship. The

Third Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee held on December 18, 1978, completely negated Chairman Mao and Chairman Mao's line of continuing the socialist revolution. It was another decisive step in the comprehensive implementation of Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line in China and the forced implementation of the policy of comprehensive restoration of capitalism. In the words of General Secretary Xi Jinping's "Speech at the Conference Celebrating the 40th Anniversary of Reform and Opening Up": The Third Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee achieved "a great turning point with far-reaching significance in the history of the Party since the founding of New China". What is "great"? It is the "turn" from Chairman Mao's Marxist-Leninist-Maoist revolutionary line to the implementation of Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line, the "turn" from the socialist road to the capitalist road, and the "turn" from building socialism to restoring capitalism.

This time point is worth noting. China was ahead in the world at that time in restoring capitalism, and played a leading role, while the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe lagged behind. It is no wonder that Gorbachev, the leader of the Soviet Union, which was once the "big brother", came to Beijing and humbly sought advice from the revisionist "big brother" Deng Xiaoping as a younger brother.

It was under the leadership of the Chinese revisionist party that the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe underwent "dramatic changes" more than ten years later.

If it is a personal sin, then Deng Xiaoping is not only a sinner of the Communist Party of China and the Chinese people, but also a sinner of the international communist movement, the international proletariat and the broad masses of working people.

This is not the glory of the Communist Party of China, but the shame of the Communist Party of China.

Faced with this ironclad fact, Xi Jinping's "Resolution" even boasted that they "worked for the progress of mankind and for the world, and profoundly changed the trend and pattern of world development with their unremitting efforts. The Party led the people to successfully embark on the path of Chinese-style modernisation, created a new form of human civilization, expanded the path for developing countries to modernise, and provided a new choice for those countries and nations in the world that wish to accelerate development and maintain their independence." Is there anything more shameless than this? The so-called "changed the trend and pattern of world development" and the so-called "provided a new choice for those countries and nations in the world that wish to accelerate development and maintain their independence." Isn't it just promoting their Chinese-style capitalism? How shameless!

The resolution states: "(5) The Party's century-long struggle has forged a Chinese Communist Party that is at the forefront of the times. When the Party was founded, there were only just over 50 members. Today, it has become the world's largest ruling party with more than 95 million members, leading a country with a population of more than 1.4 billion and with significant global influence. Over the past 100 years, the Party has adhered to its nature and purpose, adhered to its ideals and beliefs, adhered to its original aspirations and mission, and dared to reform itself. In life-and-death struggles and arduous struggles, it has withstood various risks and tests and made huge sacrifices, tempered a distinct political character, formed a spiritual spectrum with the great Party-building spirit as its source, maintained the Party's advanced nature and purity, and continuously improved its governing ability and leadership level. It is leading the Chinese people on the path of socialism with Chinese characteristics and moving irreversibly towards the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation. It is worthy of being a great, glorious and correct party."

This is a "summary" of the current Chinese Communist Party. Such a reversal of right and wrong and confusion of black and white must be corrected.

1. It is not in line with historical facts to say that "the party adheres to its nature and purpose, adheres to its ideals and beliefs, and adheres to its original mission." The correct statement should be that the current Chinese Communist Party has betrayed the nature and purpose of the Communist Party, has betrayed the communist ideal of the Communist Party, and is no longer the real Communist Party of Chairman Mao's era, but a fake Communist Party of Deng Xiaoping's era, a real revisionist party, and a bourgeois party. This party has not only undergone a transformation in terms of its nature, but has also, in fact, transformed into a bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie. The original socialist enterprises owned by the whole people have become the economic foundation of private monopoly capitalism controlled by this class.

2. It is this party that has played the role of the leader of revisionism in the world for forty years. It has not only "led" the worst capitalist society in China, but also "led" a comprehensive "upheaval" of capitalist nature in the international communist movement, leading to the total collapse of "socialism" and the full restoration of capitalism. Today, it has used the "world's second largest economy" as capital to engage in capital export, exploit and bully economically backward countries, and play the role of social-imperialism.

3. Under such circumstances, it is a pity that the Communist Party of China, as the "world's largest ruling party with significant global influence", is no longer a "great, glorious and correct party", but a revisionist, fascist and traitorous party that "is leading the Chinese people on the path of socialism with Chinese characteristics irreversibly towards the abyss of capitalism"!

This is the correct historical conclusion and the correct expression of "historical significance".

5.

As the highest representative, the highest core, and the highest individual dictator of the bourgeoisie in the "new era", the "Resolution" of the 19th Central Committee of the Communist Party of China cannot but be heavily coloured by Xi Jinping. This is also where the "Resolution" of the 19th Central Committee of the Communist Party of China is different from the "Resolution" of the 11th Central Committee of the Communist Party of China. It can also be said that it is where Xi Jinping surpasses Deng Xiaoping. Therefore, General Secretary Xi Jinping should bear the main responsibility for the serious mistakes and historical regression shown in the "Resolution" of the 19th Central Committee of the Communist Party of China criticised here.

In fact, this is also a kind of historical inevitability. Since it is a personal dictatorship of the fascist bourgeois dictatorship, it will be branded with this personal dictatorship on all political matters. Now, General Secretary Xi Jinping plays such a role. It can be said that "Xi Jinping's "Resolution"" is Xi Jinping's self-portrait and confession. Xi Jinping's personal qualities and characteristics are also fully reflected in this "Resolution". Let me say a few more words about this.

1. A fundamental feature of "Xi Jinping's Resolution" is that it is not like a party's resolution at all, but Xi Jinping made a resolution for Xi Jinping. It is a veritable "Xi Jinping's Resolution".

The entire "Resolution" can be said to be a compilation of Xi Jinping's articles and speeches. The whole text is full of this kind of text. Comrades can see at a glance that it is not worth quoting the original text. The important thing is that we must see through this phenomenon and understand its essence.

This is a major feature of "Xi Jinping's Resolution" and another major exposure of Xi Jinping's personal ambitions. This is not the strength of this revisionist party. On the contrary, it foreshadows the political crisis of this revisionist party. Historical experience tells us that the more authoritarian the leader of a political party is, the more fragile the party is, and it is not far from collapse.

The Resolution of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 11th Central Committee criticised the personality cult of Hua Guofeng, a coup speculator and traitor. The Resolution of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee strengthened the personality cult of Xi Jinping. It seems to be Xi Jinping's success, but in fact it is the failure of this party. However, a revisionist party is destined to be like this.

It is not unfair to say that Xi Jinping is a personal careerist. It can be said that the first major thing Xi Jinping worked hard to achieve since he came to power was to use political tricks to achieve personal dictatorship. By setting up more than a dozen group leaders, he stole the power that Premier Li Keqiang and other members of the Standing Committee should have into his own hands.

This is also a rule, which has been exposed by several revolutionary mentors since Marx. Generally speaking, the leaders of opportunism and revisionism are like this. These people do not understand Marxism-Leninism, are incapable of governing the country, governing the party, and engaging in politics, but are masters at playing power games. Khrushchev and Deng Xiaoping are such living examples. As the revolutionary mentors said, these people know nothing about theory, but are masters at playing tricks and schemes. As Chairman Mao said, these people are "individual careerists and conspirators" who have infiltrated the party.

Anyone who has experience in social life can see that this is a common social phenomenon since ancient times, and will also make some analysis as to why this phenomenon occurs.

In a society of private ownership and despotism, even if a person is absolutely loyal to the emperor and patriotic, as long as what he says and does is not liked by the despotic ruler, his end is always tragic. Therefore, although the "loyal ministers" who dare to give advice are often praised from the needs of the rulers and the so-called "morality", in real life, what is accepted is flattery and bragging, because from a selfish perspective, this is the most beneficial and safest choice for oneself. This is still the case today when we have not completely gotten rid of the alienated state of mankind, and it can only be like this. Therefore, the less talented people are, not only will they not go against the trend, but they will also be good at flattery and bragging; once they have power, they will not open up the channels for speech and recruit talents, but will be more jealous of talents. This is a common and understandable mentality of people without talent and morality. However, this is a big weakness. This weakness shows that, first, Xi Jinping is not a talented and ambitious person, but only a cautious and enthusiastic mediocre person; second, the current political environment determines that Xi Jinping's mind must be used for political power. For himself, he does not rely on talent, but on the means of controlling his subordinates; for his subordinates, he cannot say that he does not want talent, but the first choice is loyalty. This can be clearly seen from Xi Jinping's political experience: there are no remarkable political achievements, but his subordinates are a bunch of corrupt bastards who are loyal to him, such as in Fujian where he worked. This is even more true after he became the general secretary, and this is also very prominent in the "Resolution".

Whether it is the common problem of opportunism and revisionism exposed by the revolutionary mentors, or the historical phenomenon of such villains gaining power that can be seen everywhere in history and real life, if we analyse it from personal and social reasons, the main reason is probably here. This is an acquired deficiency developed from a congenital deficiency.

Such a personal careerist and conspirator cannot be the leader of the Communist Party of China in any way. Two terms have passed. If we continue to let him manipulate us at will, the party will be hopeless. There are still many old comrades with political experience in the party from top to bottom. Can we tolerate such an ambitious person who blatantly violates the party's organisational discipline and destroys the party? This is really "the most dangerous time". All party members who cherish the

Communist Party of China, are responsible for the belief in communism, and are responsible for Chairman Mao and countless revolutionary martyrs should rise up and fight to pull down the "new emperor" of the "new era".

If the Communist Party of China itself is unable to solve this problem and overcome this hurdle, then it will have to leave it to the people and history to solve. Perhaps in that case, the solution to the problem will be more thorough and more in line with the requirements of history.

2. "Xi Jinping's Resolution" also tells us that although Xi Jinping belongs to the "second generation of reds", unfortunately, this comrade not only has a bourgeois and revisionist worldview, but also has a strong feudal and decadent ideology in his mind, which is a typical hodgepodge of "feudalism, capitalism, and revisionism".

During the era of Chairman Mao, our party always emphasised the need to combine Marxism-Leninism with the reality of the Chinese revolution, and said that Mao Zedong Thought is the product of the combination of Marxism-Leninism and the reality of the Chinese revolution. Since Marx, several other revolutionary mentors have repeatedly said this. This is correct and is still a truth that is not outdated. However, "Xi Jinping's Resolution" added a statement of "combining with traditional Chinese culture". This must be Xi Jinping's thoughts and opinions, and it will not come from Wang Huning, let alone from ordinary pen holders, because it fully reflects an important characteristic of Xi Jinping.

This addition is completely wrong.

First, Marxism is combined with Chinese reality. Doesn't the "Chinese reality" here include the treatment of traditional Chinese culture? Therefore, adding this new statement is at least redundant and unnecessary.

Second, any Chinese knows that the heritage of traditional Chinese culture is very rich, but it must be analysed. It is necessary to do class analysis and analysis of the difference between essence and dregs. Generally speaking, "combining with traditional Chinese culture" denies the necessity of analysing and criticising traditional culture. The result will not be "combining", but using reactionary and decadent feudal dregs to impact, distort, impersonate, and replace Marxism. There is no need to give other examples. The General Secretary did this. Other articles and speeches are not mentioned. Even in this "Resolution", there are dregs that reflect feudal ideas, and they are pretended to be the words that Communists should have, such as "the most important thing for the country", "governing the country", "strictly cultivating oneself", "I will be selfless and live up to the people", "don't forget your original intention, only then can you achieve the end", etc., etc., too many to mention. Not to mention that this is the worst kind of cultural ripping, more importantly, these sayings have different contents for different classes. How can they be casually introduced into the ideological system of the Communist Party, especially the "Resolution"? The occurrence of this mistake is the inevitable result of the General Secretary's mistaken proposal of "combining with traditional Chinese culture".

This is a manifestation of Xi Jinping's vanity and weakness. Xi Jinping's mentor Li Rui once laughed at his cultural level of a primary school student. He himself often read the wrong words in solemn meetings. If he was more humble and treated his shortcomings correctly, this would not be a big deal. There are so many Chinese characters, it is not strange not to know them. Some characters will be wrong if you read them according to the radicals, which is also a common mistake.⁴⁰ One is to dare to

⁴⁰ Chinese characters commonly consist of a component which supplies a clue as to the meaning and another which sometimes suggests the pronunciation. The first of these is called a radical. For example, the character for horse, pronounced "ma" is 马 and the character for woman, pronounced "nu" is 女. Lots of words to

admit mistakes, and the other is to be more humble and cautious, and put a copy of the "Xinhua Dictionary" next to you. However, the vanity of the general secretary determines that he always wants to cover up his ignorance with exaggeration.

When he went to Russia, he listed a long list of great Russian writers; when he went to France, he listed all the great French writers; when he went to Britain, he listed all the great British writers. The general secretary did not think about whether people who have read books and have some reading experience would believe him. Besides, the most taboo thing in reading is to study blindly. The most important thing is to be "intensive" and "comprehensive".

Internally, they simply copied the classics. First, they were not sensible, which was what Chairman Mao criticised in his favourite book, "Reading Notes on Yuewei Caotang"⁴¹, as "eating without digesting". Second, the most important thing about using allusions is the content. Anything that belongs to old ideas and old cultural content and is outdated cannot be copied. For example, the ancient talk of "virtuous politics" and "benevolent politics" had its specific class and political content; the talk of "people" and people-oriented also had its specific class and political content. For the construction of a socialist country, these ideological categories and ruling theories that belong to the culture of imperial despotism cannot be copied.

The less competent one is, the more afraid others will think that one is incompetent, and the more one wants to show that one is competent. However, because one is actually incompetent, the result is that one uses incompetent methods to cover up the incompetence, which only shows one's incompetence more in the end.

Vanity is a kind of illusory honour, and because it is illusory, it kills people. Combined with traditional Chinese culture, it is the product of such vanity.

Third, in the process of leading the Chinese revolution, Chairman Mao repeatedly emphasized to the whole party and the people of the whole country that we should attach importance to the study of history. We should not only know China today, but also know China's yesterday and the day before yesterday. We should not always mention Greece, but also understand our own ancestors. This is of course also part of the "Chinese reality". However, the content of history is very rich and very complex, and it does not only include traditional culture. Traditional culture is only a part of history. However, even so, the combination of Marxism and China's reality is mainly to combine with reality. Therefore, investigating and studying reality is of primary importance. In order to have a fuller understanding of reality, we need to know as much as possible about history. In this sense, it is not only redundant but also incorrect to put the combination with traditional culture on a par with the combination of Marxism and China's reality.

Fourth, the most important and core issue is that the so-called "combination with traditional Chinese culture" is actually to combine with traditional Chinese Confucianism and Confucianism.

do with women have 女 as their radical, as in “ma” 妈 which means “mother” and shares its pronunciation with “horse”, although both have different tones to distinguish them in speech, the word for mother having a high flat tone and the word for horse having a falling and rising tone – Trans.

⁴¹ "Notes on Reading Yuewei Caotang" is a short story of the Qing Dynasty, which was written in the form of notes by Ji Yun, and was written in the Hanlin Academy sometime during the 54th year of Qianlong (1789) and the third year of Jiaqing (1798) of the Qing Dynasty. It mainly collects all kinds strange anecdotes of foxes, ghosts, gods, and immortals, karma, persuasion of good and punishment of evil, etc., and its scope covers the whole of China as far as Urumqi and Yining, and south as Yunnan and Guizhou – Trans.

Since the May Fourth Movement, all social progressive forces have criticized Confucius, while all reactionary social forces have respected Confucius.

The fundamental disagreement here is not whether to recognise Confucius as a great educator, a scholar who made outstanding contributions to the compilation of ancient books, and a thinker with his own system. Confucius' achievements and status in these aspects are recognised by everyone and must be critically inherited. For today, this is still an academic and cultural issue that should be continuously studied. The disagreement does not lie in whether to look at the problem from the perspective of class struggle and political struggle, or from the perspective of promoting or hindering social progress.

The fundamental difference is that in the landlord society under the rule of imperial despotism in China for more than 2,000 years, Confucianism and Confucius, which were selected and processed by the ruling class according to the needs of their rule, have become the ideological tools of imperial despotism and the spiritual shackles that bind the broad masses of working people. Lu Xun said that reading this history over and over again is just one word: "cannibalism". This is a profound criticism that hits the nail on the head. Therefore, since the great May Fourth New Culture Movement, the advanced Chinese people who have followed the requirements of China's historical progress and bravely stood in the forefront of ideological and cultural struggles have unanimously raised the battle banner of "criticising Confucius". 'Down with the Confucian shop' was put forward in this way, as was Chairman Mao's remark that "Confucianism has a high name but is in fact a chaff"⁴², and its targeted criticism was directed at the imperial authoritarian ideological and cultural traditions centred on Confucianism and Confucianism.

This is like a watershed. At that time, all conservative, backward, and especially reactionary class and political forces opposed criticizing Confucius and insisted on respecting Confucius. There are countless examples, and the most typical and familiar one is Chiang Kai-shek.

However, once the Chinese Communist Party, which insisted on criticising Confucius, degenerated into a revisionist and fascist party, it actually and inevitably started to respect Confucius.

This is not surprising at all. I say inevitable because I see that the essence of Confucianism and Confucianism is to serve the rule of imperial autocracy. It is this essence that is exactly needed by the fascist bourgeois autocracy.

⁴² In 1971, after the Lin Biao incident, Mao Zedong launched a campaign to criticise Lin and Confucius, dismissing Confucianism in its entirety. He also printed Guo Moruo's poem "Ten Criticisms" which had attacked Qin Emperor Qin Shihuang who had repressed Confucianism in favour of Legalism. At a meeting of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee, he suggested that Guo Moruo's Ten Criticisms had the idea of respecting Confucius and should be criticised; in July 1973, in another talk, he said: "In his Ten Criticisms, Guo claimed to be humanist, that is, people-oriented. Confucius was also humanist, and like him Guo Lao not only respected Confucius, but was also anti-Legalist. Respecting Confucius and opposing Legalism, such was the Kuomintang! Such was Lin Biao!" Replying to Guo Moruo, Mao wrote the poem "Reading the Theory of Feudalism" in 1973, a vernacular translation of which reads:

I have come to advise you to curse Qin Shihuang less, and to discuss the matter of "burning books and burying Confucian scholars alive" again.

Although Qin Shihuang is dead, his achievements remain in the annals of history, and although Confucius has a great reputation there is little of value in practice.

Successive rulers have implemented the county system of Qin Shihuang, and the Ten Criticisms you have written is "not a good article".

Read carefully the feudalism of the Tang man Liu Zongyuan, but don't regress from Liu to the time of King Wen of Zhou.

Confucius and Confucianism have two most basic and important categories, one is the so-called "ritual" that serves political rule, and the other is the so-called "benevolence" that serves spiritual rule. Which one is the core? There is debate in the academic community, and I tend to think that "ritual" is the core. This is an academic issue, and it is not very relevant to the issue to be discussed here, so I won't go into it.

The so-called "ritual" and "regulate by ritual" of Confucius and Confucianism are nothing more than maintaining the aristocratic hierarchy of "rulers are rulers, ministers are ministers, fathers are fathers, and sons are sons", that is, to maintain the rule of the autocratic monarch. Violators and rebels are "rebellious against superiors" and must be brought to justice. This is the essence of "ritual" mentioned by Confucius. It is this kind of preaching that is needed by the fascist bourgeois dictatorship of the revisionist rulers. The "two establishments" emphasised and repeatedly advocated by the "Resolution" (establishing Comrade Xi Jinping's core position in the Party Central Committee and the core position of the entire Party, and establishing the guiding role of Xi Jinping Thought on Socialism with Chinese Characteristics for a New Era), as well as similar "determination by one person", "political rules", "no arbitrary discussion of the Central Committee", etc., are actually just another way of saying "ritual rule" and "rulers are rulers, ministers are ministers, fathers are fathers, and sons are sons". No matter whether inside or outside the Party, anyone who violates these "political rules" will also be brought to justice.

The so-called "benevolence" and "benevolent government" of Confucius and Confucianism are to cover the cruel rule of imperial despotism with the cloak of "benevolence loves people", similar to the popular "universal values" of "love of humanity" and "human love" and other super-class statements. The essence and purpose of these super-class so-called universal statements are to give spiritual comfort and deceive the suffering working people in order to maintain the cruel rule of imperial despotism.

This set of ideas has now been accepted by the revisionist rulers, such as "people-oriented", "ruling the country with virtue", and "the people are the country". The "Resolution" also repeats these wonderful words from heaven, saying: "The party's foundation is in the people, its bloodline is in the people, its strength is in the people, and the people are the greatest confidence for the party to govern and prosper the country. The people's will is the greatest politics, and justice is the strongest force." How can this nonsense be Marxist words? They are just modern versions of the Confucian "rule of rites" and "benevolent government". As long as we uncover the dark side of Chinese society from top to bottom, from high-ranking officials who are corrupt and spend hundreds of millions of dollars, to ordinary working people who are oppressed by the new three mountains, to the most pitiful and miserable girls who sell themselves, including "iron chain girls" and "iron cage girls"⁴³ who are worse

⁴³ In the 1980s, with the relaxation of restrictions on population movement under the dual household registration system after the reform and opening up, and the beginning of farmers acquiring a tradable currency after the transition to a market economy, the criminal activities of human trafficking gradually flourished in Chinese mainland. The "iron chain" and "iron cage" girls were two instances of the commodification and mistreatment of women under capitalism in modern China. The first was the case of a woman discovered in January 2022. Returning to her home town in 1977 after a divorce at the age of 21, her family and neighbours noticed that her speech and behaviour were abnormal. The following year, in 1998, the woman was abducted and sold to a man in Jiangsu, where she was abused and illegally detained by the buyer Dong Zhimin, kept on a neck chain and registered for marriage. After giving birth to her first child in 1999, her mental illness worsened, and she gave birth to seven more children between 2011 and 2020. The local government at first denied the case. Subsequently various Party and government officials were sacked for covering up the incident and failing to report the trafficking of the woman and her children. The second case came to light on March 1, 2022. A man called Li in Shaanxi Province had abducted a woman and forced her to

than slaves, this fully illustrates the essence of the so-called "people-oriented" and "ruling the country with virtue", which is still the word Lu Xun said: cannibalism!

This fully demonstrates that the so-called 'combination of Marxism and traditional Chinese culture' of the General Secretary is actually a combination with respect for Confucius, which is the highest form of respect for Confucius. The General Secretary practices what he preaches. It is no accident that he went to Qufu to pay homage to Confucius and praise him. It is no accident that he established the Confucius Foundation, and it is even more no accident that he spent so much money to set up Confucius Institutes everywhere. There is a Confucian Research Institute at Shandong University, and a professor even advocated that Marx should shake hands with Confucius. It is no wonder that the dean and professors of this institute want to be court writers and get a bite of leftovers. Naturally, they have to act according to the emperor's wishes and please the emperor. No matter what shameless words and discourses are required, they can use their own little bit of cleverness to concoct them.

After understanding all this, we can see that the General Secretary's so-called combination of Marxism and traditional Chinese culture is a historical regression and historical reaction. On this issue, the General Secretary has surpassed his two predecessors, and even Deng Xiaoping. This is really an irony. He advocates the "new era" but is reviving the old era. The seriousness of the problem lies in the fact that this is not the General Secretary's personal degeneration and reaction. The General Secretary is the core of this party and the core of the Party Central Committee. Moreover, the General Secretary's thought is the guiding ideology of the current Communist Party of China. In this case, isn't it clear where the General Secretary will lead the Communist Party of China?

Anyone who respects Confucius is usually a very corrupt person, and the general secretary is no exception. Such a corrupt person has not only served as the top leader of the Communist Party of China for two terms, but now continues to cling to power. If the Communist Party of China does not even have the ability to identify and resist this, it is the misfortune of the Communist Party of China and the Chinese people.

3. "Xi Jinping's Resolution" has another major flaw that belongs purely to Xi Jinping, that is, the style of writing is full of stereotypes.

