

Embargo: A Collection of Masterposts on SWCC and 21st Century Socialism by Bayarea415

Written by Bayarea415
Compiled by ComradeAvian

Table of Contents

Introduction: About the Author.....	4
The Overwhelming Misinformation on China and HK.....	7
The Danger of Siding With the West Against China.....	13
Hong Kong and the Uncritical Left.....	16
Why the USSR Fell While China Prospers.....	18
An ML Critique of Maoist Vanguardism and Lumpen Theory.....	21
Thomas Sankara and the Importance of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.....	28
Chinese “Imperialism”.....	32
China After 2050: Be Patient!.....	35
Western Decay and the US-Iranian Crisis.....	38
Understanding State Capitalism and its Foundations for SWCC.....	40
Drop Your Western Biases Before Critiquing China.....	49
Addressing Sinophobia and China’s Coronavirus Response.....	51
Everything You Need to Know About SWCC is in the CCP Constitution.....	55

We Need a Serious Discussion on the Overwhelming Misinformation on China and HK

Published 12 August 2019

This can be a megathread, Round 2 on the Hong Kong (HK) protests, but the mainstream community (especially on Reddit) is hypocritical, nonsensical, and war-hawkish. [They are just waiting for a "Tiananmen-like" massacre to happen](#), while the government has done everything they can to preserve peace and have respected the Special Administrative Regional Status. The amount of white savior complexes out there is incredibly high and promoting this BS. HK protesters know this. They are using this to their advantage by their [Waiving American Flags](#); [signs made in English](#); and [singing the US national anthem](#).

If you want to witness the epitome of mainstream media failure, just see how shallow their coverage of the HK protests are. Same stuff they've done to Venezuela. Only this time, they have a stronger agenda and target: China. China, even among the left, is a controversial government to say the least, but it is because of this weakness in our ranks, they pounce on it. It may not be another "brown" country the US can invade, but the same racism, bigotry, shallowness, and imperialist agenda loves to narrate on.

With all this said, this will be more of a rhetoric based rant, since we all had our fair share of resources megathreads regarding this topic (however, I will sprinkle some resources to back most of my claims here).

> Liberal Arguments and Rebuttals

1. There are some leftist who support HK, and Marxist who criticize China's authoritarian rule.

China's authoritarian rule has been blown up way out of proportion for the benefit of Western propaganda. From the Chinese revolution, to the Cultural revolution, all the way down to

Tiananmen Square, Westerners, radlibs, and others in the left LOVE to gobble up Western propaganda to either go against China, or become communist apologists. [For more information on how this is all propaganda, I highly recommend readers to check out r/communism sources on their Debunk page, section 2: the people's republic of China.](#) Also, I have [written extensively on all the falsehoods on China, promoted by the West \(even by some leftists\), including their working conditions, social credit system, Uyghurs camps, Tiananmen square, and \(the most ludicrous in my opinion\) Falun Gong Organ Harvesting.](#)

[After reading all the materials regarding China, the one piece of literature that convinced me to fully support the PRC was President Xi Jinping's "Uphold and Develop Socialism with Chinese Characteristics", where he described this rift between leftists and China, and the steadfast economic rise and success they have despite of it. I highly recommend leftist from all sects to read it.](#)

I am going to be extremely generous here. Let's say there are leftist, marxist, or even communist groups in HK that are advocating for independence. Let's say they have strong theories, praxis, and reasons as to why independence will be great for the masses and what not. Hell, I will go so far to say that they are 100% independent, not using any Western funding, backing, or influences for their stance (I think we are really in fantasy land here, but let's give it to them).

They are still a minority. I have already shown you the list of 37,000 NGOs in HK that receive money from the corrupt NED organization, State Department, and CIA. [The overwhelming amount of HK leaders and organizers meeting with US officials, along with funding, supplying, and sponsoring protests from the West](#) drowns any real chance of leftist actually promoting the working people's agenda. Does any leftist honestly think that an independent HK would allow any sort of socialism or Marxism in their country?

We can no longer ignore the semantics of China. They are an economic threat to the West. These tensions are planned. We can argue about the correct measures to help our comrades, while understanding why there may be some measures to protect the CCP, revolution, and their people. But to fall to the West's propaganda and allow its Orientalist narrative to take root in our perspectives against China is unacceptable. They are our comrades. They are closer to our ideals than any capitalist country in the West. The enemy of our enemy, is not our friend. Without the proper diligence, we may be aligning ourselves with the true oppressor (US, CIA ,etc.), rather than those fighting against them (established socialist countries that have overthrown capitalism and are on their pathway towards socialism).

2. HK deserves to be independent!

There are many things wrong with this statement. Hong Kong HEAVILY relies on China for its own financial stability, despite its gigantic economic inequality. [55% of Hong Kong's trade and 80% of its tourists are from mainland China... Hong Kong's GDP growth slowed down a bit, but by 2017 it was back on track. Then it was hit by the trade war with the Anglo countries, which is a bigger deal than the local unrest...](#)

> "Hong Kong people want money but are allergic to work, want democracy but are allergic to sharing, want to be respected but refuse to care about anybody else."

If HK protesters were not waving imperialist flags, or even, taking another step, REFUSING/REBUKING the aid of the West for its independence, I believe this ENTIRE conversation will be vastly different. If this was the case, communist would really analyze how China may deal with this problem internally.

But this is not the case. The fingerprints of the CIA and US state department (along with GB and other Western counter parts) are all over this, at the most convenient time at the height of a trade war. Proof of this includes (but not limited to):

- [Protesters getting PAID by organizers](#)
- [HK organizers/leaders meeting with Julie Eadeh, who is the political unit chief of USCG \(U.S. Consulate General in Hong Kong & Macau\)](#)
- [They admitted to receiving funding by the US](#)
- [American Government NGOs fuel Hong Kong Protests](#)
- [Hong Kong Human Rights Monitor 香港人权监察 and HKCTU 香港职工联盟, along with 68 other Hong Kong "democratic right" organizations earn hundreds of thousands every year from State Department funded NGOs](#)
- [More on this BS](#)

The People being used as a pawn for America's political gain against China. To be used like this is to do the imperialist bidding, as the US seeks to drastically influence and prop up this region through any means necessary. I can only imagine if China states it will allow HK to be independent, and then the US will HEAVILY support its development for influence to the point where Taiwan, Macau, Tibet, and Xiongnu will want to separate, and become capitalist puppets as well (talk about Domino Theory).

If you are focusing more on HK than you are on India, you've been duped. If you are praising what these protesters are doing, while lam-blasting BLM, you've been duped. If you think there are no parallels between Venezuela and HK, you have absolutely no idea how imperialism works and should not be involved with this discussion at all.

3. HK should have its democracy back!

Back? From what point in history did HK ever had democracy under British rule? British imperialism was absolutely worse than what they have now. A quick history lesson is necessary to fully rebut this statement. Now this is from an academic paper that lists out these atrocious laws while Hong Kong was under British Rule:

- Laws were passed to ensure that no Chinese would live in the most desirable areas in Hong Kong, which the British wished to preserve as their exclusive enclaves.
- In a land in which ninety-eight percent of the population was Chinese, English was the official language. The Chinese language was not permitted to be used in government offices. Laws regulating conduct were written exclusively in English, a language which the vast majority of the population could not understand.
- The British unleashed a horrid opioid epidemic on the Chinese through Hong Kong. [Here is a clip of Professor Michael Parenti stating "when the communist liberated Shanghai from the sponsored Kumintang reactionary government, in 1949, about 20% of the population of Shanghai, 1.2 million people, were drug addicts."](#)
- "The slave trade was merciful compared with the opium trade. We did not destroy the body of the Africans, for it was our immediate interest to keep them alive; we did not debase their natures, corrupt their minds, nor destroy their souls. But the opium sellers lays the body after he has corrupted, degraded and annihilated the moral being of unhappy sinners."
- The more messed up part about this was that the Chinese government seized some of the opium and destroyed it. But after the opium wars, they were forced to compensate the very people that were poisoning their country (\$6 million).
- "The highest level British official in China in the late 1840s described Hong Kong as the "great receptacle of thieves and pirates protected by the technicalities of British law."
- "Hong Kong has been Chinese Territory since ancient times. This is a fact known to all, old and young in the world.... British imperialism came to china by pirate ships, provoked the criminal "opium war", massacred numerous Chinese people, and occupied the Chinese territory of Hong Kong.... It is the British imperialist who have come from thousands of miles away to seize our land by force and kill our compatriots"
- Sex slavery was a booming market, as girls were bought and sold by wealthy Chinese and British men. British rule legalized the sale of human beings and slavery, despite it being illegal in England.

- Chinese residents were given curfews, and criminal punishments would range from legal physical beatings to bodily mutilation (compared to British rule breakers who would just pay a fine).

This is only HALF of the paper that is well sourced with primary sources. You can find the paper [here](#) and [here](#)

4. So many people are involved with the protests, they can't be all CIA operatives!

[As of 2017, more than 60% of Hong Kong citizens do not support the idea of independence for Hong Kong vs. 11.4% supporting independence.](#).. Additionally, there is extreme doubt as to whether these crowds are as large as they seem, with media drastically giving wrong calculations and numbers.

As of now, HK has one of the highest income inequalities in the world, along with a horrid housing crisis, with people sleeping in literal cages.

[On August 6, 2019, The Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions; the largest union in Hong Kong with over 410,000 workers and a pro-Beijing orientation, makes a statement vehemently opposing the one-day strike launched by the anti-Beijing Hong Kong Confederation of Trade Unions.](#)

[If you want to learn more about the Pro-Beijing Rallies that have been happening in HK \(yes, they exist\), see here](#)

If all of this does not convince you that you should at least admit that this is a complex situation where the West should stay out of, then you are part of the problem.

5. So now you support Police Officers?

This truly frustrates me because it illustrates the "blind equality" that some leftist give to ALL police without comprehending the systems, cultures, economics, and back stories of such institutions. Police in China are not the same as police in the US, which are deeply rooted in racism, slavery, and mass murder for the sake of private property. In addition, this entire point is irrelevant: whether or not police are there to maintain the peace or not, it does not resolve the tensions between HK protesters and the Chinese government.

With this said, there are some serious security threats being made against the government, including [Hong Kong police bust city's biggest bomb-making attempt](#). Now, yes, this can be considered a rebellion and violence is involved for these reprisals. But again, with the US's

fingerprints all over these protests, it is for their benefit. Not the people of HK. They are more than willing to sacrifice lives for the sake of political gain.

We are obviously not hoping for a massacre to happen (if the media does report on one, I hope all of us will be highly skeptical at first before distancing ourselves from such acts). We do not support a brutal repression, but do point the hypocrisy of crying "repression" on one side, while complaining about protesters on the other (BLM, Colin Kaepernick, Occupy, etc.). As Mao Tse Tung said:

"Communist firmly stand for peace and are against war, but if the imperialists insist on war, we shall not be afraid of it." [Michael Parenti explains why every leftist must comprehend "authoritarian measures" taken by socialist governments](#). But China does not even come close to the measures taken from their counterparts when it comes to the HK situation.

So with all that said: Chinese comrades, WE SUPPORT YOU.

