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Executive Summary

The Chinese Communist Party’s ideology has undergone remarkable changes in the past three decades as a result of dramatic reforms. To maintain its relevance and legitimacy, the Party has not only restructured its orthodox Marxism and redefined Mao Zedong Thought, but also developed new ideological theories, such as Deng Xiaoping’s Theory, Jiang Zemin’s Three Represents and Hu Jintao’s Harmonious Society. Instead of declining, China’s official ideology has thus been revitalised and reoriented, guiding the Party to adapt to rapid changes of socioeconomic situations, both internally and externally.

Also, the Party itself has been revitalised, advancing with the times and evolving from a ‘revolutionary party’ into a more modern and more sophisticated ‘governing party’ with considerable support among the Chinese people. Moreover, China’s unique Party-state apparatus has been institutionalised, and thus achieved to some extent the rule of law and democratisation, despite difficulties and weaknesses in both theory and practice. Therefore, the CCP today appears better qualified and technically more competent than at any other time in the post-Mao period, and its political system is now able to generate critical degrees of regime legitimacy.

Despite what the CCP has achieved in its ideological changes and reforms, mainstream scholars in the West still assume that Marxism is dead, ‘the Party is over’, China’s one-party political system will inevitably collapse. They assume that political legitimacy in contemporary China is precarious and the current regime suffers from a legitimacy crisis covered only superficially by economic development and nationalist politics. Consequently, the impact of political reforms on the current regime’s legitimacy has been overlooked. This is to be attributed not only to methodological or practical problems, as most researchers have focused on the centrifugal forces in Chinese society rather than on the forces that hold the system together and make it work. Apparently, the size of the Chinese political system and the scale of the social transformation it is undertaking are simply too big and too complicated to fit into any one of the theoretical paradigms. New approaches and new perspectives are needed to analyse the characteristics of Chinese experience. This is why some scholars have recently proposed a new research agenda in China Studies, taking seriously the CCP’s reforms. Only when we have a better understanding of how the Party has changed can we have a better idea of why and how the CCP remains in power.
1. Introduction

Numerous studies have examined changes in the ideology and political system of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) since 1978 when the paramount leader Deng Xiaoping initiated China’s reform and opening up. Some declared that Marxism in China was dead even before the reform. Others stated at the start and middle of the 1990s that if it was not yet totally defunct and impotent, Marxism ‘certainly seemed to be on a life support system and showed a feeble pulse’. Still others concluded by the late 1980s that orthodox Marxism–Leninism had been repudiated ‘as a lost cause amounting now to no more than a rationalisation for political privilege’ by power holders in the Party. And by the late 1990s the CCP was seen to be ‘less and less appealing to ordinary Chinese; as such, no longer ‘full of educated, idealistic people, when in fact it is more like a mafia or underworld organisation, bounded by narrow personal interests and loyalties maintained by money and force’. By 2006 it was claimed, ‘The Party may be big, but it is also corrupt, reviled, and often ineffective. It is barely functioning in some areas, having been replaced by clans or gangs’.

Thus many scholars in the West, particularly in the US, seem to assume that Communist one-party rule in present-day China is historically anachronistic, its political system is irremediable, and the regime suffers from a governance and legitimacy crisis that is deepening, inevitably leading to its downfall. For example, in the early 1990s, a study commissioned by the US Defence Department showed that half of the panel of China experts argued that China would experience a ‘Soviet-style break up’ within seven years of the death of Deng Xiaoping. Jack Goldstone, a prominent US scholar on revolution and rebellion, even predicted in his alarming article, ‘The Coming Chinese Collapse’, that ‘we can expect a terminal crisis in China within the next 10 to 15 years’, and ‘the most likely future scenario is for a replay of 1911’ after Deng’s death.

In 1998, one year after the death of Deng, the Journal of Democracy invited a number of leading Western experts on China to contribute to a symposium on the prospects of China’s reforms and democratisation. The prevailing view was that China could not be democratised unless the regime changed, which almost all of the contributors predicted would happen in the near future. Roderick MacFarquhar, a leading China scholar of Harvard University, repeatedly asserted: the PRC’s political system is fragile, and it is likely to result in a breakdown ‘in years rather than decades’. Even Dr Brzezinski, US National Security Advisor during the Carter administration, believed that China ‘will no longer be governed solely by the Chinese Communist Party’ in a decade; and that there will be ‘significant change, even disruptive change’. When this did not happen, some still argued that the signs of the CCP’s ‘disintegration’ were everywhere and that China’s reforms have been trapped, so it was just a matter of time before the Party was overthrown.

