

ONCE AGAIN, YAN'AN

MAO ZEDONG'S THESIS THAT «THE BOURGEOISIE IS RIGHT IN THE COMMUNIST PARTY» IS A MAJOR CONTRIBUTION TO MARXISM-LENINISM-MAOISM

By Edith B.

«I'm not going to admit to any crimes, not because I want to cut myself off from the people, but because I'm innocent. If I have to admit to anything, I can only say I lost in this struggle for power.»

Jiang Qing: «Declarations at the Summary Trial» (1981)

Recently, the publication of some hitherto unavailable internal documents of the Communist Party of China has allowed for a deeper study and grasp of Comrade Mao Zedong's final contributions to communist theory and practice – in particular his last and most important of these contributions.^{[1](#)}

In early 1976, Mao Zedong pointed out:

«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.»^{[ii](#)}

Even though this thesis was previously known, the entirety of the document in which it is contained was not. Moreover, many of the documents which accompanied this thesis in the Chinese press and popularized it were not known, because they were never translated from Chinese and were suppressed by the capitalist-roaders after the October 1976 State coup.

With the release of these documents, it has become necessary to once more take up the study of the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat. These documents shed light on Comrade Mao's final contribution to marxism-leninism-maoism. By grasping this thesis, it becomes possible to understand the entire process of restoration of capitalism in the former socialist countries throughout the 20th century.



The Shanghai People's Commune of January 1967 was the highest achievement of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

1. WHAT IS THE FUNDAMENTAL MEANING OF THE THESIS THAT «THE BOURGEOISIE IS RIGHT IN THE COMMUNIST PARTY»?

Continuing his thesis that «the bourgeoisie is right in the Communist Party», Mao Zedong pointed out:

«Is there class struggle under socialist society or not? What *<Take the three directives as the key link>*! Stability and unity do not mean writing off class struggle; class struggle is the key link, everything else hinges on it. Stalin made a big mistake concerning this question. But not Lenin. He said that small production engenders capitalism continuously and daily. Lenin spoke of building a bourgeois State without the bourgeoisie to safeguard bourgeois right. We ourselves have built just such a State, not much different from the old society. There are ranks and grades, eight grades of wages, distribution according to work, and exchange of equal values. Money is needed to buy grain, coal, or vegetables. Eight grades of wages regardless if you are many people or few.»ⁱⁱⁱ (My emphasis.)

This thesis is groundbreaking and a qualitatively new development in the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Essentially, Mao Zedong was saying that after the bourgeoisie is in the main defeated, a new capitalist class emerges inside of the Communist Party and the dictatorship of the proletariat. He did not state that capitalist-roaders, that is, the political representatives of the bourgeoisie, emerge within the Party and the State – he literally stated that «**the bourgeoisie is [...] right in the Communist Party – those in power taking the capitalist road**». How is this to be understood? As an objective economic fact which is tied to the struggle between the two lines and the two roads. Let us investigate how this thesis came to be before investigating its political and economic implications.

In 1852, Karl Marx pointed out:

«[...] the proletariat rallies more and more around revolutionary socialism, around communism [...]. This socialism is the declaration of the permanence of the revolution, the class dictatorship of the proletariat as the necessary transit point to the abolition of class distinctions generally, to the abolition of all the relations of production on which they rest, to the abolition of all the social relations that correspond to these relations of production, to the revolutionizing of all the ideas that result from these social relations.»^{iv}

This important thesis lays the foundation for our entire understanding of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is the very essence of communism. What is communism? It is the permanent (that is, uninterrupted) revolution until a society without private property, States and patriarchy has been reached. To reach such a communist society implies the abolition of all class distinctions, all relations of production on which they rest, all social relations corresponding to these relations of production and all the ideas resulting from these social relations. These «Four Alls» constitute the basis of what Marx called «**bourgeois right**» – to be understood as the bourgeois principle of legal equality, which implies actual socio-economic inequality.

In a lengthy passage from Marx's polemic against the opportunist Lassalle and his followers, he pointed out how this bourgeois right is to be abolished, which, I repeat, is a gradual process which takes place on the basis of the transformation of the «Four Alls» mentioned above. Marx wrote:

«What we have to deal with here is a communist society, not as it has developed on its own foundations, but, on the contrary, just as it emerges from capitalist society; which is thus in every respect, economically, morally, and intellectually, still stamped with the birthmarks of the old society from whose womb it emerges. Accordingly, the individual producer receives back from society – after the deductions have been made – exactly what they give to it. What they have given to it is their individual quantum of labor. For example, the social working day consists of the sum of the individual hours of work; the individual labor time of the individual producer is the part of the social working day contributed by them, their share in it. They receive a certificate from society that they have furnished such-and-such an amount of labor (after deducting their labor for the common funds); and with this certificate, they draw from the social stock of means of consumption as much as the same amount of labor cost. The same amount of labor which they have given to society in one form, they receive back in another.

Here, obviously, the same principle prevails as that which regulates the exchange of commodities, as far as this is exchange of equal values. Content and form are changed, because under the altered circumstances no one can give anything except their labor, and because, on the other hand, nothing can pass to the ownership of individuals, except individual means of consumption. But as far as the distribution of the latter among the individual producers is concerned, the same principle prevails as in the exchange of commodity equivalents: a given amount of labor in one form is exchanged for an equal amount of labor in another form.

Hence, equal right here is still in principle – bourgeois right, although principle and practice are no longer at loggerheads, while the exchange of equivalents in commodity exchange exists only on the average and not in the individual case.

In spite of this advance, this equal right is still constantly stigmatized by a bourgeois limitation. The right of the producers is proportional to the labor they supply; the equality consists in the fact that measurement is made with an equal standard, labor.

But one person is superior to another physically, or mentally, and supplies more labor in the same time, or can labor for a longer time; and labor, to serve as a measure, must be defined by its duration or intensity, otherwise it ceases to be a standard of measurement. This equal right is an unequal right for unequal labor. It recognizes no class differences, because everyone is only a worker like everyone else; but it tacitly recognizes unequal individual endowment, and thus productive capacity, as a natural privilege. It is, therefore, a right of inequality, in its content, like every right. Right, by its very nature, can consist only in the application of an equal standard; but unequal individuals (and they would not be different individuals if they were not unequal) are measurable only by an equal standard insofar as they are brought under an equal point of view, are taken from one definite side only – for instance, in

the present case, are regarded only as workers and nothing more is seen in them, everything else being ignored. Further, one worker is married, another is not; one has more children than another, and so on and so forth. Thus, with an equal performance of labor, and hence an equal in the social consumption fund, one will in fact receive more than another, one will be richer than another, and so on. To avoid all these defects, right, instead of being equal, would have to be unequal.

But these defects are inevitable in the first phase of communist society as it is when it has just emerged after prolonged birth pangs from capitalist society. Right can never be higher than the economic structure of society and its cultural development conditioned thereby.