The Danger of Siding with the West Against China

Published 19 August 2019

We are seeing it all over. Countries are now having anti-Chinese sentiments because of Hong Kong, fueled by Western media. They purposefully ignore all the accomplishments that the CCP has done for the people to paint them and an authoritarian dictatorship, when they have created one of the greatest economic miracles in history for their people, including Hong Kong. HK could have been like any other neo-colonial country recovering from its deep seeded wounds from Britain. But China gave it protection and prosperity while respecting the one country two system set up. If you doubt this, Please point out another neo-colonial country that ended its colonial rule, and became just as prosperous. Please point out how the West continues to play with these countries to extract its wealth, and how Hong Kong's interests were not protected by China.

We are in a dangerous period where unjustified and prejudicial doubt is being raised against China, despite its overwhelming success in the environment, sciences, and economy. 1.4 billion people. Please take a moment to consider that number. While the West is complaining about immigrants draining their resources, China is able to prosper with 1.4 BILLION under a socialistic government.

But China... let's say it is authoritarian. Let's say it restricts free speech and the ability to protest against their government. Let's say they control the media. Let's say they are not socialist/communist. Let's say they have billionaires in their parties. Let's say their police are committing brutalities. And let's say they are unjustly targeting a minority group. By the way, all of this has been thoroughly debunked by academics, international representatives, and other statistics. But let's give it to the radlibs of the West.

If you have a problem with all of these things, why the *hell* are you siding with the West to the point of pushing for a phony capitalistic war for "independence" in HK? Do you know if HK will all of the sudden become the Marxist paradise you always wanted to see? Even with its "bad experiences"

with CCP, they will flock to Marx? How naive must Western liberals must be to see that this will be far from the truth...

Free speech? If you are a fascist wanting a genocidal political agenda, you have all the free speech you want in the West, but a communist have actual laws against them, their profession, and their livelihoods, not to mention the ridiculous cultural stigma that equates us to Nazis. As Trump prepares to label antifa as terrorists (a law that has already passed in some states), please show me if China is doing the exact same with HK protesters...

Control the media? Enjoy your Fox News CNN channels that make you believe Russia and China are “really” controlling your phony democracy thru Twitter.

Not socialist/communist? *So side with actual goddamn capitalists?* To ignore the majority of these protesters being influenced by the US state department is naive at best. If HK ever obtains independence, it will be another capitalist puppet that will influence other Chinese provinces to the point of collapse (another USSR) where people will be 100% worse off. HK will never allow socialistic/communist parties in their “democracy” or have anarchist communes set up. This is utter BS.

Chinese Billionaires? Those billionaires that end up in prison more often than not? Those billionaires that *do not have the ability to vote in party matters?* Those billionaires that can be *killed* by the CCP if they negligently kill consumers for faulty products? Yes, because your Western country is so much better at treating billionaires with the respect and corruption they deserve... Billionaires serve a temporary restricted purpose in China, that has been reiterated by the CCP, and are not part of their long term pathway towards socialism (obviously).

Police brutality? Have your UN committee on the use of pepper spray in China. While entire minority populations live in *fear* in the “land of the free” in the US because a systematic police force that kills them at a moments notice was founded to catch slaves and imbedded racism. This is another issue subverted in this incediousWestern narrative that makes people have a phony concern on brutality in HK. Seriously,screw off with your white knightism with police brutality hypocrites.

And targeting minority groups. You have to be kidding me. The West have undocumented migrants in cages, kill black people with their police force, and have committed horrid genocide, and you equate China with *that?* 1.4 million Uyghurs were lifted out of poverty in the last five years, and those “camps” do not have “millions” of people that the West purposefully inflates using extremely

loose methodologies to count. To cry for the Uyghurs and not put that much effort into BLM, black panthers, and other minority advocacy groups is just, once again, showing some white knight hypocritical bull.

Whataboutism? Another liberal buzzword that I am sure I will be called out for.

The problem is here that Western narratives serve to distract and project. Distract from the actual sufferings happening in front of everyone, and project against an enemy to get everyone on their side. While the West has these exact same problems 1000x, all of the sudden they are experts in protesting against authoritarian governments to the point of making geopolitical changes that serve the 1%. Except at their own homes. Their cultural shallowness allows Westerns to think they are liberating people with their advocacy, when that has worked out so well for Iraqis, Libyans, Ukrainians, Eastern Europe, most of Latin America, etc. but I am sure HK will be different.

Don't fall for it. When the US is pushing these kinds of stories, *be skeptical*. When there is a possible genocide happening in Kashmir by the "largest democracy in the world" (India), the West will love to divert your attention to HK, where none of that kind of violence is happening. When the West is whispering in your ear to "watch out for China" flick them away. Because the true threat to your country is the one doing the whispering, which has a *deep* history of ruining countries for their own profit.

Hong Kong and the Uncritical Left: Why Our Communities Must Remember to Critically Analyze Movements Before Supporting or Opposing Them

Published 19 September 2019

Masses groups of people marching on the street demanding “freedom and democracy.” Organizations calling on the world community to stand against “dictators and tyranny.” Government vs. people.

Although on the surface these seem like solid movements to support, we end up hurting ourselves when we do not dive deeper into understanding why the movement is happening in the first place.

Freedom and democracy may just mean allowing capitalism to run amuck while imperialists reap the rewards, exploit the people, and corrupt the system. Organizations being funded by imperialist states through Western NGOs may simply label these governments as tyrannical simply because they are anti-imperialists left governments. Governments versus people may really mean government versus capitalists.

Idk how many leftists joined the bandwagon of supporting the HK protests when initial news broke on the extradition bills. I tried my best to warn leftist to think critically about this movement, especially seeing all the colonial support, Appeals to white knightism, and, of course, Trump 2020 re-election campaigning. After seeing the embarrassing failure of the United States in Venezuela to oust Maduro and get Guido in power; leftists seemingly forgot about this playbook with China, as the trade wars were heating up.

China has been a huge wedge among leftist because of its history since its revolution, and its economic make-up today. This clouds a lot of judgment more to justify the notion that “the enemy of my enemy is my friend” without realizing that they may be aligning with a monstrous imperialists that has done horrid genocidal bigoted atrocities 1000 times worse than any other country on earth.

By now, many more leftists are starting to wake up about the HK protests. Places like [r/socialism](#), LSC, and even [r/ChapoTrapHouse](#) are seeing that these are not small groups of protesters promoting trump, waving American flags, and singing their national anthem. With Joshua Wang visiting Marco Rubio, Trump, and the Senate to convince them to go against China, it is abundantly clear who is pulling the major strings in this protests. As I said, even if there are numerous leftists in the movement, they will not have a chance to voice their opinions if the ludicrous result of HK independence came to fruition.

There is A LOT of credibility lost to those leftists who still thump this HK support line, as the evidence stacks higher and higher on the US-UK imperialist motives here. There were some absolutely sickening opportunism many on the left pushed for, while indirectly supporting imperialist powers. However, I can honestly say, from the beginning, [r/communism](#) got this right, despite the backlash from other leftist.

This goes to show why leftist critical thinking goes a hell of a long way when it comes to these happenings.

As the great African revolutionary, Thomas Sankara, once said:

“A soldier without any political or ideological training is a potential criminal.”

We must stay alert, hold the line, and beat back any liberalism, opportunism, revisionism, or reactionary support in all cases against the people.

The Importance of Ideological Discipline: Why the USSR Fell While China Prospers

Published 28 September 2019

After Stalin's death, the USSR allowed revisionists to seep into its party. They were *the first* communist party to successfully overthrow a capitalist government. How could they structure a political party that gave prominence to revisionist policies and move away from Stalinism?

[When explaining the four cardinal principle of Socialism with Chinese Characteristics \(SWCC\), Mr. You described the massive amount of resources China dedicated to learn why the Soviet Union fell. The overwhelming conclusion these experts came to was because of the de-Stalinization of the Soviet Union.](#)

But how can a political structure allow such revisionism to take hold? The focus of this question is not aimed at the correct problem of ideological compromise. A breakdown of ideology is not halted or obstructed by political bodies, but rather through ideological party discipline.

[Mao Tse-Tung brilliantly illustrated this danger:](#)

After the October Revolution, Lenin pointed out a number of times that:

a) The overthrown exploiters always try in a thousand and one ways to recover the "paradise" they have been deprived of.

b) New elements of capitalism are constantly and spontaneously generated in the petty-bourgeois atmosphere.

c) Political degenerates and new bourgeois elements may emerge in the ranks of the working class and among government functionaries as a result of bourgeois influence and the pervasive, corrupting influence of the petty bourgeoisie.

d) The external conditions for the continuance of class struggle within a socialist society are encirclement by international capitalism, the imperialists' threat of armed intervention and their subversive activities to accomplish peaceful disintegration.

The constant threat of bourgeois elements does not end at a victorious revolution. It is ongoing, evolving, and malleable. Despite the critiques against Deng, his economic reforms not only led to the prosperous China we know today, but SAVED the CPC from corruption. The Four Cardinal Principles were created by Deng and are the four issues for which debate was not allowed within China:

1. The principle of upholding the socialist path
2. The principle of upholding the people's democratic dictatorship
3. The principle of upholding the leadership of the Communist Party of China (CPC)
4. The principle of upholding Mao Zedong Thought and Marxism–Leninism

To my knowledge, the USSR never had such ideological commitment. Although this is Socialism with Chinese Characteristics, I can never imagine evolving capitalism to socialism to communism without a party even having these already imbedded in their political structures and party ideology.

But we can see what happens when a party lacks ideological discipline:

In announcing the abolition of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union, the revisionist Khrushchov clique base themselves mainly on the argument that antagonistic classes have been eliminated and that class struggle no longer exists...

Ever since Khrushchov seized the leadership of the Soviet Party and state, he has pushed through a whole series of revisionist policies which have greatly hastened the growth of the forces of capitalism and again sharpened the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and the struggle between the roads of socialism and capitalism in the Soviet Union.

The USSR was the target of some of the most horrendous espionage and guerrilla tactics from the West. At the time Yeltsin got elected, it was basically a CIA-ran election.

In short, we must remember that socialism is a transition. Proper focus and discipline cannot falter while bourgeois elements fester in new forms. The beauty of Marxism and what SWCC has shown is that our ideology is just as adaptable to survive and thrive so long as we remain committed to that road.

I Empathize With Maoists, But Leninism Can Work For People of Color | A ML Critique on Maoist Vanguardism and Lumpen Theory

Published 20 October 2019

Preface

Before we begin, [I highly recommend watching the Black Internationalist's video on First World Lumpen](#). It is a great introduction that gets into the meat of Maoist theory on the Lumpen and vanguard, with some great analysis (although there are some parts and analysis I disagree with throughout (thus me writing this essay)). As a Latinx-American comrade who grew up on the streets of America, I empathize with Maoists like the Black Internationalist (TBI) or Black Red Guard (BRG). The perception of our races, class, identities, and communities are so misunderstood, even by some of the most elite leftists. Maoist analysis on our classes hit some great points, as we may well be the best potential for revolutionary activities. This is not to merge racial struggle and strife between Latinos and Blacks in the first world; our struggles are unique. But they are under the same white capitalist boot that we are so desperately trying to overthrow. Be that as it may, I still believe Marxist-Leninism is the best philosophy and theory to abide by, especially when understanding vanguardism and the lumpen proletariat.

