

A Struggle Within the Chinese Communist Party

Bill Fletcher, Jr.

On July 1, 2001 Chinese Communist Party (CPC) general secretary Jiang Zemin delivered a speech recognized immediately to be of great importance. He advocated the admission of capitalists to the Chinese Communist Party.

A struggle broke out within the CPC. Inner party struggles within the CPC do not take place openly. Reports on disputes within the CPC in the press inside China are rare and in a sort of code. Even the Hong Kong press shies away from such a subject. Two letters from prominent older party figures opposing the admission of capitalists to the party began to circulate privately from hand to hand. The existence of these letters, and therefore the existence of the struggle, became widely known. But of public discussion there was none.

The importance of the conflict is clear. It was, and is, a test of the strength of an almost invisible but very real presence: the opposition within the CPC to further extensions of capitalist social relations in China. As of last summer, the public voice of this Marxist opposition within the CPC were four small theoretical journals. None had a circulation much greater than *Monthly Review*.

On August 16, 2001 Erik Eckholm reported in *The New York Times* that the “small but influential Marxist journal” *The Pursuit of Truth* had been closed “for attacking President Jiang Zemin's plan to bring capitalists into the Communist Party.” He went on to report that “despite the unease in some circles about Mr. Jiang's direction, the editor at a party magazine said today, ‘The decisions have already been made, and opposition is futile.’ ”

But things were not that simple. On August 23, 2001 Vivien Pik-Kwan Chan reported in the right-wing Hong Kong *South China Morning Post* (SCMP) that “President Jiang Zemin has ordered that anti-reform leftist forces be ‘exterminated at the budding stage’ ” and that “ Mr Jiang, on the one hand, fears that a rise in the influence of leftists...would drive away foreign businessmen at a time when the country is about to join the World Trade Organisation. On the other, he fears it will endanger his bid for leadership at the [Fall 2002] 16th Party Congress.”

It was extraordinary for the SCMP, which as editorial policy almost never reports *left* opposition in China, to suggest that Mr. Jiang feared his leadership endangered from that quarter.

And apparently there was some truth to this. The CPC Central Committee held a plenary session September 24-26, 2001. On October 23, 2001, Xu Yufang reported in the Taiwan owned, Hong Kong based, *Asia Times Online* that “[w]ith no fuss and without a word in public at all, the ruling Chinese Communist Party (CPC) has repudiated the bold plan of its leader, General Secretary Jiang Zemin, to open the party to capitalists and entrepreneurs.” The article remains, as of May 2002, available at <http://www.atimes.com/china/CJ23Ad01.html> and deserves to be read in its entirety. It reports that “Ding Guangen, the CPC propaganda chief and Jiang's major protege, received the most rebukes for having tried to suppress discussion on the plan's merits while the party had yet to make a decision.” As far as we can tell, the accuracy of this *Asia Times* story has not been denied.

Anecdotal reports from China suggest that in practice censorship of left Marxist voices within the CPC has, if anything, intensified. Of the four left Marxist theoretical journals only two are still permitted to publish, and those two exercise a strict self-censorship. And many individual capitalists in fact belong to the CPC, as indeed was the case before Mr. Jiang's speech of July 1, 2001.

The question is one of a fundamental *de jure* shift away from Marxist and Leninist traditions, and given how far the CPC has progressed *de facto* in such a direction, the October 23, 2001 Xu Yufang report of the rebuke delivered to Mr. Jiang came as a decided surprise.

More recently Jiang Xueqin, in a “Letter from China” published in *The Nation* of March 4, 2002, stated that “[w]hen Jiang Zemin welcomed capitalists to join the party last year...[f]ourteen Old Guard Communists wrote a letter to Jiang accusing him of violating party unity in a manner that would eventually lead China into a Soviet Union-like collapse. Jiang responded by placing the suspected ringleader, Wei Wei, an 82 year-old writer under house arrest. China's security apparatus arrested lesser officials and sympathizers found distributing the letter.” This is a reference to one of the two letters whose circulation last summer led to so surprising—if perhaps temporary—an outcome.