In a higher phase of communist society, after the enslaving subordination of the individual to the division of labor, and therewith also the antithesis between mental and physical labor, has vanished; after labor has become not only a means of life but life's prime want; after the productive forces have also increased with the all-around development of the individual, and all the springs of cooperative wealth flow more abundantly – only then can the narrow horizon of bourgeois right be crossed in its entirety and society inscribe on its banners: From each according to their ability, to each according to their needs!»y

Thus, there exists in socialist society (the lower phase of communist society) still remnants of the «Four Alls» mentioned above. As a result, unequal bourgeois right continues to exist, since it has in practice not yet been made obsolete. Therefore, the State continues to exist as well. And under socialism, this State – the dictatorship of the proletariat – is, as Lenin would point out, a State based on the preservation of this exact unequal bourgeois right! Lenin pointed out:

«And so, in the first phase of communist society (usually called socialism) <bourgeois right> is not abolished in its entirety, but only in part, only in proportion to the economic revolution so far attained, that is, only in respect of the means of production. <Bourgeois right> recognizes them as the private property of individuals. Socialism converts them into common property. To that extent – and to that extent alone – <bourgeois right> disappears.

However, it persists as far as its other part is concerned; it persists in the capacity of regulator (determining factor) in the distribution of products and the allotment of labor among the members of society. The socialist principle: <The one who does not work shall not eat>, is already realized; the other socialist principle: <An equal amount of products for an equal amount of labor>, is also already realized. But this is not yet communism, and it does not yet abolish <bourgeois right>, which gives unequal individuals, in return for unequal (really unequal) amounts of labor, equal amounts of products.

This is a <defect>, says Marx, but it is unavoidable in the first phase of communism; for if we are not to indulge in utopianism, we must not think that having overthrown capitalism people will at once learn to work for society without any rules of law. Besides, the abolition of capitalism does not immediately create the economic prerequisites for such a change.

Now, there are no other rules than those of <bourgeois right>. To this extent, therefore, there still remains the need for a State, which, while safeguarding the common ownership of the means of production, would safeguard equality in labor and in the distribution of products.

The State withers away insofar as there are no longer any capitalists, any classes, and, consequently, no class can be suppressed.

But the State has not yet completely withered away, since it still remains the safeguarding of <bourgeois right>, which sanctifies actual inequality. For the State to wither away completely, complete communism is necessary.

[...]

Only now can we fully appreciate the correctness of Engels' remarks mercilessly ridiculing the absurdity of combining the words <freedom> and <State>. So long as the State exists there is no freedom. When there is freedom, there will be no State.

The economic basis for the complete withering away of the State is such a high state of development of communism at which the antithesis between mental and physical labor disappears, at which there consequently disappears one of the main sources of modern social inequality – a source, moreover, which cannot on any account be removed immediately by the mere conversion of the means of production into public property, by the mere expropriation of the capitalists.

[...]

In its first phase, or first stage, communism cannot as yet be fully mature economically and entirely free from traditions or vestiges of capitalism. Hence the interesting phenomenon that communism in its first phase retains <the narrow horizon of bourgeois right>. Of course, bourgeois right in regard to the distribution of consumer goods inevitably presupposes the existence of the bourgeois State, for right is nothing without an apparatus capable of enforcing the observance of the rules of law.

It follows that under communism there remains for a time not only bourgeois right, but even the bourgeois State, without the bourgeoisie!»^{vi} (My emphasis.)

As Lenin explains, the necessary existence of bourgeois right under socialism until the gradual abolition of the «Four Alls» has been completed and communism is realized necessitates the existence of a State – what Lenin terms a «**bourgeois State without the bourgeoisie**». This is an extremely important thesis, which Mao Zedong's thesis that «**the bourgeoisie is right in the Communist Party**» is based upon.

In order to grasp this thesis in its proper context, we must understand socialism as a transitional period – what Marx called «**a permanent revolution**» – in which society struggles over which of the two roads to take – the capitalist road or the communist road. Marx pointed out that the dictatorship of the proletariat «**itself only constitutes the transition to the abolition of all classes and to a classless society**».^{vii} During this transitional period, as Mao Zedong correctly stated: «**Under the**

dictatorship of the proletariat such things [as bourgeois right] can only be restricted.»^{viii}

This leads us to an important question. If bourgeois right is the social basis for the emergence and continued existence of a new bourgeoisie inside the Party and State under socialism, then what is its economic basis? It is exploitation. In his «Critique of the Gotha Program», Marx pointed out that the workers are paid according to their contribution **«after deducting their labor for the common funds»**, that is, after a certain amount of surplus value has been extracted from the labor process by the **«bourgeois State without the bourgeoisie»**. Marx foresaw the problem in this and therefore highlighted the decision of the Paris Commune to lower the portion of these **«common funds»** expended on the salaries of Party and State functionaries to the lowest possible amount (which constituted an important restriction on bourgeois right). Marx wrote:

«Instead of continuing to be the agent of the Central Government, the police was at once stripped of its political attributes, and turned into the responsible, and at all times revocable, agent of the Commune. So were the officials of all other branches of the administration. From the members of the Commune downwards, the public service had to be done at a worker's wage. The vested interests and the representation allowances of the high dignitaries of State disappeared along with the high dignitaries themselves. Public functions ceased to be the private property of the tools of the Central Government. Not only municipal administration, but the whole initiative hitherto exercised by the State was laid into the hands of the Commune.»^{ix}

Mao Zedong emphasized this point when he spoke about the need for restricting bourgeois right under socialism. He pointed out:

«Lenin said: <Small production engenders capitalism and the bourgeoisie continuously, daily, hourly, spontaneously, and on a mass scale.> This also occurs among a section of the workers and a section of the Party members. Both within the ranks of the proletariat and among the personnel of State organs there are people who follow the bourgeois style of life.»^x

All Party and State functionaries under socialism are paid from the **«common funds»** of which Marx spoke. This constitutes a form of bourgeois right. Moreover, these salaries are not the return of a part of the value generated by productive labor, but salaries for non-productive labor – this constitutes a form of small production, which **«engenders capitalism and the bourgeoisie»**, as Lenin said.^{xi} Therefore, not only in society at large, but inside the **«bourgeois State without the bourgeoisie»** itself, capitalism and a new bourgeoisie are continuously being generated.

This clearly constitutes a form of exploitation. Objectively speaking, under socialism, the paid functionaries of the Party and the State constitute – as an economic category – a new bourgeois class. This is the very essence of Mao's thesis that **«the bourgeoisie is right in the Communist Party»**. This thesis points out the fact that all functionaries of the Communist Party and the socialist State are capitalists. Mao also pointed out in the quotation above:

«Stalin made a big mistake concerning this question. But not Lenin. He said that small production engenders capitalism continuously and daily. Lenin spoke of building a bourgeois State without the bourgeoisie to safeguard bourgeois right. We ourselves have built just such a State, not much different from the old society. There are ranks and grades, eight grades of wages, distribution according to work, and exchange of equal values. Money is needed to buy grain, coal, or vegetables. Eight grades of wages regardless if you are many people or few.» (My emphasis.)