Maoism, Vanguardism, and the Lumpenproletariat

For anyone wanting a more thorough introduction on Maoism, [I suggest watching this quick video not only explaining MLM, but also how it relates to Socialism, Marxism, and Leninism](#). There are several aspects to Maoism, including 5-6 elements that can somewhat reflect Leninist approaches towards revolution (Unity and Struggles of Opposites, New Democracy, Mass Line, Cultural

Revolution, Protracted People's War, and (possibly) Third Worldism). I have a lot to disagree with Maoists when it comes to China, the USSR, "social imperialism", etc. But for now, I want to focus on their theory on the vanguard and lumpen class.

As Leninists, we all know the importance of having a vanguard party to lead the revolution to its fullest potential. They are the tip of the spear that makes the penetration, while the real damage is made by the butt of the spear; the people. Without either, there will be no penetration or lasting damage to overthrow capitalism. However, cultivating the vanguard is where MLs and MLMs split.

Mao was highly critical of the vanguard being made up of the peasantry, especially in China. Mao thought true revolutionary potential was within the peasantry, which made up a large segment of the masses within a fragmented China. Applying this to China was, obviously, the right thing to do.

In particular, Mao included his focus on the lumpen class; the lowest class where drug addicts, dealers, pimps, unemployed, homeless, destitute, gang members/leaders, and other "degenerates" lingered. This is where my sympathies rise because some Leninists cast several of these individuals as "illegal capitalists" who are just as exploitative as the bourgeoisie and completely disregard them. I, however, do not have such inclinations, especially coming from such a background.

Leninist should and do embrace the Lumpen class

I know all too well how black and brown people struggle to find the food, clothing, shelter, and basic necessities to survive. This is a materialist struggle that forces people into desperate positions, where the only way out is through participating in illegal exploitation. Capitalist society places us into these positions because of who we are as people, where we were born, and so forth. Even the most successful kingpins cannot be haphazardly equated to Amazon CEO Jeff Bezos, as they built their systematic exploitation from survival, rather than opportunity or profit. The more successful they were with their ruthless exploitation of the people, the more that behavior was reinforced from their wealth and success. But all of this was due to their environmental beginnings within a society that has left them no other option. Illegal capitalists do corrupt society and rather keep it that way for their own benefit, but it was because of the survivalist aspect of their class that produced them in such a way. Compared to the actual Bourgeoisie who were not forced to think about such mechanisms to exploit their wealth, they had much better ethics to build on, rather than the successful illegal capitalist. They are truly malicious because they at least had better opportunities to learn about the superstructure of capitalism to break away. Moreover, the benefit of a capitalist government from illegal capitalists having full reign is a win-win for them. It's not something that

illegal capitalists have to lobby for, so to speak. They want illegal capitalists to flourish so that they have slave labor in prisons, while preserving the white capitalist supremacy over them.

There are some that attempt to quote Marx's disdain for the lumpen class, but this I chalk up to misunderstanding and distance rather than malicious outcasting. [I think TBI explained both Marx's quotes and the Leninist Lumpen class perspective here.](#) It's because of this I cannot place even the most successful illegal capitalist of the lumpen class with the Bourgeoisie. Environment and ethics play too much of a materialist role in a capitalist society to make them vastly different. This is not to say they are not guilty of anything, but this must be seen critically as more of a production of racist capitalism rather than exploitative ignorance.

A majority of MLs do not disregard this class, however. Nor they should not. [I disagree with MLs attempting to "scrap the concept of the 'lumpen-proletariat' as a meaningless if not value-laden term."](#) Although, I highly agree with this multifaceted approach to create a vanguard made up of all sects of the proletariat (which I will discuss more below), I don't think dismissing the lumpen and separately categorizing them into different classes is helpful, as those addicts, homeless, and black/brown do not fit as "criminalized", "indigenous", or "reserved labor." My experiences and understanding of Leninism states that the lumpen are just as important as the other sectors of the proletariat that must be included in the vanguard, especially considering their exploitative status under capitalism. They do have a lot of potential for revolution, but cannot be the main focus of such efforts (as Maoists attempt to advocate for), as I will explain why ends only in failure.

I am highly in favor of MLs embracing the term, using it *in conjunction with* their efforts in establishing a vanguard of the proletariat, instead of attempting to divert all their effort into developing a vanguard made up only of this class (as Maoists do).

Realism and the myth of ML elitism

BRG shared a great tale about Mao's approach towards Marxist elites. There were a group of Chinese students who studied under the Bolsheviks during and after their revolution, and thought they were the key leaders of the vanguard party. Mao simply told them to try to implement their leadership by telling the history of the Soviet Union to the Chinese peasants to see if they cared.

I think MLs also know the absurdity of this request as well, though. Seeing how ML leadership is made up today, to call these groups "elitist" and not "down to earth" is a myth, as more and more comrades of color are joining the ranks to become part of such ML leadership. In turn, there are large campaigns to help the lumpen classes and assisting them with their everyday struggles to

provide and sustain themselves, while assisting those who are willing to learn more theory to become leaders in their communities to fight to end these struggles as well. A large number of party leaders do come from a multitude of sectors of the proletariat, including the lumpen class. Even reflecting on Xi Jinping's upbringing and how he became president reflects the more merit based system, yet non-discriminatory practice of allowing leaders to come from any sect of proletariat society. I think the film, *Ratatouille*, said it best at the ending: "Not everyone can be a great artist, but a great artist can come from anywhere." Here, we are not forcing everyone to become part of the vanguard, but we know that the vanguard party must and does come from all sectors of proletariat society, and not just the super exploited.

My Struggles of Applying Marxist/Class Analysis

Again, as my experience as a minority living in the belly of the dragon, I cannot reduce every analysis to class. I continue to struggle with racial and identity struggle, and how that may apply to Marxist analysis. For instance, the firebombing of an extremely wealthy black neighborhood in the 1920s by rioting whites. Although wealthy black capitalists should have enjoyed the same status as any other bourgeois class, they did not because of a White/Western imperialist complex that felt threatened of losing power to the point of stomping out their community. Although an ML could argue that they were taking away more materialist resources from their own white communities, there is an obvious supremacy complex that is not answered here.

But I can't say Leninism completely shuts down anything outside class analysis either. Class reductionism is frowned upon by most MLs as it does not critically analyze the proletariat. There are obvious cultural mechanisms; racial, gender, orientation oppression where I found Leninism embraces rather than cast out. Even within the article that disregards the lumpenproletariat, I do support the idea of including indigenous thought and engagements when bringing them into the vanguard parties. I continue to find comfort in their combination of class and critical theory on such oppression and struggle of individual identity, without falling into liberal lines "to promote diversity" for the sake of it.

Emphasis on the Chinese Revolution, but not Cuba, Vietnam, Laos, Nicaragua, Burkina Faso, Etc.

I find this tendency from Maoists to gloss over or cast these revolutions and socialistic developments within these countries in a negative light deeply uncritical and frustrating. If we as Marxists take a scientific approach towards it, it is not "revisionism" to explain how the successes, developments, or even failures of these revolutions outside China were still major achievements for

the people. Maoists that say Mao was the first non-white revolutionary seem to belittle the other revolutionaries that followed Leninism like Castro, Sankara, Minh, Un, and Ortega (and many others). Their revolutions produced a variety of achievements and progress for their people I highly doubt any of their people would attempt to reverse.

Revolution is Multifaceted

Maoists' overt focus on revolutionizing today's "peasantry" and lumpen is well-intended and logical. However, it cannot be the only push for revolution, where the vanguard ought to include a more multifaceted approach towards including the proletariat. One of the things I did like about the Canadian article (mentioned above and [here](#)) is its classification and distinctions on how to approach the multiple levels of the working class, and how to engage with them, rather than an over-time strategy of including them in the fold once the revolution has begun. This is a reflection of attempting to have a vanguard made up of the proletariat, rather than just the exploited class.

As a Latinx ML, I know all too well what would happen if black and brown people all of the sudden started a movement to overthrow capitalism (violent or not), as BRG is advocating for. We cannot be the only ones doing this, although we do have the most revolutionary potential in the Western world due to our over-exploited status both economically (workers, cheap labor, etc.) and socially (scapegoatism, negative stereotypes, etc.). I could not think of a better example of this, than the Black Panther Party.

Lessons from the Rise and Fall of the Black Panther Party (BPP)

BPP was a Marxist-Leninist organization who successfully organized the black lumpen and proletariat into a radical revolutionary group. They not only espoused Marxism, internationalism (visiting China, Korea, Cuba, etc.), and militarism, but also community. They were the most effective organization helping their own people and communities with free children breakfast programs; sickle cell testing (tested over 500,000 before the government realized that sickle cell was a plague on the black community and reacted); shoe/backpack giveaways; job training; free transpiration and ambulance services. They were truly an organization that mobilized the people (at least the people of the Black community). I highly recommend watching Spike Lee's "A Huey P. Newton Story", for a great introduction to the BPP and all their achievements.

However, their decline and dissolution due to capitalist infiltration and attacks was a gigantic lesson, and why I still remain to be an ML. Slowly, but surely the BPP fell into decay despite their massive potential of organizing an effective movement for their communities that threatened the

capitalist superstructure. However, in analyzing their decline, I can only imagine their success if Latin laborers, blue-collar unions, and other super exploited proletariats joined their causes and they marched as one, yet respected their groups' aspects (a coalition of proletariat of sort into a strong vanguard). Capitalists are just as multifaceted as we are, and can study each group as a separate entity to infiltrate and destroy. But if the BPP had done more to instill their teachings and successes within their own community to other community leaders of the proletariat, they most likely would have gained several support systems, defense measures, and political successes. The vanguard cannot stay insulated to one class, no matter how successful they are mobilizing that class. This may be a working theory, but I have a strong inclination that the sabotages of the US government within and around the BPP would have not been as effective if they had more support systems.

ML is the most effective and adaptable approach towards revolution

To say that ML's application of Mao Tse Tung thought is "nonsense" is belittling the strives and adaptability of Leninism to revolution (to quote BGR). To say that there are no socialist states in the eyes of a Maoist when the unbelievable accomplishments of countries that continue their pathway towards socialism is "revisionist f*olishness" is throwing away China's lifting of 800 million from poverty, or Cuba's countless medical/scientific achievements for the people with a trillion dollar embargo impressed upon them. Leninism has encapsulated these ongoing pathways and successes not as a one-size-fits-all, but a continuous progress that has ultimately overthrew the capitalist classes and continues its struggles against imperialism. Through a solid vanguard made up of all sectors of the proletariat; mobilizing the state to defend against revisionist, opportunists, infiltrators, and elements of capital; and structuring government around the dictatorship of the proletariat, Leninism has been the most successful revolutionary theory of our time. Although we continue to struggle to discover how this can be implemented in the West, we can continue to study and progress our comrades to embrace such goals.

I had a discussion with many comrades here, including u/ parentis_shotgun, where we came to this analysis on the development in the West: "I do agree that the acceleration of late state capitalism where the lumpen and poor classes are getting bigger are putting more traction to our movement. But this places a bigger importance on a multifaceted vanguard, rather than a vanguard made up of only the most exploited.

