

The Programme of the Revolutionary Union of China

The General Line

The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution was by no means a disaster in itself, on the contrary its defeat was. Since then, the people of the world have completely lost all socialist regimes, the red wave on an international scale has receded, capitalism has emerged from the crisis of the 1960s and 1970s, while hundreds of millions of free labouring people, countless revolutionary soldiers, lost everything, retaining only a glimmer of the flame of hope in the mountains and forests of India, the Philippines, Turkey and some other countries. In China, the bourgeoisie in the party have evolved into a bureaucratic monopoly bourgeoisie independent of the control of other international capitalists in the course of a full-scale restoration of capitalism. Politically, in order to establish a fascist dictatorship that would make even Hitler ashamed of himself on the corpse of the revolution, and in order to restore the capitalist system, they began by destroying the Communist Party of China, which once belonged to the working class, the revolutionary organisations all over the country, and the vast majority of the mass organisations, in the most brutal way. Then, with the huge industrial heritage, military force and economic resources left from the socialist era, it quickly reintroduced the capitalist mode of production in China through the so-called "reform and opening up". But in the process China did not become a semi-colony of international monopoly capital, like former socialist and people's democratic countries such as Vietnam, Cuba and Eastern Europe; on the contrary, the high degree of monopoly and independence of capitalism in China made it inevitable that China would evolve into an imperialist country from the moment of the restoration, as it has already done so, and it is the only imperialist country that has the ambition and the ability to compete with the US imperialism for world hegemony in the world today.

There is no doubt that in China today, as in any imperialist country, the dominant mode of production is capitalist socialised mass production. But China is different from common imperialist countries, especially countries with hollowed-out industry like Great Britain and the United States. Today's China has the most powerful industrial capacity in human history, and therefore is the greatest industrial super power in the world. Along with this, today's China also has the largest working class in human history, also a highly educated one. Yet the pathetic thing is that under the present mode of production and ruling order, the most important and major part of the means of production, the means of circulation of commodities and all political power are in the exclusive hands of a very, very small class, the bureaucratic monopoly bourgeoisie; while all the labouring people of China, headed by the working class, are forced to sell their labour power to earn a living without uttering a word because of their deplorable political and economic position; they have long since been reduced from the master of the socialist republic to wage slaves at the mercy of others. Together with the numerous revolutionary breakthroughs of the productive forces in recent decades, the capital, while frantically accumulating surplus-value (the only purpose of the capitalist mode of production is to accumulate surplus-value forever and continuously as much as possible, which is why, fundamentally, capitalism is a blind, anti-human existence), is also bound to bankrupt a large number of non-monopoly bourgeois and small producers and further marginalise the remnants of those classes and make them more dependent on the monopoly capital. Similarly, as a result of the enormous progress in the productive forces, the bourgeoisie's demand for workers' living labour has greatly reduced, there is now a serious surplus of the commodity of labour power, and the size of the legion of surplus labour is now very large and is continuing to grow. This inevitably leads to the plight of our labouring people in a cutthroat competition, which inevitably leads to the death of

one part of the workforce from overwork, while the other part has no means of earning a living. In the end, except for the monopoly capital, all people work to death for nothing. In a word: the status quo is "those who work, acquire nothing, those who acquire everything do not work; the people are competing, while the capital is benefiting." This inevitably leads to a contradiction, an antagonistic and irreconcilable contradiction, between all labouring people headed by the working class and the bureaucratic monopoly bourgeoisie. This is the principal contradiction of Chinese society today, how it is going to be resolved will have a bearing on the destiny of the whole of human civilisation in the next few decades.

We Marxist-Leninist-Maoists (MLM) believe that in order to fundamentally resolve this contradiction, we must mobilise the masses to destroy capitalist China and rebuild the socialist China. To this end, we must unite with the labouring people, destroy the present fascist dictatorship of the bureaucratic monopoly bourgeoisie and reconstruct the dictatorship of the proletariat. In other words, the only way to resolve the principal contradiction of China today is to carry out a second socialist revolution. (The former one was from 1949 to 1956.)