Early in 2002 the official state news agency Xinhua set out a list of criteria for capitalists who want to join the Communist Party, such as treating employees fairly and re-investing their

profits in their enterprises. In May 2002 Xinhua reported that the Communist Party of Guangdong province (the heart of capitalist development in China) had selected capitalists among its delegates to the 16th Party Congress, scheduled to meet in the fall of 2002. Such evidence suggests that the question of a formal change in the Party's Basic Statute will be reopened at the 16th Congress, and that opposition to the admission of capitalists to the party is being, or has been, suppressed. Yet the rebuke to the proposal at the September 2001 plenum was unexpected, and the outcome of this hidden struggle is not yet certain.

We make available here for the first time an English translation of the [Letter of the Fourteen](#), as well as a translation of the second—somewhat longer and more theoretical—[letter addressed to the Central Committee](#) by Ma Bin, former General Manager of Anshan Iron and Steel Company and Han Yaxi, former Alternate General Secretary and Head of the Propaganda and Education Department of the All-China Federation of Trade Unions.

Letter of the Fourteen : **A Letter to the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party**

Distinguished members of the central committee:

In his speech at the meeting celebrating the Eightieth Anniversary of the Founding of the Chinese Communist Party, Comrade Jiang Zemin openly called for admission of owners of private enterprises to membership of the Party.

The proposition that capitalists, who personify Capital, should be allowed to join the Party, has immediately caused enormous confusion in the minds of party members; it also came as a surprise to people both in China and abroad who were concerned about the fate of the Chinese Communist Party. Commentators in the foreign bourgeois media noted that the admission of private business owners to membership of the Chinese Communist Party would change the nature of the communist party, “and transform it into a ruling party of the entire people.”

On such an important issue of principle that bears on the overall development and, in a fundamental way, the very fate of the Party and the State, Comrade Jiang Zemin hastily proclaimed to the whole party, the entire nation and the whole world a position which had not been considered and adopted by the Congress of the Party. This is a blatant attempt to

manipulate opinions of Party members and set the stage for foisting this erroneous position on the Party Congress by invoking the need to uphold Party unity. This constitutes political misconduct unprecedented in the history of our Party.

Now that these things have already come to this stage, we, a group of old Communist Party members, are duty-bound to state clearly our position and submit our views to the Central Committee in exercise of our rights under the Basic Statute of the Party. We hereby solemnly declare that we firmly and without reservation oppose the proposition that private business owners be allowed to join the Party. We believe that Comrade Jiang Zemin's position in this regard is entirely wrong, and this is because of the following reasons:

In the first place, it runs counter to the Marxist theory of the proletarian party.

The admission of capitalists to membership of a Communist party is unheard of in Marxist theory or practice that has emerged since the *Communist Manifesto* was first published. Comrade Deng Xiaoping shared this stand as well when he stressed that “a Party member must be a person who works but not exploit others' work,” and “We must call upon every Communist Party member to clearly draw a line between labor and exploitation.” (Deng, Vol. 1, p. 243.) Comrade Jiang tries to obfuscate the exploitative class nature of private business owners by lumping them together with various segments of the working class, under the label of “deepening” of the understanding of the theory of labor value.

This in no way constitutes a “creative renewal” of Marxism, but rather, an outright negation of its basic principles.

Secondly, his stand on this matter contravenes our Party's programs and Basic Statute.

The nature of the Chinese Communist Party has been defined by the stipulation that “the CCP is the vanguard of the Chinese working class.” This is a tenet enshrined in our Party's Program and Basic Statute adopted at each session, from first to the fifteenth, of the CCP Congress. This is by no means the same as the proposition, as put forth by Comrade Jiang Zemin, that “the CCP has at the same time become the vanguard of the Chinese people and nation.” Anyone who is at all familiar with our Party's history and has an elementary understanding of Marxism knows that a distinction must be drawn between an individual's class origin and this person's class status. If one comes from a family background of exploiting class and has undergone protracted transformation and rebelled against the class

to which one once had belonged, then of course he or she may join the Party. However, if a capitalist does not repudiate the bourgeois class and continues to engage in exploitation, how could he or she become a worthy element of the proletarian class? How could a capitalist, as a member of the exploiting class, be expected to devote his or her whole life time to struggle for the realization of communism? Comrade Jiang Zemin's views do not make any sense in this respect.