Xi Jinping said that we should combine with traditional Chinese culture, and the achievements of Chinese classical literature are very high. Whether it is poetry, prose, or large-scale works, its achievements can be compared with those of any nation in the world. Since the May Fourth Movement, under the leadership and promotion of many great thinkers and writers, the Chinese language has been vernacularised and colloquialised, and many beautiful and outstanding vernacular literary works have been created. Chairman Mao and Lu Xun are the most outstanding representatives. Chairman Mao insisted that articles should be colloquialised, and praised Lu Xun's works for using a lot of colloquialisms. In his own poem in his later years, he even dared to write "No farting allowed".⁴⁴ Chairman Mao and Lu Xun can be said to be heroes with similar views.

live with him. He used her for financial gain as well as for his sexual gratification. He attracted 78,000 subscribers to a live-streaming platform where he detailed his capture of the woman, his physical punishment of her including having welded an iron cage onto the back of a flatbed tricycle into which he placed her for "misbehaviour". He told his subscribers that he had sold a daughter the couple had to a neighbouring village for 30,000 yuan. Following complaints from citizens, Li was arrested during one of his live broadcasts – Trans.

⁴⁴ The line is from Mao's Autumn 1965 poem "Two Birds: A Dialogue" written against the background of the ideological split between the Marxist-Leninist Communist Party of China and the revisionist Communist Party of the Soviet Union. A roc, representing the CCP, soars through the air creating a great storm. A sparrow representing the CPSU hides in fear in a bush, uttering empty words in praise of goulash. The roc says "No farting

When Engels talked about the translation of Marx's works, he also expressed the same idea as Chairman Mao. Engels praised Marx's language for being lively, concise and clear, especially absorbing many folk sayings.

However, it is very regrettable that there is such a rich linguistic and literary heritage of the Chinese nation, as well as the teachings and examples of revolutionary mentors, especially Chairman Mao's serious criticism of the party's stereotyped writing. It's really strange that our general secretary always throws out some articles or speeches full of stereotyped writing. The "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee is no exception. It can be said that the whole article is full of this kind of stereotyped writing. Whoever had to read it had to go through an ordeal, which I know all too well in order to criticise this Resolution.

Listing a few paragraphs of this kind of text, I dare not list more, that would be tantamount to torturing the readers.

"Adhere to the determination to investigate all cases and punish all corruption, use strong medicine to cure the disease and severe punishment to control chaos, and have the courage to scrape the bone to cure the poison and cut off the arm of a hero."

"There are many problems of weakening, hollowing out, diluting and marginalising the implementation of the party's leadership."

"In particular, there are those who practice nepotism and exclude dissidents, those who form gangs and factions, those who make anonymous accusations and fabricate rumours, those who buy people's hearts and minds and attract votes, those who make promises and celebrate, those who act on their own and act in a hypocritical manner, and those who are too powerful to be eliminated and make irresponsible comments on the central government. Political and economic problems are intertwined, and the degree of corruption is shocking."

"The party's political leadership, ideological guidance, mass organization and social appeal have been significantly enhanced."

"Strictly cultivate oneself, strictly use one's power, strictly discipline oneself, be truthful in one's work, be truthful in one's business, and be truthful in one's behaviour."

"Blindly giving in will only lead to further bullying, and compromise will only lead to more humiliating situations."

"The Chinese people have become more self-confident, self-reliant and stronger, which has greatly enhanced their ambition, backbone and confidence."

"The party's foundation lies in the people, its bloodline lies in the people, and its strength lies in the people. The people are the greatest confidence for the party to govern and prosper the country. The people's will is the greatest politics, and justice is the strongest force."

"Comrade Xi Jinping pointed out that the great social changes in contemporary China are not a simple continuation of the master narrative of our country's history and culture, nor a simple application of the template envisioned by the classic Marxist writers, nor a reprint of the socialist practice of other countries, nor a copy of foreign modernisation development. "

allowed". "Farting" in this context refers to speaking rubbish, and most translators have rendered the words as "Stop your windy nonsense!", "Shut up", and "Wind and baloney!" The poem was first published in 1976 – Trans.

"The whole party must bear in mind that we are born in hardship and die in peace⁴⁵, always have long-term vision and be prepared for danger in times of peace, continue to promote the new great project of party building in the new era, and adhere to comprehensive and strict governance of the party."

"We must persist in educating people with Xi Jinping Thought on Socialism with Chinese Characteristics for a New Era, unite people with the party's ideals and beliefs, cultivate people with the core socialist values, inspire people with the historical mission of the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation, and cultivate a large number of successors who are capable of shouldering the heavy responsibility of the times."

"Educate and guide young party members to always take the party's flag as their flag, the party's direction as their direction, and the party's will as their will, continue the party's red bloodline, carry forward the party's fine traditions, and experience the wind and rain, see the world, strengthen their muscles and bones, and grow their talents in the struggle. We must continuously cultivate outstanding talents who are patriotic, dedicated, and innovative, truly love talents, carefully cultivate talents, and use talents meticulously, and gather outstanding talents from all aspects to the great struggle of the party and the people."

"Don't forget the hardships and glory of yesterday, be worthy of today's mission, and live up to tomorrow's great dream."

This slogan-like language style, this repeated and superimposed parallel language form, has never been seen in any important document of the Communist Party of China. It is a typical language style of Xi Jinping's "new era". Unfortunately, it is a stereotyped language style. It is precisely because of so many repeated and superimposed sentences that it is inevitable to have "two establishments", "two maintenances", "three representatives", "four consciousnesses", "four self-confidences", "four comprehensives", "five in one" and other "characteristic" languages. As Chairman Mao said in the article "Oppose Stereotyped Party Writing": "Viewed historically, stereotyped Party writing is a reaction to the May 4th Movement." Chairman Mao also said: "Lu Xun had opposed this foreign stereotyped writing long ago." Chairman Mao pointed out the essence of the problem. The reason why Lu Xun and Chairman Mao opposed the stereotyped writing of the Party was that it was not only a problem of language form, but also a reaction to the May Fourth Movement. For the Communist Party, this is actually a problem of party spirit and party style. Therefore, in Yan'an, opposing the stereotyped writing of the Party was linked to opposing subjectivism and sectarianism. Now the General Secretary has come up with a "Xi's stereotyped writing", and the seriousness and essence of the problem lies here. The emergence and existence of "Xi's stereotyped writing" also proves that the General Secretary does not understand the essence of Chinese traditional culture at all, and there is no way to combine it with the essence of Chinese traditional culture. On the contrary, it can only combine with the dregs of Chinese traditional culture. From content to form, it cannot get rid of this reactionary tendency.

This may be related to the General Secretary's experience. From "Xi's Eight-Legged Essay"⁴⁶, we seem to see the language that some rural brigade party branch secretaries⁴⁷ liked to use in a specific period.

⁴⁵ "Born in hardship, die in peace" is a phrase from the writings of Mencius. Its meaning is that a person must go through all kinds of setbacks and tests before achieving comfort through great achievements and dying at ease – Trans.

⁴⁶ The "eight-legged essay" was a formal requirement of Confucian scholarship and was ridiculed by Mao in "Oppose Stereotyped Party Writing" – Trans.

⁴⁷ Xi joined the Communist Party of China (CPC) in January 1974, and became the Party branch secretary of the Liangjiahe Brigade in rural Shaanxi Province, later the same year – Trans.

Under the influence of exaggeration, "big words" replaced down-to-earth work; in terms of ideological methods, it also belongs to the subjective thinking method and work attitude criticised by Chairman Mao.

The level of writing is consistent with the level of thought. The level of writing in "Xi's Eight-Legged Essay" is consistent with the emptiness and mediocrity of "Xi Thought". "Xi's Eight-Legged Essay" tells us that Xi Jinping is indeed a person with great ambitions but little talent. He likes to be false, big, and empty, and likes to be ambitious, but his ability to do practical work and control the overall situation is not up to par. There are many such examples in Xi Jinping's political experience. Now, as the king of a country, and an autocratic monarch who is "determined to be the only one", the losses and harms such a style will bring to the country are simply immeasurable.

This is not surprising. A long history of China has repeatedly told us that ambition is not always consistent with great talent, but more consistent with stupidity and incompetence. As a result, it brings nothing but disaster to history.

4. An important purpose of concocting the "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee is to build momentum for Xi Jinping's re-election as General Secretary.

The result is just the opposite.

The "Resolution" once again proves that Xi Jinping's appointment as General Secretary of the Communist Party of China is a historical mistake. If he continues to be re-elected, it will not only make a mistake on top of a mistake, but the most direct, terrible and most likely consequence will be the final destruction of the Communist Party of China. The king of the fallen party and the king of the fallen country may be the last crown that history fairly pronounces on him.

According to the historical experience and lessons of the international communist movement, the key to the problem is not the term of re-election, but the democratic system within the party. Like any political party, the Communist Party must have its own stable, competent and capable leaders and leadership groups. This is beyond doubt and was also discussed by Lenin. However, the party leaders and leadership groups must be elected through democratic elections in accordance with the party's democratic system. The painful lesson of history is that the Communist Party has not correctly and thoroughly solved this problem. This is one of the most important reasons why the Communist Party has degenerated into a privileged party, an authoritarian party, and a revisionist party. Xi Jinping's rise to power was caused by this problem; if Xi Jinping refuses to step down, it is also caused by this problem. Whether the 20th National Congress can overcome this problem and solve the problem of the Communist Party's democratic system can be said to be a key to the survival of the Communist Party. As the ruling party, whether the Communist Party has a democratic system is unified with whether the entire country has a democratic system. It is impossible for an authoritarian party to implement a democratic system under its rule and leadership. History has once again proved this point.

Xi Jinping's appointment as General Secretary of the Communist Party of China was the result of a designation, not an election by the National Party Congress. People will not forget that when the members of the Central Committee were elected, Xi Jinping was the Central Committee member with the fewest votes. This tells us that if a democratic election system had been truly implemented, Xi Jinping would probably not have become the General Secretary of the Party. However, the democratic system within the party has been destroyed, and history has proven that the designated successor is unqualified as the leader of the Communist Party of China. The result of his "governance" is to lead the Communist Party of China to its final death.

Let us make a summary of this leader in conjunction with the "Resolution".

1. Xi Jinping is not a true Marxist or communist, but a revisionist with a strong feudal fascist character. From a theoretical and practical point of view, the most core, main and full manifestation is the negation and betrayal of class struggle as the key link. This is fully reflected in his so-called "governance" both internally and externally.

Xi Jinping betrayed Chairman Mao's theory of continuing socialist revolution, implemented the revisionist line, and restored capitalism. He represented the monopoly bourgeoisie and betrayed the broad masses of workers and peasants.

Politically, the people's democratic dictatorship was betrayed, the people's right to be masters of their own country was betrayed, and the people's freedom of speech, assembly, association, publication, and demonstration stipulated in the Constitution became empty words. The people were completely under a position of dictatorship, and they would fabricate charges, arrest, and sentence people at any time. Moreover, this kind of rule was full of feudalism, and even revived the "rule of rites" of feudal society from top to bottom.

Economically, the socialist public ownership was stolen and turned into capitalist private ownership. The only so-called "state-owned ownership" that remained has actually degenerated into bureaucratic monopoly bourgeois ownership. The Chinese working class of workers and peasants has been cruelly exploited and oppressed by the dual monopoly bourgeoisie at home and abroad. Against the background of such economic relations, the serious polarisation between the rich and the poor is of course inevitable in China.

In terms of ideology and culture, it is synchronized with the political and economic reactionary regression. As the superstructure of the "worst capitalism", it also reflects Xi Jinping's need to respect Confucius and Confucianism. It is a hodgepodge of feudalism, capitalism, and revisionism, and the spread of the most decadent and shameless ideology and culture. When Deng Xiaoping was in power, there was still a saying of "opposing spiritual pollution". Now the spiritual pollution in Chinese society has reached a thorough level. It is not surprising. Xi Jinping, who alone is "fixed in one", likes this kind of spiritual pollution.

Xi Jinping betrayed Lenin's theory of imperialism and Chairman Mao's theory of the three worlds, and implemented the line of capitulationism and social-imperialism.

On the one hand, they have surrendered to the imperialist group headed by US imperialism, betrayed the Chinese working class, and become the labourers of the international monopoly bourgeoisie. Under the cover of the so-called "partnership", they have done their utmost to be servile and submissive to the head of the imperialist group and the hegemonic US imperialism, acting like slaves who are beaten and humiliated.

On the other hand, they have participated in the struggle between imperialist countries in the guise of great power chauvinism of social-imperialism, and are particularly enthusiastic about economic aggression against backward countries. They have completely abandoned the Marxist principle of proletarian internationalism and the national policy of "never seeking hegemony" formulated by Chairman Mao, inciting the narrow nationalism and narrow patriotism of the bourgeoisie, and tying the Chinese working people, especially the young working people, to the chariot of the narrow nationalism and narrow patriotism of their monopoly bourgeoisie, so that they can serve as their ignorant cannon fodder for the export of capital and for the struggle with the hegemony of US imperialism for the interests of the monopoly bourgeoisie.

2. Like all revisionists, Xi Jinping's philosophy and thinking methods are full of compromise. I once wrote an article entitled "Compromise is Revisionism". In this article, I specifically criticised the errors of compromise in Xi Jinping's thinking. Comrades who are interested can read it.

I criticised it there, saying, "The new leadership is trying to compromise on the 'two thirty years before and after' by promoting 'two things that cannot be denied'. In reality, they are compromising between Chairman Mao's line and Deng Xiaoping's line. However, this is not feasible. Chairman Mao advocated class struggle as the key link, while Deng Xiaoping denied class struggle as the key link. The two are completely and fundamentally opposed. If you want to affirm the former, you must deny the latter; if you want to affirm the latter, you must deny the former. It is impossible to deny both at the same time. More than a year of ruling practice has told us that what is actually being implemented is still Deng's line, which still denies class struggle as the key link, which naturally means denying Chairman Mao's line. There is no room for compromise here. If you look at the first thirty years from the perspective of affirming the second thirty years, you will inevitably come to the conclusion of denying the first thirty years. The Resolution is a model of this. Conversely, the same principle applies."

In fact, Xi Jinping is practicing compromise on all issues. This is his basic and main way of thinking. The way of thinking of compromise is always opposed to dialectics, and the final destination is bound to be revisionism.

The core idea of dialectics is the idea of contradiction, which is the idea of revolution that Chairman Mao repeatedly emphasised before his death. This is also the essence of dialectics expounded by Marx in the "Postscript" of the second edition of "Capital". However, those who practice revisionism always obliterate struggle and revolution, and advocate reconciliation, compromise, and regression, that is, advocacy of reaction.

It can be said that this is the weak point of Xi Jinping's thinking method and the key point that always makes him stumble.

2. Xi Jinping's political style is not at all the political style that a true Communist should have. It has a strong "characteristic" of Xi Jinping, and most of these "characteristics" are the embodiment of the dregs of Chinese traditional culture.

For example: During the ten years that Xi Jinping has been in power, so many things about personal worship have been done, and these wrong practices have not been criticised by Xi Jinping, but have been repeated again and again. In fact, all over the world, with the continuous modernisation of productivity, the entire society is also constantly progressing. Even capitalist society, driven by the struggle of the working class, is constantly improving and progressing. The progress of social conditions in developed capitalist countries in Northern Europe is recognised by the world and is more manifested as the eve of socialism. In this realistic context, Xi Jinping's actions will only arouse people's disgust and damage his own prestige. However, Xi Jinping would rather follow the backward thoughts of the backward masses than reject this stupid act of "high-level black and low-level red".

Not only that, Xi Jinping's concept and organisational line of governing the party and the country is to appoint people based on personal connections and loyalty. The words of Beijing Municipal Party Committee Secretary Cai Qi and Tianjin Municipal Party Committee Secretary Li Hongzhong, who flattered and fawned on Xi Jinping, are simply disgusting and are not what a Communist Party member should say. However, such people are trusted and valued by Xi Jinping. Such people have become role models for party members. The whole party should learn and emulate them to show their loyalty to Xi Jinping. Otherwise, they will be removed at the lightest, arrested and sentenced at the worst, on

the pretext of "making irresponsible remarks about the Central Committee" and "not abiding by political rules".

The one who really likes to play the game is Xi Jinping. We can't see other examples, but there are more than one in international activities. He played the game with Putin to make friends, saying that he is just like him and has a firm will. When Trump came, he also played the game, and after a walk around the palace, he became Trump's "good friend". When Kim Jong-un came, he coaxed the little brother around, flattering him and giving him generous gifts. Please think about what Chairman Mao and Premier Zhou did? There is really no comparison, it is ridiculous. How stupid it is to apply the "brotherhood" and "righteousness" of the underworld to dealing with bourgeois politicians. This not only shows that Xi Jinping does not understand Marxism in essence, but also shows that Xi Jinping is childish and ridiculous, and his level is really low.

4. Xi Jinping is a personal ambitionist.

This problem is clearly seen by everyone, and the "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee is the best example, needless to say.

Ambition is inversely proportional to talent. History will never call these people ambitious historical figures, because their historical achievements are unified with their talents. The reason why ambitious people are called ambitious people is that they only have ambitions but no talents. They will not create history or promote the progress of history. On the contrary, what they do will not only end up in vain, but also hinder the progress of history and become a stumbling block to the progress of history. In the end, they will inevitably be eliminated by history, so such people are fixed in the very appropriate position of ambitious people by history. Ambition is always associated with stupidity that overestimates one's own capabilities. It is a pity. Xi Jinping is playing such a role.

Apart from other things, in terms of democracy, Xi Jinping is anti-democratic and authoritarian. For a while, he seemed to be able to cheer for the people and was very proud. However, he did not know that he was just successfully playing the role of a historical sinner and a historical clown, and would eventually "retain a bad name in history". Stupid, right? But this is the law of the careerist's death. No matter who advises him, he will not listen.

I wrote a speech in commemoration of Women's Day on March 8, and I quote it here.

If we look at the issue from the perspective of the degree of women's liberation as the measure of social liberation, the iron chain woman tells the world that our beloved motherland is currently the most backward country in the world. It is this measure that tells us that not only are our women iron chain women, but our men are also iron chain men. Don't the billionaires have this iron chain around their necks? Don't the delegates to the two sessions sitting in the Great Hall of the People have this iron chain around their necks?

Marxism talks about social forms. It is from this principle that the most important criterion for measuring whether a country is advanced or backward is not to look at the GDP of material production, but to look at the degree of human liberation, that is, the degree of social liberation. Aren't people under the neo-Nazi rule, where freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of movement are all deprived, chained people? Isn't this kind of society the most backward society in the world today? Shouldn't it be laughed at by the whole world? In such a situation, as a patriot of the working people, shouldn't you face this reality and rise up to change your own destiny? If you only look at GDP, only look at those who stutter and have a nest, and even happily and fanatically sing narrow nationalism, aren't you even

worse than pigs? Pigs probably don't have narrow patriotism, which is the patent of slaves who are inferior to pigs.

Wake up, dear people of the motherland. March 8th and May Day are festivals for the working people to awaken and carry out revolution. They belong only to the revolutionary people!

Getting rid of the backward authoritarian society and moving towards a people's democratic society is the most important and main political GDP of the Chinese people!

In 1949, Chairman Mao led "the Chinese people to stand up", and now we need to "the Chinese people to stand up again!"

A democratic China is the foundation for the reunification of the two sides of the Taiwan Strait. We hope and strive for a new democratic and unified motherland!

I put forward a basic Marxist principle. The level of social progress ultimately depends on the level of people's liberation. The progress of material production activities only creates the foundation for human liberation. Only when the liberation of people, mainly workers, is achieved, can the progress of material production activities also achieve ultimate liberation. Therefore, human liberation, that is, whether the people can be the masters of their own country, is the highest and ultimate measure of social liberation.

However, Xi Jinping is leading our country and our people in the opposite direction of personal dictatorship. What else can this kind of personal ambition be but a historical reaction? In the end, it will surely be eliminated by the Chinese people and Chinese history!

Now we are facing the very important 20th National Congress, which is the last test for Xi Jinping and the Communist Party of China.

Under certain historical conditions, as a famous person said, "leadership is political power", who will be the general secretary? It is related to the overall situation, the line, the fate of the party, and the fate of China.

A revisionist like Xi Jinping is not suitable to continue to stay in the position of general secretary. This is not mainly a question of term, but a question of qualification. In terms of qualification, both terms were arranged wrongly, and he should not have been the general secretary of the Communist Party of China.

The Chinese Communists must make a firm choice at this critical moment, while many old Communists and Communists who have been educated in Chairman Mao's ideology are still around, to decisively and resolutely bring Xi Jinping down, and to decisively and resolutely reform the party's democratic system (we won't go into details here), and through a truly sound democratic election system at all levels of the party, select representatives to the National Congress, and have the National Party Congress directly elect the Party's Central Committee, the Political Bureau, the Standing Committee of the Political Bureau, and the General Secretary; and re-examine and formulate the party's line for continuing the socialist revolution.

Only in this way can the Communist Party of China have the possibility of rebirth and the 20th National Congress can play the historical role it should play.

At the end of my article "Why the 20th National Congress is extremely important to China", there is a paragraph:

"It is from these aspects that we deeply feel that the 20th National Congress is indeed extremely important to the Communist Party of China, to the Chinese people, and to China. If the 20th National Congress, no matter what form it takes, can correctly solve the problems of the line and leadership of the Communist Party of China, it can save the Communist Party of China, and more importantly, it can save China's socialism. Its significance is no less than that of the Zunyi Conference."

We are not harbouring illusions, but making a final effort. We have feelings for the Communist Party of China and we have to take responsibility. We call on the party members and cadres who really want to make revolution to rise up and resist, bombard the bourgeois headquarters, bombard the revisionist leaders, and solve the revisionist problem with revolutionary means. This is the advice we should and must give, and it is also in accordance with Chairman Mao's consistent teachings. We believe that the majority of our party members and cadres are good and want to make revolution.

At a time when launching the socialist revolution again faces great difficulties, in order to save the Party and the Chinese revolution, we have no choice but to once again explain Chairman Mao's theory of continuing the socialist revolution to the broad masses of Party members and cadres. We hope that comrades will live up to Chairman Mao's words that the broad masses of Party members and cadres are good, carry forward the revolutionary spirit of rebellion that Chairman Mao advocated throughout his life, and rise up to resolve the historical issue of life and death facing the Communist Party of China.

We firmly believe in the old saying that Chairman Mao liked: The future is bright, but the road is tortuous.

March 23, 2022, at the hometown of Marx

Why is the 20th National Congress so important to China?⁴⁸

The 20th National Congress is extremely important to China. This is almost a consensus among all people at home and abroad who care about China's destiny and major events.

However, from different class standpoints and different interest groups, the views and answers to this question are completely different.

Historical laws are difficult to find, and historical predictions are even more difficult. Not to mention mediocre people, even some powerful figures, the laws and opinions given by them were finally proved to be inaccurate by history. Not only did they fail, but sometimes they were even contrary to the truth, and even had a bit of irony.

This is not surprising at all. From the perspective of Marxist epistemology, in the face of the object of human cognition, no one can escape the limitations of certain historical conditions given by the times. Therefore, human cognitive ability and level of cognition are inevitably subject to certain historical limitations. No matter how high the level of human development is, no matter how great a person is, this limitation of cognition is always inevitable and will always be accompanied by it. No one can absolutely transcend it. This is the fundamental reason why no one should be proud from the perspective of epistemology.

If we admit and adhere to such a scientific epistemological thought, then we can say that although everyone knows that the 20th National Congress is extremely important to China, in order to answer such a grand question as why the 20th National Congress is extremely important to China, I am afraid that everyone who wants to answer this question will be limited by historical conditions - the limitations of their own historical conditions and the limitations of objective historical conditions, so it is not necessarily possible to give a completely scientific and completely correct answer. In the best case, we can only strive to do it more scientifically and correctly.

Therefore, I have enough self-doubt, and I don't expect that I can answer this question more scientifically and correctly. I just hope that the little reference opinions I provide can serve as some ideological materials for the great figures of this era to think about this issue. If I can meet this small requirement, I will be satisfied.

1

My understanding of the importance of the 20th National Congress is linked to my concerns about China after the 20th National Congress.

This concern first starts from a set of simple numbers. The "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe" occurred more than 70 years after the victory of the October Revolution. The victory of our revolution has just reached this period of more than 70 years.

⁴⁸ The 20th National Congress of the Chinese Communist Party was held in Beijing from 16 to 22 October 2022. This article is addressed to members of the Party, explains why the Congress is important, and calls for the repudiation of revisionism and the return to the socialist road. The article was written at the beginning of March 2022 and its warnings about the consolidation of monopoly capitalist autocracy under a re-elected Xi Jinping as General-Secretary came true when he was unanimously approved for an unprecedented third term. The Congress also saw the elevation of his ideological director Wang Huning to fourth position in the Party hierarchy, chairing the presidium of the Congress and later becoming chair of the National People's Political Consultative Conference – Trans.