It has been said that we communists refuse to use peaceful and gradual means to promote social progress and are keen on violent means. This is COMPLETELY wrong. For it is never we, but the ruling class, stand in the way of peaceful social progress. In fact, we genuine communists are not terrorist extremists obsessed with bloody violence, why should we shed blood when we can achieve the same result by peaceful means? Unfortunately, we cannot completely liberate the oppressed labouring people by peaceful means, because the ruling class is bound to use the bayonet to defend its rule, and it is doing so (the fascist tyranny of the Chinese ruling class cannot even tolerate the existence of any organisation not under its control, not even those purely reformist public interest organisations which are at present completely harmless to the existing order) Moreover, our practical experience of history over the past 170 years or so has shown that all those who advocate changing the nature of society in a way that does not touch on the core interests of the ruling class, from a host of traitors in the Socialist International to the Nepalese revolution of the present century have eventually either perished outright or degenerated to bourgeois representatives in scarlet. And we must not follow their footsteps! We therefore believe that the only way to achieve our goal is through the means of violent revolution, the means of Lenin. "Political power grows out of the barrel of gun." is a truth that applies to all revolutions, ancient and modern.

So, does this mean that present Chinese revolutionaries should return to Mountain of Jing'gang and reconstruct an armed revolutionary base? The answer is clearly no.

In the last century, from the semi-colonial and semi-feudal nature of China society at that time, revolutionary predecessors led by Mao, explored the revolutionary path of "forming the armed independent regime of workers and peasants; using the rural areas to encircle the cities and seize political power with armed force", which is a New Democratic Revolution line that applies to all backward countries, (and only to countries with a large number of pre-capitalist mode of production, not to all semi-colonies) through which the revolutionary masses will gradually seize the state power by means of a protracted people's war, thus artificially creating a special kind of capitalist country in the age of imperialism, which is called the new democratic country. The prospect for the development of such a country is not to become an imperialist one, but rather to make a peaceful and legal (New Democratic legal) transition to socialism by adhering to the socialist line. (But this still needs to be fought resolutely in the New Democratic era!) This is what Karl Marx was referring to the country whose "inevitable social revolution might be effected entirely by peaceful and legal means". Because in such

countries, the irreconcilable contradiction between the working class and the bourgeoisie is transformed into a non-confrontational contradiction in this case, since the people have already got the political power beforehand. Such a revolutionary struggle is being waged today by the comrades of the Communist Party of India (Maoist) and the Communist Party of the Philippines.

This new democratic revolutionary line of the proletariat and its allies to gain power through people's war and further transition to socialism is applicable because the ruling class in semi-colonial and semi-feudal societies is certainly weaker compared with the ruling class in the imperialist countries. Since almost all such countries have never achieved industrialisation (nor indeed could they have done so under the global imperialist order), it is often difficult for the power of their central governments to reach the local level. In addition, the various imperialist powers in such countries were also in conflict and often do not coordinate. Therefore, in semi-colonial and semi-feudal societies, there are often political gaps on which revolutionary parties can operate. It is also because the masses tend to be dominated by peasants in such countries (especially the small peasants who approximate to the pre-modern era), and the society as a whole is filled with a large number of pre-modern modes of production and ideologies. Therefore, the class consciousness of the proletariat can only be instilled into the masses through a profound and protracted people's war, a protracted people's war that sweeps through the whole of society.

The theory of protracted people's war, on the other hand, is clearly not applicable in the imperialist countries (even the industrialised semi-colonial countries, such as South Korea and the Ukraine), and especially in a great industrial power such as China. Those Gonzaloists who forcefully present the revolutionary line, which is only applicable to backward countries, as a universal theory are committing a serious error of dogmatism and sectarianism, and they simply do not understand the need to analyse the situation on a case-by-case basis. In the face of an even stronger ruling class, with almost non-existent political gaps and very close economic links between different parts of the state, we must adopt the Bolshevik line, which is to say, the line of the October Revolution, to solve the problems of the Chinese Revolution today.

To carry out this line, we MLMs need, first of all, to reach out to all strata of the masses (first of all, of course, to the working class, which is always our base), to propagate, to organise, to study and to educate. In a word: implement the leadership and organisational principle of "from the masses, to the masses". In other words, as Chairman Mao said, "Take the ideas of the masses (scattered and unsystematic ideas) and concentrate them (through study turn them into concentrated and systematic ideas), then go to the masses and propagate and explain these ideas until the masses embrace them as their own, hold fast to them and transform them into action, and test the correctness of these ideas in such action. Then once again concentrate ideas from the masses and once again go to the masses so that the ideas are persevered in and carried through and so on. Over and over again in an endless spiral, the ideas will become more correct, more vital and richer each time." The three processes described here are indispensable, and each step deserves to be properly analysed.