I will be more than willing to openly discuss these concepts with anyone, especially my class analysis struggles with race and white supremacy. I would also be up to discuss/debate BRG or

other Maoists about this as well. I hope I am hitting some nails on the head here, but feel free to tell me if I am way off base or need to look into something further.

Burkina Faso, Thomas Sankara, and The Importance of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

Published 28 October 2019

In the liberal portrayal of Thomas Sankara in Ernest Harsch's "Thomas Sankara An African Revolutionary", Sankara rose through the ranks of the Upper Volta military due to his commitment, experiences, and accomplishments abroad, as the military began to have more radical leftist leanings. Sankara took higher and higher political and governmental positions, as he became a more principled marxist, learning from trade unions, professors, and students, while teaching his more junior officers socialistic tenants as well. Burkina Faso was in the mists of protests and rallies, as the military mobilized itself again and again to control the situation. However, Sankara and his colleagues new that a more revolutionary government was needed to make the necessary shift the people demanded. After capturing the lasts of the governmental officers, a semi-bloodless coup took place on August 4 1983:

By 10:00pm on August 4, Sankara was on the radio to announce the overthrow of the government and the start of a new revolutionary process. In a declaration broadcast several times during the night in French, Moore, and Gourounsi, he proclaimed the creation of the National Council of the Revolution and called on citizens throughout the country to form popular committees to safeguard it. The new government's main goal, he said, was to defend the people's interests and to help them achieve their "profound aspirations for liberty, true independence, and economic and social progress."

Now, despite these details, I call Harsch's book liberal because he portrayed Sankara as someone who shied away from "labels" of socialism and communism (even [others](#) dislike the telling of his

assassination as mere political differences rather than an international plot by the CIA). Yet, even Harsch admitted:

“Throughout Sankara’s October 1983 address and in other speeches, the influence of Marxist ideas was evident. Sankara readily acknowledged his appreciation of the Russian, Chinese, and Cuban revolutions. During visits to his office it was easy to spot volumes by Marx and Engels on his bookshelves and a bust of Lenin on his desk.”

We can also see throughout Sankara's political career use and apply socialistic/communistic tenants within his speeches and his policies for the people. It is plainly obvious that the mobilization of the state, centralization of resources/power, party vanguard, and policies for the people. Many call Sankara a Marxist-Leninist and Pan-Africanist. However, there was one element that left Burkina Faso's revolution vulnerable: Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

Sankara's Vanguard

I want to touch on the vanguard element since it is pretty unorthodox on how this was created compared to other revolutions. One could argue that Sankara secured the vanguard through the more radical officers and organizational ranks of the military. This is a highly unusual way of categorizing a vanguard, but it was quite successful in leading the revolution. Most of those officers who led the coup that placed Sankara in power were, in fact, leaders of the CNR. In particular, Jean-Baptiste Boukary Lingani, participated in many communistic activities, even forming a secret left-wing organization within the lower officers when he was in the military, and being arrested alongside Sankara right before he announced his presidency. And once Sankara became president, Lingani became Minister for Popular Defense, Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces in Sankara's cabinet, and part of the CNR (along with many other revolutionary officers who assisted Sankara). He was one of many officers who became professional revolutionaries *within the military, which sustain their livelihoods so they would not succumb to capitalist conditions*. It was seemingly contradictory on how the military of a neo-colonial government could radicalize itself to lead a ML revolution. But thanks to the lack of oversight, infrastructure, and attention Upper Volta was obtaining during this time, Marxism was able to seep into the officers to overthrow the government, and place Sankara.

The CNR successfully rallied most of the people to promote Sankara's policies, along with promoting Sankara propaganda to curb any other dissent. This success drastically increased progressive policies like deforestation, women's rights, stopping government corruption, medical

access (like vaccinating 2.5 million children in two weeks), literacy campaigns, educational reform, transit projects, land redistribution, and, of course, breaking the neo-colonialist chains against imperialist powers.

The Failure of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat

The CNR was a successful political party structure that internally processes all policies, sometimes even overturning Sankara. However, the CNR was not the only party in political power, and the lack of the consolidation of power may have been their downfall.

Sankara spoke and acted in the name of two institutions: the government and the CNR. The government acted as an executive branch, while the CNR acted as the DotP. The government allowed other leftist parties to participate in positions and implementation programs.

Before diving into the specific politics a bit more, I wanted to provide a solid definition of the DotP:

The term "dictatorship" indicates the retention of the state apparatus, but differs from individual dictatorship, the rule of one man. The term dictatorship of the proletariat implies the complete "socialization of the major means of production", the planning of material production in service to the social and economic needs of the population, such as the right to work, education, health and welfare services, public housing... Marxism–Leninism follows the ideas of Marxism and Leninism as interpreted by Vladimir Lenin's successor Joseph Stalin. It seeks to organise a vanguard party, as advocated by Marx, and to lead a proletarian uprising, to assume state power on behalf of the proletariat and to construct a single-party "socialist state" representing a dictatorship of the proletariat, governed through the process of democratic centralism, which Lenin described as "diversity in discussion, unity in action".

The CNR was lacking this. Government and party are one institution under a single party. When Sankara rose to power, his allies came from two civilian organizations that consisted of students and academics (League for Patriotic Development or Lipad) and the trade unions (Union of Communist Struggle-Reconstructed or ULCR). Political parties at this time, including both of these parties, were expelled later, but arose in different parties under different names (ULC, UCB, GCB, etc.), as many trade unions and academics fought harder against the CNR. It was not until 1986 when the CNR decided to merge all parties into one unified party, but the sectarianism and ideological differences (including Compaore) did not make this happen. Along with neo-colonial powers plotting against Sankara, their vulnerability could not sustain his downfall.

Sankara had not only been overthrown, but also killed. The radio broadcast very little hard information- not even an official announcement of Sankara's death. It reported only that the CNR, government, and a few other institutions had been dissolved and replaced by a mysterious "Popular Front" headed by a new president "Captian Blaise Compaore... Sankara was vilified as a "traitor" to the revolution, a "petty-bourgeois" who "consorted with bourgeois potentates"... even a "paranoiac misogynist."

Sankara and 12 other comrades were slain and buried unceremoniously. The ineffectiveness of the DotP failed to protect the revolution because of multiple infightings among leftists.

However, Sankara's revolution lives on in the hearts and minds of the country people in "the Upright." May his vision of a prosperous Burkina Faso arise once again within this new generation.

Chinese "Imperialism"

Published 2 November 2019

As a Latin comrade, I am so freaking sick of leftists accusing the Chinese government of "imperialism." My countries suffered tremendously messed up imperialist neo-colonial cruelty and leftist feel it is quite adequate to categorize China like that??

Tell me:

- What Chinese companies mandated their government to assassinate their president or candidates?
- What country did the Chinese army invade to extract their natural resources?
- What Chinese company toppled government after government that were not aligned with their interest?
- Which election did the Chinese government manipulate to put their people in power?
- How many death squads or paramilitary armies did the CPC sponsor?

Response 1: But comrade, they are in Africa investing in some companies with bad labor practices, and they are extracting their natural resources!

I know. There are many things China can improve with their foreign investment plans, but is this imperialism? Is this the murderous conquistadors or CEOs that topple a people to extract and exploit for the sake of profit? Or are they treating them as equal trading partners, but not yet directing them to having better labor standards for their workers in their own countries?

Again, I recognize there are issues with more indigenous populations, and this is not to make light of their plight. I do think China, with their economic pull, can make significant changes and demands before investing to change such treatment. But this isn't chopping off hands with machetes or killing families of workers/activists type oppression that Western multinationals funded, supported, or actually did. Imperialism is some serious crimes of humanity that should not be haphazardly thrown around without critical analysis.

Response 2: But comrade, they are investing in Africa's infrastructure and giving them loans so they are always beholden to them.

Again, this is not imperialism like the West did. [During the banana republic era, American businesses took over to develop the infrastructure of entire countries, but they were only build to surround their business, not to benefit the people.](#) I highly recommend watching the entire video to see the oppressive violence that these companies that are still in business did and are still doing.

China is actually given money and investments to the governments of these countries to invest them back to the people, not Chinese CEOs. In fact, [specifically on their "loans", most of them given to African government have been forgiven, to a point where Westerns are saying they should have "lender's remorse" for trying to give them so much money.](#)

From [u/Gang__](#):

Those damn Commie neo-colonists are back at it again. Not only have they have tried to debt trap poor African countries, but the Chinese have...FORGIVEN their loans. Clearly, this is a highly highly highly highly advanced neo-neo-neo colonist move, there's no name for it, but I'm sure the Western press will come up with a catchy one soon enough.

Without disclosing the amount, in April Beijing wrote off the interest-free loans Ethiopia owed China at the end of 2018.

Ethiopia has borrowed more than US\$13.7 billion from China between 2000 and 2017, according to the China Africa Research Initiative at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies.

Ethiopia, China's second-largest African borrower after Angola, also received relief when Beijing extended the repayment period from 10 years to 30 years for a US\$3.3 billion loan it had taken on to build its Addis-Djibouti railway line.

4 other African countries

This year, China cancelled Cameroon's US\$78 million debt. Last year, it wrote off Botswana's US\$7.2 million debt and US\$10.6 million that Lesotho owed. In 2017, it cancelled US\$160 million of debts owed by Sudan.

China's efforts in Congo helped unlock \$400million + of IMF funding

And the recent deal to restructure debt owed by the Republic of Congo helped unlock US\$449 million from the International Monetary Fund (IMF). The central African nation's troubles can be traced to mid-2014 when, because of global oversupply, crude oil prices fell from a high of US\$100 per barrel to as low as US\$30. Oil sales account for more than 70 per cent of the government's revenues.

Chinese international cooperation with African countries and international institutions - IMF

However, debt levels soared to 118 per cent of Congo's annual economic output by 2017. With a deep hole in the country's finances, it was China that stepped in to help. China holds more than a third or US\$2.5 billion of the Congolese debt, which stands at about US\$9 billion. Since 2017, the Republic of Congo has been trying to get financing from the IMF to revive its economy. The IMF demanded that the country restructure its Chinese debt as a precondition for a three-year extended credit facility programme. China's decision to restructure the debt is in response to the IMF demand.

Zambia, Angola, Mozambique and Djibouti are said to be currently engaged in similar negotiations with China.

This article is worth a read. Please tell me [what does the IMF and other Western institutions do? Oh yeah....](#).

Other leftists really need to understand that imperialism is a very serious charge to levy against another country, especially one that is not Western. It's goddamn offensive when I see this accusation leveled [to the point where people are saying China's "imperialism" is "a thousand times worse" than US or any other Western country.](#)

China After 2050. Be Patient!

Published 31 December 2019

I was deeply disturbed about [the first answer to this question regarding doubts about the CPC and the "future" of Socialism with Chinese Characteristics \(SWCC\)](#). I think it places too much emphasis on what socialism ought to be, and not enough on the accomplishments it has already done for China.

What cemented Xi Jinping's legacy with Mao and Deng is his 37-year-plan on how to modernize China's planned market economies and transition to a modern socialist society. Xi Jinping has set two goals called the "Two Centenaries." In it is preparing the following:

1.) 2020-2035: Socialist modernization. Creating larger and sustainable capital to support socialist initiatives of the people.