If we go from the rise of Khrushchev's revisionism to the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe", we have experienced more than 40 years of revisionist rule. We have just reached the period of more than 40 years of revisionist rule.

The Russian Party failed and disbanded when it was nearly 100 years old. The Chinese Party has just reached this period of more than 100 years.

The reason why I attach importance to this set of numbers is not to use this set of numbers to make historical analogies. What I care about is the historical content behind this set of numbers, because it is the historical conditions constituted by these historical contents that determine this historical timetable, so there are historical laws that can and should be found.

History will not simply repeat itself, and the time required for the historical movement process will not be exactly the same. The difference is absolute. Although world history is increasingly showing more unity, the particularity and difference of the historical movement of each country are still very huge. Therefore, when we see this set of numbers, we cannot make a simple mechanical understanding and think that Chinese history will simply repeat the timetable of Russian history.

This is impossible. History has never been so simple to repeat. If history moves forward in such a simple and repetitive form, then our understanding of history would be too easy and too simple. Unfortunately, the movement and development of history have never been like this.

However, we cannot absolutise the differences and particularities of history. If we understand history in this way, we will make mistakes in another way, that is, we will deny the unity and regularity of history, and we will completely deviate from historical materialism.

Marx said that sometimes history will have "striking similarities". This "striking similarity" is certainly not accidental. In the final analysis, it is because the unity and regularity of history are at work. Historical materialism is the accurate theoretical revelation and scientific summary of this unity and regularity of human history.

Lenin, who was only 24 years old, wrote the great Marxist classic "What the "Friends of the People" are and How They Fight the Social Democrats" with his mature Marxist level. It was in this work that Lenin explained to us how historical materialism found the laws of human historical development. Lenin summarised three meanings.

First, Lenin tells us that historical materialism solves the relationship between social thought and social existence. Lenin said: "Only the materialist conclusion that the course of thought depends on the course of things is the only conclusion that is compatible with scientific psychology."

Second, Lenin tells us that " Hitherto, sociologists had found it difficult to distinguish the important and the unimportant in the complex network of social phenomena (that is the root of subjectivism in sociology) and had been unable to discover any objective criterion for such a demarcation. Materialism provided an absolutely objective criterion by singling out "production relations" as the structure of society, and by making it possible to apply to these relations that general scientific criterion of recurrence whose applicability to sociology the subjectivists denied. So long as they confined themselves to ideological social relations (i.e., such as, before taking shape, pass through man's consciousness) they could not observe recurrence and regularity in the social phenomena of the various countries, and their science was at best only a description of these phenomena, a collection of raw material. The analysis of material social relations (i.e., of those that take shape without passing through man's consciousness: when exchanging products men enter into production relations without even realising that there is a social relation of production here)—the analysis of material social

relations at once made it possible to observe recurrence and regularity and to generalise the systems of the various countries in the single fundamental concept: *social formation*. It was this generalisation alone that made it possible to proceed from the description of social phenomena (and their evaluation from the standpoint of an ideal) to their strictly scientific analysis, which isolates, let us say by way of example, that which distinguishes one capitalist country from another and investigates that which is common to all of them.”

Third, Lenin also tells us that historical materialism "for the first time made a scientific sociology possible was that only the reduction of social relations to production relations and of the latter to the level of the productive forces, provided a firm basis for the conception that the development of formations of society is a process of natural history. And it goes without saying that without such a view there can be no social science.”

These basic principles of historical materialism that Lenin talked about are now almost common sense here. However, when we turn common sense into a way of thinking, whether we can use it well or not, practice has proved that this is not an easy task. It is like solving a math problem. Knowing the theorem does not mean that you can use these theorems to solve the math problem. What's more, solving social problems is far more complicated than solving math problems. At least we often encounter the problem of whether the materials are sufficient.

The question we raise here, "Why is the 20th National Congress so important to China?" is such a difficult question.

2.

History can be studied comparatively. Let's start with the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe". It should be noted that the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe" were not accidental, but inevitable.

There are two historical inevitabilities here.

One is that these countries all engaged in revisionism, and under the rule of the revisionist line, what they built was not a true Marxist scientific socialist society.

However, people will naturally ask, why did revisionism emerge? Why did they all take the revisionist path? This is not a problem of one country, but a common problem of all the so-called "socialist countries" in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. This cannot be explained by chance, but we have to admit that it contains historical inevitability. The important historical task now is to find this historical inevitability.

Another thing is that these revisionist-ruled countries, after about forty years, all experienced "dramatic changes" with the participation of the broad masses of the people, and the ending was that the ruling "Communist Party" stepped down and the country returned to the path of a bourgeois democratic republic. In the face of this great change, the Communist Party of China has repeatedly stated in the international community: "We respect the choices of the people of all countries." As for what choices the people of all countries made? Why did they make such choices? The Communist Party of China has never given us a serious explanation.

Such a major turning point, or major failure, of the international communist movement should be studied seriously, and on the basis of serious study, a serious answer should be given.

The Chinese Communist Party, which has undergone transformation, has not given an answer, nor can it give an answer. Because the "Chinese evolution" and the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and

Eastern Europe" directed by the Chinese Communist Party, which has undergone transformation, actually have the same end, that is, the restoration of capitalism. If there is a difference, it can only be said that the "Chinese evolution" is worse than the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe". So we don't have to hope that the revisionist Chinese Communist Party, which has undergone transformation, can correctly and scientifically answer this question.

To answer this question, we can only rely on Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, especially Chairman Mao's theory of continuing socialist revolution.

Why did the titular Communist Parties in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe not satisfy the people? Why was the ruling party itself dissatisfied with its performance, and why did it even fail in the end? Gorbachev came up with a "new thinking", and this "new" came up with the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe", and with a re-selection of history.

This historical choice certainly contains historical inevitability, and now we need to find this historical inevitability.

More than 30 years have passed since the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe", and it can almost be said that this is a century-old problem. People are looking for this historical inevitability and trying to answer this historical inevitability. However, so far, this exploration is still ongoing.

If we look back on this period of history and study it carefully, we should see and realise that the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe" came later and the "Chinese evolution" came first. It can be said that the "Chinese evolution" opened the precedent for the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe". Deng Xiaoping was Gorbachev's teacher.

It's just that the conditions of the two parties are different, especially the level of the leadership groups of the two parties is different. The Chinese Party only carried out economic system reform, not political system reform, to stabilise itself, so-called "stability overrides everything". Once unrest occurred, the army was decisively pulled out to suppress it, showing the high political level and tough means of the leaders of the Chinese Party represented by Deng Xiaoping. The Soviet Party led by Gorbachev, however, carried out political system reform right from the start, but did not make every effort to solve the economic difficulties and economic problems that the people were more concerned about. This kind of political system reform, in our words, is nothing more than a "bourgeois liberalisation" system reform, which ended up messing itself up even more. You may remember that the Gorbachev group was at a loss at the time, and Yeltsin played the leading role and was determined to win; the result was a dramatic change and collapse, which was inevitable.

This real class struggle, the struggle for capitalist restoration, fully confirmed that what Chairman Mao said about the bourgeoisie being in the Communist Party is a truth. It was the bourgeoisie in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, or the capitalist-roaders in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, who directed the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe". The masses followed suit and became the tail of this "dramatic change".

It was not a bloody revolution, but a "colour revolution" as the West calls it. In fact, in our view, Khrushchev's coming to power and carrying out revisionism is a "colour revolution". Compared with socialism, this is not a revolution, but a "peaceful evolution", a counter-revolutionary restoration of capitalism.

The historical conditions of China and the Soviet Union are different. Although the final outcome of "China's evolution" and "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe" is the restoration

of capitalism, "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe" brought about a capitalist society under the bourgeois democratic republic system; while "China's evolution" brought about a monopoly autocratic capitalist society under the fascist bourgeois dictatorship system, that is, the "worst capitalist" society that Chairman Mao repeatedly worried about and often warned about. History has fully verified that Chairman Mao's sharp question was not aimless, but was based on a deep understanding of China's national conditions, which is very realistic and very accurate.

Chairman Mao's theory of socialist revolution and socialist continued revolution has given us ideological weapons. Today, we fully realize that after this great historical change, if we look at the essence instead of just the flags, the signs and the names, then it is obvious that the evil consequences of "China's evolution" far exceed the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe".

I have made some superficial explorations into the historical process of capitalist restoration in China and the Soviet Union, and have written several pamphlets, such as "On Socialism with Chinese Characteristics", or "On China and Eastern Europe", which is one of them. It talks about the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, mainly about China, and explores the historical inevitability and regularity of "the party changes to revisionism and the country changes colour".

Now, we have to continue to work hard to explore. This article is also such an exploration.

3.

This is a century-old problem that the Communists have not yet solved. To solve this century-old problem, I think the most important thing is to adhere to the basic method of historical materialism expounded by Lenin quoted above, and to examine and solve this problem from the regularity of social development.

With his profound understanding of Chinese society and great sense of history, Chairman Mao always worried and warned us that China might, and very likely would, have revisionism. History has verified Chairman Mao's premonition without any error.

The genius Lenin, soon after the victory of the October Revolution, was keenly aware that in Russia, it would be extremely difficult to carry the socialist revolution through to the end. In the article "The Third International and Its Place in History" written on April 15, 1919 (only one and a half years after the October Revolution), Lenin emphasised: "I have repeatedly said that compared with other advanced countries, it is easier for the Russians to start the great proletarian revolution, but it is more difficult to continue it to the final victory, that is, to fully build a socialist society."

Next, Lenin analysed the six conditions that made it easier to launch the Russian revolution, and said that "what has been said is of course incomplete."

Then Lenin emphasised: "To continue the work of socialist construction and to carry this work through to the end, there is still a lot of work to be done. The Soviet Republic established by countries with a higher level of education, a larger proportion of the proletariat and a greater influence, as long as they take the road of proletarian dictatorship, will have every possibility to surpass Russia."

This is a very profound and scientific view, and history has verified that Lenin's view is very correct.

This is the ideological method left to us by the revolutionary mentor to analyse the century-old problem. This ideological method requires us to examine the historical problems we encounter from the actual social development conditions and development level we are in.

It is precisely from this perspective that we can see that, whether it is Russia, China or other countries that have developed socialism, the starting point of the socialist revolution is relatively low. They all started from a relatively backward social situation and under specific historical opportunities to launch the New Democratic Revolution (in recent years, after research, I believe that the nature of this revolution should be classified as a proletarian people's democratic revolution, correcting the view that the New Democratic Revolution still belongs to the nature of a bourgeois democratic revolution) or the socialist revolution. Because the historical starting point of this revolution is relatively low, it is relatively easy to start, as Lenin analysed, because there are at least "six conditions". However, if we want to continue the revolution and continue to move forward, push the socialist revolution with a higher historical starting point to the final victory, build a complete and truly scientific socialist society in the strict sense, and thus have the possibility of completing the transition to a communist society, it will be quite difficult.

In previous discussions on this issue, there were both "leapfrog theory" and "make-up class theory", which actually simplified and dogmatised the issue. It is impossible to get the correct answer in this way.

Lenin's opinion is undoubtedly very correct from the perspective of the laws of historical development and the method of thinking. It is certainly difficult to try to build a higher social form from a lower social form by skipping some conventional historical stages. If this point is denied, it is equivalent to denying the existence of historical laws. This is not difficult to understand. People in a lower social form often have a cartoon-like understanding of a higher social form. At the mass mobilisation meeting in the anti-Japanese base at the foot of Mount Tai, our cadres did propaganda to the masses and said when talking about the bright prospects of communism, "When communism comes, we will use an electric griddle to spread pancakes, one by one, one by one." Even after entering the city, the understanding of communism was still "upstairs and downstairs, electric lights and telephones." This seems like a joke, but it contains the truth of historical materialism.

Specific historical phenomena are always specific, special, and complex. To explain specific historical transition issues, we can only start from historical reality, not from theoretical dogma, otherwise we will not find the correct conclusion. If we want to correctly analyse the century-old problem, we can only reach the other side of the truth by starting from historical reality.

This is exactly the case. From our previous exploration of this issue, if we can combine the historical reality we have experienced, especially the historical reality of "the party changed to revisionism and the country changed colour", which led to the restoration of capitalism, we may have a more perceptual understanding of Lenin's principles, and it may be easier to rise to the correct rational understanding.

The historical reality we are facing is that after experiencing the anti-revisionist struggle, and even after overthrowing Deng Xiaoping, a counter-revolutionary coup finally took place. The revisionist leaders seized power and came to power. With the support of the whole party, they invited Deng Xiaoping back and unswervingly implemented Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line. They not only retraced the path taken by the Soviet revisionist party, but also went further and more thoroughly than the Soviet revisionist party, taking the reactionary and criminal step of completely betraying socialism and completely restoring capitalism, which the Soviet revisionist party had not had time to take or dared to take.

What happened to our party? Why didn't we listen to Chairman Mao and follow Chairman Mao, but listened to Deng Xiaoping and followed Deng Xiaoping? Why did we even think that Chairman Mao

was wrong and made a "Resolution" that accused Chairman Mao of mistakes, but on the contrary, we thought that Deng Xiaoping was always right, and even really carried out Deng Xiaoping's fight against the "two whatevers", and persisted in it to this day, persisting through to the so-called "new era" of "Xi Jinping Thought", and still obediently holding high the banner of Deng Xiaoping and claiming to be Deng Xiaoping's loyal successor. To use a common saying during the Cultural Revolution, although Deng Xiaoping is no longer with us, his ghost is still around.

Can we blame Deng Xiaoping alone? No, we can't. We can only look for the reasons within our party.

Facts tell us that it is not accurate to say that our party, which "does not have many members who really understand Marxism-Leninism," is a proletarian party. Apart from other things, how can we simply say that this party is destined to be a proletarian party without considering the specific historical conditions, given that it dared to overthrow Chairman Mao, overthrow socialism, and restore capitalism?

It seems that we still need to re-examine the overall problems of this party.

As for the class composition of our party, due to our backward national conditions and the revolutionary path, the party members are mainly not from the industrial working class tempered by class struggle, but from peasants, and peasants with little education, and a large number of petty-bourgeois intellectuals (including intellectuals from exploiting class families). Even after the founding of the People's Republic of China, most of the members who joined the Communist Party of China as workers were just former peasants who put on work clothes and picked up hammers. This cannot but have a profound impact on the class nature and political level of our party.

Chairman Mao talked about this issue in his article "Oppose Stereotyped Party Writing" written in 1942: "China is a country with a very large petty-bourgeois component. Our party is surrounded by this large class, and a large number of our party members are from this class. They all inevitably drag a petty-bourgeois tail into the party for a long or short time."

Moreover, the purpose of the new democratic revolution and the requirements for those who participate in it are fundamentally different from the purpose of the socialist revolution and the requirements for those who participate in it. I am afraid that there is no need to explain this point in detail. It is precisely because these are two revolutions at different historical stages that those who can participate in the new democratic revolution may not be able to keep up with the pace of history and participate in the socialist revolution. The transformation from the new democratic revolutionaries to the socialist revolutionaries is a test that every revolutionary must pass through self-transformation. This is a leap in a person's thinking and world outlook. Under the leadership of Chairman Mao, our party often talked about this issue and proposed "to pass the test of socialism well." Chairman Mao also talked about this issue repeatedly during the Cultural Revolution, saying that some old comrades' thoughts stopped at the historical stage of the democratic revolution, and they did not want to move forward, and even opposed the socialist revolution. In fact, our party has indeed always had this problem. Some party members cannot pass this test due to their own class and social influence.

Historically speaking, under the leadership of the Party, under the education of Marxism-Leninism, especially Mao Zedong Thought, and under the promotion and influence of the trend of the times and, first of all, the entire international communist movement, and after experiencing the cruel class struggle of blood and fire, especially the tempering and transformation of armed struggle, the thoughts and world outlook of the vast majority of Party members have undergone profound changes; however, the transformation of people's thoughts and world outlook will continue to change with the continuous changes in the social environment. It is an endless process of ups and downs and

development and change. If we want to completely overcome the inherent historical limitations of the class, especially after entering the city and under the new historical conditions of taking power, it will be even more difficult to continue to pay attention to overcoming the inherent historical limitations of the class, not be hit by the sugar-coated bullets of the bourgeoisie, and keep up with the pace of socialism in thoughts and world outlook without repetition and regression.

Historical facts tell us that after moving to the city, when the social environment and social existence changed, especially when there were some drawbacks in the economic and political systems, what generally happened to the majority of party members, especially senior cadres, that is, the "big officials" mentioned by Chairman Mao, was that some inherent non-proletarian ideological limitations, coupled with newly infected and newly bred bourgeois ideas, merged into one and expanded rapidly.

Chairman Mao often talked about this danger. Even in the "Theoretical Instructions" made in December 1974, he still said: "Lenin said that small production is constantly, every day, every hour, spontaneously and in large numbers, producing capitalism and the bourgeoisie. This situation also exists in a part of the working class and a part of the party members. Among the proletariat and among the staff of the organs, there are bourgeois lifestyles."

This is a historical phenomenon of the so-called "degeneration and deterioration" of Communist Party members. This phenomenon did not happen by chance. Its historical inevitability can be seen if we observe it using the method of class analysis. Chairman Mao was the first to see that this danger had its inevitable historical class reasons, and therefore repeatedly warned the whole party to pay enough attention to this danger.

Whether we can deeply understand this is a question of ideological method and even more a question of ideological level. The objective need for leaders and the importance of leaders are particularly clear here.

As Engels said when commenting on Marx, Marx was a genius, while we are at most capable. Marx stood higher and saw farther than all of us; Chairman Mao said that genius is nothing more than a little cleverness; the fact is that this cleverness is beyond the reach of ordinary people. This is the significance and value of revolutionary mentors and leaders, but revisionists do not understand this. The Chinese revisionists made the same mistake in front of Chairman Mao. It is impossible for the small to understand the great, but the small always mistakenly think that they are great. The "crystallisation of collective wisdom" theory belongs to this kind of stupidity. Chairman Mao's observation of the problems existing in our party and the danger of possible degeneration is the most acute. This should be understood as the level of the Marxist revolutionary mentor is higher than that of our general comrades, and it is very important for leading the socialist revolution. Unfortunately, a large majority of party members cannot keep up with Chairman Mao's thoughts; this is not difficult to understand and is normal. As long as we respect Chairman Mao's opinions and study Marxism-Leninism-Maoism seriously, we will keep up. But the problem is that these comrades are more likely to follow Deng Xiaoping. Not only did they not put their relationship with Chairman Mao in the right place, they no longer respected Chairman Mao. Later, they even opposed Chairman Mao and Chairman Mao's thoughts, thinking that Deng Xiaoping was the saint in their hearts, and willingly followed Deng Xiaoping's revisionist thoughts and revisionist line.

The Communist Party and its members have such problems. This is not a new problem, nor is it only the Communist Party of China. A look at the history of the international communist movement shows that this is probably an old problem that all Communist parties have. It can also be said that this problem has existed since the Communist Party was established. In the past, it was often said that

"joining the party organisationally does not mean joining the party ideologically", which is aimed at this common problem.

After the Communist Party came to power, historical conditions changed fundamentally, and this problem became more acute. Lenin carried out a "purge" and proposed "it is better to have one good pear than a basket of rotten pears". Stalin also proposed at the last party congress in his later years that it was necessary to fight against bureaucracy, fearing that the party was degenerating.

Chairman Mao was the one who saw the class nature and seriousness of this issue most deeply and sharply. He repeatedly stressed and warned that this issue would lead to revisionism. Chairman Mao finally bravely and mercilessly said that the bourgeoisie "is within the Communist Party", which was very accurate and scientific. This is the core of Chairman Mao's theory of continuing socialist revolution and an important symbol of the third milestone in the development of Marxism.

Now everyone knows about the problem of corruption and is very concerned about the fight against corruption. In fact, since the 1950s, under the leadership of Chairman Mao, the fight against corruption has been ongoing. The "Three Antis and Five Antis" was an early typical struggle of this kind, and the later "Four Cleanups Movement" also included such a struggle. There is a fundamental difference between the practices at that time and the practices now. Under the leadership of Chairman Mao, this problem was solved by taking class struggle as the key link, relying on the mass line and mobilising the masses. It is different now. We have abandoned class struggle as the key link, do not understand and deal with this struggle from the perspective of class struggle, do not follow the mass line, do not mobilise the masses, but selectively fight corruption. These are actually two fundamentally different and fundamentally opposing lines on this issue. What is the nature of corruption? It is a class behaviour of the bourgeoisie that undermines socialism. The essence of fighting corruption is class struggle. Only by following the line of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, taking class struggle as the key link, and mobilising the broad masses of the people to fight, can such problems be truly and thoroughly solved.

Revisionism is revisionism. Revisionism is revisionist in any way it deals with issues. None of them are based on the scientific theory of Marxism. Unlike the revisionists, Chairman Mao's proposal of problems within the Party is based on the scientific analysis of Marxist historical materialism, especially Marxist class analysis. The scientific nature of Chairman Mao's theory of continuing revolution lies in the fact that Chairman Mao not only revealed the fact that the bourgeoisie would emerge within the Communist Party, but also explained the fundamental reasons why the bourgeoisie would emerge within the Communist Party.

Chairman Mao's scientific thoughts and main expositions on this theory are all contained in the "important instructions" published in the Central Document No. 4 in 1976, which Chairman Mao left us.⁴⁹

I have repeatedly said that these "important instructions" published in the Central Document No. 4 in 1976 can be understood as the political will left by Chairman Mao to the entire party and the people of the whole country.

There is an old saying in Chairman Mao's philosophical thought: internal factors are the basis of change. The reason why the bourgeoisie emerged in the Communist Party and why the Communist Party became revisionist is that the basis lies in the Communist Party. Chairman Mao revealed all these "bases" in his final "important instructions", especially the "theory of privileges of big officials" and so

⁴⁹ There is a very good translation of the Central Document No. 4 here: [ChairmanMao'sPrimaryDirectives-CCP-CC-1976-Doc4-EngWithNotes.pdf](#) – Trans.

on. This is a sublimation of theoretical cognition. These theoretical summaries expressed in popular language have laid a solid foundation for Chairman Mao's theory of continuing socialist revolution. Everyone is familiar with these theoretical expositions. Due to space limitations, I will not elaborate too much here; I just want to remind everyone that whoever wants to truly understand Chairman Mao's theory of continuing socialist revolution must study these important theoretical instructions carefully and repeatedly.

Flies don't bite seamless eggs.⁵⁰ The sugar-coated bullets can get in because of the internal factors. The Communist Party itself has problems. The Communist Party itself has transformed into a revisionist party. It is inevitable that this party will restore capitalism. This truth is too easy to understand for the Chinese people today. The performances of a large number of corrupt officials are the most accurate footnotes to Chairman Mao's theory. This can also be regarded as the role of corrupt officials as negative teachers. They openly "confidently" said: If there is no benefit, why join the party? If you are not greedy, why be an official? This is the essence of their insistence on "confidence". With such thoughts and world views, what kind of party will this party become? Isn't it conceivable?

From this we can see that the newly established socialist society may encounter a frenzied counterattack by the internal and external reactionaries, which may lead to very intense class struggle and even put civil war on the agenda, just like what Lenin encountered back then. This has been proven by history and is understood by everyone. Lenin's theory in his relevant works that the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat will encounter very intense class struggle is based on this reality. The theoretical ideas about class struggle in the new era that we put forward in the early days of the founding of the People's Republic of China, including the campaign to suppress counter-revolutionaries in practice, and the long-term policies against landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements, and rightists, and even the socialist education campaign, were still understood as struggles with the old exploiting class elements, the so-called "pull them out and beat them in". As for the so-called "capitalist roaders in power are the focus of the current movement" put forward by Chairman Mao, most people in the whole party from top to bottom still cannot understand and accept it. It is still like this today. This is not surprising. The principles of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism are clearly class-based. How could the revisionists and the bourgeoisie accept them?

After the socialist revolution has achieved basic victory and the socialist transformation has been basically completed, the first question is whether there is still class struggle under the historical conditions of this new socialist society, and the second question is how to understand the class struggle in this new historical period? The actual situation is that all our comrades in the party cannot keep up with Chairman Mao's understanding. Even today, not to mention the revisionist rulers, even our comrades who claim to be Maoists still cannot keep up with Chairman Mao's understanding in terms of ideology. The main problem is that they always examine this historical issue from the perspective of personal sins, rather than using the method of class and class analysis to examine this historical issue.