(I) "Concentrating the scattered and unsystematic opinions of the masses" never means that we should blindly collect the views of the masses which are held by most of people; for example, the majority of the masses today are in favour of nationalism which is prompted by the "characteristic party"(CPC), in that case, we must not blindly follow, otherwise we would become bourgeois populists of the worst kind; Similarly, this concentration of mass opinion does not in any way mean that we should deliberately seek out the opinions that we want to hear, opinions that

are in line with the Marxist "dogma". What we need to do is to use the theory of scientific socialism to discover those opinions which have been confirmed by the reality of the class struggle and fit in with the long-term interests of the proletariat.

(II) Once we have concentrated the opinions of the masses, we should systematise them. The opinions after our process should cover the immediate needs of the masses to the fullest extent, and contain or be orientated towards the ultimate goal of "overthrowing the ruling class", rather than being simple or fragmentary. At the same time, this kind of processed opinion should not be overly doctrinaire or complicated, so that it is difficult for the masses to understand and apply.

(III) Stalin said it well: "theory becomes purposeless if it is not connected with revolutionary practice" When we have finished collecting and systematising the views of the masses, it is the duty of our propagandists and organisers to extend the processed views to the masses, to make them their own, and to test them in the practice of class struggle. If we carry out such a style of leadership and organisation, we will be invincible.

It is worth noting that, we can appropriately raise the bar and encourage to put forward some more advanced demands, when sometimes the masses are in high spirits and the movement is going smoothly. But on the whole, we should not detach ourselves from the current reality and prematurely put forward certain demands and opinions that are far beyond the current stage, for this will make the masses leave us and all potential gains be lost. Sometimes because the masses were immersed and caught in the sea of bourgeois ideology for a long time, they inevitably cling to certain erroneous or even reactionary ideas; And at this point, when we raise different opinions, people may be dissatisfied (but we must do so), we cannot replace the actions of the masses with our own ideas. Of course, it does not mean that we should give up our principles, yield to the spontaneous tendencies and passing sentiments of the masses and degenerate into populists. Rather, we should wait patiently and persuade them slowly, so that they can gradually realise what the problem is, what is right and what is wrong, through their own practical activities. Mao summed up this point by saying, "They must link themselves with the masses, not divorce themselves from the masses. In order to do so, they must act in accordance with the needs and wishes of the masses. All work done for the masses must start from their needs and not from the desire of any individual, however well-intentioned. It often happens that objectively the masses need a certain change, but subjectively they are not yet conscious of the need, not yet willing or determined to make the change. In such cases, we should wait patiently. We should not make the change until, through our work, most of the masses have become conscious of the need and are willing and determined to carry it out. Otherwise, we shall isolate ourselves from the masses. Unless they are conscious and willing, any kind of work that requires their participation will turn out to be a mere formality and will fail. The saying 'Haste makes waste' does not mean that we should not make haste, but that we should not be impetuous; impetuosity leads only to failure. This is true in any kind of work, and particularly in the cultural and educational work the aim of which is to transform the thinking of the masses. There are two principles here: one is the actual needs of the masses rather than what we fancy they need, and the other is the wishes of the masses, who must make up their own minds instead of our making up their minds for them. "

If we want to implement the leadership and organisational principle of "from the masses, to the masses", then we must first solve the problem of how to go to the masses ourselves. As long as everything is different, there is bound to be contradiction, but the question lies only in the nature of the contradictions. We MLMs, as the advanced elements of the masses, as the group that has mastered

scientific socialism, still have contradictions with the rest of the masses. These are obviously non-antagonistic contradictions. How these contradictions are resolved is a matter of whether the labouring people, led by the working class, will be able to advance towards revolution under the leadership of their advanced ranks.