Xi described the period from 2020 through 2035 as a phase for the nation to realize modernized socialism and a time to expand the middle-class and narrow the wealth gap to create a more harmonious society.

2.) 2035-2049: Transition to a modern socialist country.

The period from 2035 to mid-century, on the other hand, will be spent building a great world power based on a fully modernized socialist society. He said Chinese citizens would live in a moderately prosperous society, while the nation itself moves toward a focal position in the world.

<https://asia.nikkei.com/Economy/China-s-Xi-outlines-vision-of-great-modern-socialist-country>

Now, [these two goals are indeed crafting several five-year plans for the economy, investing heavily in tech, development, infrastructure, and other booming areas of the economy.](#)

For leftist to say,

"There is currently no plan to return to a centrally planned economy or to eliminate exploitation,"

is absolutely missing the progress already being made in these fronts and mischaracterizing China's communist future. Beyond the logical fact that there is already a plan that will take 37 years to make, we cannot expect China to talk about 2049 and beyond until they are ready to tackle the issues of 2012-2049. I believe this was a major problem with other socialist nations in the past. They rush too far into the future, rather than focusing on issues of the now. [The USSR stated they can ABOLISH the dictatorship of the Proletariat after Stalin died was the beginning of the end for the Soviet Union.](#)

China signals it has no plans to give up its government-led economic model or weaken the role of its state-owned enterprises, a change the United States has stipulated as one of its key demands in the ongoing trade war - "Beijing [plans] to make the state economy stronger, better and bigger": https://www.scmp.com/economy/china-economy/article/3038993/china-wont-give-its-state-led-economic-model-top-trade?fbclid=IwAR2ys8_Y_6Nxq2x_BM4SoKdR63it7X_JRy1XJdkLw4QrK0VQ77mXYrcks

To say that China will not be on the socialistic pathway because there is no plan beyond 2050, is not looking on what has happened and what is going to happen between now and 2049:

In his speech, Xi said that socialist modernization will have been basically realized by 2035.

If this goal is reached, the CPC would turn socialist China into one of the world's richest and most powerful countries on earth -- the first time a Marxist party has achieved such a feat.

Karl Marx, the 19th century German philosopher, believed socialism would create a better future beyond capitalism. More than a century after his death, the CPC is applying his theories in practice, albeit with Chinese characteristics, and leading the country from poverty to prosperity.

"When China enters the front ranks of nations, we shall not only have blazed a new path for the peoples of the third world but also -- and this is more important -- we shall have demonstrated to mankind that socialism is the only path that is superior to capitalism."

The illusion that socialism is over is now dead in the water.

http://www.xinhuanet.com/english/2017-10/18/c_136689652.htm

But what about the billionaires and the workers?

Open markets breed contradictions, there is no doubt about this. However, the CPC has done an excellent job both in their ideological discipline and structure to ensure progress for the people, over capital. Many are still equating Western billionaires are the same and non-Western. Billionaires in China are highly monitored and regulated, and workers have been reaping the rewards from a communist government as well. [Eric Li, academic in China, has stated that under their centralized one-party state, the billionaires can NEVER rise above the politburo. But in capitalism, they do it all the time.](#)

Here are some more resources about the worker situation as well.

- [The west views China as one big sweatshop, but the actual working hours aren't much more than anywhere else. The average for a migrant worker \(most vulnerable to exploitation as they are traveling from the countryside\) is 8.8 hours, little under an hour more than a typical working day. Labor strikes are rarely suppressed, there are many examples of workers on strike getting the support of the PRC. The Chinese state rules in favor of the workers](#)
- [Why do Chinese billionaires keep ending up in prison?](#)
- [Wages themselves are also forced to rise in the private sector by the CPC \(+16% every years, +400% since 1980\) who force the capitalists to accept the presence of CPC chapters who represent the interest of the workers, increasing workers control even in the capitalist parts of the economy.](#)
- [The workplace safety standards of China are better than in the capitalist countries of the West like in Australia who have an higher rate of work related death despite having a GDP per capita 3-5 times higher.](#)
- [More debunking China's Western narrative sources here](#)

So for those leftists who want an answer on how China may look like in 2050: BE PATIENT. China is becoming the largest superpower under SWCC, and will continue its commitment to communism. As President Xi Jinping once said:

[The capitalist road was tried and found wanting. Reformism, liberalism, social Darwinism, anarchism, pragmatism, populism, syndicalism—they all were given their moment on the stage. They all failed to solve the problems of China's future destiny. It is Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought that guided the Chinese people out of the darkness of that long night and established a New China; it is through socialism with Chinese characteristics that China has developed so quickly."](#)

The Stage is Set for Inevitable Western Decay: An Interpretation of the US-Iranian Crisis

Published 9 January 2020

I think everyone is breathing a bit easier now that both countries have agreed to end military aggression towards each other (for now). Iran lost an incredibly influential military leader who has helped military tribes/orgs to protect Iranian borders, stop ISIS and offered strategic military aid to both Syria and Palestine.

Iran retaliated by bombing a US base in Iraq. [Minimal damage was reported and, imo vastly under proportionate to losing such an influential military general.](#) I think the world is breathing a bit easier now that military actions have de-escalated, and the focus will be more on punishing the Western economy.

To be honest, I am a bit upset that people's emotions are toyed in such a way to preserve peace. It truly feels like a "wag the dog" scenario where one country has to save face, while another plays along for the phony sake of peace, while everyone is talking about WWII, drafts, and nuclear disasters. However, analyzing all these outcomes, I can say that this has set the international military decline of the West for the following reasons:

1. Iraq has ordered the pullout of all Western forces from Iraq. European military units have already withdrawn, while US troops are now on edge in an unwelcomed occupied territory (but what else is new)
2. Both Russia and China has pledged support to Iran, with China offering to sell more military equipment to Iran for their defenses.
3. Iranian protests against the government have come to a screeching halt because of the assassination of Solemani. The Iranians are more unified than ever to fight against the West.

4. And lastly, but certainly not least, there is absolutely no way nuclear disarmament will happen now. Rouhani has unrestricted uranium enrichment limits and may be well on its way in building nuclear weaponry *for its own defenses*. No amount of diplomacy will now convince the Iranian people that they do not need nukes.

The world is now set for the West's decline. This is the first time in a long time a sovereign country bombed a US base, basically as a free B. Non-Western countries are rallying against Western influences in their regions, as they are mobilizing for harsher responses from a desperate declining power.

Although things may calm down, for now, things are far from over. The next move by the US military may not have such a pretty response. And, unfortunately, it will be the people that may pay the consequences.

Understanding State Capitalism and its Foundations for Socialism with Chinese Characteristics

Published 14 January 2020

I am currently working on a piece to lay out Socialism with Chinese Characteristics ("SWCC") in a straightforward manner for everyone to understand. The purpose of this piece is to demonstrate the Marxist commitment the CCP has demonstrated over its decades, and how Socialism with Chinese Characteristics is not only a legitimate ideology, but reveals an extremely important pathway towards obtaining socialism and, ultimately, communism.

However, I realized the immensity of this feat. Several academic sources from all spectrums of the left makes this an extremely complicated and complex subject to understand. However, those scholars and leaders committed to explaining SWCC are not doing it to justifying it through mental gymnastics through convoluted revisionism. There is a masterful logic of Marxism and Leninism that I am appreciating, thanks to reading and understandings these works.

The keywords I am finding when trying to understand SWCC are "state capitalism", "transition", and "New Economic Policy (NEP)." Luckily, there is one significant pamphlet authored by our favorite Marxist (besides Marx, but even he said he's not a Marxist, lol) that explains this all: Lenin.

1.) Demystifying the Phrase "State Capitalism"

Before I get into the text, there are some misleading inclinations from the left when it comes to the term "state capitalism." Lenin took an incredible amount of time in explaining state capitalism because of the left opposition that were taken aback by this position (as he stated "I can imagine with what noble indignation some people will recoil from these words. . . . What! The transition to state capitalism in the Soviet Socialist Republic would be a step forward? . . . Isn't this the betrayal

of socialism?”). This careful and detailed development caused so much turmoil and confusion in understanding the importance of this transitional phase.

“But it’s authoritarian capitalism! It’s crony capitalism! Government controlling capitalism for itself!”

Some leftists (especially in the West) use it as a negative definition where the state/government uses mechanisms of capital to control the means of production for its own benefit, and the benefit of capitalists, rather than the workers. Lenin agrees! However, Lenin makes the distinction between state capitalism where the government is controlled by the bourgeois, and when workers hold state power:

State capitalism, which is one of the principal aspects of the New Economic Policy, is, under Soviet power, a form of capitalism that is deliberately permitted and restricted by the working class. Our state capitalism differs essentially from the state capitalism in countries that have bourgeois governments in that the state with us is represented not by the bourgeoisie, but by the proletariat, who has succeeded in winning the full confidence of the peasantry.

Unfortunately, the introduction of state capitalism with us is not proceeding as quickly as we would like it.

[Lenin, To the Russian Colony in North America, 1921](#)

2.) Understanding “Transition”

The previous statement from Lenin (“Unfortunately, the introduction of state capitalism with us is not proceeding as quickly as we would like it”) PERFECTLY emphasizes the importance of transition between capitalism and socialism through state capitalism. This section will show not only the importance of state capitalism, but why it is needed. Although there may be lots of copy and paste from the text, it is critical in understanding the importance of state capitalism as a critical stage to obtain socialism.

Firstly, we must examine the nature of the transition from capitalism to socialism that gives us the right and the grounds to call our country a Socialist Republic of Soviets...

But what does the word “transition” mean? Does it not mean, as applied to an economy, that the present system contains elements, particles, fragments of both capitalism and socialism?

Everyone will admit that it does. But not all who admit this take the trouble to consider what

elements actually constitute the various socio-economic structures that exist in Russia at the present time. And this is the crux of the question.

Let us enumerate these elements:

- (1)patriarchal, i.e., to a considerable extent natural, peasant farming;
- (2)small commodity production (this includes the majority of those peasants who sell their grain);
- (3)private capitalism;
- (4)state capitalism;
- (5)socialism.

This is absolutely critical in understanding transition from capitalism to socialism. There are several socio-economic elements within a society that exist even after revolution, and it is necessary to understand all of their interactions in order to fully transition a state into socialism:

Between what elements is this struggle being waged if we are to speak in terms of economic categories such as “state capitalism”? Between the fourth and fifth in the order in which I have just enumerated them? Of course not. It is not state capitalism that is at war with socialism, but the petty bourgeoisie plus private capitalism fighting together against state capitalism and socialism.

The petty bourgeoisie oppose every kind of state interference, accounting and control, whether it be state-capitalist or state-socialist. This is an unquestionable fact of reality whose misunderstanding lies at the root of many economic mistakes.

Capitalists HATE interference. This is why many may find “state capitalism” to be an oxymoron. Capitalists do not want any restrictions or control from higher powers, especially when the government is run by workers. Capitalists want unlimited exploitation to reap the rewards, wealth, and resources for themselves to either reinvest or enjoy. State interference obstructs capitalists from enjoying their exploitation. Lenin emphasizes this more by saying:

The petty bourgeois who hoards his thousands is an enemy of state capitalism. He wants to employ these thousands just for himself, against the poor, in opposition to any kind of state

control. And the sum total of these thousands, amounting to many thousands of millions, forms the base for profiteering, which undermines our socialist construction.