Thirdly, Comrade Jiang acted in violation of Party discipline. Once the Party's program and Basic Statute is adopted, every member must firmly implement them. As General Secretary of the Party, Comrade Jiang Zemin acted in open defiance of the Party's current program and constitution, as well as the decision adopted by the Central Committee on August 28, 1989, that there be no admission of private-business owners to Party Membership. By way of a surprise attack, he went before the entire nation to proclaim ideas that run counter to the program and Basic Statute and other relevant decisions of the Party in an attempt to place his own individual will above the entire organization of the Party. This constitutes a most egregious breach of Party discipline.

And fourthly, he has acted against the will of both the Party and the people.

The Party and the entire nation will not allow our party to change its essential nature of being the vanguard of the proletarian class. They do not wish to see a splitting of the Party caused by a certain attempt to change her red color. They will not allow our Party to follow in the footsteps of the Communist Parties of the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries whose trajectory in the name of "a party of the entire people" led to the great historical reversal. For these reasons, we wish to propose the following:

1. The Central Committee should adhere to the principles of Marxism and act in conformity with the correct stipulation against admission of capitalists contained in the Party Program and Basic Statute as well as the Central Committee decision of August 28, 1989. The "Circular regarding Strengthening the Party-building work" clearly states: "There exists between the private business owners and their workers in practice a relationship of the exploiting versus the exploited. We must not accept private business owners to our Party." Comrade Jiang Zemin, in his speech on August 21, 1989, expressed clear support for this decision of the Central Committee. He asked, "If we allow those who refuse to give up exploitation but rely on it for a living to join our Party, then what kind of political party do we

expect our Party to be?" (Jiang, "A Documentary Selection on the Party's Construction in the New Era." People's Publisher, 1991. p. 442.)

However, Comrade Jiang Zemin has abandoned the correct point of view he once held, and made an about turn with his "July First Speech" this year. If, indeed, there is any significant change in the objective circumstances as compared with those in 1989, it is none other than the fact that the number of private business owners has gone up and their capital has expanded. However, the fact that "there exists between the private business owners and their workers, in practice a relationship of the exploiting versus the exploited" has remained and there are no grounds whatsoever to modify the correct decision of the Central Committee made in 1989. We propose that this correct decision be reiterated in the Party's Basic Statute to be adopted at the 16th National Congress of the Party in order to guarantee that our Party's essential nature as a proletarian political party will remain unshaken by any attempt of individual leaders of the Party to impose their personal will on the Party. Any substantive revisions of the Party's Basic Statute put forward at the 15th National Congress of the Party should be pursued by consulting the entire Party membership and ensuring full discussions well in advance of the 16th Congress, so that on major issues of principle the question of right and wrong can be resolved on the basis of the Marxist theory on Party building.

2. Comrade Jiang Zemin needs to carry out serious self-criticism within the Party regarding his misconduct in order to remove ideological confusions that have been caused by his misconduct and to undo its negative consequences.

3. The Party's Central Committee has not withdrawn the 1989 document; no branch of the Party's organization shall act against the decisions contained therein. It is not admissible for any member of the new media to propagate the erroneous proposition that private business owners are eligible for Party membership. Disciplinary measures should be pursued in cases where a branch of the Party's organization and its leaders took upon themselves to admit private business owners to Party membership, and notices in regard to such cases should be circulated among the entire Party membership to serve as an object lesson. Private business owners who have already joined the Party, or Party members who became private business owners, should be dealt with in accordance with the Central Committee's 1989 document; they must strive to be models of abiding by the state's relevant laws and regulations. Moreover, they must act in accordance with the Party's ideology and principles, carry out in

earnest their duties as a Party member, and be remunerated at an income level commensurate with that of managerial personnel; they must use after-tax profits for the purpose of enhancing production, treat workers equally, and respect their legal rights. If they fail to behave in this manner they are not qualified for Party membership and shall be advised to leave the Party.