In China, where the working day can be as long as 14 hours and where political supervision is extremely strict, it is clear that it is not possible for individuals to work alone in labour integration (join in labor and go deep into the working class), or at least "the investment is not proportional to the return". If we don't want to do nothing, we must first organise ourselves, and then we can go out to the workers with half the effort and carry out further work. Considering that, at present, our Chinese MLMs are mainly urban petty-bourgeois intellectuals, especially university students. At this stage, one of the things we have to do is to organise ourselves in the various universities to form preliminary student organisations. We know that the students themselves are fragile (economically, politically and ideologically) and it is natural that student organisations cannot serve as the basis of the future revolutionary proletarian party. But at this stage, as mentioned above, we need to maximise the use of our existing manpower without wasting every genuine MLM. We need to use student work as much as possible as the match to light up the torch of our workers' work. Specifically, when our student work reaches a certain scale somewhere, we can, and should, send people to contact the labouring masses as much as possible. Of course, in the place where we are well prepared and strong enough, we can also establish direct contact with the labouring masses, a path that has been practised by some comrades with some success. Such contacts as those mentioned above are undoubtedly the most basic contacts at the outset, and we should never imagine that we can turn a worker deeply immersed in the sea of bourgeois ideology into Thälmann at once simply by verbal exchange of words. Just as a populariser of physics should not lecture on the theory of relativity to everyone, so we should not begin with lecturing the masses (including students) on extremely esoteric theories of scientific socialism, we should not start with lectures on "violent revolution" and "the dictatorship of the proletariat", because this will do nothing but dissuade people from coming to us. In fact, we should start from the most basic communication, sincerely treating the workers as our friends, not the ignorant students waiting to be lectured by their teachers. We should understand their lives, know their sufferings, and gradually guide the masses from the most everyday, even the most insignificant details. When we have built up a certain trust with the masses, it will be possible for us to unite with them in the daily practice of class struggle (at this stage now, undoubtedly economic struggle) in an organised struggle, thus making them aware of their own strength. We must always be clear that the masses are often not aware of their own power and do not believe it is possible for them to succeed. But once the masses have won a victory under our organisational leadership, even if it does not end up with much material reward, it will greatly increase their confidence and the efficiency of organisation, and as soon as there is a first struggle, there is a second and a third. Each such struggle will exponentially increase our influence. It is important to know that the masses, if they follow us, do not do so because we are MLM or anything else, but because we have opened their eyes, spoken for them, acted for them, and thus they recognise us as the spokesmen for their interests, and are willing to listen to us (the instilling of class-consciousness requires that special attention be paid to this aspect), and are willing to accept our leadership; Therefore, all our actions must take into account whether they are acceptable to the majority of the people and whether they are in line with the fundamental interests and present needs of the majority of the people. It is true that, however, at the present time we hardly have any practical power at all, but this is not because we are in such a hurry to achieve success that we have gone to the opposite side of the masses by engaging in "blind

activism", but rather because our work is so inadequate that our organisational and propaganda work of all kinds simply does not satisfy the needs of the various mass movements at the present time, and so we MLMs are lagging far behind the masses in actions, so that we have collectively "disappeared" when all kinds of mass struggles are in full swing. We have the obligation to solve this problem as quickly and as well as possible.

If we are able to carry out the MLM style of leadership and organisational principles mentioned above, then we shall certainly be able to help as many people as possible, as well as ourselves in the complex realities of the class struggle to improve our consciousness, to increase our confidence, accumulate our experience, forge our organisation and train our cadres. And all this is in preparation for facilitating and winning the final class duel. When the old rule of the bourgeoisie can no longer continue as usual, when the people can no longer live on as usual either, when this crisis involves even the most backward masses in the political activity. All that we have accumulated in countless daily practices of class struggle will come into play. We have reasons to believe that a self-conscious proletarian contingent, forged through our long work and countless daily practices of struggle, will be able to seize national power and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat by means of highly organised urban uprisings and armed general strikes when the storm of the revolutionary crisis arrives. (Narrowly speaking, in terms of the final battle, a revolution in an industrial country is approximately equal to a national armed general strike.) As the history of the Russian Revolution proved to us that the working class was able to seize power by this route even in an extremely backward imperialist country like Tsarist Russia a hundred years ago, what excuse is there for us. As revolutionaries in the world's leading industrialised country in the twenty-first century, we have no excuse not to help the workers to revive Lenin's cause? There are no excuses, there can be none!

It is worth noting that while the theory of protracted people's war only applies to those countries that still need to carry out new democratic revolutions, as mentioned above, the principle of violent revolution, i.e., "power comes out of the barrel of a gun," is universal. Therefore, this brings us to the question of where our "guns" actually come from.