Chairman Mao said, "You are making the socialist revolution, and yet don't know where the bourgeoisie is. It is right in the Communist Party." The fact that a party will produce revisionism, turn into a revisionist party, or even a fascist bourgeois party, cannot be explained by personal sins, because this is a historical phenomenon of a great change in classes and class relations. People like Khrushchev, Gorbachev, Yeltsin, Deng Xiaoping, and even the biggest capitalist-roader general secretary who is "set in stone" and no one is allowed to make any comments on him, in the final analysis, as Chairman Mao

⁵⁰ A folk saying from the countryside of northern Jiangsu, the original meaning is that flies will not bite eggs without cracks, because flies generally only fly to smelly things, and eggs that will emit a foul smell must also be bad eggs – Trans.

defined in the famous "May 16 Notice", are just representatives of the bourgeoisie. Chairman Mao said this to tell us that these bourgeois representatives are only representatives of the bourgeoisie, and their actions are not personal behaviour, but represent the needs of the bourgeoisie. Of course, these individuals have an unshirkable heavy historical responsibility; however, if a major change in class relations, and social and economic forms is regarded as the result of individual sins, this is actually exaggerating the role of these individuals, as Marx said.

This is not the view of historical materialism. We should understand and analyse this great historical change from the viewpoint of historical materialism.

Lenin repeatedly said that Russia was a backward country with a large number of petty bourgeoisie. He often criticised this danger, saying that small production was producing the bourgeoisie every day and every hour. This sentence was also valued by Chairman Mao. Don't forget that China is a country more backward than Russia. In addition to the characteristics of small production and a vast sea of petty bourgeoisie, the historical burden of feudal autocratic ideology and culture is particularly heavy. It is precisely this specific historical condition of Chinese society and the class conditions determined by this specific social and historical condition that determine the inevitable situation of the Communist Party of China, making this party inevitably carry some serious weaknesses and limitations pointed out by Chairman Mao. This is the most profound historical, social and class fundamental basis and fundamental reason for "the party becomes revisionist and the country changes colour".

Chairman Mao made many criticisms, and I would like to focus on two points here, which are naturally very important and fundamental.

The first is that Chairman Mao pointed out that "not many people in our party really understand Marxism-Leninism."

The acuteness of this problem lies in the fact that not only do not many Party members in general really know Marx and Lenin, but not many senior Party cadres, or even the leaders' group, really know Marx and Lenin. Back then, the leader group was Mao, Liu, Zhou, Zhu, Chen, Lin and Deng. I dare not make any presumption. Please think about this: Apart from Chairman Mao, which one of them really understands Marx and Lenin? Herein lies the acuteness and severity of the problem.

In fact, this is not just a problem of the Chinese Party. When Marx wrote "Critique of the Gotha Programme" and Engels wrote "Critique of the Erfurt Programme", who were they criticising? Wasn't it the leaders of the German Party? Wasn't the final degeneration of the Second International determined by the degeneration of the leaders of the Second International? How did Lenin's letter to the Party, which was equivalent to a political testament, comment on several leaders of the Party? Wasn't it equivalent to saying that except for Stalin, who had shortcomings but was the best, the rest were people who did not understand Marxism-Leninism, which inevitably led to Stalin's violent purge in the end. However, after Stalin's death, the leaders of the Soviet Party did not inherit the line of Lenin and Stalin. They still did not understand Marxism-Leninism, and were strongly opposed to Stalin and engaged in revisionism. Precisely because the Communist and Workers' Parties always have the problem of "not understanding Marxism-Leninism", especially the leaders of the parties, revisionist thoughts and lines have always existed in the international communist movement, and in some parties they have even been dominant for a long time. It can be seen that this is a universal social phenomenon determined by social existence. The situation within the Communist Party is just a reflection and a manifestation of this social phenomenon.

After the victory of the socialist revolution, once the true Marxist revolutionary mentor died, the leaders of the Communist Party, without exception, degenerated into revisionists. Khrushchev was

only the chief and representative of them, and the leaders of the other satellite countries became Khrushchev's lackeys. Deng Xiaoping, who had participated in the anti-revisionist struggle, directly denied his participation in the struggle against the Soviet revisionist party in Beijing in 1989 to Gorbachev, and stubbornly wanted to follow the path that Khrushchev had taken. It was under the leadership of these revisionist chiefs and representatives of the bourgeoisie that, from the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe to China, everyone engaged in revisionism, promoted the revisionist line, and took the capitalist road, which led to the inevitable "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe" in Europe, and the complete collapse of the fake Communist Party; the inevitable "Chinese evolution" in China, and the Communist Party degenerated into a revisionist party and a fascist party, and created a monopoly and authoritarian capitalist society in China, which was self-interpreted as a "socialist society with Chinese characteristics."

It seems that the possibility of the Communist Party degenerating into a revisionist party is a universal phenomenon. Chairman Mao often used the phrase "if it is not handled well", which is probably referring to this danger and universality. Indeed, since it is a universal phenomenon, it is not accidental, which means that it contains the universality, commonality, inevitability and regularity of contradictions.

The Chinese Communist Party did not escape this fate in the end.

It can be seen that when Chairman Mao sternly pointed out that "not many members of our party really understand Marxism-Leninism", he raised a very acute, severe and common problem in the Communist Party. It is the inevitable existence of this problem that determines that although a party claims to be guided by Marxism-Leninism, the majority of its members do not really understand Marxism-Leninism, and especially even the leadership group has this problem. Under such circumstances, once the outstanding revolutionary mentor who truly understands Marxism-Leninism passes away, the Party's change to revisionism is a trend that is very difficult to reverse. Even the great Chairman Mao was not able to reverse this trend. Chairman Mao, regardless of the possibility of offending his old comrades and the possibility of being smashed to pieces, still resolutely and unswervingly launched and led the Cultural Revolution at the age of more than 70. As a result, as everyone knows, it still failed cruelly and inevitably. A few hours after he insisted on listening to an international document for the last time, he closed his eyes forever. He really fought for the people until the last moment. But at this time, when the people of the whole country were still in infinite grief, the revisionist leaders felt the opportunity for the seizure of power that they had waited for had finally arrived. They completed the conspiracy to usurp power at lightning speed. Less than a month after Chairman Mao left the people he loved and worried about, they successfully launched a counter-revolutionary coup without any hindrance. Chairman Mao's final struggle against the bourgeoisie in the party ended in failure, and everything that followed was inevitable.

However, the phenomena of thought, line and reality do not come out of thin air, nor are they determined by the quality of individual qualities. Marxist historical materialism tells us that the phenomena of thought, line and reality are determined by class and social phenomena.

A person's ideological tendency, ideological level, and class standpoint are the result of a person's historical conditions in all aspects. In the social and historical environment we are currently in, it is quite difficult for a person to truly understand and comprehend Marxism and put it into practice. There are too many constraints in various aspects, such as class, social environment, social experience, cultural level, and even the degree of intelligence and talent, etc., which will restrict a person's ideological tendency, ideological level, and class standpoint; and the objective object that needs to be understood is a complex social organism composed of various classes, all kinds of people, and various

groups. It can be said that it is a complex social organism composed of a variety of people. If you want to be able to deeply analyse and understand such a social organism, its difficulty is imaginable, especially if you want to be able to use Marxism to analyse and understand such a social organism, it is even more difficult, and it is often shown that "not many people really understand Marxism-Leninism."

The specific situation of the problem of "not many people really understand Marxism-Leninism" needs further analysis.

If you don't understand Marxism-Leninism, you can improve your level and solve this problem slowly by reading books carefully. No one can be born to understand Marxism-Leninism. Chairman Mao himself studied all his life, and even in his later years he needed large-print copies of Marxist-Leninist works for his own reading and learning. It is indeed difficult to understand how socialism should be carried out. Lenin repeatedly said that we made mistakes on the issue of wartime communism, so later we raised the issue of the new economic policy. In 1958, when Chairman Mao met Wu Lengxi on the special train, he also said that during the democratic revolution, mistakes were made in the battle of Changsha, and later the correct path was found; now in socialist construction, without experience, mistakes may also be made. It doesn't matter if you make mistakes. Summarise the experience and slowly find the laws of socialist construction. Chairman Mao repeatedly said this. When answering Li Zongren's question, he also said that we make a living by summarizing our experience. Chairman Mao, like several other revolutionary mentors, almost always talked about "making mistakes" and never avoided making mistakes. As Chairman Mao said, he insisted on the "theory that mistakes are inevitable." This can be explained from the perspective of Marxist epistemology. Human cognition always goes from ignorance to knowledge, from less knowledge to more knowledge, and in this process of cognition, mistakes are always inevitable, and it can even be said that they are always inevitable. The correct cognition that comes later is always a correction of the previous wrong cognition and an affirmation of the correct cognition. Only in this way can there be continuous development of cognition and continuous acquisition of truth. This principle is not a problem at all in Marxist epistemology.

It doesn't matter if you don't understand or make mistakes. What matters is that the general direction and the path cannot be wrong.

Deng Xiaoping, Hu Yaobang, Zhao Ziyang and others have said more than once that they are not clear about what socialism is and how to build socialism. This may be the truth. If you don't understand, you should study. The books of Marx, Lenin and Mao are there, so you can study them. Practice is also there, so you can study it. It is wrong not to respect Marx, Lenin and Mao, not to study the works of Marx, Lenin and Mao, and to emphasise "crossing the river by feeling the stones" as Chairman Mao criticised many times for "not reading books or newspapers". What is even more wrong is that in practice, Deng Xiaoping and others actually still believe in their own set of ideas and insist on their own set of ideas, that is, the so-called "white cat, black cat" set, the "three directives as the key link" set, the "one centre and two basic points" set. In short, they still want to deny class struggle as the key link, deny taking the socialist road, deny the general direction of socialism, and do revisionism. This is by no means a question of cognition or understanding, but a question of standpoint, direction, the problem of differences and struggles between Marxism and revisionism, and the problem of differences and struggles between the Marxist line and the revisionist line.

Therefore, we need to analyse Chairman Mao's statement that "not many people in our party really understand Marxism-Leninism". For the majority of party members, it is a question of reading books and studying hard to understand Marxism-Leninism. Otherwise, first, they will be fooled by revisionism,

such as what happened on Mount Lushan.⁵¹ Second, if they do not do it well, they will follow revisionism and eventually slide into the revisionist quagmire. However, for the revisionist leaders, it is not a question of understanding or not, but a question of opposing Marxism and engaging in revisionism. From this, we can see that Chairman Mao's statement that "not many people in our party really understand Marxism-Leninism" is not only a very sharp opinion, but also a very important opinion against revisionism within the party.

Chairman Mao's second important opinion is that in his later years, Chairman Mao, in combination with the repeated and complex struggles of the ten-year Cultural Revolution, further conducted a serious theoretical discussion on the issue of opposing revisionism and the restoration of capitalism, and saw the shortcomings of the socialist system we have established, thereby revealing the economic and political basic reasons and fundamental reasons for the existence of the bourgeoisie within the party.

In the "Important Instructions" that Chairman Mao left us, based on his final discussion of this issue, he profoundly and comprehensively discussed the existence of certain serious problems in the socialist system we have established, focusing on the privileges of senior officials and other aspects, including bourgeois right, which can only be restricted but not eliminated for the time being. It is precisely these institutional problems that determine, as Chairman Mao said, "If Lin Biao and his ilk come to power, it will be easy to establish a capitalist system."

Chairman Mao used the word "system" here, which has a profound meaning. It shows that the system has drawbacks, which provides conditions for the transformation to capitalist restoration. In the continuation of the system, "it is very easy to restore capitalism." "Very easy" is linked to the fact that the system "has problems".

Chairman Mao repeatedly said that if revisionism came to power, it would establish a fascist bourgeois dictatorship and the worst capitalism. This must be observed, studied, and explained from the shortcomings of the socialist political system and political system we have established.

When talking about some political events that happened in the Soviet Communist Party and in our Party, Chairman Mao said more than once in comparison with the political systems of Western bourgeois democratic capitalist countries, "Such things would not happen in Western capitalist countries." When criticising the revisionists for coming to power and establishing fascist bourgeois dictatorship, he also said figuratively that "Hitler was worse than de Gaulle," which was also what he meant. Chairman Mao obviously thought about and studied this issue from the comparison of political systems and political institutions, and from the shortcomings of the political system and political institutions we have established.

This exploration and research is quite difficult. It takes time, practice, and even repetition. In the continuous exploration, we can gradually gain correct understanding. It was after such repeated research and understanding for many years that Chairman Mao clearly stated in his "Important Instructions" in 1976 that after gaining revolutionary power, "The thinking of some comrades, principally the old comrades, remains "standing still" at the stage of the bourgeois democratic revolution. They don't understand, resist, or even oppose the socialist revolution. [In their minds] there are two kinds of attitudes towards the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, one is dissatisfaction, and the other is "settling accounts:" settling the account of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. Why didn't Lenin "stand still"? After the democratic revolution the workers and the poor and lower-middle

⁵¹ i.e. at the Lushan Conference of July-August 1959 when there were open disagreements among the leadership over the correct line to take – Trans.

peasants did not stand still, they wanted revolution. On the other hand, a number of Party members have not wanted to go forward; some have moved backward and opposed the revolution. Why? Because they became high officials and wanted to protect the interests of high officials. They have a good house, a car, a high salary, and attendants, [this is] more grievous than the capitalists. With the socialist revolution they themselves come under fire. When it came to the co-operative transformation of agriculture there were people in the Party who opposed it, and when it [now] comes to criticising bourgeois right, they resent it. You are making the socialist revolution, and yet don't know where the bourgeoisie is. It is right in the Communist Party—those in power taking the capitalist road. The capitalist-roaders are still on the capitalist road. Will there be a need for revolution a hundred years from now? Will there still be need for revolution a thousand years from now? There is always need for revolution. There are always sections of the people who feel themselves oppressed; junior officials, students, workers, peasants and soldiers don't like bigshots oppressing them. That's why they want revolution. Will contradictions no longer be recognised ten thousand years from now? Why not? They will still be recognised."

According to the "Notice of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China" issued by Document No. 313 of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China on October 7, 1967, Chairman Mao "has inspected the North, South Central and East China regions in the past two months, and investigated the situation of the proletarian cultural revolution in Hebei, Henan, Hubei, Hunan, Jiangxi, Zhejiang, Shanghai and other provinces and cities. During the inspection, Chairman Mao gave extremely important instructions on the Cultural Revolution movement in various regions." Among them, these issues were also discussed: "Chairman Mao said, why are some cadres criticised and struggled by the masses? One is that they implemented the bourgeois reactionary line, and the masses are angry; the other is that they have become powerful officials and have received more salaries, so they think they are great and put on airs, do not consult with the masses when there is something, treat people unequally, are undemocratic, like to curse and scold people, and are seriously out of touch with the masses. In this way, the masses have opinions. They don't have the opportunity to talk about it in normal times, but it broke out during the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. Once it broke out, they thought it was terrible and made them very embarrassed. We must learn lessons in the future, solve the problem of the relationship between superiors and subordinates well, and improve the relationship between cadres and the masses. In the future, cadres should go to the grassroots to take a look, consult with the masses when encountering problems, and be the primary school students of the masses. In a sense, the smartest, and most talented are the most practically experienced fighters." This instruction of Chairman Mao was very famous at the time, especially the last paragraph, which was soon published in the newspapers.

It can be seen that Chairman Mao has always been studying the contradictions and problems existing in our socialist society. If we link some of the opinions expressed by Chairman Mao in the 1950s and 1960s and some of the ideological theories he expressed, it is not difficult to find that Chairman Mao's ideological theories on this issue are coherent and constantly developing. Chairman Mao has increasingly clearly analysed the main reasons why the bourgeoisie and revisionism emerged within the party. Chairman Mao used popular language to express to the masses his profound theoretical thoughts on the need for continued revolution in socialist society.

If we use the written language of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, these important thoughts of Chairman Mao can be roughly summarised as follows: Our socialist society has serious institutional deficiencies and problems in both economic and political relations.

From the perspective of economic relations, there is a way of distributing privileges to high-ranking officials that deviates from the socialist principle of distribution according to work: "He has a good house, a car, a high salary, and an attendant, which is more powerful than the capitalists."

From the perspective of political relations, the problem of the socialist democratic system has not been well solved. The so-called "issues of relations between cadres and the masses" and the so-called "training people at every turn" mentioned by Chairman Mao, especially the more serious "cruel struggle and ruthless blows", the problem of treating comrades as enemies and treating contradictions among the people as contradictions between enemies and ourselves, etc., are actually problems of not doing a good job in socialist democracy and not solving the socialist democratic system that unifies the dictatorship of the proletariat and proletarian democracy.

Chairman Mao's theory that socialist society must continue to carry out revolution is very rich. Here, we only give a superficial introduction and explanation of two important opinions. If we really understand Chairman Mao's two opinions, we can better understand the fundamental reasons why "the party becomes revisionist and the country changes colour", revisionism and capitalist restoration will occur in socialist society. The importance of these two opinions can be imagined. It can be said that this is a major breakthrough in Marxist theory of socialist society.

Because if you don't understand Marxism-Leninism, you will inevitably engage in revisionism under the guidance of bourgeois ideology and world outlook, put forward a revisionist line, and restore capitalism under the guidance of this line.

Because of the shortcomings of the system, once revisionism comes to power and capitalist restoration takes place, firstly, it will be 'easy'; secondly, it will turn into the worst kind of fascist bourgeois dictatorship of monopolistic and authoritarian capitalism. Party leadership will be transformed into one-party dictatorship, and a despotism at that; the socialist publicly-owned economy will be transformed into a bureaucratic monopoly capitalist economy, and a bureaucratic monopoly bourgeoisie will be created.

Is not the history of the past 40-odd years such a history?

If we look at things in this way, we will not see the occurrence of this capitalist restoration in China as the result of individual sins. Over the past forty years, China has come step by step to where it is today, and it is not Deng Xiaoping alone who is doing this, nor is it Deng Xiaoping's generation of leaders who are doing this, but it is the entire Party which has been doing this generation after generation over a period of more than forty years. Of course it is true that Deng Xiaoping was the biggest capitalist-roader, that the Party Central Committee was the highest bourgeois command, that there was a strong fascist bourgeois dictatorship, that there was a strong army, that there was a strong police force, that major crackdowns took place, and that there were even more minor crackdowns. But let us not forget that this shows that it is the whole of this party that is carrying out the restoration of capitalism, and not the individual behaviour of any one person. Chairman Mao has repeatedly warned the whole Party that in the event of capitalist restoration, there should be local revolts, party members should revolt and the whole Party should revolt. However, a party with more than 90 million members has not acted in accordance with Chairman Mao's words. Instead, it has honestly, and some of its members are even more energetic, implemented Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line and engaged in capitalist restoration. To paraphrase an old saying, it can be said that the kind of party members there are makes the party what it is. It is the standard of the whole party that determines the fate of the party. Therefore, it is right for us to see the historical culpability of Deng Xiaoping's gang, but it is again insufficient and inaccurate

just to see the historical culpability of these individuals of theirs, and it is impossible to find a way to solve China's problems.

By comparison, we will realize more deeply and painfully the seriousness of the party's problems.

If the Communist Party of China had been in the same situation as it is now, how could it have led the Chinese New Democratic Revolution to victory? In order to win the victory of the New Democratic Revolution, the Communist Party of China sacrificed so many good party members and comrades that Chairman Mao said passionately at the solemn Ninth National Congress: All the good comrades have sacrificed, and we are the left-overs! If the party is in this situation now, how can it be qualified to lead the Chinese revolution and lead the Chinese revolution to victory? There will always be sacrifices in the revolution. Without the sacrifice of thousands of good party members and comrades, how could the new China be born?

On the other hand, if the members of this party do not have the spirit of sacrifice to defend socialism, but follow the restoration of capitalism, then under the historical conditions of this party as the ruling party, the restoration of capitalism can only be inevitable.

If you want to ask, why does the same Chinese Communist Party have such different changes before and after? This can only be analysed from the perspective of historical materialism, why will the party change and degenerate under different historical conditions before and after. A communist party that was once very revolutionary, great, glorious and correct can be transformed into a degenerate and even reactionary revisionist party that betrays the people and communism and is no longer great, glorious, or correct.

This is how it is, and it is not strange at all. Historical phenomena that seem strange are still the result of historical inevitability. This is true not only for the history of the Communist Party of China, but also for the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The transformation from a promoter of revolution to a reactionary faction must have internal causes and laws that led to the transformation.

It can be seen that preventing the restoration of capitalism is a difficult historical task. Chairman Mao and his loyal comrades-in-arms ended up playing the role of tragic heroes of the 20th century socialist revolution. Chairman Mao said many times that he believed that someone might want to reverse the Cultural Revolution in the future. For example, on May 4, 1969, in a conversation with comrades in the army, he said: "In every period, there is always a tendency that covers up another tendency. Now there is the proletarian Cultural Revolution. Will the bourgeoisie reverse it in the future? There were people who reversed the verdict on the Yan'an Rectification Movement during the Proletarian Cultural Revolution. Will there be people who reversed the verdict on the Cultural Revolution in the future?" In the final "Important Instructions", it was also emphasized that "there are two attitudes towards the Cultural Revolution. One is dissatisfaction, and the other is to settle accounts, to settle accounts with the Cultural Revolution." Chairman Mao's foresight has become a cruel reality. The case has been overturned and the accounts have been settled for now. But what's the big deal? The progress of history always comes at a price, including the price of blood and life. Real history is not written in ink, but in blood. To paraphrase Marx: Human beings use their heads as wine glasses to drink sweet wine. Although Chairman Mao led the people to fight this battle, although it failed, history will remember that heroes are still heroes and greatness is still greatness. Therefore, we have enough courage and ability to face the tragedy, and we are not pessimistic. What we value and must do is to find the experience and lessons of history and find the regularity of history. Aren't we doing this?

It is only by looking at problems from a practical perspective and from the perspective of historical materialism that we can easily understand that although Chairman Mao saw the seriousness of the

problem and did a lot of work, the results were minimal. Some work, such as the Cultural Revolution, instead caused a backlash from "old comrades". This was not only reflected in the accusation against Chairman Mao at the 4,000-person meeting, which used the most vicious language to completely negate Chairman Mao; it was also not only reflected in the arrest and imprisonment of Chairman Mao's only surviving comrades, relatives, and rebels who followed Chairman Mao and actively participated in the Cultural Revolution; what was more profound, cruel, and serious was that Chairman Mao's theory and line of continuing socialist revolution were completely overthrown and replaced with Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line. Under the guidance of this line, capitalist restoration was frantically and continuously implemented in China. Chairman Mao's greatest and heaviest worry turned into a painful history written by the working people with blood and tears. This turned the struggle between the two lines and the two classes that Chairman Mao originally intended to deal with in accordance with the struggle within the party and the contradictions among the people into a life-and-death class struggle and political struggle between the enemy and us, which was ruthlessly elevated by the bourgeoisie within the party who seized power with the counter-revolutionary coup as the starting point.

This is a very cruel and vivid history. We must learn profound historical lessons from this history.

From the history of the entire international communist movement, from the history of the Soviet Party and the Chinese Party, we can see that whether in the process of seizing power, carrying out the people's democratic revolution or the socialist revolution, or after the victory of the socialist revolution to seize power, in the struggle of continuing the socialist revolution, there has always been a struggle between the Marxist line and the revisionist line in the Communist Party. Its essence is the reflection of the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the party. The revisionist line is the bourgeois line, and the leaders of revisionism are the representatives of the bourgeoisie. This historical phenomenon can and should be scientifically understood as the bourgeoisie is within the Communist Party.

In the historical stage of the New Democratic Revolution, this problem actually already existed. Chen Duxiu's right-wing opportunist line led to the failure of the Chinese Communist Party in the First Great Revolution, and Wang Ming's left-wing opportunist line led to the near failure of the Agrarian Revolution. This is essentially the same as Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line leading to the failure of the socialist revolution. Both can be said to be the evil consequences caused by the bourgeoisie within the Communist Party. In addition to external reasons, such as the reasons of the Communist International, this wrong line was able to dominate the party and be implemented. In fact, there are also internal reasons within the party, including the reasons of the class basis we are talking about now, and the reason that there are not many people who really understand Marxism-Leninism.