Why did Stalin make a big mistake concerning this question? In his «Economic Problems of Socialism in the Soviet Union», Stalin wrote:

«Further, I think that we must also discard certain other concepts taken from Marx's <Capital> – where Marx was concerned with an analysis of capitalism – and artificially applied to our socialist relations. I am referring to such concepts, among others, as <necessary> and <surplus> labour, <necessary> and <surplus> product, <necessary> and <surplus> time. Marx analyzed capitalism in order to elucidate the source of exploitation of the working class – surplus value – and to arm the working class, which was bereft of means of production, with an intellectual weapon for the overthrow of capitalism. It is natural that Marx used concepts (categories) which fully corresponded to capitalist relations. But it is strange, to say the least, to use these concepts now, when the working class is not only not bereft of power and means of production, but, on the contrary, is in possession of the power and controls the means of production. Talk of labour power being a commodity, and of <hiring> of workers sounds rather absurd now, under our system: as though the working class, which possesses means of production, hires itself and sells its labour power to itself. It is just as strange to speak now of <necessary> and <surplus> labour: as though, under our conditions, the labour contributed by the workers to society for the extension of production, the promotion of education and public health, the organization of defence, and so on, is not just as necessary to the working class, now in power, as the labour expended to supply the personal needs of the worker and his family.

It should be remarked that in his <Critique of the Gotha Program>, where it is no longer capitalism that he is investigating, but, among other things, the first phase of communist society, Marx recognizes labour contributed to society for extension of production, for education and public health, for administrative expenses, for building up reserves, and so on, to be just as necessary as the labour expended to supply the consumption requirements of the working class.»^{xii}

This is only correct in terms of one aspect. As Lenin pointed out in the quotation above, «in the first phase of communist society (usually called socialism) <bourgeois right> is not abolished in its entirety, but only in part, only in proportion to the economic revolution so far attained, that is, only in respect of the means of production. <Bourgeois right> recognizes them as the private property of individuals. Socialism converts them into common property. To that extent – and to that extent alone – <bourgeois right> disappears». (My emphasis.) Therefore, Stalin is correct only insofar as a part of the surplus value extracted from the workers under socialism is given back to them in the form of socialist construction, social services, and so on. But in terms of the payment of salaries of non-producing Party and State

functionaries, Stalin is mistaken, for this still constitutes a form of exploitation. Moreover, it constitutes the economic basis of the inner-Party bourgeoisie. This is why «**Stalin made a big mistake concerning this question**».

In conclusion, the meaning of Mao's thesis that «**the bourgeoisie is right in the Communist Party**» is exactly that – a new capitalist class is generated on the basis of surplus value extracted from the working class, which takes the form of salaries for Party and State functionaries. This is objectively the economic category to which all such people belong to, also members of the Left and communist leaders such as Lenin, Stalin and Mao. Of course, this in no way means that such people are the political representatives of the capitalist class – that is the case only with the capitalist-roaders, as Mao correctly pointed out. For the members of the Left, it is a case of being in a similar position to Friedrich Engels, who was a member of the old bourgeois class but nonetheless served the proletarian cause for his entire life. Therefore, as a political term, it makes sense to only use the term «inner-Party bourgeoisie» to refer to the capitalist-roaders, and not to the communist-roaders – but as an economic term, categorizing all functionaries as capitalists is necessary, so as to grasp the social basis of capitalist restoration.

This thesis may sound controversial to some people, but I don't believe it to be. Lenin made the exact same observation about the labor aristocracy of the Social-Democratic Parties. He pointed out that the functionaries of political parties, trade unions and other working-class organizations were bribed by the bourgeoisie in a million different ways. This constituted the economic basis for their turn toward opportunism, social-patriotism and revisionism. This also takes place inside the Communist Parties, where professional revolutionaries are paid by dues and other forms of profit obtained by the Party. Recognizing this is the first step one must take in order to prevent the emergence of opportunism in such a Party – ignoring it will inevitably lead to the victory of opportunism.

Finally, as Lenin pointed out, it is not only small production inside of the Party and State apparatus which generates capitalism and a bourgeoisie, but small production in general. Therefore, under socialism, a bourgeoisie also emerges continuously outside of the Party and the State. These new capitalist elements represent the interests of the non-State-monopoly bourgeoisie, whereas the inner-Party bourgeoisie represents the State-monopoly bourgeoisie. From this can be seen the struggles which took place between the social-fascist and bourgeois-democratic faction of the big bourgeoisie in the Soviet Union and China in the decades following the restoration of capitalism there, in which it was decided which «shade» of capitalism would be built in those countries. In the Soviet Union, the non-State-monopoly bourgeoisie won out, but in China, it was the State-monopoly bourgeoisie. Of course, both of these factions collude and contend, and it must be emphasized that they assist one another in promoting the restoration of capitalism. For instance, Liu Shaoqi promoted the growth of non-State-monopoly capitalism in the Chinese countryside.^{xiii}

The fact that all Party and State functionaries under socialism constitute part of a new capitalist class leads us to center not on economics but on politics. The economic basis of the inner-Party bourgeoisie can only be changed through a protracted struggle

against the «Four Alls», which cannot be completed from one day to the next. However, the social basis of the inner-Party bourgeoisie is bourgeois right. This leads the struggle between the capitalist road and the communist road under socialism to center on the struggle on whether to restrict or expand bourgeois right.

2. TO CONSOLIDATE THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT AND FIGHT CAPITALIST RESTORATION, ONE MUST CENTER ON THE QUESTION OF BOURGEOIS RIGHT

The expansion of bourgeois right constitutes the restoration of capitalism, whereas its restriction constitutes the consolidation of socialism. This is the very essence of the «**permanence of the revolution**» as Marx stated. Mao Zedong pointed out:

«Our country at present practises a commodity system, and the wage system is unequal too, there being the eight-grade wage system, and so on. These can only be restricted under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Thus it would be quite easy for people like Lin Biao to push the capitalist system if they come to power. Therefore, we should read some more marxist-leninist works.»^{xiv} (My emphasis.)