Engels made a special reference to this in his article to the French workers, he said "But the votes of the electors are far from constituting the main strength of German socialism. In our country you do not become a voter until the age of twenty-five, but at twenty you are a soldier. Moreover, since it is precisely the younger generation which provides the party with most of its recruits, it follows that the German army is becoming more and more infected with socialism. Today we have one soldier in five, in a few years' time we shall have one in three, by 1900 the army, hitherto the most outstandingly Prussian element in Germany, will have a socialist majority. That is coming about as if by fate. The Berlin government can see it happening just as clearly as we can, but it is powerless. The army is slipping away from it." Although present China under the tyranny of bureaucratic order is not even close to the fake bourgeois democracy that existed under the Kaiser in those days, the underlying logic of Engels' discourse continues to apply to all industrial nations. Needless to say, in capitalist societies the army has always been at the heart of the state apparatus (in socialist countries the heart of the state apparatus is the vanguard of the working class), it's an apparatus of violence in its purest form, an extremely reactionary existence. But such an anti-people organisation has to be composed of labouring people, which undoubtedly constitutes another great contradiction. The bourgeoisie can never eliminate this contradiction, because in a capitalist society the main component of the army can never be made up of the ruling class, and therefore the ruling class cannot eliminate the fact that the army is made up of the people. Moreover, the army

controlled by the bourgeoisie, like any other apparatus of violence, exists for the sole purpose of maintaining and expanding the ruling of the bourgeoisie, so the very purpose of the army's existence can never be in accordance with the fundamental interests of the ruled (the labouring people, headed by the proletariat). Anyone who expects the bourgeoisie to voluntarily give up the machinery of violence for the defence of its rule is therefore either stupid or evil, or both. However, any contradiction that exists must necessarily be resolved. Since the representatives of capital are incapable of resolving the irreconcilable contradiction between the purpose of the army's existence and its components, it is the representatives of the people that resolve it in order to realise the class interests of the working class. Sooner or later, as stated above, we shall have to send our comrades into all sections of society, and those of the masses who have been influenced by MLM will certainly enter the army more or less, and sooner or later we shall have to send our comrades likewise into the army to do the work of the masses, which will inevitably lead to the anti-people's army being "infected more and more with socialism", and when this infection is completed, the above-mentioned contradictions will inevitably become more and more acute. And since the army is, after all, a social organisation, the contradictions in society are bound to affect the army to a greater or lesser extent; when the revolutionary crisis sweeping over the whole of society arrives, and when "Among the oppressed masses who are previously politically unconcerned, the number of people turn to waging political struggles are increasing tenfold or even hundredfold," there is bound to be a shake-up and a split within the army as well. At that time, the number of soldiers who turn to the side of the revolutionary people will depend on the effectiveness of our daily work (including, of course, the work in the army).

In the last century, we had achieved a great deal and were red all over the world, yet all this was eventually destroyed in its entirety by all kinds of opportunists and revisionists. Accordingly, it is clear that the greatest threat in the communist movement is mainly the revisionist forces within the revolutionary organisations. It must be made clear that, in the class society, all social organisations, including the revolutionary party, are bound to reflect, to a greater or lesser extent, the reality of the class struggle in society as a whole. Therefore, anyone who tries to construct a thoroughly pure organisation is a complete fantasist. Having said that, what determines the nature of an organisation is, after all, the ideological line that predominates with it, and it is our mission on the left to ensure that the revolutionary Marxist line can predominate within the organisation. To achieve this, it is necessary to engage in line struggle, constantly confronting all sorts of other wrong lines (especially revisionist ones) with the correct line, which is in the fundamental interests of the masses (at this stage, the attainment of the state power). If the text were to end abruptly, however, then the above exposition would be a bunch of hot air. After all, the correct line cannot come out of thin air, and the struggle for the line must also be based on certain methods and strategies.

The correct line is essentially the practice of our correct understanding of ourselves, that is, our true rational understanding. With regard to how to achieve true understanding, Chairman Mao concluded that "Lenin said: 'Practice is superior to (theoretical) understanding because it has not only the character of universality, but also the character of direct reality.'" The Marxist philosophy of dialectical materialism has two most distinctive features: one is its class character, which openly affirms that dialectical materialism is in the service of the proletariat; the other is its practical character, which emphasises the dependence of theory on practice, and the fact that theory, which is based on practice, is in turn in the service of practice. The truth of an understanding or a theory is not determined by what one feels subjectively, but by the results of social practice objectively. The criterion of truth can only be social practice.