They can apply to join other democratic parties, if they so wish.

4. Good United Front work is essential. We should unite well with, educate and provide guidance to, successful private business owners who have made contributions to national construction, affording them appropriate honors and political status. They may be selected as members of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Committee or deputies of the Chinese People's Congress which all fall within the purview of United Front work. If we downgrade our Party to the level of the United Front organizations, we will undermine not only the Party but also the United Front.

We solemnly request the Party Central Committee to accord serious attention to views we express herein and provide a serious and responsible response to the entire Party membership.

By— (with signatures in alphabetical order)

Ma Bin, Former Advisor, State Council Center for Development Research Youth League membership since 1932; Party membership since 1935

Wang Dinglie, Former Deputy Commander. Air Force. People's Liberation Army, Youth League membership since 1935; Party membership since 1936

Deng Liqun, Former Secretary of Central Committee Secretariat of the CCP Party membership since 1936

Shi Shan, Former Vice Minister of Agriculture

Qi Yiding, Veteran Cadre, Ministry of Electronic Industry

Liu Zhenhua, Former Political Committee Member and Lieutenant General, Beijing Military Area

Li Yuanru, Former Vice Minister of Electronic Industry

Li Feiping, Former Vice Minister of Metallurgical Industry

Li Zhaoji, Former Vice Minister of Electronic Industry

Li Dezhong, Former Secretary of the Jilin Province Party Committee

Zhang Chen, Veteran Cadre, Municipal Party Committee of Beijing;

Gao Jun, Former Vice Minister Of Electronic Industry

Qian Min, Former Minister of Electronic Industry

Huang Zhigang, Former Secretary Tianjin Municipal Party Committee

Han Xiya, Former Candidate Secretary, All-China Federation of Trade Unions

Wei Wei, Writer, Party membership since 1938

Monthly Review, May 2002, <http://www.monthlyreview.org/0502cpc3a.htm>

Letter of Ma Bin and Han Yaxi, July 15, 2001

**A Letter to Comrade Jiang Zemin
and the Party's central Committee**

From about a year ago, we have had mainly three questions:

1. What is value? Is value created only through labor, or through land, capital, as well as labor?

It is well recognized that labor can create value. That means that any type of material items (goods) is materialized labor or created by labor. The value of the material products (goods) is determined by the value of the means of livelihood consumed by the worker during the

time he or she produces the material product (goods). A natural substance without application of human labor may have use value but does not have value. A piece of land will not have value without being used by human being. Even if it is growing grasses that may be used to feed cattle or sheep and thus has use value, cattle or sheep can be fed on it only through human labor of herding or harvesting, through which the land will have value. Without herding or harvesting, the grasses will only grow and naturally create no value.

A certain amount of money capital locked in a safe will not generate any value. Even if production tools and subject of labor are bought using money, without being used for producing a product by workers, they have only transferred value and would not generate new value. Not only that, due to oxidation when exposed to certain environments, they may well be degraded and even become totally useless. Only when processed in production by workers, can new value be created. This clearly explains why value can be created only by labor. Without labor, land and capital will not create any value and will not become the sources of rent and profit.

In a capitalist society, the reason that land may generate rent, and capital may generate profit is because of the establishment of bourgeois right and privatization of land and capital. The laborers own nothing and become a proletariat who have only their own labor to sell. Under these circumstances, if one needs to use land, one has to rent it from and to pay rent to a landlord. The owner of capital can use his capital to buy land, production tools, subject of labor, and the proletariat's labor, forcing them to work for him. The result of the production is that the land, the production tools and the subject of labor transfer their value to the newly produced goods without any increase in value. Only the labor of the proletariat created a new value that includes the amount paid by the capitalist to them to maintain their livelihood, and surplus value that is the source of the profit for the capitalist or the rent for the landlord. This explains why neither land nor capital can create value. The nature of rent and capital profit is occupying and sharing the surplus value created by the proletariat.