In this quotation, Mao pointed out that whereas socialism can only be consolidated step by step through the gradual restriction of bourgeois right, capitalism can be restored overnight. In fact, this «**would be quite easy**». As the historical experience in China has shown, capitalism was indeed restored in the course of only a few months in the summer and fall of 1976. The State coup in October 1976 only represented the culmination of this process. This is why Mao Zedong pointed out:

«The rise to power of revisionism means the rise to power of the bourgeoisie.»^{xv}

This assertion of mine runs counter to what is stated by certain people, such as Deng-yuan Hsu and Pao-yu Ching, who misunderstand the question of the inner-Party bourgeoisie. For example, they state that «*the transtion between 1949 and 1978 was socialist*» and that «*the direction of the transition was reversed by Deng's reform since 1979*».^{xvi} Thus, in their view, the socialist road was being followed until Hua Guofeng was removed from power in 1978. This runs counter to Mao Zedong's thesis, because the point to center on is bourgeois right, not the relations of production. As was pointed out by Mao Zedong in 1969:

«Apparently, we couldn't do without the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, for our base was not solid. From my observations, I am afraid that in a fairly large majority of factories – I don't mean all or the overwhelming majority – directorship was not in the hands of real marxists and the masses of workers. Not that there were no good people in the directorship of the factories. There were. There were good people among the secretaries, deputy secretaries and members of Party committees and among the Party branch secretaries. But they followed that line of Liu Shaoqi's, just resorting to material incentive, putting profit in command, and instead of promoting proletarian politics, handing out bonuses, and so forth. [...] But there are indeed bad people in the factories. [...] This shows that the revolution is still unfinished.»^{xvii}

This leads us to center not on the ownership system, but on the question of directorship – which class is directing the ownership system? Is bourgeois right being restricted or expanded? According to Mao, the question of bourgeois right is the very essence of the struggle between the capitalist road and the communist road. It has nothing to do with socialist economic forms as put forward by Hsu and Ching. Zhang Chunqiao pointed out:

«Chairman Mao's remarks not only explain the necessity for the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution but also help us be more aware that in the problem of the system of ownership, as in all others, we should pay attention not only to its form but also to its actual content. It is perfectly correct for people to give full weight to the decisive role of the system of ownership in the relations of production. But it is incorrect to give no weight to whether the issue of ownership has been resolved merely in form or in actual fact, to the reaction upon the system of ownership exerted by the two other aspects of the relations of production – the relations among people and the form of distribution – and to the reaction upon the economic base exerted by the superstructure; these two aspects and the superstructure may play a decisive role under given conditions. Politics is the concentrated expression of economics. Whether the ideological and political line is correct or incorrect, and which class holds the directorship, decides which class owns those factories in actual fact. Comrades may recall how we turned any enterprise owned by bureaucratic capital or national capital into a socialist enterprise. Didn't we do the job by sending a military-control representative or a State representative there to transform it according to the Party's line and policies? Historically, every major change in the system of ownership, be it the replacement of slavery by the feudal system or of feudalism by capitalism, was invariably preceded by the seizure of political power, which was then used to effect large-scale change in the system of ownership and consolidate and develop the new system. Even more is this the case with socialist public ownership which cannot be born under the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Bureaucratic capital, which controlled 80% of the industry in old China, could be transformed and placed under ownership by the whole people only after the People's Liberation Army had defeated Chiang Kai-shek. Similarly, a capitalist restoration is inevitably preceded by the seizure of directorship and a change in the line and policies of the Party. Wasn't this the way Khrushchev and Brezhnev changed the system of ownership in the Soviet Union? Wasn't this the way Liu Shaoqi and Lin Biao changed the nature of a number of our factories and other enterprises to varying degrees?»^{xviii}

It is necessary to center on the question of the superstructure in order to discern whether or not a country is socialist. That is, one must look at the ideological and political line which guides the directorship of the Party and the State. The line pursued by Hua Guofeng was one of expanding, not restricting, bourgeois right. Hua put forward the policy of «standing still», which is in effect the policy of expanding bourgeois right. In discussing the question of learning from Dazhai in agriculture, Hua Guofeng stated:

«To build Dazhai-type counties all over the country means enabling every county in China to achieve stability and unity on the basis of Chairman Mao's revolutionary line and go all out to build socialism will millions united as one.»^{xix}

Here, it is already «*stability and unity*» which is being emphasized instead of the class struggle. But to this revisionist character, what does it mean to follow Mao Zedong's revolutionary line? He further stated:

«It means that every county will implement the general principle of <taking agriculture as the foundation and industry as the leading factor> in developing the national economy, undertake large-scale farmland capital construction, basically realize the mechanization of agriculture, <take grain as the key link and ensure an all-round development> so that production of grain, cotton, oil-bearing crops, pigs, all industrial crops and forestry, animal husbandry, side-occupations and fishery will surpass the targets set in the National Programme for Agricultural Development and outstrip the State plans. We should see to it that the modernization of agriculture will more effectively put forward and guarantee the modernization of industry, national defense and science and technology so as to greatly strengthen the material base of our great socialist homeland for preparedness against war and natural disasters.»^{xx}

Is the question of learning from Dazhai fundamentally a question of agricultural modernization and industrialization, or is it fundamentally a question of class struggle? Jiang Qing's position taken at the very same conference at which Hua Guofeng was speaking was in total contradiction to his line. She stated:

«It is true that agricultural production in the whole nation is currently encountering some difficulty. This can be imputed to natural disasters and the threat of a capitalist restoration in the countryside. Natural disasters can be surmounted. Haven't many Red Flag irrigation ditches appeared in the country? These are the best proof of our comrades' triumph over drought. The capitalist restoration in agriculture is dangerous, for the pernicious influence of Liu Shaoqi's revisionism has been thoroughly eliminated. It is reported that in some production teams there still exists the revisionist policy of San Zi Yi Bao [extension of plots for private use, extension of free markets, an increase in the number of small enterprises with sole responsibility for their own profits or losses, and the fixing of output quotas on the basis of individual households]. Isn't it strange? According to the report of our comrades in Jiangxi some counties in that province did not comprehend properly the Central Committee's agricultural policy. They doubt the feasibility of agricultural mechanization in five years as programmed in the 5th Five-Year Plan formulated by the Central Committee. The emergence of this kind of conservative attitude is also a stumbling block to the development of agriculture. Still, some other comrades in their reports to the Central Committee questioned the feasibility of relying on agricultural banks for the development of the agricultural economy. I would like to advise you here that all development plans for agricultural production must be drawn up in accordance with Chairman Mao's instructions on <practicing self-reliance to acquire adequate clothing and food> rather than on reliance on agricultural credits for developing production. To rely on ourselves and strive for greater achievement is the key to success. Only through self-reliance can we achieve triumph over difficulties.»^{xxi}

Mao Zedong pointed out that in the socialist development of agriculture, the key link is class struggle, the struggle between the capitalist road and the communist road. He

stated:

«If socialism does not occupy the rural front, capitalism assuredly will. Is it possible to take a road which is neither capitalist nor socialist?»^{xxii}

The line put forward by Hua Guofeng is precisely what Mao Zedong called «standing still» on the problem of bourgeois right – the problem of ignoring class struggle, which leads to the restoration of capitalism. Mao pointed out:

«Is there class struggle under socialist society or not? What *<Take the three directives as the key link>*! Stability and unity do not mean writing off class struggle; class struggle is the key link, everything else hinges on it.

[...]