The view of practice is the first and fundamental view of the epistemology of dialectical materialism." We have also mentioned above that the line struggle within the organisation is in fact the reflection of the class struggle in society within the organisation. All our strength, all our roots derive from our deep and extensive links with the proletarian masses in the real practice of class struggle. It is true that we also know that sometimes theoretical knowledge based on the practice of the class struggle in the past can also keep a person at least basically politically and ideologically on the proletarian revolutionary line. However, what determines the strength of a political organisation is never the subtlety of its theory or the brilliance of its theorists, but rather how many masses are actually willing to follow the organisation's line. Even if we have 100,000 theorists, even if we are as tightly and perfectly organised as we are, what is the use of not organising and leading the masses? Once we communists are detached from the masses, what else can we do but be slaughtered or run away and bury our heads in the sand? In a word, the correct line must be rooted in the real class struggle, and it is necessary for us to develop it by applying the mass line.

In addition, sometimes the correct understanding is only held by the minority in the first place, while the organisation as a whole may have made mistakes. So, what should be done to stop the loss in time and promote correct understanding? In the view of the Union, this requires relying on the principle of democratic centralism. It is true that in order to carry out the will of the organisation and the principle of unity of proletarian action, any proletarian revolutionary organisation needs to put into firm practice the centralised and unified views, and the broad opinions formed after democratic discussion. Any member of the organisation, even comrades who hold a minority view in opposition to the majority must implement the decisions of the majority, even if they disagree with it. (Provided that the decision itself is not contrary to the underlying programmatic principles.) Yet people tend to forget about internal party democracy, which is, in fact, the main aspect of democratic centralism. This democracy is by no means a formal democracy of the bourgeois type, but a proletarian democracy, of the Paris Commune and the Soviet type. In addition to the right to support and choose a certain opinion (in "democratic" capitalist society, limited to the formal right to vote), people also have the right to refuse, to dismiss certain opinions and cadres. If our organisation is a truly practical proletarian revolutionary organisation, it is only right that the vast majority of the organisation should be practical workers, professional revolutionaries and the proletarian masses themselves, who are deep in the front line of popular struggle. They are definitely the ones who are able to gain the most direct and correct understanding from the fiery practice of the class struggle, in the course of their dealings with the masses. Under these circumstances, if our organisation is truly organised in accordance with proletarian democracy, it goes without saying that the vast majority of our collective resolutions will certainly be on the right lines. And even if occasional mistakes are made, they can be corrected quickly. Historically, when Lenin first returned to Russia from Germany, there were many people in the upper echelons of the party who opposed his uncompromising revolutionary line, but Lenin did not yield to those leaders who were wavering, but effectively implemented the principle of intra-party democracy, relying on the thousands of grass-roots party cadres and gathering their views into a torrent, which was eventually transformed into a unified opinion of the majority of the party. Thus winning a great victory in the Party's internal line struggle.

The correct line must consolidate its dominant position more and more in the midst of battles, not just a fragile flower growing in a greenhouse. At the time, the centrist leaders of the German Social Democratic Party (SPD) were particularly afraid of a line struggle within the organisation, particularly afraid that this would undermine the unity and stability of the organisation, and as a result, the

contradictions within the party gradually intensified, the rightist forces gradually swelled up, and the party as a whole degenerated from being the vanguard of the proletariat all over the world to the life-saver of the German bourgeoisie. We MLMs today must not repeat this mistake. We must encourage line struggles within the organisation, and we have reasons to believe that the scientific theories of MLM are able to win the support of the majority of cadres and the masses, and are able to maintain the dominant position of the revolutionary line within the organisation. In the case of comrades who have made mistakes, we have to use the formula "unity, struggle, unity" to make them realise their mistakes and help them make self-criticism, to realise why they have made mistakes and how to correct them. Only on this basis can we truly unite with the majority of the organisation and the masses.