Lenin illustrates the link between this state capitalism and socialism transition:

This simple illustration in figures, which I have deliberately simplified to the utmost in order to make it absolutely clear, explains the present correlation of state capitalism and socialism. The workers hold state power and have every legal opportunity of “taking” the whole thousand, without giving up a single [penny], except for socialist purposes. This legal opportunity, which rests upon the actual transition of power to the workers, is an element of socialism. But in many ways, the small-proprietary and private-capitalist element undermines this legal position, drags in profiteering and hinders the execution of Soviet decrees. State capitalism would be a gigantic step forward even if we paid more than we are paying at present, because it is worth paying for “tuition”, because it is useful for the workers, because victory over disorder, economic ruin and laxity is the most important thing, because the continuation of the anarchy of small ownership is the greatest, the most serious danger, and it will certainly be our ruin (unless we overcome it), whereas not only will the payment of a heavier tribute to state capitalism not ruin us, it will lead us to socialism by the surest road. When the working class has learned how to defend the state system against the anarchy of small ownership, when it has learned to organise large-scale production on a national scale along state-capitalist lines, it will hold, if I may use the expression, all the trump cards, and the consolidation of socialism will be assured.

In the first place economically state capitalism is immeasurably superior to our present [fragmented] economic system.

Lenin touches on the need to pay “tribute, tuition, payment” (aka taxes) to state capitalism, as it would go to the workers and, ultimately, socialism. But this paragraph emphasizes the transitional need that state capitalism provides between capitalism immediately after revolution, and all its fragmented elements, into socialism.

3.) What is the purpose of “state capitalism?”

To develop productive forces. Again, pointing towards the fragmented socio-economic elements, and after devastating wars, including imperialist infiltrators and counter revolutionaries attempting to take the power back from the communists, the Russian economy desperately needed to jump start its production on a massive national scale. It was not getting done by worker co-ops, anarchist

communities, or profiteers exploiting the system. A mass governmental mobilization, controlled by the workers, was needed to keep production from failing. And the best part is, is that the capitalist actually helps to build towards socialism because of their very hunger for profit!

The concessionaire is a capitalist. He conducts his business on capitalist lines, for profit, and is willing to enter into an agreement with the proletarian government in order to obtain superprofits or raw materials which he cannot otherwise obtain, or can obtain only with great difficulty. Soviet power gains by the development of the productive forces, and by securing an increased quantity of goods immediately, or within a very short period. We have, say, a hundred oilfields, mines and forest tracts. We cannot develop all of them for we lack the machines, the food and the transport. This is also why we are doing next to nothing to develop the other territories. Owing to the insufficient development of the large enterprises the small-proprietor element is more pronounced in all its forms, and this is reflected in the deterioration of the surrounding (and later the whole of) peasant farming, the disruption of its productive forces, the decline in its confidence in the Soviet power, pilfering and widespread petty (the most dangerous) profiteering, etc. By "implanting" state capitalism in the form of concessions, the Soviet government strengthens large-scale production as against petty production, advanced production as against backward production, and machine production as against hand production. It also obtains a larger quantity of the products of large-scale industry (its share of the output), and strengthens state regulated economic relations as against the anarchy of petty-bourgeois relations.

Lenin goes further in a different text, from the Third Congress of the Communist international:

Within the limits indicated, however, this is not at all dangerous for socialism as long as transport and large-scale industry remain in the hands of the proletariat. On the contrary, the development of capitalism, controlled and regulated by the proletarian state (i.e., "state" capitalism in this sense of the term), is advantageous and necessary in an extremely devastated and backward small-peasant country (within certain limits, of course), inasmuch as it is capable of hastening the immediate revival of peasant farming. This applies still more to concessions: without denationalising anything, the workers' state leases certain mines, forest tracts, oilfields, and so forth, to foreign capitalists in order to obtain from them extra equipment and machinery that will enable us to accelerate the restoration of Soviet large-scale industry...

4.) How in the world is state capitalism compatible with socialism??

Lenin answers:

*Can the Soviet state and the dictatorship of the proletariat be combined with state capitalism?
Are they compatible?*

Of course they are. This is exactly what I argued in May 1918. I hope I had proved it then. I had also proved that state capitalism is a step forward compared with the small proprietor (both small-patriarchal and petty-bourgeois) element. Those who compare state capitalism only with socialism commit a host of mistakes, for in the present political and economic circumstances it is essential to compare state capitalism also with petty-bourgeois production.

Capitalism is a bane compared with socialism. Capitalism is a boon compared with medievalism, small production, and the evils of bureaucracy which spring from the dispersal of the small producers. Inasmuch as we are as yet unable to pass directly from small production to socialism, some capitalism is inevitable as the elemental product of small production and exchange; so that we must utilise capitalism (particularly by directing it into the channels of state capitalism) as the intermediary link between small production and socialism, as a means, a path, and a method of increasing the productive forces.

The transition from capitalism to socialism through state capitalism produces the materials and conditions necessary to sustain a society's economy and population, while steering away capitalists that attempt to exploit and take advantage of the workers.

5.) What does all of this have to do with SWCC?

Despite Lenin's words about the inevitability of using capitalism to create the production necessary to sustain socialism, his New Economic Policy or "state capitalism" was justified as a temporary measure to kick start the economy after several wars and sabotages. **But if it was only to be used as a temporary measure to jump start the USSR's economy after the ravages of war, why does China take decades to develop its own productive forces?**This is where Deng Xiaoping, and his 1978 Reform and Opening Up policy comes in. Welcome to Socialism *with Chinese Characteristics*.

Mao states the following:

"The present-day capitalist economy in China is a capitalist economy which for the most part is under the control of the People's Government and which is linked with the state-owned socialist economy in various forms and supervised by the workers. It is not an ordinary but a particular kind of capitalist economy, namely, a state-capitalist economy of a new type. It exists not chiefly to make profits for the capitalists but to meet the needs of the people and the state. True, a share of the profits produced by the workers goes to the capitalists, but that is only a small part, about one quarter, of the total. The remaining three quarters are produced for the workers (in the form of the welfare fund), for the state (in the form of income tax) and for expanding productive capacity (a small part of which produces profits for the capitalists). Therefore, this state-capitalist economy of a new type takes on a socialist character to a very great extent and benefits the workers and the state."

Professor Roland Boer is a distinguished author and professor of philosophy at the Renmin University of China. [He was able to connect everything mentioned from Lenin's text above to what Deng Xiaoping to further his New Economic Policy:](#)

This brings us to the fourth direction arising from Lenin's work, concerning which I need to mention Chinese scholarship. These scholars have pointed out that part of the inspiration for Deng Xiaoping's breakthrough with the Reform and Opening Up was precisely Lenin's New Economic Policy...

[A]s we look back after a century, we can see certain shortcomings in Lenin's approach. Notably, he assumed that private enterprise and market exchange were by definition capitalist, while public ownership and a planned economy were necessarily socialist. We now know that this is not the case, for market economies have existed under many different – and non-capitalist – conditions. At the same time, Lenin did make the crucial point that everything depends on the underlying system within which a market economy works... It would be better to speak of a market economy as a component of a larger socialist system. Let me emphasize that this point is not made by foreign scholars, since they tend not to use Chinese sources for their work.

To sum up, state capitalism has an intriguing and complex history, with its initial development in the Marxist tradition through Lenin, its subsequent misuse by a number of Western Marxists in relation to the Soviet Union and China, its redeployment (without knowledge of the Marxist tradition) to try and understand the turn away from the neoliberal project, its Leninist sense by a

small number of Marxists in relation to China, and then Chinese scholarship that fully acknowledges Lenin's influence on Deng Xiaoping but then takes his insights a significant step further.

Deng emphasized the importance of the underlying system that controls the market. Despite his opening up policy, [Deng created the four cardinal principles that are not allowed for debate to ensure ideological discipline within the CCP, as they opened up their markets.](#) Deng elongated the transitional period Lenin emphasized, while utilizing state capitalist principles to ensure a stable pathway towards socialism.

In a country as big and as poor as ours, if we don't try to increase production, how can we survive? How is socialism superior, when our people have so many difficulties in their lives? The Gang of Four clamoured for "poor socialism" and "poor communism", declaring that communism was mainly a spiritual thing. That is sheer nonsense! We say that socialism is the first stage of communism. When a backward country is trying to build socialism, it is natural that during the long initial period its productive forces will not be up to the level of those in developed capitalist countries and that it will not be able to eliminate poverty completely. Accordingly, in building socialism we must do all we can to develop the productive forces and gradually eliminate poverty, constantly raising the people's living standards. Otherwise, how will socialism be able to triumph over capitalism? In the second stage, or the advanced stage of communism, when the economy is highly developed and there is overwhelming material abundance, we shall be able to apply the principle of from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs. If we don't do everything possible to increase production, how can we expand the economy? How can we demonstrate the superiority of socialism and communism? We have been making revolution for several decades and have been building socialism for more than three. Nevertheless, by 1978 the average monthly salary for our workers was still only 45 yuan, and most of our rural areas were still mired in poverty. Can this be called the superiority of socialism? That is why I insisted that the focus of our work should be rapidly shifted to economic development. A decision to this effect was made at the Third Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee, and it represented an important turning point. Our practice since then has shown that this line is correct, as the whole country has taken on an entirely new look.

Is this revisionism? Absolutely not. I want to dive into a bit more on how Deng and SWCC expands NEP and state capitalist theory, but don't have the space for it here. However, I will say Because of

SWCC and the relentless leadership of the CCP, China has grown to become the largest economy in the world; eradicate poverty, homelessness, and hunger for its 1.4 billion population; and concentrate its capital, not in corporations or capitalists, but in education, healthcare, technology, workers, and the welfare of its people. The CCP is the largest political party on earth, with 90 million members, and millions of others around the world upholding SWCC. The CCP has extensive control over large private companies, and are not scared of going after capitalists (they recently sentenced a banker to death). [Xi Jinping and the CCP has reiterated again and again their commitment to socialism, especially after modernizing their state and initiating the transition between 2035-2049.](#)

.A perfect summary could not be better [said](#):

So while China has introduced elements of capitalism in the 40 years since the start of 'reform and opening up', these do not constitute a negation of socialism, any more than they did in the New Democracy period in the 1950s, or under the New Economic Policy in the Soviet Union in the 1920s. The point of the reforms is to lay the ground for a more advanced socialism: "In order to realise communism, we have to accomplish the tasks set in the socialist stage. They are legion, but the fundamental one is to develop the productive forces so as to demonstrate the superiority of socialism over capitalism and provide the material basis for communism."

Socialism with Chinese Characteristics is a reflection of Lenin's state capitalism and new economic policy, elongated, enhanced, and improved by Deng Xiaoping.

Before Critiquing China, Drop your Western Biases

Published 23 January 2020

Corporations in China \neq Western corporations (where party and public control is nowhere to be seen). [An excellent breakdown of China's "private" industry here](#). Another one [here](#).