In 1949 it was proposed that the main contradiction within China was that between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. 13 years later, the question of class struggle was raised again, and the situation began to take a turn for the better. What is the Great Proletariat Cultural Revolution up to? Class struggle. Liu Shaoqi promoted the theory that class struggle had died out. In fact he himself had not *<died out>*. He wanted to protect his bunch of traitors and diehard followers. Lin Biao wanted to bring down the proletariat and staged a State coup. So has it died out?

Why do some people not clearly see the issue of the contradictions in socialist society? Don't the old bourgeoisie still exist? Hasn't everyone seen the great numbers of small bourgeoisie? Are there not many bourgeois intellectuals who still have not well remolded? Is the influence of small production, corruption, and speculation not everywhere? Are the anti-Party groups of Liu, Lin and others not horrifying? The problem is that they themselves belong to the small bourgeoisie and their thinking easily turns Rightist. The issue is that they themselves represent the bourgeoisie, but say that class contradictions are not recognizable.

The thinking of some comrades, mainly 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. [...]

Why didn't Lenin <stand still>? After the democratic revolution the workers and the poor and lower-middle 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, more grievous than the capitalists. With the socialist revolution they themselves come under fire. When it came to the cooperative transformation of agriculture there were people in the Party who opposed it, and when it now comes to criticizing 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 100 years from now? Will there still be need for

revolution 1,000 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 recognized 10,000 years from now? Why not? They will still be recognized.»^{xxiii} (My emphasis.)

By centering on the problem of the ownership system and not the problem of which class holds political power, the authors of the book «Rethinking Socialism» end up taking position in favor of the revisionism of Hua Guofeng. But where did Deng Xiaoping's revisionism come from? It came to power along with Hua Guofeng. What Hsu and Ching end up «rethinking» is the principles of marxism-leninism-maoism. This is also the case with others who don't understand Mao Zedong's final thesis.

In China, capitalism was restored when the capitalist-roaders took political power, not once the old ownership system had been restored. The process of capitalist restoration took place over the course of 1976 and culminated with the coup of October. It had its antecedents already in the 10th Party Congress of August 1973, at which Zhou Enlai headed the restoration of a bunch of capitalist-roaders to positions of political power. Already in June 1976 at the latest, Mao Zedong pointed out that the capitalist-roaders had taken political power. In his «Last Will and Testament», addressed to Jiang Qing, he wrote:

«No compromise with others is good.

If the blade turns, and I believe it has, against the revolution,

Then it will be necessary to wage guerrilla warfare once again.

Once again, Yan'an...»^{xxiv}

Here, «**compromise with others**» refers to compromising with the capitalist-roaders and their allies, the Centrists. Previously, in May 1975, Mao had criticized Jiang Qing and Zhang Chunqiao for isolating themselves, not winning over the majority of the Central Committee and instead acting as a «**gang of four**».^{xxv} This sectarian approach led to the victory of the Right in the two-line struggle, at which point «**the blade [turned] [...] against the revolution**» and the only solution was immediately «**[waging] guerrilla warfare once again**». I will return to this key point later on. For now, I will simply state that this clearly proves my position that the capitalist-roaders were already in power in May 1976 and that they only needed to «formalize» their power-grab through the arrest of the Leftist leaders.

It is now necessary to proceed to the problem of how to center on the restriction of bourgeois right under socialism.



Workers, peasants and soldiers take part in the administration of the State at the 2nd All-Russian Congress of Councils.

3. HOW DOES THE RESTRICTION OF BOURGEOIS RIGHT TAKE PLACE?

How is bourgeois right to be restricted? This process of restriction cannot take place faster than the transformation of the «Four Alls». Zhang Chunqiao pointed out:

*«We must be soberly aware that there is still a danger of China turning revisionist. This is not only because imperialism and social-imperialism will never give up aggression and subversion against us, not only because China's old landlords and capitalists are still around and unreconciled to their defeat, but also because new bourgeois elements are **<being engendered daily and hourly>**, as Lenin put it.*

[...]

We often say that the issue of ownership <has in the main been settled>; this means that it has not been settled entirely, and also that bourgeois right has not been totally abolished in this realm. The statistics cited above show that private ownership still exists partially in industry, agriculture and commerce, that socialist public ownership does not consist entirely of ownership by the whole people but includes two kinds of ownership, and that ownership by the whole people is still rather weak in agriculture, which is the foundation of the national economy. The disappearance of bourgeois right in the realm of the system of ownership in a socialist society, as conceived by Marx and Lenin, implies the conversion of all the means of production into the common property of the whole of society. Clearly we have not yet reached that stage. Neither in theory nor in practice should we overlook the very arduous tasks that lie ahead for the dictatorship of the proletariat in this respect.

Moreover, we must see that both ownership of the whole people and collective ownership involve the question of directorship, that is, the question of which class holds the ownership in fact and not just in name.»^{xxvi}

This thesis is completely valid. It sheds some extremely important light on how to restrict bourgeois right in the non-State sector – through the gradual conversion of all property into the property of the entire people through the socialist State. However, the question of restricting bourgeois right inside the socialist State still remains. After all, as a **«bourgeois State without the bourgeoisie»** in which **«capitalism is being engendered daily and hourly»** and in which the **«high officials [...] have a good house, a car, a high salary, and attendants, more grievous than the capitalists»**, the socialist State is the main source of the restoration of capitalism. It was the State-monopoly bourgeoisie, not the non-State-monopoly bourgeoisie, which restored capitalism in the historic socialist countries.

Let us begin with the initial measures to be taken. As Marx pointed out, the exploitative salaries of the Party and State functionaries must immediately be lowered to **«a worker's wage»**. This is the bottom line. Lenin pointed out:

«The bourgeoisie are emerging [...] from among our council government employees [...].»^{xxvii}

«Among the council engineers, the council school-teachers and the privileged, that is,

the most highly skilled and best situated, workers in the council factories, we observe a constant revival of absolutely all the negative traits peculiar to bourgeois parliamentarism, and we are conquering this evil – gradually – only by tireless, constant, prolonged and persistent struggle, proletarian organization and discipline.»^{xxviii}

Moreover, the exploitative element must be restricted through the participation of these functionaries in productive labor. Mao Zedong pointed out:

«It is necessary to maintain the system of cadre participation in collective productive labour. The cadres of our Party and State are ordinary workers and not overlords sitting on the backs of the people. By taking part in collective productive labour, the cadres maintain extensive, constant and close ties with the working people. This is a major measure of fundamental importance for a socialist system; it helps to overcome bureaucracy and to prevent revisionism and dogmatism.»^{xxix}

These measures – the lowering of living standards of Party and State functionaries to the level of common working people and the participation of these functionaries in productive labor – will serve as an important basic restriction on bourgeois right. However, they will not suffice. In order to do away with bourgeois right in the State, it is necessary to do away with the State itself, for it to wither away through a gradual process. Lenin pointed out:

«We need a State, but not the kind the bourgeoisie needs, with organs of government in the shape of a police force, an army and a bureaucracy (officialdom) separate from and opposed to the people. All bourgeois revolutions merely perfected this State machine, merely transferred it from the hands of one party to those of another.