The same formula applies to our strategy in dealing with the various pan-leftists, with whom we must instead fight uncompromisingly in order to truly unite them. We know that we shall be accused of sectarianism and of not being able to show solidarity to the various pan-lefts. But the question is what is "solidarity"? If we define "solidarity" as 'the united action of a certain range of individuals or different groups choosing to act in unison under certain principles in order to achieve a common goal', then the purpose of our solidarity (here we refer to principled solidarity) with anyone must be to realise the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is the supreme requirement of the stage of socialist revolution. However, we MLMs emphasise theoretical analyses and practical proofs, and our theories and paths are by no means absolutely correct laws that philosophers or great teachers have come up with out of a vacuum, but they have been summed up step by step by countless revolutionary Marxists over the past one hundred and seventy years or so, in the practice of concrete, fire-and-blood class struggle. Our theory has been repeatedly tested by the practice of revolution represented by the Russian and Chinese revolutions and the people's wars that are still being fought today in places like India and the Philippines; our theory is capable of self-reflection and continuous development in practice. (How else did it evolve from Marxism to MLM?) History and reality have likewise proved countless times that all sorts of other things like Social Democracy, Trotskyism, Anarchism and so-called "Western Marxism" have never really integrated with the workers' movement on a large scale. They have hardly ever achieved a breakthrough for the movement, but have often acted as an obstacle, nor have they ever overthrown the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie by means of their strategies. Not to mention the modern social democrats who have been reduced to no real difference from the liberals and the anarchists who have been expelled from the Socialist International. Even the Trotskyists, who have always claimed to be orthodox Bolsheviks, are just the same as the rest. The contradiction between workers and peasants advocated by the Trotskyists has never been a major antagonistic contradiction in any socialist or people's democratic country; and the so-called 'bureaucratic problem' on which they are so keen to discuss is in fact the same as the so-called 'The Order of Qin' which the liberals denounce every day. As for the absurd 'theory of world revolution', it calls for disregarding the logic of the development of the movements in the countries of the world, not believing in the ability of the people of every country to liberate themselves, and demanding with extreme arrogance that, the countries whose revolutions are the first to triumph should disregard the realities of their own circumstances and forcibly push forward the so-called "world revolution"(this theory negates the basis for socialism in one country, which is the real means by which the proletariat, after winning victory in the revolution, can really support the world revolution to the greatest extent possible); Such a strategy cannot push the world revolution, however it would lead to the defeat of the existing socialist regimes. It is also worthwhile to distinguish between those who call themselves 'Marxist-Leninist-Maoist, principally Maoist', which are actually the Gonzaloists. We believe that the great majority of our Gonzaloist friends are more or less theoretically

grounded, and that a considerable number of them have actually been misled by a very small number of Gonzaloists who are stubbornly close to being revisionists or even are already revisionists. For the former, we believe that as long as they continue to study the basic theories and reflect on them more, they can certainly continue to make progress and eventually join our ranks; but in order to help them make progress, we have to keep pointing out their present problems. As for the very few very stubborn Gonzaloists, we can almost ignore them as long as they have no real influence, but if they do, we shall have to treat them in the same way as we treat our revisionist foes. The fact is that the line struggle between the Gonzaloists and the MLM mainstream has been going on for a long time and will continue to do so, some of our comrades have already confronted them many times in some of the legitimate domestic and public platforms, and have written some excellent articles... In fact, the problems of the pan-left are by no means limited to what we have just talked about, but it is not possible to discuss them comprehensively here, so we shall only talk about one point: in order to genuinely promote the progress of those on the pan-left, in order to genuinely realise a large-scale solidarity, what is needed is never for we MLMs to compromise on principles or reluctantly accept the others' so-called "compromises". Rather, we must persist in the struggle for the line, and insist on using the methodological logic of MLM to point out what are right and wrong and why they are right or wrong; only in this way can we realise a truly broad solidarity under the banner of the revolution, otherwise what is the use of the so-called 'solidarity' with the pan-Left when we have achieved it under the wrong line? Such a 'solidarity' would even force us to lose what we had been relatively right about, and the loss would really outweigh the gain. If we are able to summarise the basic consensus of MLM, forge it into a sharp blade, and actually use this blade to deeply dissect various realities in concrete cases and in the development of the movement, then anyone who is genuinely willing to promote the revolution and who has the basic ability to reflect will be more likely to reject what is wrong and join our rank, thus achieving a truly great solidarity. "

At the same time, we MLMs in China are now in dire need of another kind of solidarity, that of genuine revolutionary organisations. A new breed of more advanced revolutionary organisations has been born in China, which are better able to deal with the division of labour between the offline and online, the clandestine and public, and the inside and outside of the Chinese internet, than the preliminary organisations of the previous period. But it is precisely because of the sheer number of new organisations and the lack of links between them that a great deal of revolutionary work (such as the writing and editing of publications) has been duplicated, and valuable man-powers have been wasted. But those organisations can and should be united with each other.