History cannot be assumed. The "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee said that if the Chinese revolution had not been led by Chairman Mao, the Chinese Communist Party might have had to grope in the dark for a long time. This seems to be a polite assumption, but it is actually self-boasting. It is hard to say whether it can be established. Another assumption, in my opinion, is more likely. If it had not been for Chairman Mao's leadership, the Chinese revolution would have been likely to fail under such a critical situation at the time. Can people like Deng Xiaoping and Lin Biao grope their way to victory in the Chinese revolution? Anyway, I don't believe it. You know, in all countries facing the historical task of the new democratic revolution, not all revolutionary struggles under the leadership of the Communist Party can be victorious.

We are Marxist historical materialists. We neither agree that heroes create history nor that villains create history. However, we do not deny that individuals can play a great role in history under certain historical conditions, and sometimes even a decisive role. However, in the final analysis, this kind of

individual historical role can only be played under certain historical conditions. Without certain historical conditions, no one can display their talents, create history, and change history.

We should hold such a historical materialist viewpoint towards Chairman Mao, Deng Xiaoping, and all historical figures.

Therefore, when we explore the major and fundamental historical issues such as the occurrence of revisionism and the restoration of capitalism, we cannot mainly look for the reasons from individual people, but should analyse and study the entire social existence and the entire party's situation to find the answer.

This historical responsibility should be placed on the Chinese Communist Party in a realistic and reasonable manner.

The phrase "the party changes to revisionism and the country changes colour" is very appropriate here. It is "the party changes to revisionism" that brings about "the country changes colour".

Historical facts tell us that the top leaders of the Party were unanimously committed to revisionism and wanted to promote the Deng Xiaoping group as the leader. They could not even tolerate Hua Guofeng, who had made great contributions to the revisionism's rise to power through speculation and coup d'etat. This was the sharpness of the class struggle and the struggle of the line. Only by completing such a thorough cleansing and establishing the authority of "whoever does not reform will step down" could the revisionist line of Deng Xiaoping be implemented unimpeded and capitalism be completely restored in China.

In this situation, although some comrades in the Party resisted, the entire Party still fully implemented and promoted Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line, and the whole Party restored capitalism together.

These facts tell us that the emergence of revisionism in China and the change of the color of the Chinese Party cannot be explained by individual sins. It is very clear that this is the inevitable result determined by the overall situation of the Party from top to bottom. Now, we still have many comrades who just vent their anger and hatred on Deng Xiaoping and just curse Deng Xiaoping. However, this is not a profound understanding that conforms to the viewpoint of class analysis. This kind of emotion cannot deeply understand the class nature of this great historical change and the great change in class relations, and it cannot explain the historical inevitability contained in this great historical change.

The scientific conclusion can only be: the history of the Chinese Communist Party over the past 40 years is a history of revisionism and capitalist restoration. The Chinese Communist Party, which was once great, glorious and correct, has degenerated into a revisionist party that implements the revisionist line and restores capitalism. It has become a party that is no longer great, glorious or correct, and can even be denounced as a traitor party. When commemorating the 100th anniversary of the birth of the Communist Party of China, I wrote a short article: "Traitors, you are not qualified to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the birth of the Communist Party!" They were probably very angry and found the national security in my hometown of Shandong and asked them about my work and to stop me writing like this. You have done it, so what does it matter if I write a few words? I just told the truth.

Now, the question we need to clarify is why the Chinese Communist Party has undergone such a transformation, and not only the Chinese Communist Party, but also the Soviet Party has undergone such a transformation.

It is still the basic truth revealed by Marxist historical materialism, and it is also the truth that the great Lenin has "repeatedly" specifically talked about. The reason why this problem occurred, that a party that was once revolutionary, would undergo transformation and go to the opposite side, the most fundamental reason, and the most fundamental historical inevitability, is that the social foundation for the birth, survival and development of the Chinese Party, including the Soviet Party, is relatively backward countries.

It is this social foundation that determines the state of the party and the possibility of the party's transformation.

The inevitability of history lies in this point. Only by seeing this point and recognizing this point can we not face the disaster of capitalist restoration that we have experienced and pour all our anger on individuals, thinking that this is the result of the personal sins of the capitalist ruling clique like Deng Xiaoping. Don't forget that the capitalist roaders themselves are a product of history. They are not a person but a "faction" (from the historical experience gained later, it is a "class". The Chairman called them the bourgeoisie in the party, which is absolutely correct). They were able to come to power because they relied on the support of the entire bourgeoisie in the party. This is a historical phenomenon that is bound to happen due to certain historical conditions. It is by no means caused by an individual's accidental historical misunderstanding.

It is precisely because historical conditions have determined that the ruling Communist Party has such historical limitations that the socialist system it has established inevitably has two major limitations.

One is the system of privileges for senior officials that Chairman Mao repeatedly criticised from the 1950s to his death. This system is the political and economic basis for the emergence of privileged classes in all socialist countries.

Another is the issue of democratic centralism, that is, the issue of the democratic system, which Chairman Mao repeatedly criticised, especially at the 1962 Seven Thousand People's Conference. Chairman Mao criticised that "where is the reason for one person to have the final say?" However, within the party and in the whole society, there is always one person who has the final say and occupies a dominant position, which has actually formed a political system. The so-called "one person has the final say" is actually an autocratic system that is opposed to the democratic system.

This autocratic system and privilege system complement each other and are the two biggest drawbacks of the socialist system established from the Soviet Union to China that have caused the people's dissatisfaction.

Moreover, once the revisionist line comes to power and capitalism is restored, the bureaucratic privileged class will immediately transform into a bureaucratic autocratic monopoly bourgeoisie, and under the manipulation of this class, through power and money transactions, a private monopoly bourgeoisie will be born.

This process of capitalist restoration has been carried out step by step, and it has deepened step by step. It has never stopped, let alone self-corrected. Like some comrades fantasise about "returning to socialism", the fact is that the restoration of capitalism is becoming more and more thorough, and the worst capitalism is getting worse and worse.

Moreover, we also see that it is precisely because it is the worst kind of capitalism under the fascist bourgeois dictatorship, the dictatorship is particularly harsh, the repression is particularly severe, and the backward masses determined by the backward national conditions are the natural basis of the dictatorship tools. Some things that are impossible in bourgeois democratic republics are

commonplace here. This also contains a certain historical inevitability. It is this historical inevitability that determines that it is quite difficult to launch a socialist revolution. We are accepting the torment of this kind of capitalism, and we have no choice but to accept this kind of capitalist torment. This also contains historical inevitability, which is also what we want to explore.

All of this is a historical fact that every Chinese has witnessed and experienced in person over the past forty years. We are now only using the viewpoint of historical materialism to find the historical inevitability contained therein. With the guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, especially Chairman Mao's theory of continuing socialist revolution, as long as comrades work together unremittingly to find the regularity contained therein, we can still do it step by step.

4.

In the historical process of capitalist restoration and great changes in class relations in China, how did the masses, who were inevitably harmed in the end, behave and what role did they play?

It is a shame for us to say this, and it is even more disappointing for Chairman Mao. In short, the working people did not listen to Chairman Mao and rise up to resist the restoration of capitalism. On the contrary, they basically followed Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line. They neither emulated nor learned from the struggle of the loyal fighters of Chairman Mao represented by Comrade Jiang Qing and Zhang Chunqiao who fought bravely and were not afraid of sacrifice. Some people even still believe in the so-called "charges" that reverse right and wrong.

As for the revisionist rulers' crazy deprivation of the historical achievements of socialism and the vital interests of the broad masses of working people that have been obtained in the socialist era, the working people, as the deprived, are dissatisfied, have complained, and have some individual rights protection struggles, but they basically still play the role of a passive and weak tail. Among them, there are a very small number of people who take advantage of the situation and use all kinds of despicable and bad means to get into this plunder, so that they can quickly transform themselves into new bourgeois upstarts with billions of wealth. More than 40 years have passed, and this basic situation has not changed fundamentally.

Comrades who are used to hearing and have a one-sided understanding of "the masses are the real heroes" may disagree with me saying this, do not accept it, or even feel disgusted.

Actually, I don't want to say this either. But, first, this is the fact, and second, this is consistent with the principles that Marxism has repeatedly said.

The masses are a historical concept. The main body of the masses is the working people, and the working people are the creators of history. Even in the slave society, as Marx said, the slaves are also the "negative pillars" of this society. It is very scientific, it is the pillar of history, without the labour of slaves, this society cannot exist for a day; but, it is also a negative pillar, because slaves can only play a negative role in this society, and the active role is played by the slave owners, who lead this society. The Communist Manifesto also adheres to such a historical materialist view when it first writes about the bourgeoisie. It is said that the bourgeoisie played a very revolutionary role in history and created huge productive forces. However, this huge productive force was realised by the proletariat who engaged in material production labour. The proletariat is also the pillar of this society, and it is also a passive pillar. It is only when the historical conditions for a new, communist social form to replace capitalist society with the continuous development of capitalism are met that the proletariat will step onto the historical stage and play an active historical role. Therefore, Marx and Engels have repeatedly emphasised that "the liberation of the working class is the business of the working class itself" since

the founding of Marxism. Even if the development of history has reached such a level, created such historical conditions, and has such historical possibilities, the Marxist revolutionary mentors have repeatedly taught us that if the working people want to achieve the goal of their own liberation, if they want to eliminate private ownership and classes once and for all and realise communism through socialist revolution and proletarian dictatorship, in this revolutionary process, in order to ensure the success of the revolution, the working people still have to learn and transform themselves, get rid of the ignorance and backwardness that the exploitative class society inevitably brings to themselves, and master the ideological weapons for realising the socialist revolution, mainly Marxism, including the new form of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. It is precisely to help the working people realize the revolutionisation and scientificisation of this ideological understanding that the revolutionary mentors, in the process of leading the proletariat in revolutionary practical activities, always promptly and painstakingly wrote for us one great and brilliant work after another of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, providing us with powerful ideological and theoretical weapons to understand and transform the world, and at the same time understand and transform ourselves.

Chairman Mao left us the most teachings in this regard and took the most measures, such as the Rectification Movement during the New Democratic Revolution, the thought reform movement after the founding of the People's Republic of China, the Socialist Education Movement, the Movement to Learn from Comrade Lei Feng, and so on, especially the Cultural Revolution, a thought reform movement that "touched people's souls."

Today, we must still unswervingly inherit the ideological legacy left to us by Chairman Mao. In the historical process of preparing for the socialist re-revolution, we must bear in mind Chairman Mao's teachings, practice Chairman Mao's teachings, learn to correctly understand ourselves, treat ourselves correctly, constantly transform our own thoughts, and constantly find the gap between our own thoughts and world outlook and the historical tasks we face. Only in this way can we mobilise and organise various forms of fighting organisations for the socialist re-revolution, and form a powerful material force that has mastered the ideological weapons of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. Only then can we talk about winning the victory of the socialist re-revolution.

I am afraid that comrades will not like to hear "bad words" that negate themselves, and dare not face up to their own historical limitations and mistakes they have made. Therefore, I repeat the revolutionary mentor's teaching on the need to make a scientific analysis of the masses of the people in a Marxist historical way. I hope that our comrades can stick to the view of dichotomy. In order to shoulder the arduous and great historical task of transforming the objective world, they must first transform their subjective world so that they can meet the requirements of history for themselves.

Facts are the most important and the most convincing. Let us do a simple historical review.

The first fact that everyone has witnessed and experienced is that during the counter-revolutionary coup, the subsequent total negation of the Cultural Revolution and the nationwide counterattack against the rebels, including the 11th Central Committee's Sixth Plenary Session's "Resolution" on Chairman Mao's mistakes, the vast majority of party members and the masses of the country basically supported and even condoned it; the ones who truly maintained a clear and correct understanding, dared to resist and fight were the relatively small number of comrades among the cadres, the working class, and the intellectuals who truly accepted Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, especially Chairman Mao's theory of continuing socialist revolution.

Why did this historical phenomenon occur? Now we need to conduct research and summarise the experience and lessons.

The answer to this question from the standpoint and perspective of the revisionist rulers has not changed fundamentally in more than 40 years. Starting from the standpoint and viewpoint of denying the Cultural Revolution and then denying Chairman Mao and Chairman Mao's theory of continuing socialist revolution, they naturally believe that it is normal and correct for the majority of party members and the masses to support what they did at that time. Some party members, especially the "big officials" among them; some people, especially the right-wing intellectuals among them, actively participated in this great historical change and gained vested interests from it. Therefore, it is natural and understandable that these people want to resolutely safeguard the legitimacy and correctness of this great historical change. To this day, they still often wield the big stick of "reversing the verdict of the Cultural Revolution", which is determined by their basic class standpoint and class interests. Criticising various phenomena and various problems that occurred during the Cultural Revolution is something they often do. For example, the "scar literature"⁵² discussed recently is a reflection of this standpoint and trend of thought in the field of literature.

A part of the Maoist comrades who had been tempered by the brutal class struggle and had a relatively high level of thinking, from the point of view of self-criticism, rejected and criticised the positions and attitudes adopted by the majority of the Party members and the masses of the people at that time during the counter-revolutionary coup d'état and the rise to power of revisionism, which was a great class struggle and a great change in class relations, and regarded it as a manifestation of the working masses' lack of enlightenment and of the fact that they had been duped. .

I have reflected a little further on this question. I am thinking about this issue from two basic facts.

One fact is that the Cultural Revolution has failed.

Of course, some comrades do not acknowledge this fact and think that the Cultural Revolution has achieved a great victory. For example, some comrades say that the Cultural Revolution lasted only three years and achieved a victory in seizing power; the fact that the country's mountains and rivers are red is a sign of the victory of the Cultural Revolution. There are some such claims, but basically they are not based on historical facts and border on sophistry, so they will not be discussed here.

Another fact is that the victory of the October Revolution and the victory of the Chinese Revolution were achieved under the leadership of the Communist Party, with the heroic struggle and even life-sacrificing endeavours of the Party's members, and with the resolute support of the masses of the people, especially the working masses, who constitute the majority of the population.

However, the Cultural Revolution did not achieve this. Chairman Mao had a high prestige at the time. The rise of the Cultural Revolution, to use a popular saying at the time, was because "Chairman Mao personally launched and led it." Even so, not only the majority of cadres, but also the majority of party members and the general public have never understood the Cultural Revolution.

There is a simple phenomenon that everyone understands, that is, all schools, factories, enterprises, institutions, government agencies, including military colleges, institutions, etc. that participated in the Cultural Revolution, there were two major factions of conservatives and rebels, and the vast majority of party members, league members, old workers, and model figures stood on the side of the

⁵² "Scar literature" was promoted on the Chinese mainland from the late 70s to the early 80s of the 20th century. It gets its name from Lu Xinhua's short story "Scars" which was based on the life of educated youth in the Cultural Revolution. Its thrust was to claim that the emotional cost of continuing the revolution under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat was too high – Trans.

conservatives; only a very small number of party members and league members stood on the side of the rebels, and the rebels have always been a minority.

Chairman Mao once said that he did not understand this phenomenon, and he also thought that it should not happen, so there was a famous quote: "There is no fundamental conflict of interests within the working class. There is no reason for the working class under the dictatorship of the proletariat to split into two irreconcilable factions."

Chairman Mao's reasoning is correct, "there is no fundamental conflict of interests" and "no reason", but this is an objective existence. In fact, there are profound reasons for the occurrence of this phenomenon, both historical reasons and current reasons, which are relatively complicated. This is a special topic. In-depth research should be carried out in the future. Due to space limitations, I can only mention it here, and it is not convenient to write more.

This situation of opposition between conservatives and rebels continued until the failure of the Cultural Revolution and the counterattack. The rebels were thoroughly annihilated through "investigation", arrests, and sentencing, as Marshal Ye⁵³ ordered: "Eliminate all evil."

Wherever there are people, there are left, centre, and right. "Revolution and conservatism" has always been an inevitable phenomenon in the development of human history. It is worth studying why this problem occurred during the Cultural Revolution, and it is a major issue related to the success or failure of the Cultural Revolution.

What we need to discuss here is that the above two facts that we have seen and experienced personally are not only objectively existing, but also unified. It can be said that it is the latter that determines the former. The comparison of political forces determines the outcome of political struggles. The Cultural Revolution was a battle that must be lost.

What kind of understanding should we draw from this?

Therefore, we completely negate Chairman Mao's theory of continuing the socialist revolution, just as the revisionists do. Obviously, this is wrong. The consequence, as we all see, is to slide into the quagmire of revisionism, engage in revisionism, and restore capitalism under the guidance of the revisionist line.

However, if we cannot see the failure of the Cultural Revolution, especially if we cannot study the reasons for the failure of the Cultural Revolution, and only oppose the complete negation of the Cultural Revolution, but insist on the complete affirmation of the Cultural Revolution, is it correct? Our Maoist comrades usually do this, and some comrades even advocate a second Cultural Revolution, and recite Chairman Mao's opinions, believing that it should only happen once every seven or eight years. Is this view and propaganda correct? I think it is not. This is not a correct attitude and correct way of thinking towards history in Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

This has prevented us from finding valuable historical lessons from the failure of the Cultural Revolution for many years, and from enriching and developing the theoretical ideas of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism on guiding the current and future socialist revolution and the socialist continued revolution.

⁵³ Ye Jianying (1897-1986) was the top military leader in the 1976 coup that overthrew the Gang of Four and ended the Cultural Revolution, and was the key supporter of Deng Xiaoping in his power struggle with Hua Guofeng. After Deng ascended to power, in his capacity as Chairman of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress, Ye served as China's head of state during the period from 1978 to 1983 – Trans.

This is a major mistake on our part.

The failure of any great revolution is not accidental, and there are inevitable historical reasons for its failure. The failure of the Cultural Revolution did not deviate from this historical law.

Unfortunately, while we correctly resisted the erroneous trend of thought that completely negated the Cultural Revolution, we completely ignored the serious study of the historical reasons for the failure of the Cultural Revolution.

In the Marxist theory of socialist revolution, there is a very important issue, that is, on the basis of a correct analysis of the historical conditions and nature of the revolution, there must be a correct choice of the road of revolution, and thus a correct general line of revolution and a series of revolutionary strategies.

For example, we often say that the road of the October Revolution is the road of violent revolution. The form of this violent revolution is to hold an armed uprising in the central city, seize power through armed uprising, and win the victory of the socialist revolution. The proletarian party led by Lenin, the Bolshevik Party, formulated a correct general line for leading this revolution and a corresponding series of revolutionary policies, and correctly solved which class to lead, which class to rely on, which classes to unite, and form the broadest revolutionary united front to carry out this revolution and win the victory of this revolution. In the words of Chairman Mao, this is an important reason that determines everything for the victory of the October Revolution.

The Communist Party of China also followed this basic law when leading the New Democratic Revolution. China's New Democratic Revolution was also a violent revolution. Unlike the October Revolution in Russia, according to the historical conditions of China at that time, the form of the violent revolution of the Chinese Revolution was to first establish a rural revolutionary base, then surround the city from the countryside, and finally seize the city through armed struggle. In order to lead such a revolution, as everyone knows, Chairman Mao formulated a correct general line of the New Democratic Revolution and a series of policies that were compatible with this line for the Communist Party of China. It also correctly solved which class should lead, which class should be relied on, which classes should be united, and how to form the broadest revolutionary united front, thus ensuring the correct leadership of the Communist Party of China over this revolution and finally winning the victory of this revolution.

By carefully reviewing and studying these valuable historical experiences of past revolutions, and re-learning Marxism-Leninism-Maoism in light of these historical realities, we will be able to answer the question of why the Cultural Revolution failed more correctly and more profoundly.

In my opinion, it is mainly because the question of continuing the revolution under socialist conditions is a new question. In terms of cognition and theory, we have not yet fully understood the laws of the road of continuing socialist revolution. For example, the object of revolution, the nature of revolution, the tasks of revolution, the composition of revolutionary class forces, the methods of revolution, the leadership of the party over the revolution, how to mobilize and organize the masses, how to deal with the state apparatus, which includes the army, government, public security, procuratorial and judicial organs, etc. For these issues, it is not enough to rely only on some major principles and theories. For example, there are such deficiencies in cognition and strategy regarding the very important and core issue of capitalist-roaders. It was right to identify the capitalist-roaders, which was a great leap forward in the theory of socialist revolution and continuing revolution; it was also right to strategically determine that the capitalist-roaders who were the targets of struggle were only a "small handful", but in the actual struggle, the mistake of "overthrowing everything" was made; it was said that the

focus of the movement was to fight against the capitalist-roaders, but under the guidance of the idea of sweeping away all monsters and demons, many comrades who should not have been hurt were indeed hurt, leading to some painful tragedies that should not have happened under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat. All this shows that the problem of how to deal with the objects of revolution strategically has not been well solved. This is just one example of capitalist-roaders. The actual problems involve a wide range of aspects. These very important and fundamental issues must be completely clarified and completely accurate. If this is not done, it will be impossible to formulate and there will be no correct line, principles and policies to guide the socialist revolution. The line determines everything, and policies and strategies are the life of the party. The facts of the Cultural Revolution we have experienced tell us that these crucial issues that are related to success or failure were not correctly resolved at the time, which led to failure. It was inevitable that some tragedies that should not have happened and could have been completely avoided were also inevitable.

I believe that this is the main reason for the failure of the Cultural Revolution. All the twists and turns, all the mistakes, and all the misfortunes that occurred during the Cultural Revolution were caused by this.

The Cultural Revolution was not understood by the broad masses of the people for quite a long time, including the actions of some central leaders who stood on the side of Chairman Mao but resisted "overthrowing everything". These should be correctly analysed and understood. Even today, we should never continue to adhere to the wrong ideas of "overthrowing everything". As for the erroneous understanding and even denial of the Cultural Revolution by different classes and political forces due to the mistakes made during the Cultural Revolution, we should also analyse them in detail and treat them correctly. From the perspective of self-criticism, we must see that the shortcomings and mistakes of the Cultural Revolution are also an important reason for some people's misunderstanding.

Here we only discuss the fundamental reasons for the failure of the Cultural Revolution. We do not want to, nor can we, touch upon the myriad facts that occurred during the Cultural Revolution. That is a task for further and more in-depth special research.

To be realistic, whether it is the May 16 Notice or the Sixteen Articles, which are said to be guiding documents and ideological weapons guiding the Cultural Revolution, anyone who has participated in the Cultural Revolution knows that these documents did not meet the requirements we mentioned above that must be met to guide this revolution, and therefore were not able to truly assume the role of guiding the Cultural Revolution. To guide the Russian Revolution, Lenin wrote several very important works such as Two Strategies, which armed the Bolshevik Party ideologically, theoretically, and in terms of line. To guide the Chinese Revolution, Chairman Mao wrote several very important works such as On New Democracy, The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party, and On the Coalition Government, which also armed the Chinese Communists ideologically, theoretically, and in terms of line. We all know that "without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement" and "the correctness of the ideological and political line determines everything." These great works are great works that are complete and systematic and were written to help the Communists formulate the correct theoretical line, political line, and revolutionary line. In the end, they did play a decisive role in the victory of the revolution. It is very regrettable that there was no such work that met the requirements of the revolutionary task to guide the Cultural Revolution, a revolutionary movement that swept hundreds of millions of people across the country, and to formulate the program, line, and strategy for the Party to guide this revolution. "Great chaos in the world" did occur, but "great order in the world" did not appear for a long time, which determined the ultimate fate of the Cultural Revolution.

Without the strong, reliable and concrete leadership of the Party, and without the correct line, principles and policies, the revolution cannot be victorious. Practice has proved that mass organizations cannot bear the responsibility of leading the revolution, and mass organizations cannot replace the historical role of the Communist Party.