The proletariat, on the other hand, if it wants to uphold the gains of the present revolution and proceed further, to win peace, bread and freedom, must <smash>, to use Marx's expression, this <ready-made> State machine and substitute a new one for it by merging the police force, the army and the bureaucracy with the entire armed people. Following the path indicated by the experience of the Paris Commune of 1871 and the Russian Revolution of 1905, the proletariat, must organise and arm all the poor, exploited sections of the population in order that they themselves should take the organs of State power directly into their own hands, in order that they themselves should constitute these organs of State power.»^{xxx}

He also pointed out:

«There is a small-bourgeois tendency to transform the members of the councils into <parliamentarians>, or else into bureaucrats. We must combat this by drawing all the members of the councils into the practical work of administration. In many places the departments of the councils are gradually becoming merged with the commissariats. Our aim is to draw the whole of the poor into the practical work of administration, and every step that is taken in this direction – the more varied they are, the better – should be carefully recorded, studied, systematized, tested by wider experience and embodied in law. Our aim is to ensure that every toiler, after having finished their eight hours' <task> in productive labour, shall perform State duties without pay: the

transition to this is particularly difficult, but this transition alone can guarantee the final consolidation of socialism.»^{xxx1}

As a result of this process, the working people will more and more take over the functions of administration, policing and defense, until the elimination of the bureaucracy, police and standing army has taken place. The armed proletariat will itself constitute the nation, as Marx emphasized. But to reach this point requires a long historical process which cannot take place faster than the transformation of the «Four Alls» can. Therefore, in order to undermine the danger of capitalist restoration, a solution is required – a solution which will impulse both the transformation of the «Four Alls» and the withering away of the State. This solution is the proletarian cultural revolution. Comrade Gonzalo pointed out:

«The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in a historical perspective is the most transcendental aspect of Chairman Mao's development of marxism-leninism; it is the solution to the great pending problem of the continuation of the revolution under the proletarian dictatorship. [...] It was [...] the most Earth-shaking political process and the greatest mass mobilization the world has ever seen [...].

[...]

The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution implies a landmark in the development of the proletarian dictatorship towards the proletariat's securing political power, concretely expressed in the revolutionary committees.»^{xxxii}

The reason why the proletarian cultural revolution is such an important contribution to marxism is that it is the concrete means by which the abolition of the «Four Alls» and bourgeois right takes place, the State withers away and communism is reached. As the Communist Party of China pointed out:

«The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution now unfolding is a great revolution that touches people to their very souls and constitutes a new stage in the development of the socialist revolution in our country, a stage which is both broader and deeper.

[...]

Although the bourgeoisie has been overthrown, it is still trying to use the old ideas, culture, customs and habits of the exploiting classes to corrupt the masses, capture their minds and endeavour to stage a comeback. The proletariat must do the exact opposite: it must meet head-on every challenge of the bourgeoisie in the ideological field and use the new ideas, culture, customs and habits of the proletariat to change the mental outlook of the whole of society. At present, our objective is to struggle against and overthrow those persons in authority who are taking the capitalist road, to criticize and repudiate the reactionary bourgeois academic <authorities> and the ideology of the bourgeoisie and all other exploiting classes and to transform education, literature and art and all other parts of the superstructure not in correspondence with the socialist economic base, so as to facilitate the consolidation and development of the socialist system.»^{xxxiii}

The Party also pointed out the method by which this cultural revolution is to be

carried out:

«The whole Party must follow Comrade Mao Zedong's instructions, hold high the great banner of the proletarian cultural revolution, thoroughly expose the reactionary bourgeois class position of those so-called <academic authorities> who oppose the Party and socialism, thoroughly criticize and repudiate the reactionary bourgeois ideas in the sphere of academic work, education, journalism, literature and art, and publishing, and seize the leadership in these cultural spheres. To achieve this, it is necessary at the same time to criticize and repudiate those representatives of the bourgeoisie who have sneaked into the Party, the Government, the Army, and all spheres of culture, to clear them out or transfer some of them to other positions. Above all, we must not entrust these people with the work of directing the cultural revolution. In fact many of them have done and are still doing such work, and this is extremely dangerous.

Those representatives of the bourgeoisie who have sneaked into the Party, the government, the army, and various cultural circles are a bunch of counter-revolutionary revisionists. Once conditions are ripe, they will seize political power and turn the dictatorship of the proletariat into a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Some of them we have already seen thorough, others we have not. Some are still trusted by us and are being trained as our successors, persons like Khrushchev, for example, who are still nestling beside us. Party committees at all levels must pay full attention to this matter.»^{xxxiv}

But as Mao Zedong stated, to get rid of capitalist-roaders is not the aim of the cultural revolution – it is only its method. The aim is to «**change the soul**», as he pointed out:

«To struggle against power-holders who take the capitalist road is the main task, but it is by no means the goal. The goal is to solve the problem of world outlook: it is the question of eradicating the roots of revisionism.»^{xxxv} (My emphasis.)

The significance of the proletarian cultural revolution was summed up by Mao when he stated:

«The current Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution is absolutely necessary and most timely for consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat, preventing capitalist restoration and building socialism.»^{xxxvi}

And at the end of his life, after almost ten years of cultural revolution, he made the following synthesis of its experiences:

«The general view on the cultural revolution: Basically correct, with some shortcomings. What we want to study now is the shortcomings. The ratio is 70:30, 70% achievements and 30% mistakes, and the views on it are not necessarily consistent. There were two mistakes made in the cultural revolution: 1. Overthrow everything, and 2. All-round civil war. Regarding <overthrowing everything>, some of the attacks were correct, such as against Liu's and Lin's groups. Some of them were mistakes, such as those against some old comrades. These people also made mistakes, so some criticism of

them is fine. The experience without war has already lasted ten years. During the <all-round civil war>, guns were taken, most were distributed. Armed fighting is also an exercise. But beating people to death and not rescuing the wounded, this is not good.»^{xxxvii}

The uninterrupted proletarian cultural revolution, which is carried out through periods of consolidation and periods of leaps (campaigns), is the concrete expression of «**the permanence of the revolution**», as Marx described, the end result of which is the abolition of the «Four Alls», the dissolution of bourgeois right, the withering away of the State in favor of governance by the entire armed people, the destruction of patriarchy and the complete and total elimination of the possibility of capitalist restoration – in a word, a communist society, which is governed by the only communist right: «**From each according to their ability, to each according to their needs!**»



The 1981 summary trial against Jiang Qing, Zhang Chunqiao, Yao Wenyuan and Wang Hongwen.

4. CAPITALIST RESTORATION CANNOT BE PREVENTED, BUT IT CAN BE NEGATED THROUGH SOCIALIST COUNTER-RESTORATION

From the above, it can be clearly seen that the question of which road is being taken, the capitalist road or the communist road, is determined by whether bourgeois right is being restricted or expanded. The communist road corresponds to restricting bourgeois right, whereas the capitalist road corresponds to expanding it or «standing still» on the problem. As soon as bourgeois right is no longer being actively restricted, it is an expression that the inner-Party bourgeoisie has already taken power.