These assumptions and predictions, like so many in the China field, proved incorrect. The CCP is still alive and well; its membership has doubled in the last three decades to reach 73.3 million, and it has now become the largest ruling Party in the world. While it may be true that, at the mass level, in the immediate post-Mao period cynicism and apathy rendered most discussions of ideology more or less irrelevant, the CCP leadership always swears allegiance to Marxism–Leninism and reaffirms its commitment to the building of socialism with the ultimate goal of reaching the truly egalitarian communist stage of human society. It is worth noting that ever since the 1978 ‘Practice is the sole criterion for testing truth’ campaign, the Party has changed the role ideology plays in the political system. The official doctrine is no longer a dogma and has been made more flexible, effective and institutionalised. After surviving the political turmoil of the Tiananmen Incident of 1989, the CCP continued its reform program of building socialism with Chinese characteristics.
The Chinese economy not only continued to grow but began to stir fears that it had become an unstoppable economic juggernaut as China became the manufacturing centre of the world. Even its diplomatic pariah status has vanished as China emerged as an influential presence in world councils, especially in Asia. China entered the WTO in 2001. The change in China’s status was strikingly highlighted by the back-to-back appearances of President Bush, who spoke to the Australian parliament in 2003, and Chinese President Hu Jintao, who was greeted much more enthusiastically, when he spoke to the parliament the following day. The conservative Australian paper the Financial Review summed up the public mood in its headline: ‘Bush came, Hu conquered’.13 And now people have been talking about China’s emerging ‘soft power’, as, in a comparative context, political support in China is among the highest in the world, which is illustrated in the data collected by the World Values Surveys (WVS) in 1990, 1995 and 2000 respectively.14

My research question came from such a stark contrast between what the CCP has changed since 1978 and how it has still been perceived in the West in the context of relevant literature as cited here. The central question I ask in this paper is: How has the CCP changed its ideology in relation to its reform and opening up policy over the last three decades? The focus of my research is the CCP’s ideology, because ‘ideology has played a crucially important role in the politics of state socialism or communist regimes’.15 This is particularly true in the case of communist China. Etymologically, the Chinese term for ‘ideology’ is yi shi xing tai. Here ‘yi shi ‘ translates as ‘consciousness’, while ‘xing tai ‘ means ‘shape’ or ‘form’, which in a holistic rendering of the parts combined, ‘shape of consciousness’ can be social, cultural or political, depending on its context of use. There are some other words that might, in particular contexts, serve as synonyms or simply reflect close relationships with the concept of yi shi xing tai, such as si xiang (thought), xinyang (doctrine), and lilun (theory). The CCP’s conceptualisation of ideology has been ‘political thought’ and ‘theory’ guiding its ‘thought work’ (si xiang gong zuo) and policy.16

That is why the key to a better understanding of politics in China is the Party’s official ideology, as identified earlier by the leading scholar Franz Schurmann.17 Commenting on why ideology is still very important in China, Tu Wei-ming points out that ‘even if we choose to believe that power struggle in China is more a political game than ideological debate, it is worth noting that the widely accepted way to exercise power in this political game is through ideological debate’.18 That is what has been demonstrated by the far-reaching significance of the ‘great debate on the criterion of truth’ in the post-Mao era.19

The term ‘ideology’, however, is one of the most hotly contested concepts in the social sciences. But it can be defined succinctly as a set of political values, feelings, and ideas that guides individuals to act or behave in a certain manner for achieving a particular goal. At a cognitive level, ideology acts as a language that defines the key concepts of political thought; on a value based level, it provides party members with a set of moral beliefs about ‘what is good or bad, right or wrong’; and on an instrumental level, ideology sets out the principles that guide the action on political leaders and operation of political institutions. The theoretical foundation of the CCP’s ideology is Marxism–Leninism. It is the guiding principle for both the Party and the state. The framework of communist ideology is frequently classified by political scientists into two components: Seliger’s ‘fundamental’ and ‘operative’ ideology; Moore’s ‘ideology of ends’ and ‘ideology of means’; Schurmann’s ‘pure’ and ‘practical’ ideology; and Lowenthal’s ‘utopia vs. development’. The former refers to universal truth, philosophical absolutism and communist end-goal at the fundamental level, while the latter refers to practical ideas, policy references and action means at the operative level.20