These basic principles of Marxism will never be outdated. Now during the primary period of socialism, our economy is relatively backward. In order to develop the economy, under the dominance of socialist public ownership, it may be necessary for us to make use of foreign and domestic private capital and therefore to allow part of the new value created by the labor of the working class to be shared with the owners of private capital as surplus value. Nonetheless, this does not mean that capital creates value. This only reflects bourgeois right.

All what we have discussed above has become common knowledge and we have just expressed it in our own words.

2. In August last year, you said “Scientific and technological work and management work are playing more and more important roles in social production”. Meanwhile, you proposed “to further understand labor and labor value problem according to the reality of modern production.” After that, the documents of due Fifth Plenary Session of the Fifteenth Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party proposed to “encourage capital and technology as key elements of production to participate in profit sharing.” In addition to this idea, the outline of the Tenth Five-Year Plan further proposed “the salaries of the senior managers and technical professionals should be increased to a level that sufficiently reflects the value of their work, ...”

The work in science, technology and business management is playing a more and more important role in social production. How to fully understand this requires analysis that should be performed practically and realistically. How the national policy on income distribution is decided also requires research. However, if we still want to apply Marxist theory of labor and labor value to the problem, we have to combine the basic principles of Marxism with practice in research that has to be scientific.

Work in science, technology and business management is distinguished from direct physical labor. It mainly involves mental labor, or complex labor, while direct physical labor is likely manual labor or simple labor. This has not been the way types of labor are categorized for some time now. Recently, a new way of classification has been proposed in which labor is divided into “creative labor and repetitive labor.” Whether this new way of classification is adequate could be discussed. The three types of classification: mental labor versus manual labor, complex labor versus simple labor, and creative labor versus repetitive labor are basically the same though their intention may be slightly different.

The reason for us to say that work of science, technology and business management as complex labor is more important than direct and simple labor is that this type of labor may be more effective in creating use value. It may create more, newer, more efficient products that consume less key elements of production.

Now, let us take a look at whether or not complex labor is more valuable than simple labor. During the same period of time, a worker of complex labor may create higher value than a

worker of simple labor does. This has been recognized by Marxism. Marx said that complex laborer may create value that is several times as much as a simple laborer does in the same period of social labor time. It is due to the following reasons. First a complex laborer requires a lot more education and training, secondly, complex labor often cannot be finished in a fixed time period. A mental laborer, or a technical person, or a business manager may have to study the problem he has to solve during fixed office hours. However, he may still have to think about, study, plan and even handle the problem after office hours. Sometimes, in the fixed office time, a mental laborer may not achieve any accomplishment. However, he may come up with achievements in leisure time. Therefore, if an eight hour working day is given to a mental laborer and a manual laborer, the manual laborer leaves his working place and means of production and thus ceases his working activity, while the mental laborer may continue his work after his office hours. If the value of their labor is evaluated on an eight hour basis, the mental labor will have higher value than the manual labor even if the unit values of the two are the same- Thirdly, complex labor, or scientific and technologic work, or business management, often is not going to be successful at once but may likely fail once or several times before the final success. Thus longer working time is needed. Of course, this does not mean that the more times they fail, the longer time they spend, the higher their value of labor. Society could only recognize the mean working time and mean labor value for similar mental labors. In summary, due to these factors, complex labor or mental labor has higher value than simple labor does. This also shows that Marx's statement of "several times" difference between complex labor and simple labor fits the practical situation. Today, in our country, a manual laborer also needs to finish nine years of compulsory education. Many workers have a high school diploma. A college graduate is considered a mental laborer. Comparing the two, the education time for a mental laborer is not a few times longer than that for a manual laborer.