During the Cultural Revolution, some people's understanding of "chaos" was wrong. The occurrence and historical significance of "chaos" should be understood and evaluated from the historical conditions under which "chaos" occurred. Under the conditions of capitalist society, due to the economic crisis leading to the political crisis, "chaos" occurred, which created conditions for the socialist revolution of the proletariat. The "chaos" at this time was a good thing, and it created favourable historical opportunities and historical conditions for achieving "great governance in the world" after the victory of socialism. The "chaos" at this time should be affirmed. In the socialist continued revolutionary movement under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, should there still be and need for "chaos"? The correct answer should be no. At that time, Lin Biao had a saying that the so-called chaos is chaos imposed on the enemy, not chaos imposed on oneself, 'the achievements are the greatest, greatest and the greatest, and the shortcomings are the smallest, smallest and the smallest'.⁵⁴ This is a deceptive statement against the Chairman and the people that disregards the facts (very important for understanding Lin Biao). Whether it was the October Revolution or the Chinese Revolution, Lenin, Stalin, or Chairman Mao, they all emphasised the Party's discipline. The Party's strong leadership and strong unity are unified with discipline. The so-called "strengthening discipline, the revolution is invincible" is an important summary of Chairman Mao's experience of the proletarian revolution. Simply unifying "chaos" with revolution is a distortion of Marxism. Especially under the socialist conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, it is more possible and more necessary to carry out the revolution in an organised and disciplined manner under the leadership of the Party, and it is easier to avoid "chaos", especially to avoid "chaos everywhere across the land". At that time, many comrades asked, "Where did the Party's leadership go?" This was a question raised from the historical experience of the proletarian revolution and the reality of the "chaos across the land" at that time. Looking back, this question is correct.

As Chairman Mao said, the Cultural Revolution was a serious exercise. We had neither the experience of our predecessors nor our own experience. Moreover, Chairman Mao was already over 70 years old at that time, and our party and our people were at the same level and in such a state. Under such circumstances, the launch and development of the Cultural Revolution had its shortcomings and limitations, which was inevitable and completely understandable. It was on the basis of such a correct attitude that we had the courage to correctly understand and treat the mistakes of the Cultural Revolution, and dared to admit that mistakes had occurred in the Cultural Revolution, and some of the mistakes were very serious. It is reasonable that many people have opinions, criticisms, and even denials, calling it a "disaster." There is an old saying called "strict ideological criticism." As long as we don't make a fuss and simply deny everything with class hatred, it is good to be strict in criticism, which will help us learn from historical lessons in the future.

The theory guiding the Cultural Revolution is Chairman Mao's theory of continuing socialist revolution. This is the principle of the Cultural Revolution. This theory and principle are correct. This is neither a statement made out of thin air nor a simple theoretical argument, but it has been verified by the revisionists coming to power and the restoration of capitalism. Deng Xiaoping and others played the

⁵⁴ On October 20, 1968, at the 12th Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, Lin Biao said that the achievements of the Cultural Revolution were "the greatest, the greatest and the greatest, and its shortcomings were the smallest, the smallest and the smallest", thus winning enduring applause – Trans.

role of the best negative teacher. They proved from the negative side that the theory of capitalist roaders as the core content of the theory of continuing socialist revolution is correct. It is precisely from this perspective that Chairman Mao said: "This great proletarian cultural revolution is completely necessary and very timely for consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat, preventing the restoration of capitalism, and building socialism." It is also from this perspective that although the Cultural Revolution failed, we must still firmly defend the principles of the Cultural Revolution and insist that the principles of the Cultural Revolution are correct and eternal.

We also have sufficient reasons to say that we summarised the reasons for the failure of the Cultural Revolution precisely to uphold and defend the principles of the Cultural Revolution.

Regarding the principles of the Cultural Revolution and the mistakes that occurred during the Cultural Revolution, can we simply say that this is a question of principles and methods? Principles must be upheld and methods must be improved. Because only in this way can we avoid repeating the mistakes made in the Cultural Revolution when we carry out the socialist continuation revolution after winning the victory of the socialist re-revolution in the future, and truly be able to correctly and well carry out the socialist continuing revolution, and truly achieve the purpose of promoting the continuous and gradual transition of socialist society to communist society.

It is precisely because we view the Cultural Revolution and Chairman Mao's theory of continuing socialist revolution from such a standpoint and perspective that we firmly oppose the "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee and the "Resolution" of the Sixth Plenary Session of the Nineteenth Central Committee, which completely negates the Cultural Revolution and Chairman Mao's theory of continuing socialist revolution.

It is also based on this reason that we believe that the fact that the majority of party members and the masses did not understand the Cultural Revolution and even felt disgusted with it, and supported the counter-revolutionary coup at that time, supported the rise of revisionist leaders such as Deng Xiaoping, and supported the implementation of the revisionist line in China, is understandable and even forgivable.

However, this is incorrect after all and should be self-criticised.

In terms of understanding, this is mainly due to a failure to distinguish between the mainstream and the tributaries of the Cultural Revolution, between the principles of the Cultural Revolution and the practices of the Cultural Revolution. In his 'important instructions' of 1976, Chairman Mao clearly stated: 'The general view of the Cultural Revolution is that it is basically correct, but there are some shortcomings. What we should now focus on are the shortcomings. The view is not necessarily unanimous: seven out of ten for achievements and three out of ten for mistakes.' It can be seen that Chairman Mao himself did not affirm the Cultural Revolution in its entirety, but thought that it should be 'divided into thirty and seventy per cent', and at the same time, he also knew that 'the views may not be unanimous', which is an issue that needs to be further studied.

Those who accuse the Cultural Revolution often use "human nature" as an excuse. Chairman Mao repeatedly criticised and opposed the cruel and ruthless persecution of people during the Cultural Revolution. Whether then or now, most kind-hearted people hate this and firmly oppose it.

If we talk about human nature, how could some party members and ordinary people have such great hatred for Chairman Mao? How could they cheer for the arrest of Chairman Mao's wife and nephew! The working people were not persecuted during the Cultural Revolution. Not only were they not

persecuted, they were praised to the sky. "The working class must lead everything" was the principle implemented from beginning to end of the Cultural Revolution.

Besides, didn't Chairman Mao launch the Cultural Revolution because he was worried that the working people would suffer twice after the revisionists came to power? Chairman Mao offended the senior officials and intellectuals. They hated Chairman Mao, his relatives, and the rebels. They wanted to strike back and punish them. This is completely understandable. However, how could some of the working people be so inhumane as to follow them to retaliate against Chairman Mao, his relatives, and all comrades who wanted to make revolution, even including the old comrades who had followed Chairman Mao closely and had passed away?

This is worth reflecting on for our working people. I hope that the sufferings we are experiencing today can help some comrades cleanse their ignorance, do some self-criticism, and return to Chairman Mao's side.

Having said that, we can move on to the second fact.

Although the kind and docile Chinese working people blindly and enthusiastically supported the Chinese revisionists coming to power, the revisionist rulers who came to power turned their backs on the Chinese working people and mercilessly imposed the disaster of capitalist restoration on them. There is nothing strange about this. Chairman Mao repeatedly warned that this is class struggle, and class struggle has never been tender and affectionate. There is no policy of concession, only counterattack and revenge.

In this counterattack, that is, the process of capitalist restoration, the ideological awareness and political performance of the majority of party members and the masses can and should be analysed.

First, in terms of the situation of the majority of party members, generally speaking, the majority of party members accept Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line in thought and implement Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line in action.

However, we must see that there are also a very small number of cadres and party members, including a few senior cadres, who truly accept Chairman Mao's theory of continuing socialist revolution and the experience and lessons of the Cultural Revolution. They oppose Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line in thought and resist it in action. However, due to the constraints of party discipline, the form of this struggle is quite different and quite tortuous.

At the same time, we must also see that as natural laws determine, some of these comrades gradually leave us, and the force within the party that resists revisionism is not strengthening, but weakening.

Second, in terms of the situation of the working people, the working class, especially the veteran workers, awakened earlier and were opposed to and dissatisfied with the essence of Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line of restoring capitalism and the ongoing activities of restoring capitalism. As a result, many rights protection activities took place, the essence of which was to safeguard socialism. However, due to insufficient ideological and theoretical preparation and insufficient organizational preparation, facing the relatively strong rule of the revisionist party, the rights protection activities of the workers basically did not succeed. Even if they achieved some demands for a while, they were completely lost as the restoration of capitalism deepened step by step.

Nowadays, the old workers, through capitalist means such as 'lay-offs' and 'buy-outs' and the elimination of the laws of nature, have already left their posts of production and are in a state of retirement. The new workers, on the other hand, under the conditions of capitalist production and in

the entire capitalist living environment, are still somewhat different from the old workers in terms of their ideological awareness, their feelings and understanding of socialism, and their bourgeois ideological concepts are seriously affecting them, and embourgeoisification is seriously affecting them. This is most prominent in the case of white-collar workers, who are all highly educated, some of whom have also studied abroad. Under today's revisionist bourgeois educational line, and in an environment where capitalist economic relations dominate China's realities, they are more receptive to the Western bourgeois worldviews and systems of thought. If they are also dissatisfied with the existing society, they generally make their criticisms from the perspective of bourgeois ideological views, and perhaps the returnees are more prominent in this respect. Young people based on such an ideology are unlikely to be the main force in launching a socialist re-revolution, but are likely to be the main force in launching a 'colour revolution'.

The current situation of the Chinese working class is really not optimistic. This class has not yet strongly demonstrated its determination to oppose revisionism, oppose the restoration of capitalism, and defend socialism. It has not yet risen to the level of class consciousness, class will, and class demands to carry out a socialist revolution. It cannot leap forward to organise itself as a class and a political party, hold high the red flag of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, and fight to launch a socialist revolution.

I cannot but say this frankly with great regret. If the facts were not like this, I would be happy because of my wrong judgment.

Third, let's talk about the peasant class. Generally speaking, farmers accept the division of land and individual farming, and the household contract responsibility system. Farmers not only work hard on their own responsibility fields, but also on their children, and do their best to support their children to study hard, become officials after learning well, strive to get into the elite class as soon as possible, mix into the bureaucracy, and become a new bureaucrat of the state machine of the fascist bourgeois dictatorship, so as to gain a share of the surplus value created by the working people in the capitalist restoration activities. They thank Deng Xiaoping for restoring the college entrance examination. Lenin repeatedly emphasised, and Chairman Mao also emphasised in his later years, that small production is producing capitalism every day and every hour, which is indeed a truth.

The migrant workers who went to the city to work under the wave of capitalist restoration are the most miserable group of people who have been differentiated from the peasant class and flowed into the working class.

Class suffering is the best teaching material for class education. The ideological status of migrant workers is far better than that of their parents. They are awakening, they are thinking, they are accepting socialist thoughts, and they are beginning to carry out rights protection activities. Of course, all this is just the beginning, and it still requires time to accumulate and practice to hone. The migrant workers' poems⁵⁵ they wrote are very touching. It declares to the world that migrant workers from the loess land are joining the ranks of the working class and fighting for their own beautiful future. As far as literature is concerned, poets are born out of grief and anger, and in the future they will definitely recognise the important position of migrant workers' poems in the history of Chinese literature.

⁵⁵ Migrant worker poems are poems that describe or reflect the working and living conditions and voices of rural people who left their hometowns to work in economically developed cities. The migrant worker phenomenon arose with the dismantling of the people's communes in the first wave of capitalist restoration. In the 1980s, this category was extended to include part-time workers who were employed by private enterprises and received salaries. The content of the poems mainly express the feelings and emotions of migrant and part-time workers subjected to intense exploitation by the capitalist class at the top of Chinese society – Trans.

This situation of the working class and peasant class actually determines the current state of class relations and political relations in China. The members of the huge state machine that implements the fascist bourgeois dictatorship also mainly come from these two classes.

What can well reflect the nature of the problem is that in 1989, both China and Romania experienced "turmoil", both were caused by the dissatisfaction and widespread participation of the masses, and the army also intervened, but the results were fundamentally different. In addition to other historical conditions, the different conditions of the army are also an important reason. This has left valuable historical experience and lessons.

The army and the police are the main pillars of the country. The members of the army and the police are mainly from the ordinary people. The capitalist bosses are reluctant to let their children stand on the front line where bloodshed and sacrifice will occur. From this sense, the level of consciousness of the army and the police is unified with the level of consciousness of the working people. It is also from this sense that the strength of the state machine of the exploiting class ultimately depends on the level of consciousness of the exploited class, which is determined by the degree of social development. As Lenin said, if all the masses of the exploited class are awakened, then the rule of the exploiting class cannot exist for a day. We still need historical progress.

Fourth, let's talk about intellectuals. The situation of intellectuals needs to be analysed.

Some intellectuals, with their own selfish demands, actively act as court writers, racking their brains and scrambling to create the theoretical basis for the restoration of capitalism in various ideological, cultural and academic fields, acting as pioneers. The performance of these people fully verifies that Chairman Mao's judgment that the world outlook of some intellectuals is basically bourgeois is correct.

It is important to point out that since Deng Xiaoping's revisionist education line has taken the dominant position, the bourgeois tendency of the newly trained intellectuals has become increasingly serious, especially intellectuals from the liberal arts field, who have basically stood on the side of the bourgeoisie and served the restoration of capitalism. This fact fully proves that the restoration of the college entrance examination is not the essence of the matter. The essence lies in the education line, whether it is the socialist education line of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism or the revisionist bourgeois education line. This is the essence and key of the problem. If the restoration of the college entrance examination only satisfies the requirements of personal selfishness and only trains young people into the reserve army of the bourgeoisie, then in this sense, the restoration of the college entrance examination is only part of the revisionist education line, and the evil consequences it brings are inevitable. This serious harm has continued to this day, and has seriously poisoned our young generation. We used to mock the Soviet youth under the rule of the Soviet revisionists as the "lost generation", and now this disaster has fallen on our heads. Even the terms they often use, such as "disaster" and "the brink of collapse", are not exaggerating. This situation has facilitated the unimpeded restoration of capitalism in China and seriously interfered with the development of China's socialist revolution.

In recent years, some young people not only follow capitalism, but also follow the narrow bourgeois nationalist patriotism, and even want to tie themselves to the chariot of the bourgeoisie to become cannon fodder for bourgeois patriotism. This is a kind of stupidity and mistake that young people often make because they are deceived, which can be seen everywhere in the world. Young people need and should read Lenin's "State and Revolution". The state is class-based. When we look at a country, we must first look at which class holds the power of this country and what the nature of this country is. Specifically, is this country a capitalist country or a socialist country? This is the fundamental issue that

we must first distinguish, and it is also the basis for us to determine what kind of patriotic banner we should raise!

There is another group among the intellectuals. This is also something we must correctly see. This group of intellectuals includes both those within the Party, who are the main ones, and those outside the Party, who are also quite numerous, and also includes a small number of intellectuals among veteran cadres. Because they have the basic qualities of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, have practiced integration with the working masses of workers and peasants, have participated in various forms of revolutionary practice under the leadership of Chairman Mao, and in the process of practice, their positions, thoughts, and world outlook have all undergone relatively serious self-transformation. Therefore, in this fierce class struggle of great turmoil, great reversals, and great reorganisations, they were able to maintain a relatively clear mind, adhere to a relatively correct position, have a relatively correct understanding of Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line, and dare to resist the restoration of capitalism in various forms and to varying degrees, including in the fields of ideology, culture, and academic theory.

Such revolutionary intellectuals exist in all age groups. What is particularly encouraging to us is that among young people, especially college students, there are promising revolutionaries who accept Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, study the works of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism diligently, and some of them even devote themselves to the practice of the workers' movement and integrate with the masses of workers. Although they are constantly suppressed, the successors of the revolution are always forged in this way. Talents and heroes emerge from struggle.

The hope of socialist revolution rests on them. Hope is hope, reality is reality. Reality is more important, and reality is our starting point. After we have made a brief analysis of the various classes and political forces in Chinese society, we can still see more clearly that it is not surprising that the implementation of Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line and the restoration of capitalism have been unimpeded for more than 40 years. There is historical inevitability in it.

In short, it is still the basic truth revealed by historical materialism that the foundation of a society and the level of development of various aspects determined by this foundation, especially the level of development of people, determine the economic, political and social forms of this society. This is the most fundamental principle that we must grasp when observing all the existing problems in Chinese society. Without this principle, it is unscientific to explain the changes and development of Chinese society from any other angle or aspect. In my article "Rethinking Historical Materialism" in the book "Continuing Thinking of Epistemology", I specifically discussed some new understandings of historical materialism from the perspective of the importance of the level of human development to the level of social development.

Whether it was the "dramatic changes in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union" or the "dramatic changes in China", they both verified with iron facts what Lenin had repeatedly taught us: it is very difficult for backward countries to carry out socialism to the end; they also verified what Chairman Mao had repeatedly warned us: socialism may fail, revisionism may come to power, and capitalist restoration may occur.

This is a scientific understanding, and scientific understanding is understanding that conforms to the law. To see the level of social development, we must not only look at the level of productivity development, but ultimately look at the level of human development. Facts tell us that the difficulty here is not in productivity. It is relatively easy to leapfrog to new productivity. However, historical facts tell us that it is quite difficult for people to leap from a lower social level to a higher social level. The

transformation of people's thoughts and souls is far more difficult than the transformation of productivity. We are experiencing such a historical fact. This fact tells us that during his long reign, Chairman Mao always paid special attention to the ideological transformation of the people. This is Chairman Mao's profound understanding of the law that enables people to transform the objective world and promote the progress of history. Speaking of reform, the reform of people is the most profound and greatest reform. This is completely beyond the vision of the shallow revisionists. These dwarfs can only look at problems by lying down and feeling their way, and never know that people should stand up and have a far-sighted vision.

This is the established fact we are facing. Everything should be based on reality, which means starting from this established fact. It is precisely from this established fact that I deeply feel that the 20th National Congress is extremely important to China.

We have come to a historical node.

5.

What kind of historical node have we come to?

The simplest historical phenomenon is the timetable. But the timetable itself does not explain anything. What is important is the historical facts behind the timetable.

After the above analysis, we can see the general situation of the facts:

The most basic and fundamental fact is that the result of the comparison of various classes and political forces in China has determined China's current situation, determined that revisionism will inevitably come to power, and capitalism will inevitably be restored. Moreover, it has been going on for forty years, and it has become more and more serious, more backward, and darker. The most profound historical lesson left by the tragic, pitiful, and infuriating "Xuzhou Iron Chain Woman" recently exposed is that it fully illustrates how dark Chinese society has become?! Naturally, it also fully illustrates what kind of society "socialist society with Chinese characteristics" is?!

The seriousness of the problem lies in the fact that the basic conditions of the various classes and political forces in Chinese society analysed above have not changed fundamentally. If there is any change, then the most prominent and serious problem is precisely that the tendency of bourgeoisification is becoming more and more serious, while the revolutionary and progressive forces that adhere to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism are still too loose and weak.

Just like the timetable experienced by the Soviet Union, China is also experiencing such a timetable.

First, the laws of nature determine that one or several generations of revolution will eventually become a thing of the past.

In the more than 40 years since Lenin and Stalin passed away, the generations that had followed Lenin and Stalin in the revolution and the generations that had been taught by Lenin and Stalin gradually became a thing of the past. Under the rule of revisionism and in a capitalist environment, the new generations that grew up had lost the old generation's passion for revolution, belief in Marxism, and pursuit of the communist ideal. At that time, there was a saying about Soviet youth that they only cared about and pursued a few "things": wives, children, cars, and houses. In their hands, they no longer held the two knives of Lenin and Stalin. Therefore, sooner or later, the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe" were bound to occur, and they would take the capitalist road.

In almost the same way, in the more than 40 years since Chairman Mao's death, the generations that once followed Chairman Mao in the revolution and the generations that once received Chairman Mao's teachings have gradually become a thing of the past. The generations that grew up in a capitalist environment under the rule of revisionism have also undergone considerable changes. It cannot be said that all, but at least a considerable proportion, no longer hold the knife of Chairman Mao in their hands. Without the two knives of Lenin and Stalin, and without the knife of Chairman Mao, the proletariat and the broad masses of the working people would have lost their theoretical weapons to fight the powerful bourgeoisie, and it would have been impossible to launch a socialist revolution and rebuild a socialist society.

On the contrary, after more than 40 years of revisionist rule and management, China has been restored to a bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalist society. On the basis of the all-encompassing bureaucratic autocratic monopoly capitalist economic relations, Chinese society has been fully capitalistised. Social existence determines people's social thoughts. Generations that grow up in such a capitalist environment will inevitably undergo serious bourgeoisification. This is a fairly large group. This group will be the basis of the bourgeoisie's "colour revolution". Specifically, if China undergoes major historical changes, this group will support the path of "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe", that is, the path of a bourgeois democratic republic. Needless to say, if this path is taken, it will also receive full support from Western imperialist countries led by the United States.

This is of course the scourge left to us by revisionism, and this scourge is precisely a very important and very terrible fact contained in this timetable.

Second, we must recognise the dialectical development of history and see that the development of history has ups and downs and rhythmic changes.

The revolutionary years and the war years created a high-spirited and militant revolutionary social atmosphere; however, as the revolution won and economic construction became the main historical task, it was inevitable that another social atmosphere of pursuing stability and life would be created. The so-called "transformation from a revolutionary party to a ruling party" and the so-called "farewell to revolution" were proposed in this context.

This is the dialectics of historical development and the rhythmic changes of historical development. History has not only its highs but also its lows; history has both rapid advances and steady progress. People must respect this dialectical development of history.

Only a great revolutionary mentor like Chairman Mao can truly respect and master this historical dialectic. Facing the transition from the revolutionary era to the peaceful era, Chairman Mao repeatedly warned the whole party and the people of the country to maintain the revolutionary spirit of the Yan'an era and the revolutionary war era. In order to achieve this, after the founding of the People's Republic of China, Chairman Mao continuously launched various forms of socialist education movements, set up many collective or individual examples that embodied the revolutionary spirit, and encouraged the people of the whole country to learn from them. It was precisely under the impetus of Chairman Mao's superb and effective practices that embodied the idea of continuing revolution that the whole Party and the people of the whole country maintained a vigorous revolutionary spirit, and maintained their belief, pursuit and struggle for the great ideal of communism during his lifetime. He left behind so many so-called "big words" and so many heroic deeds and examples that make us full of admiration and nostalgia for them to this day. Sometimes, when we think of them, we can't help but shed tears of emotion. This is our "scar". It is under the brilliant and superb leadership of Chairman Mao that our country has the "four greats": our party is worthy of being a great party; our army is

worthy of being a great army; our people are worthy of being a great people; our country is worthy of being a great country. In Beijing, a truly revolutionary and radiant socialist red flag was set up for the whole world, becoming the new centre of the international communist movement at that time. Chairman Mao was also naturally respected by the revolutionary people all over the world as their revolutionary leader and revolutionary mentor. At that time, as a Chinese, no matter where you go, you will be proud and glorious.

This is where Chairman Mao was so great, and it is something that ordinary people cannot do, and even more so, something that people like Deng Xiaoping cannot do; not only can they not do it, but because they do not understand these principles at all, and only know how to grope around in revisionism, they have taken a path completely opposite to Chairman Mao's, messing up the Chinese people's thinking and Chinese society, so many bad people and bad things have naturally continued to happen, not only harming the common people, but also harming the high officials.

This inevitably leads to the fact that we are now in a low tide period of the socialist revolution. The social environment has changed, the social spirit has changed, and the social atmosphere has changed. The best result of this change can only be to abandon the worst capitalism, take the path of the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe", take the path of Western capitalist countries, and turn China into a bourgeois democratic republic.

Third, the historical conditions for the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe" have matured here.

The "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe" that happened back then were not accidental. Simply blaming Gorbachev and Yeltsin cannot explain this historical change in depth.

It was not just the Soviet Union that collapsed in the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe", but all the so-called socialist countries in Eastern Europe, like a domino effect, all "dramatic changes" occurred together, and finally collapsed together. This is certainly not accidental, and cannot be explained only from the perspective of accidentality.

The problems in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe at that time were very clear and serious. Under the rule of revisionism, the economy was not well developed and the living standards of the working people were not improved; politically, the fascist bourgeois autocracy was implemented, there was no people's democracy, and the masses could not manage the country; ideologically, communist ideology and culture could not occupy all fields and positions. Revisionist and bourgeois ideology messed up the spiritual world of the people in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. It was these serious social problems that constituted the social foundation of the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe" and also constituted the historical inevitability of the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe".

The Soviet Union and Eastern Europe are European countries. Here, first, there is a bourgeois democratic tradition, and second, there are developed capitalist countries in Western Europe for comparison. With these two conditions as the background, the strong dissatisfaction of the people in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe with the political, economic, ideological and cultural aspects under the rule of revisionism is more understandable.