Billionaires in China \neq billionaires in the West (where they are able to buy out party members and are left uncontrolled, unregulated individuals with massive amounts of access and power). Why do Chinese billionaires keep [going to jail?](#) Also, [they just recently sentenced a banker to death for corruption](#).

Government in China \neq Western governance (lobbying, dark money, corrupt agendas set by capitalists, gerrymandering, racial discrimination, etc.). In fact, [someone like Trump would be impossible to elect thanks to China's democratic centralism and politburo structure](#).

Western Imperialism \neq China's works around the world.

For those who claim China is imperialist, I always pose the question:

- What Chinese companies mandated their government to assassinate their president or candidates?
- What country did the Chinese army invade to extract their natural resources?
- What Chinese company toppled government after government that were not aligned with their interest?
- Which election did the Chinese government manipulate to put their people in power?
- How many death squads or paramilitary armies did the CPC sponsor?

Read more about my response [here](#)

Worker conditions in China \neq Working conditions in the West. (Unsafe working conditions, poor stagnant wages, union busting, lack of benefits, etc.).

- [The west views China as one big sweatshop, but the actual working hours aren't much more than anywhere else. The average for a migrant worker \(most vulnerable to exploitation as they are traveling from the countryside\) is 8.8 hours, little under an hour more than a typical working day. Labor strikes are rarely suppressed, there are many examples of workers on strike getting the support of the PRC. The Chinese state rules in favor of the workers](#)
- [Wages themselves are also forced to rise in the private sector by the CPC \(+16% every years, +400% since 1980\) who force the capitalists to accept the presence of CPC chapters who represent the interest of the workers, increasing workers control even in the capitalist parts of the economy.](#)
- [The workplace safety standards of China are better than in the capitalist countries of the West like in Australia who have an higher rate of work related death despite having a GDP per capita 3-5 times higher.](#)

Other leftists critique state that China is capitalists, but, as Lenin stated, that is against capitalist interests!:

The petty bourgeoisie oppose every kind of state interference, accounting and control, whether it be state-capitalist or state-socialist. This is an unquestionable fact of reality whose misunderstanding lies at the root of many economic mistakes.

When you have one party, DotP, democratic centralism, vanguardism, and other Marxist Leninist hallmarks, there is no question that there are obvious socialist and communists pathways towards Marxism and not capitalism. Professor Roland Boer, distinguished author and professor of philosophy at the Renmin University of China, [wrote an excellent article on the major differences with what Western critiques and scholars fail to grasp \(and access\) when speaking about china.](#)

I noticed the left attempt to universalize their Western knowledge and experiences to every non-Western country and apply it accordingly to inappropriately critique other communities and cultures. This leads to massive misunderstandings and gravely unhelpful critiques that only aid capitalist oppressors, rather than the people. Leftist must have a more multilateral approach towards non-Western countries and rid themselves of such biases before critiquing.

Communists, MLs, and pro-SWCC supports don't say China is infallible, as we know there are numerous issues that ought to be resolved. However, saying China is capitalist without acknowledging their major Leninist tenets in their governance and commitment to the people only show your ignorance, rather than benevolence in actually improving the lives of Chinese people.

[MegaThread] Addressing Sinophobia and China's Coronavirus Response

Published 29 January 2020

Comrades all over our communities, on Reddit and IRL, have most likely saw the direct and incognito attacks on Chinese culture, people, and communities. [It is no surprise that when the United States has an enemy, racism, scapegoatism, and bigotry certainly follows.](#)

I want to make a megathread that not only beat backs those sinophobic attacks and understand the virus but also praises the very culture and government these Westerners attempt to discredit.

1.) Where did the virus come from and scapegoating Chinese culinary diets.

["The origin of the new coronavirus is the wildlife sold illegally in a Wuhan seafood market," Gao Fu, director of China Center for Disease Control and Prevention.](#) However, there is some speculation that [it may not have even came from food](#). Contrary to Westerners' portrayal of Chinese cuisine, these markets are, in fact, illegal in China, and are not "more popular" in this region. In fact, there is a huge problem of illegal exotic meat markets all over the world, especially the rise of it in the West:

- [Here's an article about illegal exotic meat markets in the UK and the dangers of becoming a potential "global pandemic".](#)
- Funny enough, [Fox news reported on an couple of illegal exotic meat market in Illinois USA, and one of the butchers liking rattlesnake.](#)
- [Just a funny tid bit, here Binging with Babbish getting almost every kind of exotic meat he can find for his 2 million subscriber special.](#)

However, Westerners use Sinophobic stereotypes to target China's cuisine and blame them for spreading the virus, despite this potentially coming from other illegal exotic markets. [Although mostly about MSG, this video explores the racist and sinophobia surrounding Chinese cuisine.](#)

[where they even have a clip where Anthony Bourdain said "you know what causes Chinese Restaurant Syndrome? Racism"](#). Also, there was a piece of fake news circulating of a Chinese women eating a bat, when, in fact, [she was in Palau, an archipelago in the western Pacific 3 years ago](#).

It is obvious that the West is simply attempting to pile on more of its patented racism onto another country that is a target of its capitalistic government. From Muslim slayers to Muslim protectors, the West weaponizes its racism through individuals' behaviors and applies as it sees fit. Western culture is founded on bigotry and scapegoating, surrounding itself with individualistic economic systems that will ultimately be its own demise.

Iraqis, Venezuelans, Chinese, Iranians, and now back to Chinese; the West's focused racism is like a flavor of the month. But China is becoming a bigger and bigger target because of its unstoppable economic power and influence that threatens Western hegemony.

Sinophobia is only going to get worse from here. There needs to be a greater campaign to push against this bigotry, and challenge such disgusting cultural elements in the West.

2.) The virus itself

The Coronavirus is an mRNA virus that attacks the repertory systems in mammals, including humans. Although it is a fast spreading disease that has a 10-14 day incubation period (making it more difficult to detect), there is only a 3% fatality rate.. There are currently 7,259 confirmed cases and 169 deaths, most of which have been those between the ages of 35-90, with the average being around 75. More information about the virus can be found [here](#). Along with this, people have been recovering and "being cured" by having their immune systems simply fight it off (with the help of hospitals and medical teams). See [here](#) and [here](#). Additionally, [the coronavirus outbreak may reach its peak in one week or around 10 days, renowned Chinese respiratory expert Zhong Nanshan said](#).

[To compare, "Flu-related illnesses the week of Jan. 18 spiked to nearly 15 million cases nationwide as health officials from the Centers for Disease Control reported an additional 1,400 deaths since last week — 15 of which were of children."](#)

3.) The Government's response has been strong and effective in stopping and curing the Coronavirus

Westerners have been complaining about the governments slow and oppressive response to stopping the Coronavirus, even going so far as to say they deserve it. Despite the [the World Health Organization is praising the Chinese government's quick response to the crisis, with director-general Tedo Adhanom Ghebreyesus saying the country was taking "very strong measures...with full commitment. We are in agreement with Chinese authorities who have been clear and transparent..."](#)

Here are a couple of highlights of what the government has done to halt the spread (most come from this [article](#) here):

- Only a week after the coronavirus outbreak, China State Construction Engineering has already begun speedbuilding a new, specialised 25,000m2 public hospital with 1,000 beds from the ground up: aiming to open it to patients in under 11 days.
- [Another 1,300 bed hospital being built](#)
- [China is on the verge of obtaining a vaccine, being able to isolate the virus and fast-tracking manufacturing within 40 days to start clinical trials](#)
- [Curtailling price gouging and hoarding vital products for outbreak, as profiteering from crisis is banned, and regulators set up a hotline for consumers to report violators](#)
- [Successfully quarantine major cities, to where, again World Health Organization said cutting off a city as large as Wuhan is "unprecedented in public health history" and praised China for its incredible commitment to isolate the virus and minimize the spread to other countries.](#)
- 450 medical staff from the People's Liberation Army are now on the way to Wuhan to provide relief to doctors and nurses there along with hundreds more giving up their new years to help with the relief.

But what has been Westerner's response [TW: Racism, Sinophobia]?

- [Government is not doing anything, so village builds a wall](#)
- [China allocated \\$8 billion in emergency funds to Wuhan yet some medical supplies like N95 masks are in short supply b/c they're patented by US companies.](#)
- To a "non-western" extent, Hong Kong protesters [bombed a hospital](#) and [set fire to a building attempting to house the infected](#).
- [And, of course, reddit's sinophobia.](#)

[Instead of sympathizing and helping those in need with this crisis, rampant bigotry against Chinese communities, and the hypocrisy with other emergencies is incredible..](#)

But this has all gotten to the point, where even [foreign immigrants in Wuhan state “Seeing the reactions from outside world, especially in western media, racist, political comments and so on is so disgusting, people should stop this.”](#)

Conclusion

China’s coronavirus response shows what’s possible when people come before profits. This is a title of an article that hits the nail on the head. [I can only imagine what the US response may be when it comes to this](#). From the article:

Party General Secretary Xi Jinping, who is also president of China, chaired the meeting. “Life is of paramount importance,” he said. “When an epidemic breaks out, a command is issued. It is our responsibility to prevent and control it.” He said that party members at all levels and across the country must “stand on the frontline” to safeguard public health...

The paper called the crisis “a test for China’s governance system and capability,” saying it was especially urgent to guarantee the storage and supply of drugs and medical supplies. “China, as the world’s factory, does not lack a production force, and filling the current supply gaps is not a difficult matter. We call on the relevant parties to put the pedal to the floor to guarantee production, and urge every city in the country to offer mutual assistance to get through the challenge.”

On Wall Street, meanwhile, profit rather than public health was the focus. In New York, the stocks of airlines, travel companies, casinos, and tourism-oriented companies were down in Friday trading as investors worried about how the China travel freeze could impact margins. This downward pressure was balanced, however, by eager financial advisers telling their clients to buy shares in companies that manufacture masks and medical supplies and biotech firms that make vaccines—especially as the United States reported its first case of the coronavirus.

The contrasting responses of government and Communist Party officials in China and that of Wall Street investors puts the distinction between the socialist and capitalist systems in sharp relief and prompts the question: Which comes first—people or profits?

Everything You Need To Know About Socialism With Chinese Characteristics Can Be Found in the Communist Party of China's Constitution.

Reading the [Constitution Of The Communist Party Of China](#) contextualized much of the leaderships ideals and goals in an inspirational and literal way. Within the first paragraph, the constitution reads:

The Communist Party of China is the vanguard of the Chinese working class, the Chinese people, and the Chinese nation... The Party's highest ideal and ultimate goal is the realization of communism.

"Wait a minute..." one may say. "Aren't they communists? Why is this an 'ultimate goal?' Why are they not pushing and promoting communistic measures now? Does that mean this is all just manipulative fluff that only shows they are communists on paper and capitalists in practice? What about the billionaires in their party?"

All these are addressed in the constitution. The first portion of the constitution reaffirms the CPC's commitment to Marxism-Leninism, with a brief political history since their revolution. It explains 6 important doctrines that Socialism with Chinese Characteristics ("SWCC") abide by:

1. Marxism-Leninism

Marxism-Leninism reveals the laws governing the development of the history of human society. Its basic tenets are correct and have tremendous vitality. The highest ideal of communism pursued by Chinese Communists can be realized only when socialist society is fully developed and highly advanced. The development and improvement of the socialist system is a long

historical process. By upholding the basic tenets of Marxism-Leninism and following the path suited to China's specific conditions as chosen by the Chinese people, China's socialist cause will ultimately be victorious.