The uncertainty of the working time of a mental laborer may result from two situations. A hard-working mental laborer may use his mind on work continuously for 24 hours, while a lazy mental laborer may not seriously work even during his office hours. The criticism of workers to some of our managers and technical professionals as "drinking one cup of tea, smoking one cigarette, and reading one newspaper for half a day" is exactly this kind of situation. Nowadays, some company senior managers are busy networking outside the company. They claim that it is necessary to do so. However, it is questionable how much of such activity is necessary labor.

It is said that science and technology are the first productive forces. This means overall science and technology. In the advancement of science and technology, scientists and technical professionals should lead and therefore play an important role in research and invention. However, under the conditions of socialized productivity, the process from the success of a scientific research or invention to its transferring into some real social productive force must involve more than a single or a few technical professionals. It is necessary also to involve workers who directly participate in production. In addition, manual labor may also include mental labor, complex labor, and creative labor. In practice, a technical professional has invented or designed a product and wants to produce it. He has to do it through operating workers who can handle the technology. The workers often have to modify an imperfect, unreasonable design. The design from a technical professional should be understandable to and followed by operating workers. A technical professional may be able to do calculation and design but often may not be able to operate machines. Thus, it is said that “machines are made instead of sketched.” This may be a biased statement or even a little disrespectful one to scientific and technical professionals. But it indeed reflects the real situation in one aspect. Everyone knows the importance of senior technical professionals. The advancement of science and technology is the cause of the whole working class. The representative of advanced productive force is the entire working class. The Charter of the Anshan Iron and Steel Company that proposes the three-in-one combination of technical professionals, workers, and managers is correct. It shows the advantage of our socialist system. Nowadays, it is absolutely correct to say that we have to enhance the overall quality of the working class. It is incorrect not to pay attention to scientific and technical professionals. It is equally incorrect to neglect manual laborers.

In managing a company, the leaders of the company are important. In modern industrial production, the companies need to be organized from top to bottom. The management system is like a pyramid. Socialist business management should also follow the principle of democratic centralism. Although the chief executive officer is important, in order to be successful, he has to depend on both the managers at every level and all employees in both inside management and in marketing and sales. If he is all by himself, no matter how capable he is, it is hard for him to be successful because even the wise are not always free from error. We have to pay attention to the ability of the senior manager of a company. However, his contribution should not be exaggerated.

It should also be pointed out that if we thoroughly understand that “the value of labor is determined by the value of the means of livelihood in producing, developing, maintaining and regenerating labor” (Marx in *Salary, Price and Profit*) we should be able to say that the expenditure of labor is actually the expenditure of a laborer's life. In this sense, comparing mental and manual labors, it is difficult to judge which one consumes more life of the laborer. We are communists and Marxists and therefore should consider all the laborers and every member of the working class similarly valuable and equal. When we pay attention to the mental laborers, we should also recognize that broad masses of manual laborers work under hard, exhaustive, dirty, difficult, and dangerous conditions. They may have to not only put in a lot of physical effort and sweat all over but also take a risk of being injured or even killed in certain circumstances. For those who work underground in a coal gallery, high above the ground, in high temperature and extremely low temperature, in high noise level, in highly dusty places, in hazardous gases, or a highly radioactive environment, have to not only possess the strength and specialties in the specific profession, but also to take a risk of contracting job related diseases and disability and even shortening of life span. If we take these factors into account, the value of manual laborers should also increase significantly.

Therefore, as long as we combine theory with practice and really seek the truth from facts in our research and understanding of the problem, we should recognize that Marxist theory of labor and labor value is not out of date in today's socialist society. Having realized that the value of mental labor is greater than that of manual labor, we should not think that the value of mental labor is so much higher than that of manual labor and thus allow the income of the two types of laborers to be greatly different.