Unfortunately, there was no real Marxist-Leninist-Maoist Communist Party in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe at that time, so it was impossible to lead the people to carry out socialist re-revolution, overthrow the backward, decadent, reactionary, bureaucratic, autocratic and privileged society, and rebuild the Marxist scientific socialist society. Under such circumstances, the spontaneous choice of

the masses was to transform from the backward, decadent, reactionary, bureaucratic, autocratic and privileged society to the capitalist society of the bourgeois democratic republic. From the historical conditions at that time, it was completely understandable for the masses to make such a choice, which was a historical inevitability.

Today, China has fully met the historical conditions for the outbreak of the "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe".

In fact, the severity of the problems of China's bureaucratic monopoly capitalist society has far exceeded the problems of the bureaucratic monopoly privileged society in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. It is only because of the reasons mentioned above that China has not yet experienced "dramatic changes" or revolutions, but this does not mean that there will never be any. Moreover, from the above analysis, this critical point is getting closer and closer.

We are now facing the historical inevitability of solving China's problems. Contradictions have accumulated to such an extent, and class forces and political forces in all aspects have accumulated to such an extent that the outbreak of contradictions is imminent. This is the current historical pattern of China that the 20th National Congress must deal with.

If the Communist Party of China continues to adhere to the revisionist line, continues to insist on capitalist restoration, and continues to insist on the worst capitalism, then the timetable for "dramatic changes in the Soviet Union" will come into play.

This will lead to an absolute result: the worst capitalism will finally accumulate enough dissatisfaction among the Chinese people, so that class contradictions will reach the point where they will inevitably break out, and then the highest form of resolving contradictions will unfold. It doesn't matter what it is called, whether it is revolution, "dramatic change", or something else. What matters is that class relations and social forms will definitely undergo major changes, and a new social form will definitely be born.

Can the army be mobilized to suppress the "Liu si" again?⁵⁶ History will not simply repeat itself, because by then, the historical conditions inside and outside the party, the government and the army, the bureaucratic masses, and the major cities will be completely different.

Therefore, anyone who calmly cares about national affairs, naturally including any calm politician, must seriously see that major historical changes are inevitable; and they are right in front of us. As for the results of the changes, from now on, there are probably two possibilities.

The first possibility, which is also the possibility we hope for, is that China's Marxist-Leninist-Maoist members, the genuine Chinese Communists, under the leadership of their own leaders and leadership groups selected through the test of the storms of class struggle, will raise the link of class struggle and the correct revolutionary line of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, lead the broad masses of people, with the working people of workers and peasants as the main body, who are willing to participate in the socialist re-revolution, resolutely and bravely plunge into this great social change, seize power in the

⁵⁶ The June 4th 1989 Incident is a banned topic in China. It is abbreviated as "六四" (pronounced "liu si") where "liu" is "six" and "si" is "four". To get around the censorship, netizens use similar-sounding code words such as "陆肆" (pronounced "liu si"), as Xiang Guanqi has done here. In this case "陆" and "肆" are the alternative written forms of "six" and "four" used on financial documents to avoid mistakes or alterations – Trans.

new and specific form of the socialist re-revolution, and rebuild the scientific socialist society, that is, the people's democratic socialist society that is possible at this stage.

The second possibility is not what we want, but it is very likely to happen, that is: the bourgeois democrats lead and influence this great social change, and the broad masses of the people follow them. The result is the establishment of a capitalist bourgeois democratic republic. The so-called universal values of the bourgeoisie, "freedom and democracy", will be an important banner for their victory.

In this great social change, will there be chaos and warlord melee? Small chaos is inevitable, but I think that chaos, especially warlord melee, will not happen. Because history has progressed after all, the Chinese people will not agree to let their country fall into warlord melee again. Whoever wants to do this will be eliminated by the Chinese people and by history.

This is an extremely acute, serious and realistic historical issue facing the 20th National Congress of the Communist Party of China.

Do not show your ignorance of history, let alone adopt an ostrich policy towards history.

If we see the inevitability of this history and fully realise the possibility of major changes in history, then the 20th National Congress can almost be said to be a congress that determines the survival of the Communist Party of China.

It is precisely based on the inevitability of China's historical development, the interests of China and the Chinese people, and the responsibility to the countless martyrs represented by Chairman Mao who sacrificed their lives for the liberation of the Chinese people and the socialist communist cause of the Chinese people that the only correct choice for the 20th National Congress of the Communist Party of China is to carry out a thorough self-revolution, abandon Deng Xiaoping's revisionist line, and return to Chairman Mao's revolutionary line of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. This is the only correct way to save the Communist Party of China.

If it is said that General Secretary Xi Jinping has done the work of "correction", then we can tell him with certainty that theoretically, "correction" is not enough at all. In fact, it has been proved that "correction" is not only not enough, but is even worse, more backward and more reactionary. The reason is simple, clear and sharp. The essence of China's problem is whether to take the socialist road or the capitalist road. This cannot be solved through so-called "correction". The only way can only be revolution, either proletarian revolution or bourgeois "colour revolution". Anyway, not revolutionising, making compromises and "correction" are all weak revisionist illusions and deceptions. Whether we can bravely and boldly take this big step forward is the last test of history for the Communist Party of China and the vast number of party members and cadres of the Communist Party of China, and it can also be said to be the last chance.

Progress or reaction, rebirth or extinction, all lies in this choice. Now people are paying attention to the 20th National Congress, and what they are most concerned about is whether General Secretary Xi Jinping will abide by the customary law of only serving two terms as the political rules of the Communist Party of China require, or break this customary law and continue to be the general secretary, or continue to serve as the party's top leader in disguise.

The term of office is a problem, and the term of re-election is also a problem. This is a problem of the inner-party democratic system that still needs to be studied. I think the key to this problem lies in the democratic election system, which is not the main issue to be discussed in this article, so I will omit it.

I just want to emphasise that the most important and fundamental issue facing the 20th National Congress is not this issue, but the issue of line. As Chairman Mao said, the line is the life of the party, and the correctness of the ideological and political line determines everything. If the 20th National Congress does not solve the line issue, but only considers whether General Secretary Xi Jinping will be re-elected, and continues to adhere to the revisionist line regardless of whether General Secretary Xi Jinping is re-elected or not, then it will not be General Secretary Xi Jinping who will be denied by history, but the Chinese Communist Party will be denied by history in the end.

As the Marxist revolutionary mentor said, we are still at a relatively low stage of development in human history. Under such historical conditions, it is undeniable that individuals will still play a huge role in history, at least, this is still the case in China. It is precisely such historical conditions or historical limitations that determine that for the Communist Party of China, for the 20th National Congress, and even for China and the Chinese people, the most important thing is not whether to be re-elected or not, but what kind of person should be selected as the general secretary of the Communist Party of China and what kind of line this person must implement. This is the essence, key and crux of the whole issue.

If we can correctly solve the democratic election system of the Communist Party of China, and through democratic elections, elect comrades who truly understand Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, truly understand Chairman Mao's socialist revolutionary line, and who are both strong and upright in political style (not flatterers), able to withstand strong winds and waves and good at uniting comrades and listening to various similar or different opinions) as the leaders of the Party, and form a team to implement collective leadership, and at the same time, this leadership team must be under the direct supervision of the whole party and constantly accept the inspection and test of the whole party. If this is done, it will actually be a political system reform of decisive significance, which will have socialist revolutionary significance both for the progress of the Communist Party of China and for the progress of Chinese society. Only by doing so can we fundamentally solve the problem of "the party changing to revisionism and the country changing its colour" and effectively ensure that in the long run, the Communist Party of China will be able to adhere to and implement a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist revolutionary line, unswervingly lead the Chinese people along the socialist road, and unswervingly fulfill its proletarian internationalist obligations. This will not only achieve the great victory of China's socialist revolution, but will also make the greater contribution that the Communist Party of China and the Chinese people should make to the development and final victory of the communist movement throughout the world.

The line does determine everything, but the line is mainly formulated by the party leaders and is also implemented by the party leaders. It is from this sense that establishing a true Marxist-Leninist-Maoist leadership team for the Communist Party of China is consistent with establishing a true Marxist-Leninist-Maoist revolutionary line for the Communist Party of China, so it is crucial.

This is not to promote the "genius theory" or to advocate that heroes create history, but to recognise that the party leaders will still play a huge role in history based on the actual level of social history today. Looking at the world, historical facts have repeatedly proved that in today's world, leaders still play a vital role in history. Don't ignore that the lower the level of social development, the greater the role of individuals in history.

In fact, this is a rather difficult task. One of the important reasons for the disastrous defeat of socialism is that this problem has not been properly resolved. Chairman Mao attached great importance to this issue and proposed to train tens of millions of successors to the proletarian revolutionary cause. However, in the end, the most important party leaders were not selected well. As a result, Deng

Xiaoping turned the world upside down. Of course, he had a deep and strong class foundation, which should be the most fundamental class reason; however, Chairman Mao did not find a successor who truly understood Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, understood Chairman Mao's theory of continuing socialist revolution, was politically strong and upright, and could not transfer power to such a successor. This was an important reason why the socialist revolution suffered a tragic defeat in a short period of time after Chairman Mao's death. At least, this was the case in terms of what actually happened at the time.

I need to repeat that the fundamental cause of major historical changes lies in class, class relations, and class struggle. However, during the entire transition period of socialism, there are always two directions, two roads, and two possible struggles: socialism and capitalism. In such a historical period, since the overall level of social and historical development is still relatively low, the role of individuals in history is particularly prominent. Otherwise, we cannot explain why it was possible to build socialism under the leadership of Chairman Mao and why it was possible to build capitalism under the leadership of Deng Xiaoping. Isn't this the important historical role that individuals can play under such historical conditions? We cannot avoid this historical reality and cannot misunderstand the theory of historical materialism on the role of individuals in history. Seeing and acknowledging that in a specific historical period, individuals will have a significant impact on the rhythm of history, and in terms of a historical period, even a decisive impact, not only does this not violate historical materialism, but it is precisely adhering to historical materialism.

It is from these aspects that we deeply feel that the 20th National Congress is indeed extremely important to the Communist Party of China, the Chinese people and China. If the 20th National Congress can correctly solve the problems of the Communist Party of China's line and leadership, whether in a violent or peaceful form, it can save the Communist Party of China and, more importantly, save Chinese socialism. It can be said that its significance is no less than that of the Zunyi Conference.

We are not harbouring illusions, but making a final effort. We have feelings for the Communist Party of China and we have to take responsibility. We call on the party members and cadres who really want to make revolution to rise up and resist, bombard the bourgeois headquarters, bombard the revisionist leaders, and solve the revisionist problem by revolutionary means. This is the advice we should and must give, and it is also in accordance with Chairman Mao's consistent teachings. We believe that our broad party members and cadres are good and want to make revolution.

Of course, I also want to solemnly explain here that for a party that has been engaged in revisionism for more than 40 years, has been completely bourgeoisified, and has become rotten to the core, it is probably difficult to achieve the party's internal struggle to realize self-revolution, abandon the revisionist leaders, abandon the revisionist line, and rebuild a true Marxist-Leninist-Maoist revolutionary Communist Party and re-raise Chairman Mao's revolutionary line. The reason why we still want to put these words here is that we are kind and righteous, and it has the meaning of "don't say I didn't warn you."

If the 20th National Congress cannot correctly complete its historical mission, then we can only wait for the correct arrangement of history. We believe that the power of history is unstoppable, and anyone who wants to stop the pace of history can only play the role of a historical clown.

Our country is still very backward. Although the economy is a little better, there is no democracy in politics, only autocracy. In today's world, it is a backward and despised country. 1.4 billion Chinese people with wisdom and intelligence should be able to solve this problem. If we say that we should uphold patriotism, then we should rely on our own strength to get rid of this backwardness, move

from autocracy to democracy, and show the image of a beautiful socialist society with socialist democracy and the people truly being the masters of the country to the people of the world. This is the patriotism of the proletariat that has gotten rid of the narrow nationalism of the bourgeoisie.

Socialism and communism are the beautiful societies that people all over the world have longed for. However, satellites went up to the sky, red flags fell down, and revisionism has ruined the reputation of socialism. If we Chinese people can raise the red flag of socialism again in the difficult situation of the socialist movement, with a developed economy, political freedom and democracy, noble ideology and culture, and happy people's lives, then we can not only be at the forefront of all countries in the world, but also promote the socialist and communist movements around the world with our own example. If we do this, we will realize Chairman Mao's wish: to make a greater contribution to mankind.

This is our proletarian patriotism, this is our patriotism that is unified with proletarian internationalism.

March 3, 2022 in Marx's hometown.

Comrade Xi Jinping should consciously give way to others

Hong Er Ji Ti

The 20th National Congress of the Communist Party of China will be held this year. This is a major event that the whole party, the people of the whole country, and even the whole world are paying attention to.

The correctness of the party's line determines everything. In our view, the most important, main and fundamental historical task of the 20th National Congress should be to mobilise all party members and the people of the whole country to re-discuss the party's line, principles and policies in an extensive and in-depth democratic manner under the leadership of the Party Central Committee, and strive to raise the party's line, principles and policies to a new and higher level of building scientific socialism on the basis of summarising historical experience and historical lessons. In particular, the focus is mainly on solving the problem of democratisation of the political system to ensure that our country can truly move forward along the path of socialism in a long-term and stable manner.

In connection with this fundamental task, the replacement of the highest central leadership of the Party, including the replacement of the general secretary, is an important issue that must be dealt with at the 20th National Congress. The line is formulated by the central leadership headed by the general secretary, and it is also implemented by the central leadership headed by the general secretary, leading the entire party and the people of the country. Under the current historical conditions, the leadership of the Party Central Committee is actually the political power. Who holds the political power determines the nature of the line and whether it is correct, and thus determines everything.

It is based on this basic principle that we are very concerned about the replacement of the central leadership of the 20th National Congress, and first of all, the replacement of the general secretary.

Now, a very practical question we face is whether General Secretary Xi Jinping realises that he should hand over the post, must hand over the post, and is willing to hand over the post.

The practice of governing for ten years has fully proved that Comrade Xi Jinping is not a qualified candidate for the post of General Secretary of the Communist Party of China. Comrade Xi Jinping works very hard, but some of his weaknesses and mistakes are fundamental and principled, which is not allowed for a general secretary of the Communist Party.

The fact of governing for ten years is there, and everyone can see and understand that the widespread dissatisfaction inside and outside the party has not been a day. Therefore, we don't need to talk about the facts here, just a few key points, which may be enough to show that Comrade Xi Jinping cannot be re-elected as general secretary.

1.

The Communist Party is the vanguard of the working class guided by Marxism. This party implements advanced democratic centralism, selects party leaders and leadership groups through democratic elections, and never allows individual careerists and conspirators to usurp the party's leadership. Chairman Mao also emphasised that "we must be vigilant against careerists and conspirators like Khrushchev."

On this issue of right and wrong, Comrade Xi Jinping's weaknesses and mistakes are very prominent.

Originally, during the ten years when Comrade Hu Jintao was in power, the central leadership team still embodied collective leadership and division of labour and cooperation. Comrade Hu Jintao was

modest and prudent, and he never called himself the "core" and never took all the work under his name. However, as we all saw, after Comrade Xi Jinping became the general secretary, the first thing he did was to establish his "core" status, and he took all the work under his name, setting up more than a dozen "groups" and serving as the group leader, which was actually a disguised seizure of power. Not only did he monopolise the major powers, but he also did not distribute the minor powers. Below the prime minister, it was simply a formality. Moreover, he appointed people based on personal connections and loyalty, and organised his own "convenient team", which everyone called "Xi's army". It is not difficult to understand why these wrong practices aroused the disgust of the whole party and the people of the whole country.

Once the concentration of power was completed, Comrade Xi Jinping began to cultivate his own personality cult. The Party's "Resolution of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 11th Central Committee" clearly stated that it opposed the personality cult and specifically criticised Comrade Hua Guofeng's mistake of cultivating the personality cult. However, Comrade Xi Jinping's personality cult has completely surpassed Comrade Hua Guofeng. After the "19th National Congress", the praise of Comrade Xi Jinping by local and military officials has far exceeded the praise of Comrade Hua Guofeng back then.

It has not been corrected until today, but has become more and more serious. One of the most prominent manifestations is the so-called "two establishments" (establishing Comrade Xi Jinping's core position in the Party Central Committee and the core position of the entire Party, and establishing the guiding position of Xi Jinping Thought on Socialism with Chinese Characteristics for a New Era), which does not allow any different voices inside or outside the Party, that is, the so-called "no arbitrary discussion of the Central Committee". Not only is there no democracy in general political life, but also a comprehensive dictatorship is implemented in cyberspace, reaching an unprecedented extreme autocratic rule.

In order to establish Comrade Xi Jinping's lofty prestige and position in the history of the Party, the 19th National Congress and the Resolution of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee fabricated a so-called "correction" of the "errors of direction" made by predecessors Jiang Zemin and Hu Jintao. After the 19th National Congress, Comrade Wang Qishan's flattering speech first made this point clear; and more seriously, the Resolution of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee is almost equivalent to making a "Resolution" for Comrades Jiang Zemin and Hu Jintao to make mistakes.

This is contrary to historical facts. The one who has really made a mistake is Comrade Xi Jinping. The greatest danger here is that Comrade Xi Jinping dared to do this while Comrades Jiang Zemin and Hu Jintao were still alive, and if Comrade Xi Jinping continues to be re-elected, isn't it conceivable how far he will go? Isn't it also conceivable how far he will 'correct' the Party's lines, guidelines and policies?

This is precisely the greatest danger facing the Party.

2.

These problems of Comrade Xi Jinping are not only the problems of a personally ambitious person, but the more important and more major and deeper problem is that what Comrade Xi Jinping is doing is contrary to the direction of history's advancement.

As we all know, one of the most important reasons for the collapse of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe is that these socialist countries ruled by the Communist Party have not solved the problem of democracy and have all turned to autocracy. Where there is autocracy, there will be privileges, and a

privileged class will emerge, and then it will inevitably happen that "the party changes to revisionism, the country changes colour", until the final collapse. Lenin once clearly pointed out that the dictatorship of the proletariat and proletarian democracy are synonymous. Without proletarian democracy, there will be no proletarian dictatorship. One-party dictatorship is the opposite of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and it will inevitably lead to "the party changes to revisionism, the country changes colour". The "Resolution of the Sixth Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee" clearly raised this issue, summed up the historical experience of our party, especially the historical lessons, and opposed the one-person rule in the party and the personal autocracy. Subsequently, political system reform was put on the agenda, mainly to target the shortcomings of the political system of socialist society under the conditions of the Communist Party's rule, mainly the lack of socialist democracy. Therefore, Comrade Hu Jintao once pointed out sharply that "there is no socialism without socialist democracy", which is very correct. This is also the fundamental reason why Comrade Wen Jiabao proposed eight times that political system reform must be carried out. Without political system reform, economic system reform cannot be implemented on the cornerstone of socialism. The theme of political system reform is not complicated. The core is one word: democracy. Of course, it is socialist democracy. In terms of current historical conditions, it is people's democracy. This is a basic political task that the Chinese people have faced since modern times, especially since the May Fourth Movement, and it must be solved but has not yet been solved.

Unfortunately, Comrade Xi Jinping, as the General Secretary of the Communist Party of China, does not understand the historical task facing China at all. In the struggle between the two historical tendencies of democracy and autocracy, he chose autocracy. Ambition requires autocracy, and the realisation of ambition is always synchronised with autocracy. Comrade Xi Jinping's so-called practice of "governing the country" is the unity of ambition and autocracy. Comrade Xi Jinping likes to talk about "governing the country", and "governing the country" is a pure concept of imperial autocracy. Since the Paris Commune, the October Revolution, and the Chinese Revolution, the Communists have insisted on the dictatorship of the proletariat and the people's democratic dictatorship. In layman's terms, it means that the people are the masters of the country. They have never talked about "governing the country" by individuals, and have placed individuals above the people and the country. This is a typical manifestation of the imperial autocracy in Comrade Xi Jinping's mind. Putting this idea into practice will inevitably lead to the emergence of comprehensive personal dictatorship and personal autocracy in politics under Comrade Xi Jinping's "governing the country".

This is a terrifying historical regression.

The seriousness of the problem is that it will bring about the destruction of the party. Looking at the world, there is no country that is more or less progressive and more developed that does not practice democracy. You can criticise it as a bourgeois democratic republic. Not to mention that Engels clearly said that "bourgeois democratic republics can be a special form of proletarian dictatorship." If you really want to criticise the hypocritical and narrow democracy of the bourgeoisie, you should engage in real socialist democracy, democracy for the broad masses of the people. However, under the rule of Comrade Xi Jinping, there is only autocracy, no democracy. In this case, what qualifications do you have to criticise bourgeois democracy? The result of doing so can only be that the Communist Party will be eliminated by history, like the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. We do not want Comrade Xi Jinping to play the role of such a historical sinner.

Politics is the commander and the soul. Political backwardness will inevitably lead to overall backwardness in all aspects. The main reason for all the stupid and wrong things that Comrade Xi Jinping did in the past ten years of "governing the country" is political autocracy. Everything is decided by Comrade Xi Jinping alone. Everyone knows that ambition is not equal to talent, and personal

ambition is always inversely proportional to personal talent. Khrushchev, Gorbachev, and Yeltsin are all typical examples of this. They are good at usurping power but incompetent in governing the country. Comrade Xi Jinping should look in the mirror of history.

3.

One of the "two establishments" is to establish the guiding position of "Xi Jinping Thought". This "establishment" is absurd and has no basis at all. The current term is "Xi Jinping Thought on Socialism with Chinese Characteristics for a New Era". In fact, this is obviously a transitional term. The final term is of course "Xi Jinping Thought", which will surpass Comrades Deng Xiaoping, Jiang Zemin, and Hu Jintao and be on par with "Mao Zedong Thought".

This is a self-irony that overestimates one's own capabilities. "Mao Zedong Thought" really has ideas, while "Xi Jinping Thought" has no ideas. There is only a hodgepodge of feudalism, capitalism, and revisionism. We read the book "Criticism of Xi Jinping Thought" written by some gentlemen. It made a comprehensive criticism of "Xi Jinping Thought". It was very convincing, and perhaps it was immediately banned because it was very convincing. Comrades who care about theoretical struggles can try to find such books and articles. We cannot make a comprehensive theoretical criticism here, but only give a few key points.

First, the general outline of "Xi Jinping Thought" is "realising the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation." It is clearly written from the "July 1st Speech" to the "Resolution of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee." In the view of "Xi Jinping Thought," the "original intention, purpose and theme" of the Communist Party of China, and the history of the Communist Party of China's 100-year struggle, can be summed up in one sentence: to realise the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation.

This is simply not worthy of criticism. The purpose of the Communists is of course to realise communism and the liberation of all mankind. First, it is class-based, and second, it is international. They never accept the narrow nationalist slogans of the bourgeoisie, but use the slogans of proletarian internationalism to unite the proletariat and the broad masses of working people all over the world to fight together and strive to achieve the final and thorough liberation of all mankind.

In fact, Comrade Xi Jinping has not yet made it clear what the "great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation" is. What exactly is to be "rejuvenated"?

There was a "Renaissance" in European history, but the real content of this "Renaissance" was the revolution of bourgeois ideology and culture, which was great at the time and had a high historical status.

But what does Comrade Xi Jinping want 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 "first saint" Lu Xun has long revealed that the word "cannibalism" is hidden between the lines of this period of history. To carry out this kind of "revival" is to revive "cannibalism". Maybe Comrade Xi Jinping has no such intention, but the facts cannot be changed. What is happening now is "cannibalism", which may be the result of pursuing the "great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation".

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 moving forward in affirmation and negation. This is a scientific world view and a scientific historical view. This is a criticism and negation of the absurd "rejuvenation" theory.

Second, "Xi Jinping Thought" is unclear about what socialism is, and it actually says that the most essential feature of socialism is the leadership of the Communist Party. This actually means that the most essential feature of socialism is the leadership of Comrade Xi Jinping.

This is completely wrong. Socialism is the first stage of communist society, and it must have the most basic characteristics of communist society. The Communist Manifesto has long made clear the most essential characteristics of communist society. That is, on the basis of the elimination of private ownership, every member of society can develop freely, and all mankind can be completely liberated from the state of class oppression and class exploitation under private ownership. This is the most essential characteristic of communist society, and of course it should also be the most essential characteristic of socialist society, the first stage of communist society. Since socialist society has just emerged from capitalist society, it cannot reach the level required by communist society all at once and needs to transition. This requires the dictatorship of the proletariat, including the people's democratic dictatorship, that is, the people are the masters of the country. As Lenin said, this is a semi-state state, that is, it is no longer the state machine of the old exploiting class, but a transition to a communist society without a state machine. Precisely because the people are the masters of the country, it has the most essential characteristics of communism.