Immediately, in the third paragraph of the constitution, we jump right into laying the foundation of SWCC: Marxism-Leninism. This is the guiding philosophy of the CPC when structuring the laws and government of China. Along with the statement that "The Party's highest ideal and ultimate goal is the realization of communism," readers are immediately plunged into the CPC's commitment to MLism.

Sprinkled and bolded in this paragraph as well is the clear and vivid statements that communism can only be realized when "socialist society is fully developed and highly advanced." Still committed to Marxism-Leninism, the constitution explains that one cannot simply jump into communism. "The development and improvement of the socialist system is a long historical process." We have witnessed China's economic prosperity under its centralized party structure and market controls, [yet focus on eliminating poverty, hunger, and homelessness](#). The prosperity is not wasted on capitalists to accumulate more capital, but rather developing a "modern socialist society" by 2049. President Xi Jinping has created a "37-year plan" on how to modernize China's planned market economies and transition to a modern socialist society, which has set two goals called the "Two Centenaries." [I wrote a bit more about this plan here](#), the constitution touches on this more when stating:

China is currently in the primary stage of socialism and will remain so for a long time to come. This is a stage of history that cannot be bypassed as China, which used to be economically and culturally lagging, makes progress in socialist modernization; it will take over a century. China's development of socialism must begin from China's own circumstances and must follow the path of socialism with Chinese characteristics. At the present stage, the principal contradiction in Chinese society is that between the ever-growing needs of the people for a better life and unbalanced and inadequate development. Owing to both domestic factors and international influences, a certain amount of class struggle will continue to exist for a long time to come, and under certain circumstances may even grow more pronounced, however, it is no longer the principal contradiction. In building socialism in China, the basic tasks are to further release and develop the productive forces and gradually achieve socialist modernization and, to this end, reform those elements and areas within the relations of production and the superstructure that are unsuited to the development of the productive forces.

[I further wrote about understanding SWCC and its development with productive forces is rooted in Lenin's foundational text "Tax in Kind" here.](#) So along with laying the foundations of the party on Marxism-Leninism, the CPC Constitution also affirms their economic development is still on the vital path towards their ultimate goal of communism.

2. Mao Zedong Thought

Mao Zedong Thought is the application and development of Marxism-Leninism in China; it is a body of theoretical principles and a summary of experiences, proven correct in practice, relating to China's revolution and construction; and it is a crystallization of the collective wisdom of the Communist Party of China. Under the guidance of Mao Zedong Thought, the Communist Party of China led the Chinese people of all ethnic groups in the long revolutionary struggle against imperialism, feudalism, and bureaucratic capitalism, securing victory in the new democratic revolution and founding the People's Republic of China, a people's democratic dictatorship.

First and foremost, I love the fact that they mentioned ethnic unity surrounding Mao Zedong Thought. This really beats back the Western image that people in Xinjiang, Tibet, or even HK are different when they are united in the revolutionary struggle. Also, mentioning the democratic dictatorship of the people is awesome as well. [I will always remember this DPRK worker stuck in South Korea, is proud that the term "dictatorship" is found in the constitution, and what that truly means](#)

There is a bit of confusion among the Western left about "Maoism" and Mao Zedong Thought that should be clarified, as they are not the same thing. China is forever grateful for Mao and his accomplishments during and immediately after the revolution, as his philosophy became embedded in the CPC's leadership philosophy. As stated, applying Marxism-Leninism to the conditions of China is where Mao's revolution became an ultimate success at liberating the people and overthrowing the economic, social, political, and cultural repression of capitalism.

However, understanding the Chinese conditions after the revolution is where most MLs, pro-SWCC, and communists split with Maoists. Maoists are dedicated to creating a more socialistic/communistic society right away, despite the economic stagnation with an agrarian-based economy that has not developed its productive forces to sustain its millions of people. Many in China do not consider late-Mao as a positive, as there were supporters who took advantage of this

economic and political chaos for power. I highly recommend looking into the "Gang of Four" fiasco to understand this tension.

But the most important thing to take note was to understand China's history and circumstances. During the revolution, Mao was extremely successful at going against the Marxist grain to rally rural peasants (rather than following the USSR's footsteps at rallying and focusing more on urban centers), and more philosophical underpinnings at sustaining the revolution. This is what is meant as Mao Zedong Thought; applying MLism to Chinese conditions to ultimately succeed in overthrowing capitalism. Deng Xiaoping said it best:

It's true that he made mistakes in a certain period, but he was after all a principal founder of the Chinese Communist Party and the People's Republic of China. In evaluating his merits and mistakes, we hold that his mistakes were only secondary. What he did for the Chinese people can never be erased. In our hearts, we Chinese will always cherish him as a founder of our Party and our state.

With all this said, I believe the CPC, and MLs/communists just have a critical perspective on Mao, which was extremely important for their progress. They agree that the success of the revolution would not have happened without Mao and his theory, but are critical with his actions taken afterward. This not only shows their gratitude towards Mao, but also shows their commitment to a scientific approach that can be self-critical, rather than dogmatic or idealistic.

3. Deng Xiaoping Theory

After the Third Plenary Session of the 11th Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, Chinese Communists, with Comrade Deng Xiaoping as their chief representative, analyzed both positive and negative experience gained since the founding of the People's Republic, emancipated the mind, and sought truth from facts. They shifted the focus of the whole Party's work onto economic development and introduced reform and opening up, thereby ushering in a new era of development in socialism; they gradually formulated the line, principles, and policies for building socialism with Chinese characteristics, brought clarity to basic questions on building, consolidating, and developing socialism in China, and thus established Deng Xiaoping Theory.

This was a large turning point in not only China's history, but also communistic theory. After the Gang of Four fiasco and economic stagnation, China, under the leadership of Deng Xiaoping, shifted its focus on productive forces through controlled markets. This was, indeed, an extremely

risky venture as this has never been practiced before, and the worries of capitalism's return would be ever more prevalent. Yet, despite this, Deng Xiaoping Theory may have saved China from the USSR's fate. As much as Deng's opening and market reforms are praised, there is not enough support for the ardent ideological disciplinary constructs he also instilled within the CPC during this time, in particular with his four cardinal principles:

- The principle of upholding the socialist path
- The principle of upholding the people's democratic dictatorship
- The principle of upholding the leadership of the Communist Party of China (CPC)
- The principle of upholding Mao Zedong Thought and Marxism–Leninism

These constructs are never to be debated within the CPC and mandated all party members to uphold these principles. [In an interview](#), Deng reiterated this commitment to socialism through his opening up and reform policy, and the "four modernizations" (focused on developing agriculture, industry, defense, and science/technology):

Question: The four modernizations will bring foreign capital into China, and this will inevitably give rise to private investment. Won't this lead to a miniaturized capitalism?

Answer: In the final analysis, the general principle for our economic development is still that formulated by Chairman Mao, that is, to rely mainly on our own efforts with external assistance subsidiary. No matter to what degree we open up to the outside world and admit foreign capital, its relative magnitude will be small and it can't affect our system of socialist public ownership of the means of production. Absorbing foreign capital and technology and even allowing foreigners to construct plants in China can only play a complementary role to our effort to develop the productive forces in a socialist society. Of course, this will bring some decadent capitalist influences into China. We are aware of this possibility; it's nothing to be afraid of.

Question: Does it mean that not all in capitalism is so bad?

Answer: It depends on how you define capitalism. Any capitalism is superior to feudalism. And we cannot say that everything developed in capitalist countries is of a capitalist nature. For instance, technology, science -- even advanced production management is also a sort of science -- will be useful in any society or country. We intend to acquire advanced technology, science and management skills to serve our socialist production. And these things as such have no class character.

4. Theory of Three Represents

The constitution does not really get into what the Theory of Three Represents are other than it builds on prior theory and new perspectives on how to move the party forward. Jiang Zemin developed this theory, and has surmised these three represents in the Selected Works of Jiang Zemin:

Our Party must always represent the requirements for developing [1] China's advanced productive forces, [2] the orientation of China's advanced culture and [3] the fundamental interests of the overwhelming majority of the Chinese people. These are the inexorable requirements for maintaining and developing socialism, and the logical conclusion our Party has reached through hard exploration and great praxis.

Jiang pushed for a more democratic opening for the party, while allowing more business voices in the party. This ramped up China's economic savvy to create the economic powerhouse it is today. [More on his three represents can be found here](#). However, this obviously created tensions and contradictions that many were increasingly dissatisfied with. Enter Hu Jintao:

5. The Scientific Outlook on Development

On the basis of the new demands of development they forged a deep understanding of and answered major questions, including what kind of development to pursue and how to pursue it in a new situation, thus forming the Scientific Outlook on Development, which puts people first and calls for comprehensive, balanced, and sustainable development... It fully embodies the Marxist worldview and methodology on development and represents a major achievement in adapting Marxism to the Chinese context.

As the country economically began to grow, gaps with its ideology began to become apparent, ever since Deng's opening. A more scientific approach must be adopted to not only close these gaps, but to create a more "harmonious society", to close the social inequality and corruption that was growing more and more. This focused more on societal growth and progress over overt economic focuses. The focus of China's economic growth turned towards a more "comprehensive" approach to include the people (mostly away from the coastal regions and more inward) to "equalize" the booming wealth China was experiencing. This "people-centered" approach towards China's

economic development built on Deng's and Jiang's opening up efforts, but now with a focus on benefiting the people.

6. Xi Jinping Thought on Socialism with Chinese Characteristics for a New Era (or "Xi Jinping Thought")

The constitution touches on Xi Jinping Thought, but not in much detail. [I created a better graphic that explains the 14 principles of Xi Jinping Thought](#). For the most part, Xi Jinping Thought reinforces economic and sustainable development under the CPC's control, with a people-centered approach towards eliminating China's most serious standard-of-living issues. This is reiterated in the constitution further:

The Party must uphold and improve the basic economic system whereby public ownership plays a dominant role and economic entities under diverse forms of ownership develop side by side. It must maintain and improve the distribution system whereby distribution according to labor is dominant and a variety of other modes of distribution exist alongside it. It must encourage some areas and some people to become well-off first, gradually eliminate poverty, achieve common prosperity, and on the basis of developing production and social wealth, keep meeting the people's ever-growing needs for a better life and promote people's well-rounded development.

Development is the Party's top priority in governing and rejuvenating the country. The Party must commit to a people-centered philosophy of development and pursue the vision of innovative, coordinated, green, and open development that is for everyone. The general starting point and criteria for judging each item of the Party's work are that it must benefit the development of the socialist productive forces, be conducive to increasing socialist China's overall strength, and help to improve the people's living standards. The Party must respect labor, knowledge, talent, and creativity and ensure that development is for the people and relies on the people, and that its fruits are shared among the people.

I could go on about the constitution. There is so much more to be said, even before we hit the articles. It is one of the only constitutions I see where ideology, welfare, and even the environment are taken extremely seriously for a framework within a society. It is truly under this pivotal document can Marxist-Leninists and communists everywhere can grow their own frameworks within society.

If SWCC has taught us anything is that the revolution is only the beginning.