Therefore, we should start with basic cooperation under a unified revolutionary line, promoting each other's growth and helping each other's revolutionary work on all sides. From the time we build the Revolutionary Union to the time we carry out some of our work together, even to the eventual organisational merger in the future under specific conditions, this kind of union can promote the growth of the affiliated organisations, and can gradually liberate our cadres so that they can go on to do more critical work. This kind of union must be conditional, it must be based on the needs of the revolutionary struggle and the real requirements of the organisations, therefore this kind of unity must be carried out voluntarily by the organisations, which also means that each affiliated organisation should have sufficient conditions to fully examine other organisations in the process, and must have the rights to freely withdraw from the Union.

If the members of all the organisations are basically genuine proletarian revolutionaries, then in the course of continuous understanding and cooperation,

and in our increasingly close revolutionary work, we shall naturally be able to promote trust and unity, and we shall be able to make a greater contribution to the progress of the revolutionary forces in this country.

Fundamental Principles

In conclusion, we, the Revolutionary Union of China, hereby make the following statement of basic principles:

1. The Union considers the interests of the proletariat to be paramount. All the work of the Union will serve to realise the interests of the proletariat.
2. The Union believes that China is now a complete bureaucratic monopoly capitalist country and a fascist imperialist country. The main contradiction in this country is "the antagonistic contradiction between the labouring people as a whole, headed by the working class, and the bureaucratic monopoly bourgeoisie." Therefore, the Chinese labouring people must carry out a new socialist revolution on to reconstruct the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is the highest demand of the entire socialist revolutionary onary stage. And the Union will do its utmost to promote this cause.
3. Marxism-Leninism-Maoism (or Maoism for short) is the only guiding ideology of the Union, is the theory of scientific socialism. MLM is the third stage of Marxism, and no person or organisation shall, under any circumstances add qualifier or suffix to MLM in foreseeable future.
4. The minimum task of the present phase of the Union is to promote the solidarity of the genuine MLM organisations in this country, and the maximum task is to reconstruct a Leninist proletarian vanguard in China.
5. The planned and organised project for integrating with the industrial workers is the most important task of the Union at present time. This is the prerequisite for all future organisational and propaganda work of the Union.
6. The Union believes that, MLMs in China shall unite as far as possible, to end the situation that the socialist movement is falling behind the spontaneous movement of the masses.
7. The Mass Line, as the "From the masses, to the masses" leadership and organisational principle, is the fundamental method of every mass work of the Union. The interest of the entire labouring people headed by working class, out of question, is our interest.
8. The Union believes that the socialist revolution movement in China, is a fairly important part in the worldwide proletarian movement. Revolutionaries in China must undertake the corresponding Internationalist obligations. Therefore, the Union should spend spare no effort in supporting the socialist revolution of the working class in any other industrialised countries, and all the new democratic revolution movements in every semi-colonial and semi-feudal country, especially supporting the struggle of the oppressed nation against Chinese Imperialism.
9. The Union resolutely opposes all imperialist forces (first and foremost the Chinese Imperialist), and resolutely resists all imperialist wars and proxy wars, especially the looming war between China and the US, and the war in Taiwan Strait.
10. The Union oppose any form of forced annexation. We advocate that in every nation, every region, people enjoy the most complete rights of autonomy. The Union oppose to ceding some regions to a certain regime for any reason, without

considering the will of the majority of certain region or nation. Here we refer first and foremost to the Taiwan question.

11. Under the condition of following the political line of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and the basic principles mentioned above, the affiliate organisations should ensure mutual respect and equality. In particular, they shall respect the internal management decisions and security issues of their respective organisations, except for major differences in political principles.

12. In adherence to Article 11, the Affiliated Organisations shall, as far as possible and without any upper limit, promote solidarity among themselves, form better relations and help each other in order to contribute to the development of the general work of the Union. At the same time, the right of each Affiliated Organisation to withdraw freely shall be guaranteed.

13. The affiliated organisations shall appoint their respective representatives to be responsible for co-operation, co-ordination and other matters between the organisations; the representatives concerned shall pool together to discuss matters of the Union. If there is any contradiction or disagreement, it should be discussed through the meeting of the representatives first, and if it cannot be solved, then each of them should make a wider common resolution on the contradiction within the organisation.

14. The affiliated organisations and their members are obliged to adhere to the above principles.