The leadership of the Communist Party is only a necessary means and necessary guarantee for realising this most essential characteristic. However, means and ends cannot be confused. The leadership of the Party is for the realisation of communism, not communism itself. The leadership of the Communist Party includes the realisation of the withering away of political parties. In a communist society, classes are eliminated, and political parties will inevitably wither away on their own. In a socialist society, it is necessary to create conditions for this historical process. In the face of such historical requirements, how can we say that the leadership of the Communist Party is the most essential characteristic of socialism? It is not justifiable in theory, and it will go in the opposite direction in practice.

From the perspective of the basic Marxist theory of socialism and communism, this idea of "Xi Jinping Thought" is very wrong and purely layman's talk. It shows that Comrade Xi Jinping does not understand what socialism is and what socialism should do. Based on this point, he is probably unqualified to be the general secretary of the Communist Party, which is committed to socialism and communism.

Third, another important content of "Xi Jinping Thought" is the "Chinese Dream". Now, "dream talk" is everywhere in China. This is both a satire on "socialism with Chinese characteristics" and a humiliation to the Communist Party of China.

The "Chinese Dream" was proposed at the 18th National Congress. At the 19th National Congress, the "Chinese Dream" was still proposed.

Can this be considered the original creation of "Xi Jinping Thought"? It cannot be considered original creation. 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 Communist Party of China do such a stupid thing?

It doesn't matter where it was learned from. What matters is that this proposal is completely unreasonable and wrong.

The reason why the Communists are called the Communist Party is because they have the ideal of communism. The ideal of communism is scientific, reliable, and can and should be pursued throughout

life. For this ideal, countless Communists are willing to fight for their entire lives and are willing to give up everything they have, even their lives. "The Internationale" - the war song of the proletariat, sings 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 environment, whether it is difficult or victorious, the banner that the Communists hold high 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", is this meaning. No matter what the meaning is, there is one thing that cannot be doubted, that is, the ideals of Communists cannot be expressed by "dreams".

Comrade Xi Jinping has no literary talent, so there is no need to do such self-defeating tricks. I remember Lenin said that even if I were skinned, I could not 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 as party leaders, we will embarrass the party. "Chinese Dream" is one of the embarrassments.

Embarrassment is not the most important thing. The important thing is that 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 ideals⁵⁷, there is a world of difference between them. Giving up ideals and replacing them with dreams is a 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. 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 deceptive trick.

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

However, this messy formulation was taken as an imperial edict, and the whole party and the whole country had to learn to say it. For many years, the Chinese people have been forced to talk in their sleep and realize their dreams. They have become a nation of sleepwalkers. Isn't this an insult to the Chinese nation? Moreover, under the autocratic rule, whoever does not say it is not "consistent" with the Party Central Committee and the "core", and whoever will be accused of "usurping the party and seizing power" will be subject to dictatorship. This is more terrible than a nightmare because it is reality.

Fourth, "Xi Jinping Thought" also has a different approach to international affairs, proposing a series of policies that are quite chauvinistic, and the so-called "building a 'community with a shared future for mankind'" is the general outline of these policies.

⁵⁷ In Chinese, dreams is “梦想” (mengxiang) and ideals is “理想” (lixiang) – Trans.

In the "Political Report of the 19th National Congress", as an important content of "Xi Jinping Thought", it is proposed to "make it clear that China's major power diplomacy with Chinese characteristics must promote the construction of a new type of international relations and promote the construction of a community with a shared future for mankind". This program and these statements are full of errors.

1. From the perspective of the great principles of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought, in today's imperialist era, it is fundamentally wrong in theory to say "construct a community with a shared future for mankind". In practice, it is not only impossible, but also harmful. This needs no further explanation.

2. Chairman Mao and Premier Zhou repeatedly said that we will not seek hegemony, we will not seek hegemony now, and we will not seek hegemony even if we become strong in the future. We will never seek hegemony. This is our established national policy. Comrade Deng Xiaoping also proposed that we should "not stick our head out, nor take the lead" and adopt the strategy of "hiding our strength and biding our time" on the issue of international relations based on the actual situation we are facing.

The two leadership teams of Comrade Jiang Zemin and Comrade Hu Jintao faithfully and conscientiously implemented this strategy.

However, Comrade Xi Jinping has left the actual situation in China and the world and has come up with his own set of ideas. The so-called "big country diplomacy", "powerful country diplomacy", "my great country", the so-called "building a new type of international relations", etc., etc., are obviously a tone of great power chauvinism and a posture of "seeking hegemony"; they have completely abandoned the strategy of "hiding our strength and biding our time" and want to stick our head out and take the lead. This leader is Comrade Xi Jinping himself.

It must be said that this is the inevitable exposure of Comrade Xi Jinping's personal ambition on international issues.

3. It is inevitable that a series of mistakes and stupid things will happen because the foreign policy is wrong. There are many specific examples, too numerous to mention. For example, the "Belt and Road Initiative" and "spending money everywhere" are mistakes that are out of touch with China's national conditions, too ostentatious, unrealistic, and will inevitably cause losses.

4. Comrade Xi Jinping's weakness of personal ambition is also directly reflected in the various diplomatic activities he personally participated in. Comrade Xi Jinping does not have the mind, pattern and level of Chairman Mao, Premier Zhou, and Comrade Deng Xiaoping, nor is he modest, prudent, and low-key like Comrades Jiang Zemin and Hu Jintao.

Comrade Xi Jinping always wants to show his style as a leader of a great country and a strong country.

Little did they know that Comrade Xi Jinping was just expressing himself from the very low-level old custom of "Righteousness of Rivers and Lakes"⁵⁸ in China, and the result was always showing one ugly face after another.

⁵⁸ The "righteousness of rivers and lakes" is a Chinese expression which mostly refers to blindly emphasising the righteousness between friends regardless of principles. In China, "rivers and lakes" can imply relationships in groups outside of mainstream society. Such groups were once located in secret societies and gangster cliques, but are not necessarily in a state of complete lawlessness. With the migrant labourer phenomenon in modern post-socialist China, and their semi-nomadic lifestyle, it is a vague zone, a state of wandering between law and lawlessness, and it is held together by the ethics of the brotherhood, or their "righteous behaviour"

In the United States. He said to foreigners, "He (referring to Vice Premier Liu He) is very important to me" to highlight himself. In Russia, he said to Putin, "I have the same personality as you, and I am strong-willed." This was both flattering Putin and highlighting himself. After all, Putin was sensible and did not say a word.

In his speech in Russia, he listed a long list of great Russian writers; in his speech in France, he listed all the names of great French writers; in his speech in Britain, he listed all the great British writers. The General Secretary did not think about whether people who have read books and have some reading experience would believe him? Besides, the most taboo thing in reading is to study hard. The most important thing is to be "essential" and "comprehensive". Less but more, learn it well. Can such nonsense play the role of bragging about yourself? No, this can only be a "high-level blackening" of oneself!

When the Director-General of the World Health Organization, Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, came, he even boasted, "I have been personally directing and deploying the work." Which leader of the Chinese Communist Party would brag about himself to foreigners like this? I'm afraid this is just Comrade Xi Jinping's personal "characteristic."

Turning the handling of very serious international relations issues into a matter of brotherhood and brotherly love is a manifestation of Comrade Xi Jinping's low ideological style in handling international issues. Comrade Xi Jinping insists on having a "friend" relationship with Putin, who was originally a member of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, took over Yeltsin's position, was a traitor who opposed Lenin and betrayed communism, and was a new tsar who reeked of Great Russian chauvinism. Even Comrade Xi Jinping wants to have a "friend" relationship with US President Trump, who is waging a trade war against China. How can this be called socialist diplomacy? This is a perverse trend that our leaders of the Communist Party of China would never do, and it is only Comrade Xi Jinping's personal "characteristic".

Premier Zhou Enlai said repeatedly that foreign affairs are no small matter. Comrade Xi Jinping is facing major events. He is ignorant and ugly in his expression of himself. Based on this alone, I am afraid that he is not qualified to be the leader of the Communist Party of China.

Fifth, "Xi Jinping Thought" is not the thought of the Chinese Communists. At most, it is Comrade Xi Jinping's personal thought without thought, which is a hodgepodge of what we used to call "feudalism, capitalism, and revisionism".

Although Comrade Xi Jinping belongs to the "second generation of reds", it is a pity that this comrade not only has a bourgeois worldview, but also has a strong feudal and decadent thought in his mind, which has the flavour of the feudal old man who advocates the worship of Confucius and reading scriptures.

Since the time of Chairman Mao, our party has always emphasized the need to combine Marxism-Leninism with the reality of the Chinese revolution, and said that Mao Zedong Thought is the product of the combination of Marxism-Leninism and the reality of the Chinese revolution. Since Marx, several other revolutionary mentors have repeatedly said this. This is correct and is still a truth that is not outdated. However, Comrade Xi Jinping added a statement of "combining with traditional Chinese culture". This addition is completely wrong. First, Marxism is combined with Chinese reality. Doesn't

towards each other. Thus the author's reference to a "very low-level old custom of 'Righteousness of Rivers and Lakes'" in relation to Xi Jinping – Trans.

the "Chinese reality" here include the treatment of traditional Chinese culture? Therefore, adding this new statement is at least redundant and unnecessary.

Since the time of Chairman Mao, our party has always emphasised the need to combine Marxism-Leninism with the reality of the Chinese revolution, and said that Mao Zedong Thought is the product of the combination of Marxism-Leninism and the reality of the Chinese revolution. Since Marx, several other revolutionary mentors have repeatedly said this. This is correct and is still a truth that is not outdated. However, Comrade Xi Jinping added a statement of "combining with traditional Chinese culture".

This addition is completely wrong.

First, Marxism is combined with Chinese reality. Doesn't the "Chinese reality" here include the treatment of traditional Chinese culture? Therefore, adding this new statement is at least redundant and unnecessary.

Second, every Chinese knows that the legacy of traditional Chinese culture is very rich, but it must be analysed, both in terms of class analysis and analysis of the differences between the essence and the dregs. To simply say "combine with traditional Chinese culture" denies the necessity of analysing and criticising traditional culture, and the result will not be "combination", but using reactionary, decadent, feudal dregs to attack, distort, impersonate, and replace Marxism. There is no need to give other examples, the General Secretary does this. Other articles and speeches are not mentioned. For example, the Resolution of the Sixth Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee is full of dregs reflecting feudal ideas, and they are disguised as the words of the Communist Party, such as "the most important thing for the country", "governing the country", "strictly cultivating oneself", "I will be selfless and live up to the people", "stay true to your original aspiration, and you will succeed", etc., etc. Not to mention that this is the worst kind of cultural ripping, more importantly, these sayings have different contents for different classes. How can they be casually introduced into the ideological system of the Communist Party, especially the Resolution? The occurrence of this mistake is the inevitable result of Comrade Xi Jinping's mistaken proposal of "combining with traditional Chinese culture".

This is a manifestation of Comrade Xi Jinping's ignorance and vanity. Comrade Xi Jinping's mentor Li Rui once laughed at his cultural level of a primary school student. Comrade Xi Jinping often reads the wrong words at solemn meetings. If he is more humble and treats his shortcomings correctly, this would not be a big deal. There are so many Chinese characters, it is not strange not to know them; some characters, if you read them according to the radicals, will make mistakes, which is also a common mistake. One is to dare to admit mistakes, and the other is to be more humble and cautious, and put a copy of the "Xinhua Dictionary" next to you. However, Comrade Xi Jinping's vanity determines that he always wants to cover up his ignorance with exaggeration.

To the outside world, as mentioned earlier, he often likes to express himself in various stupid ways, but the result is counterproductive.

Internally, they randomly copy the classics. First, they are not fluent, which is what Chairman Mao criticized in his favorite book "Notes from the Yuewei Cottage" as "eating without digesting". Second, the most important thing about using allusions is the content. Anything that belongs to the old thoughts and old cultural content and is outdated cannot be copied. For example, the ancient talk of "virtuous government" and "benevolent government" has its specific class content and political content; talking about "people" and "people-oriented" also has its specific class content and political content. For the construction of a socialist country, these ideological categories and ruling theories belonging to the imperial power autocratic culture cannot be randomly copied.

The less competent you are, the more afraid others will think you are incompetent, and the more you want to show that you are competent. However, because you are actually incompetent, the result is to use incompetent methods to cover up your incompetence, which will show your incompetence even more in the end.

Vanity is a kind of illusory honour, and because it is illusory, it kills people. The idea of "combining with traditional Chinese culture" is a product of such vanity.

Third, in the process of leading the Chinese revolution, Chairman Mao repeatedly emphasized to the whole party and the people of the whole country that we should attach importance to the study of history. We should not only know China today, but also know China's yesterday and the day before yesterday. We should not always mention Greece, but also understand our own ancestors. This is of course also part of the "Chinese reality". However, the content of history is very rich and very complex, and it does not only include traditional culture. Traditional culture is only a part of history. However, even so, the combination of Marxism and China's reality is mainly to combine with reality. Therefore, investigating and studying reality is of primary importance. In order to have a fuller understanding of reality, we need to understand history as much as possible. In this sense, it is not only redundant but also incorrect to put the combination with traditional culture on a par with the combination of Marxism and China's reality.

Fourthly, the most important and central issue lies in the so-called 'integration with traditional Chinese culture', which essentially means integration with traditional Chinese Confucianism.

Since the May Fourth Movement, all social progressive forces have criticized Confucius, while all reactionary social forces have respected Confucius.

The fundamental disagreement here is not whether to recognise Confucius as a great educator, a scholar who made outstanding contributions to the compilation of ancient books, and a thinker with his own system. Confucius' achievements and status in these aspects are recognized by everyone and must be critically inherited. For today, this is still an academic and cultural issue that should be continuously studied. The disagreement does not lie in whether to look at the problem from the perspective of class struggle and political struggle, or from the perspective of promoting or hindering social progress.

The fundamental difference is that in the landlord society under the rule of imperial despotism in China for more than 2,000 years, Confucianism and Confucius, which were selected and processed by the ruling class according to the needs of their rule, have become the ideological tools of imperial despotism and the spiritual shackles that bind the broad masses of working people. So Lu Xun said that reading this history over and over again is just one word: "cannibalism". This is a profound criticism that hits the nail on the head. Therefore, since the great May Fourth New Culture Movement, the advanced Chinese people who have followed the requirements of China's historical progress and bravely stood in the forefront of ideological and cultural struggles have unanimously raised the battle banner of "criticising Confucius". "Down with the Confucius family shop" was proposed in this way, and Chairman Mao said that "Confucianism is a high name but chaff in reality" was also proposed in this way. Their targeted criticism is directed at the imperial despotism ideological and cultural tradition with Confucianism and Confucius as the core.

This is like a watershed. At that time, all conservative, backward, and especially reactionary class forces and political forces opposed criticising Confucius and insisted on respecting Confucius. There are countless examples, and the most typical and familiar one is Chiang Kai-shek.

However, the Chinese Communist Party, which insisted on criticising Confucius, is now, of course, inevitably engaged in respecting Confucius.

This is not surprising at all. We say it is inevitable because we see that the essence of Confucianism and Confucianism is to serve the rule of imperial autocracy. It is this essence that is exactly needed by Comrade Xi Jinping's personal dictatorship.

Confucianism and Confucianism have two most basic and important categories, one is the so-called "ritual" that serves political rule, and the other is the so-called "benevolence" that serves spiritual rule.

The so-called "ritual" and "regulating people with ritual" in Confucianism are nothing more than maintaining the aristocratic hierarchy of "rulers are rulers, ministers are ministers, fathers are fathers, and sons are sons", that is, to maintain the rule of the autocratic monarch. Violators and rebels are "rebellious against superiors" and must be brought to justice. This is the essence of the "ritual" Confucius talked about. It is this kind of preaching that is needed by the fascist dictatorship. The "two establishments" that have been repeatedly advocated, as well as similar "determination by one person", "political rules", "no arbitrary discussion of the central government", etc., are actually just another way of saying "ritual rule", "rulers are rulers, ministers are ministers, fathers are fathers, and sons are sons". No matter whether they are inside or outside the party, anyone who violates these "political rules" will also be brought to justice.

The so-called "benevolence" and "benevolent government" of Confucius and Confucianism are to cover the cruel rule of imperial despotism with the cloak of "benevolence loves people", similar to the so-called "universal values" of "love of humanity", "human love", and "community of human destiny" and other super-class statements. The essence and purpose of these super-class so-called "universal" statements are to give spiritual comfort and deceive the suffering working people in order to maintain the cruel rule of imperial despotism.

This set of ideas has now been adopted by Comrade Xi Jinping, who repeatedly clamors for "people-oriented", "rule the country with virtue", and "the people are the country". He says: "The Party's foundation is in the people, its bloodline is in the people, its strength is in the people, and the people are the greatest basis for the Party to govern and prosper the country. The people's will is the greatest politics, and justice is the strongest force." How can these words be Marxist? They are just modern versions of the Confucian "rule of rites" and "benevolent government". As long as we uncover the dark side of Chinese society from top to bottom, from high-ranking officials who are corrupt and spend hundreds of millions of dollars, to ordinary working people who are oppressed by the new three mountains, to the most pitiful and miserable girls who sell themselves, including "iron chain girls" and "iron cage girls" who are worse than slaves, this fully illustrates the essence of the so-called "people-oriented" and "rule the country with virtue", which is still the word that Lu Xun said: cannibalism!

This fully demonstrates that what Comrade Xi Jinping calls "combining Marxism with traditional Chinese culture" is actually combined with respecting Confucius, which is the highest form of respecting Confucius. Comrade Xi Jinping has set an example by saying it and doing it. It is no accident that he went to Qufu to pay homage to Confucius and praise him; it is no accident that he established the "Confucius Foundation"; it is even more no accident that he spent so much money to set up "Confucius Institutes" everywhere. There is a Confucian Research Institute at Shandong University, and a professor even advocated that "Marx should shake hands with Confucius." It is no wonder that the dean and professors of this institute want to be court writers and get a bite of leftovers. Naturally, they have to act according to the emperor's wishes and cater to the emperor's preferences. No matter what shameless words and words are, they can use their own little cleverness to concoct them.

Understanding all this, we can see that Comrade Xi Jinping's so-called "combination of Marxism and traditional Chinese culture" is essentially a historical regression and historical reaction.

This is really an irony, advocating a "new era" but reviving the old era. The seriousness of the problem is that this is not Comrade Xi Jinping's personal degeneration and reaction. Comrade Xi Jinping is the "core" of this party and the "core" of the Party Central Committee. Moreover, "Xi Jinping Thought" is the "guiding ideology" of the current Communist Party of China. In this case, isn't it clear where Comrade Xi Jinping will lead the Communist Party of China and China under the leadership of the Communist Party of China?

Anyone who respects Confucius is usually a very corrupt person, and Comrade Xi Jinping is no exception. If such a corrupt person has served as the top leader of the Communist Party of China for two terms and continues to refuse to hand over power, and if the Communist Party of China does not even have the ability to identify and resist this, then isn't the future and fate of this party completely foreseeable? Isn't it also foreseeable what kind of disaster and misfortune it will bring to China and the Chinese people?

4.

This is a very realistic and important problem, and it is difficult to solve. Originally, if there was a real democratic system that implemented the principle of democratic centralism within the party, this would not be a problem at all. However, due to historical reasons and the authoritarian system within the party that Comrade Xi Jinping has worked hard to build over the past decade, this has become a problem, and it is a very difficult problem to solve.

As long as we admit that the authoritarian system promoted by Comrade Xi Jinping within the party and outside the party as analysed above is an objective existence, as long as we admit that there is a completely abnormal political life inside and outside the party, and as long as we admit that the party has been very fragile in the process of Comrade Xi Jinping promoting the authoritarian system, it is easy to understand that it is impossible to solve this problem through a bottom-up democratic election system at the 20th National Congress.

We believe that this problem can only be solved from top to bottom.

Most of the comrades of the previous two leadership teams headed by Comrade Jiang Zemin and Comrade Hu Jintao are still alive. We believe that only they have the ability and responsibility to solve this problem.

The reason we say they have the ability is based on our historical experience. The most recent historical experience is that the replacement of the leadership positions of Comrades Hua Guofeng, Hu Yaobang and Zhao Ziyang was completed under the direct intervention of the old comrades headed by Comrade Deng Xiaoping. How to evaluate and summarize historical experience and lessons are not involved here. The main purpose here is to explain that once the main leaders of the party have problems, the only feasible and safe way for our party to take is for the old comrades to come forward and solve the problem of replacing the main leaders of the party from top to bottom. Whether it is inside or outside the party, whether it is an individual or any political force, it is impossible to play such a historical role and complete the historical tasks that should be completed.

Why do the old comrades of the previous two leadership teams have this historical responsibility?

As comrades of the previous two highest leadership teams of the Party, although they have retired, at a critical moment involving the future and destiny of the Party, when the cause of socialism may be

endangered, no Communist Party member can say that in the face of such a historical task, because they have retired, they can ignore it. Moreover, as comrades of the previous two highest leadership teams of the Party, they cannot let it go just because they have retired. As far as Communist Party members fight for the great revolutionary cause of communism throughout their lives, there is no such thing as retirement or not. Didn't the oath of joining the Party say that we must fight for the cause of communism all our lives?

Jiang Zemin, Hu Jintao and other leading comrades of the previous two leadership teams should take a responsible attitude towards the Party and the cause of communism and conscientiously and effectively complete the historical task entrusted to you by the Party. This is a historical responsibility that cannot be shirked under any excuse.

We can further emphasize that Comrade Xi Jinping's position as General Secretary was arranged by your two previous leadership comrades. Ten years of practice have proven that Comrade Xi Jinping is incompetent for this leadership position. He has not only failed the trust and entrustment of the two previous party leadership teams, but also failed the high hopes placed on him by the entire party and the people of the country. This is of course Comrade Xi Jinping's personal responsibility, but the old comrades of the two previous party leadership teams have the responsibility to correct this mistake. In particular, with Comrade Xi Jinping's unification, it is already difficult for ordinary party members to solve this problem, so the last and only hope can only be placed on the old comrades of the two previous leadership teams.

Comrade Xi Jinping often uses "political rules" to maintain his personal dictatorship. However, it is he who has repeatedly violated the party's "political rules". He even went so far as to amend the constitutional term limit for the president for the sake of his personal ambitions, and it was passed. Now, he wants to violate the term limit for the general secretary of the party and continue to be re-elected. If there is no strong intervention, it is likely to be passed based on the current situation in the party. What a terrible thing this is for our party. In this regard, the old comrades of the first two leadership teams of the party must not sit idly by. This is a major historical responsibility that must be taken for our party.

Looking at the issue in a more profound sense, this is not just a question of the term of office of the general secretary, but it involves the democratic system within the party, including the party's election system. Furthermore, it is actually a question of political system reform. For our party, this is an even more important issue that must be resolved in a timely manner. It can be said that this issue actually involves the life and death of our party. In this regard, with the participation of the old comrades of the previous two highest leadership teams of the party, properly solving this problem is an unshirkable burden left to the old comrades by history.

This issue should be resolved before the 20th National Congress. Because only if this issue is properly resolved can the 20th National Congress be held successfully and it is possible to complete the major historical tasks that the 20th National Congress should complete.

We have already written about the historical tasks that the 20th National Congress should and must complete at the beginning of the article. As the end of the article, we repeat it again:

Whether the party's line is correct or not determines everything. In our opinion, the most important, main and fundamental historical task of the "20th National Congress" should be to mobilize all party members and the people of the whole country to re-discuss the party's line, principles and policies extensively and deeply under the leadership of the Party Central Committee. On the basis of summing up historical experience and historical lessons, strive to raise the party's line, principles and policies to

a new and higher level of building scientific socialism, especially focusing on solving the problem of democratisation of the political system to ensure that our country can truly move forward along the path of socialism in a long-term and stable manner.

The banner of democracy and socialist democracy is still a glorious banner that unites the whole party and the people of the whole country to follow the inevitable laws of history and forge ahead courageously!

March 18, 2022 in Beijing