There is a prevalent argument that the business activities of the capitalists of privately owned and privately funded enterprises are also labor and therefore they are workers too. It is true that the business activities of this type of capitalist have a dual character. It indeed contains labor on one hand. On the other hand, the main purpose of their business activities is to acquire profit on capital, appropriating the surplus value of workers' labor. The nature of these activities is exploitation instead of labor. In terms of compensation, they are either the chief executive officer or the chairman of the board of trustees and pay themselves a high salary. Therefore, the value of their labor has been retrieved. However, the major source of their income is from exploitation. Consequently, they do not belong to the working class and rather are exploiters. If we consider the exploitation activity of those who painstakingly builds up their own business as labor and thus think the exploiters are also workers, we will get into

a ridiculous situation. This is because exploiters, who painstakingly build up their own business, can be found among capitalists, slave owners, and feudal lords. How could we consider their activities as working and consider them workers? In *Midnight Cockcrow*, a novel written by Gao Yubao, the old landlord required the farm laborer to get up and start working after cock crowed three times. In order to force the farm laborers to get up early, he got up midnight and stuck his head in the chicken coop and mimicked a cockcrow. That was indeed hard work. Should we also regard his activity as labor? The behavior of the old landlord was really disgusting although it was still a way of management. Is there an essential distinction between this type of management and those “civilized” management methods? The answer is no. The conclusion can only be that capitalists' activities in managing their own business are not labor. Capitalists whose income mainly comes from exploitation are exploiters instead of workers.

Having discussed Marxist theory of labor and labor value, you state “the criterion of judging whether one is politically progressive or conservative should not be based on whether he has private property or how much private property he owns; Instead, they should be judged based on their political thought and practical activity, how they acquire their fortune and how they make use of their fortune, and how they contribute to the the cause of constructing socialism with Chinese characteristics through their work.”

This is another statement that needs to be clarified. Your “criterion of judging whether one is politically progressive” should be used to judge what type of people should be accepted as a Party member. Is it true that if one is politically progressive by your criterion, he should be accepted as a Party member? We do not know who told you that a person who owns a fortune is necessarily politically conservative and therefore should not be allowed to join the party. Is there anyone who ever said so?

As stated previously, as stated in the Party Basic Statute, the most clearly defined requirement of the class attribute of a party member is that “a Party member of the Chinese Communist Party should be a vanguard soldier of the Chinese working class who is a conscientious communist.” “A Party member of the Chinese Communist Party should always be a common member of the working class people.” “A member of the working class” and “a common member of the working class people” are the requirements of a party member's class attribute about which there should never be any ambiguity. From this, a capitalist who owns private capital and uses it to exploit hired workers is neither a member of working class

nor a common member of working people and therefore should not be admitted to the party. Here the deterministic factors are ownership of capital and activity of exploitation. The property mentioned in your statement is not necessarily the same as capital. We guess you know that. Do you also mean that the capitalists who own private capital and use it to exploit hired workers should not be admitted to the party?

At this point, we feel a little awkward. There were 1513 words in the section of your statement about “in implementation of the Three Representations, we have to stick with the nature of the Party as the vanguard of the working class and to always maintain the progressiveness of the party. Meanwhile, we should enlarge the class base and popular base of the Party according to the practical situation of economic and social development and steadily increase the social influence of the party.” We initially thought that we only needed to write a short letter to express our opinions. When we thought about some details, we encountered many questions and problems. In order to express our opinions in relatively detailed way, this letter became lengthy. All the words come to one sentence: we must not admit capitalists into the party. If so, the nature of the party will be changed.

Our insistence on this is not to follow a dogma or a book but to act based on reality. The bourgeois class and the working class have a natural conflict of interest, and struggle because the bourgeoisie controls capital and are thus able to appropriate surplus value created by hired workers. The working class is robbed because they have only their labor for sale. This situation has existed since the birth of the two classes in China, as well as in the world. People such as we have had such an experience ourselves. We understand deeply the pain of being exploited. It is because of that experience, we accepted the teaching of the Party, firmly believe in Marxism, and took the cause of revolution. After the victory of the revolution, we have seen the happiness and the unlimited enthusiasm for socialism of the whole working class, or the exploited after being liberated. The country was becoming more and more prosperous. Because of this, we firmly believe that the advantageous socialist system must not be eliminated. Since the beginning of the twenty some years reform, the social status and the rights of the working class have been steadily decreasing. This makes the working class and most of the Chinese people extremely unsatisfied. Now we want to admit the capitalists and exploiters into the party, making the overseas capitalist class happy while the working class will be even more unsatisfied. The party will distance itself even father away from the working class, which destroys the base of the party. We should never do that.