Mao Zedong pointed out:

«**If a Rightist, anti-communist coup occurs in China, my conclusion is they will not have peace, and it is quite possible that it will be short-lived. This is because all the revolutionaries, who represent the interest of more than 90% of the people, will not tolerate it. At that time, the Right will possibly use my words to secure power for some time, and the Left then will definitely use other of my words, organize, and defeat the Right.**»^{xxxviii}

How, then, can the restoration of capitalism be prevented?

Firstly, as we have seen, through the uninterrupted proletarian cultural revolution. However, since what in essence was an uninterrupted proletarian cultural revolution was actually carried out in China from May 1966 to October 1976, and capitalism was still restored, we can see that the cultural revolution alone was not enough. Comrade Gonzalo pointed out:

«**The restoration of capitalism in China after the 1976 counter-revolutionary coup is not a negation of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution but is plainly part of the contention between restoration and counter-restoration, and, on the contrary, it shows us the transcendental historical importance of the Great Proletarian Cultural**

Revolution in the inexorable march of humanity towards communism.»^{xxxix}

The uninterrupted proletarian cultural revolutions is the means by which bourgeois right is restricted under socialism. However, by itself, the cultural revolution cannot guarantee that capitalism will not be restored in a socialist country. The process (restoration ↔ counter-restoration) is still ongoing, both at the world level and in each country. If the capitalist-roaders come to power in a socialist country, they will immediately seek to carry out a fascist coup against the communist-roaders and restore capitalist relations of production. Therefore, the key is to carry out a seizure of political power immediately once bourgeois right is no longer being restricted. This was done by Mao in 1966, when the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution began. Mao pointed out:

«Taking over is in itself a revolution, a creation of something new. [...] We have seized power, but it may be snatched away from us again. [...] But we must keep power. This depends chiefly on the strength of the Left. When the Left is weak, power may be snatched away from it again. Therefore the Left must be strong. I support the power struggle.»^{xl}

Then, political power had been seized by the inner-Party bourgeoisie headed by Liu Shaoqi. They had not yet been able to carry out a counter-revolutionary coup against Mao, but had removed him from all positions of political power, leaving him only as Chairperson of the Communist Party. He used this position to launch the cultural revolution. However, in 1976, Jiang Qing and Zhang Chunqiao had not yet been elected to the responsible positions within the Party and State respectively – the 3rd Plenary Session of the 10th Central Committee which was to elect them as Chairperson of the Party and President of the People's Republic respectively was convened by Hua Guofeng under false pretenses and used to arrest them and their supporters. That this would happen had already been predicted by Mao in his final letter to Jiang Qing, which I quoted above. Therefore, the problem for Jiang Qing was to seize political power. Mao wrote:

«A person's life is limited,

but revolution knows no bounds.

In the struggle of the past ten years, I have tried to reach the peak of the revolution,

but I have failed.

However, you could reach the summit.

If somehow you fail,

You will plunge into a fathomless abyss.

Your body will be torn to pieces, and your bones will break.»^{xli}

Without control over the Communist Party, Jiang Qing would have been forced to launch

a people's war in order to seize power, as Mao instructed her to do. However, she did not fulfill this directive. As a result, capitalism was restored in China. Lessons must be drawn from this immensely important historical event, namely:

1. Once bourgeois right is no longer being actively restricted, it means that the inner-Party bourgeoisie has taken power.
2. Once the inner-Party bourgeoisie has taken power, it will actively work to carry out a social-fascist State coup and restore capitalism.
3. Without political power, the proletariat cannot use the cultural revolution as a means to win back power. It must seize power by means of revolutionary violence.

This leads me to highlight the importance of Comrade Gonzalo's thesis on the «**sea of armed masses**», which he developed on the basis of Marx, Lenin and Mao and the experience of capitalist restoration in China. Gonzalo pointed out:

«By militarizing the Party, we complete a step toward the militarization of society which is the strategic perspective to guarantee the dictatorship of the proletariat. The militarized society is the sea of armed masses which Marx and Engels spoke of, that guards the conquest of power and defends it once conquered. We take the experience of the Chinese Revolution, of the anti-Japanese base at Yan'an, which was a militarized society where everything grew out of the barrel of the gun: Party, Army, State, new politics, new economics, new culture. And in that way we develop war communism.

[...] We must arm the masses bit by bit, part by part, until the general arming of the people. When this goal is reached, there shall be no exploitation on Earth.»^{xlii}

We should understand the general arming of the people as a necessity. It cannot be carried out overnight, but must follow a period of mobilization, politicization and organization of the masses. Therefore, the implementation of this policy is tied to the proletarian cultural revolution and the withering away of the State. The arming of the people provides the military basis for the State to wither away. But moreover, it provides the military basis for countering capitalist restoration with socialist counter-restoration.

Once the inner-Party bourgeoisie has seized political power and is preparing its social-fascist coup, the Left has a brief window during which it can make its move. In China, this was the case before October 1976, and in the Soviet Union, it was the case before the 20th Party Congress in 1956. In both cases, the Left (in China represented by Jiang Qing and in the Soviet Union by V. M. Molotov) made its move too late – after the coup had already taken place.

Once the inner-Party bourgeoisie holds political power, it controls the people's army. Therefore, it can and will use it for restoring capitalism. This heightens the importance of the people's militia under socialism, which can be mobilized by the people's army, but can only receive orders from the lower-level Communist Party members in the local State organs, since the militia is mobilized to protect the dictatorship of the proletariat. Therefore, in this brief window of opportunity, it is

possible for the communist leaders to call upon the Left of the entire Party, the Left of the people's army and the Left of the people's militia in particular to join it in armed struggle against capitalist restoration. Inevitably, only one faction of the Party, armed forces and militia will join the Left – however, in doing so, a basis will be laid for the counter-restoration of socialism to take place.

Once the people's war is thus reinitiated, it will be possible, through a long period of protracted revolutionary war, to win over the majority of the people and many members of the Party, Army and State – who originally supported the capitalist-roaders – to the side of the socialist counter-restoration. By following this strategy, this and only this road, it will be possible to continue the process of socialist revolution. Otherwise, capitalism will be restored completely, and the communists and proletarian revolutionaries of the country in question will find themselves working much longer under the immeasurably more difficult conditions of living in a social-fascist State.

When this road is followed, and only then, will the predictions made by Comrade Mao Zedong about the revisionist countries quoted above come true.



Maoist rebels from the circle "Dare" at the Tiananmen Square protests in Beijing, 1989.

5. CONCLUSION

From the above, it can clearly be seen that Mao Zedong's final contribution to marxism-leninism-maoism, his thesis that **«the bourgeoisie is right in the Communist Party»**, has an immense historical and political significance. It is intimately connected with the problems of the proletarian cultural revolution, the general arming of the people, the struggle against the «Four Alls», the restriction of bourgeois right and the struggle between the restoration of capitalism and the counter-restoration of socialism as the continuation of the struggle between the communist and capitalist roads. It is a thesis of transcendental importance for all communists and for all those who want revolution.

Without grasping this thesis and grasping it fully, in all of its aspects, with all of its uncomfortable implications about the nature of socialist society and the historical socialist countries, it is impossible to carry out the uninterrupted proletarian revolution. Until the communists of the world grasp this thesis, no matter how many efforts are exerted and how much blood is spilled by the proletarian revolutionaries of the world, capitalism will be restored again and again. In order for us to reach communism, this thesis is absolutely essential.

The comrades working in bourgeois-democratic and openly fascist countries must grasp this thesis, for if they don't, all their efforts will be in vain. The comrades working in social-fascist countries must grasp this thesis, for if they don't, they will never understand the way out which they must take. All communists on Earth must grasp this thesis, for this understanding alone will bring us to communism. With this understanding, and not without it, as Comrade Gonzalo used to say:

WE ARE CONDEMNED TO WIN!

[i](#) I mainly rely on three documents which were published on bannedthought.net over the course of the previous year. These are the following: «Chairman Mao's Primary Directives», «A Summary of Views on the Problem of the Inner-Party Bourgeoisie» and «The Bourgeoisie Within the Party in the Socialist Period». The latter two documents are only available in the Chinese language. The third document, written by Comrade Qin Zhengxian on behalf of the Writing Group of the Shanghai Municipal Committee of the Communist Party of China during the summer of 1976, was particularly helpful. In a stunning act of revolutionary heroism, this booklet was broadcast by the *Shanghai People's Radio* for several weeks after the State coup by the capitalist-roaders in October 1976, in spite of the ban on the booklet issued by the revisionists.

[ii](#) Mao Zedong: «Main Directives» (October 1975-January 1976)

[iii](#) Ibid.

[iv](#) Karl Marx: «The Class Struggles in France, 1848-50» (January-October 1850)

[v](#) Karl Marx: «Critique of the Gotha Program» (April-May 1875)

[vi](#) V. I. Lenin: «The State and Revolution» (August-September 1917)

[vii](#) See Karl Marx: Letter to Joseph Weydemeyer (05.03.1852)

[viii](#) Mao Zedong – Quoted in Editorial Departments of the *People's Daily* and *The Red Flag*: «Marx, Engels and Lenin on the Dictatorship of the Proletariat» (22.02.1974)

[ix](#) Karl Marx: «The Civil War in France» (July 1870-May 1871)

[x](#) Mao Zedong – Quoted in Editorial Departments of the *People's Daily* and *The Red Flag*: «Marx, Engels and Lenin on the Dictatorship of the Proletariat» (22.02.1974)

[xi](#) See V. I. Lenin: ««Left»-Communism: An Infantile Disorder» (April-May 1920)

[xii](#) J. V. Stalin: «Economic Problems of Socialism in the Soviet Union» (1951)

[xiii](#) See Editorial Departments of the *People's Daily*, *The Red Flag* and the *Liberation*

Army Daily: «The Struggle Between the Two Roads in China's Countryside» (23.11.1967)

[xiv](#) Mao Zedong – Quoted in Editorial Departments of the *People's Daily* and *The Red Flag*: «Marx, Engels and Lenin on the Dictatorship of the Proletariat» (22.02.1974)

[xv](#) Mao Zedong – Quoted in Editorial Departments of the *People's Daily*, *The Red Flag* and the *Liberation Army Daily*: «Leninism or Social-Imperialism?» (22.04.1970)

[xvi](#) See Deng-yuan Hsu and Pao-yu Ching: «Rethinking Socialism» (Before 1997)

[xvii](#) Mao Zedong: «Speech at the 1st Plenary Session of the 9th Central Committee of the Communist Party of China» (28.04.1969)

[xviii](#) Zhang Chunqiao: «On Exercising All-Round Dictatorship over the Bourgeoisie» (1975)

[xix](#) Hua Guofeng: «Let the Whole Party Mobilize for a Vast Effort to Develop Agriculture and Build Dazhai-Type Counties Throughout the Country» (15.10.1975)

[xx](#) Ibid.

[xxi](#) Jiang Qing: «Address at the National Conference on Learning from Dazhai in Agriculture» (15.09.1975)

[xxii](#) Mao Zedong – Quoted in Central Committee of the Communist Party of China: «Decisions on Agricultered Cooperation» (11.10.1955)

[xxiii](#) Mao Zedong: «Main Directives» (October 1975-January 1976)

[xxiv](#) Mao Zedong: «Last Will and Testament» (May-June 1976)

[xxv](#) See Mao Zedong: «Talk with Members of the Political Bureau Who Were in Beijing» (04.05.1975)

[xxvi](#) Zhang Chunqiao: «On Exercising All-Round Dictatorship over the Bourgeoisie» (1975)

[xxvii](#) V. I. Lenin: «The 8th Congress of the Communist Party of Russia (Bolshevik)» (March 1919)

[xxviii](#) V. I. Lenin: «<Left>-Communism: An Infantile Disorder» (April-May 1920)

[xxix](#) Mao Zedong – Quoted in Editorial Departments of the *People's Daily* and *The Red Flag*: «On Khrushchev's Phony Communism and Its Historical Lessons for the World» (14.07.1964)

[xxx](#) V. I. Lenin: «Letters from Afar» (March 1917)

[xxxi](#) V. I. Lenin: «The Immediate Tasks of the Council Government» (March-April 1918)

[xxxii](#) Abimael «Gonzalo» Guzmán: «On Marxism-Leninism-Maoism» (January 1988)

[xxxiii](#) Central Committee of the Communist Party of China: «Decision Concerning the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution» (08.08.1966)

[xxxiv](#) Central Committee of the Communist Party of China: «Circular on the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution» (16.05.1966)

[xxxv](#) Mao Zedong: «Speech to the Albanian Military Delegation» (01.05.1967)

[xxxvi](#) Mao Zedong – Quoted in Lin Biao: «Report to the 9th National Congress of the Communist Party of China» (01.04.1969)

[xxxvii](#) Mao Zedong: «Main Directives» (October 1975-January 1976)

[xxxviii](#) Mao Zedong: Letter to Jiang Qing (08.07.1966)

[xxxix](#) Abimael «Gonzalo» Guzmán: «On Marxism-Leninism-Maoism» (January 1988)

[xl](#) Mao Zedong: «Conversation with Zhou Enlai on Power Struggle» (1967)

[xli](#) Mao Zedong: «Last Will and Testament» (May-June 1976)

[xlii](#) Abimael «Gonzalo» Guzmán: «Bases of Discussion for the General Political Line of the Communist Party of Peru» (January 1988)