After your speech, the general office of the Central Committee sent out a circular, stating that issues related to most important policies should not be touched till the final decision. We thought that referred to the subject of admitting bourgeois elements into the party. However it was not spelled out clearly. This is not a good style of writing. Nonetheless, it is correct to guard this pass cautiously. The circular also indicates that the department concerned in the Party Central Committee will make up the guidelines for the issue. Since this relates to the most important issues such as the class nature and class purity of the party, a single department in the Party Central Committee has no right to make a decision. The Party is the vanguard of the working class. Admitting bourgeois elements into the party is an issue that will have an impact on the fundamental interest of the entire working class and the Chinese people. If a decision is to be made, it should be made through the following process. First, all the Party members should be mobilized to extensively collect the opinions of the working class and working people. Then the Party members should have discussion on the issue and came up with opinions to be further discussed at the National Congress of the party by their representatives. Only on the basis of such discussion can a decision can be made. After all, the issue of admitting bourgeois elements into the party should never have been raised in the first place. We urge that the Central Committee be extremely cautious on this issue.

4. Finally, we would like to add one more point. Recently, it has frequently been said that you have developed Deng Xiaoping Theory and thus also developed Marxism. Someone wrote an article indicating that Chinese development of Marxism has generated two great fruits; Mao Zedong Thought and Deng Xiaoping Theory. The article further states that “a series of expositions of Comrade Jiang Zemin's in recent years, especially his important thought of Three Representations, are the new condensation of the experience of the socialist construction of our country under the new circumstances. It is a new development of Deng Xiaoping Theory.” “The thought of Three Representations is another model of combining the basic principles of Marxism with China's reality and thus is a significant achievement of the Chinese development of Marxism.”

Now, there is a rumor that some people are proposing to use a specific phrase to represent your expositions such that they will be related and parallel to Marxism-Leninism, Mao Zedong Thought, and Deng Xiaoping Theory. It will also be formally listed as one of the guides of actions of the Party. Of course, it is just a rumor and there is no evidence. Today, we write this letter to you and the Central Committee, reminding you to pay attention to this and to be cautious in taking action.

If we want to talk about developing Marxism, we should first emphasize that it is the practice of the working class and the revolutionary peoples that develops Marxism. Secondly, anyone, who firmly believes Marxism and uses it to solve practical problems, will always develop Marxism to a certain extent. As for the major leading cadres of the Party, they may concentrate the experience and wisdom of the whole Party and the people in the nation and develop Marxism to a certain extent. The problem is whether for the expositions of each term of the central leading core, we have to invent a phrase and define it as a guide of action. Nowadays, when Chinese people mention in speech and writing about their guiding thought, they have to spell “Marxism-Leninism, Mao Zedong Thought, and Deng Xiaoping Theory.” If we keep adding the expositions of one term after another of the leaders, how could we possibly handle it?

Up to today, we have just walked the first one or few steps in a ten thousand mile march on the cause of the Party. The road ahead of us is extraordinary difficult. We have not had real understanding of the role of many issues and therefore not much freedom in action. Every Communist Party member should be as extremely cautious as if we were on the edge of a cliff or stepping on thin ice. Be very, very careful.

We are both really aged and like an old cow that knows the shortness of the sunset. The reason why we candidly wrote this letter to you and the Central Committee is that we still feel our responsibility to the Party, the working class, the Chinese people, and socialist and communist venture of the human society.

Ma Bin, Former General Manager of Anshan Iron and Steel Company

Han Yaxi, Former Alternate General Secretary, Head of Propaganda and Education Department of All-China Federation of Trade Unions

July 15, 2001