As we shall see, ideology still matters as the foundation of the political culture of China’s leadership and their approach to governing. At the fundamental level, the CCP is still committed to Marxism and its ultimate goal, while at the operational level, the Party’s official ideology, policy and practice have been redefined and changed significantly. By
change it means the transformation of key structures that has a major impact on the nature of China politics. Where there is significant and rapid change, there are discontinuities between past and present with features of the present not recognisable in the past. The other side of change is continuity, which refers to the gradual evolution of structures or processes such that the present retains key features of the past. This is the definition of ‘change’ applied in the paper.

The primary objective of this paper is to explore and analyse the changes in China’s official ideology as it relates to the Party’s theory, policy and practice. The paper attempts to not only identify and chart contours of these significant changes China has been undergoing since embracing reform in the post-Mao period, but also examine the dynamics of the Party that are driving change in China. It aims to help deepen understanding of how the CCP has survived and thus enhanced its legitimacy. The purpose of this paper is to challenge the conventional wisdom while filling the gap in studies of China’s political culture in general and the CCP’s ideology in particular. This will help develop appreciation of China’s political system, contribute to debates on theories and practices of its political reforms, and highlight the necessity for new approaches in the China field as some scholars have recently proposed.

The paper is organised in a chronological ordering of empirical processes for a given period, followed by a thematic ordering of theoretical developments in that period. This is to enable changes of the CCP’s ideology to be logically connected and systematically analysed. First, I discuss what has changed in the Party’s approach to Marxism, while keeping up its basic principles as continuity. Next, I look into how the CCP has redefined Mao Zedong Thought, which is now regarded not only as a sinification of Marxism, but also a collective wisdom of the Party. Then I examine Deng Xiaoping Theory which was elevated to the level of the Party’s guiding ideology in the era of reform and opening to the world. Finally, I explore the CCP’s further ideological development in recent years, examining how successive Party leaders have gone to considerable lengths to put their personal stamp on the official doctrine by continuing to adapt Marxism to changing historic situations, such as Jiang’s important Three Represents and Hu’s Harmonious Society.
2. Restructuring Marxism

Ideological changes in the immediate post-Mao era were comparable to and reminiscent of changes in the International Communist Movement in the wake of the historical 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU). But changes in the CCP's ideology were related with public debates and the popular campaign to 'emancipate the mind', which resulted in entrenchment of the reform agenda under the leadership of Deng Xiaoping. The great debate in 1978 on 'the criterion of truth' and the National Theory Conference of 1979 show how the Party started criticising Maoist radical policies, denouncing the Cultural Revolution and initiating political reforms, and eventually restructuring its official doctrine.

The notion that 'practice is the sole criterion for testing truth' was put forward by the reformers as a weapon against the conservatives – those named as 'whatevers' who declared that 'whatever policies Mao has made we will resolutely safeguard and whatever instructions Mao has given we will forever follow'. The crux of the 'whatevers' was to justify continuing the political line of Mao's late years, and a pledged commitment to 'continuing the revolution', 'class struggle as key link', and other key slogans of the Cultural Revolution. The main proposition of the opposing 'practice faction' was that 'the ultimate criterion for testing truth is practice, rather than Marxism and Maoist doctrine'; 'the superiority of practice to theory is a fundamental Marxist principle endorsed even by Mao himself'; 'all theories are subject to revision'; and 'there should be no “forbidden zone” in political studies'. The crushing of the 'whatevers' prepared the conditions ideologically for the Third Plenary Session of the 11th CCP Central Committee held in December 1978. The Third Plenum represented a major victory for Deng as he consolidated his power, and, more importantly, it decisively introduced reform and opening up of policies, and directed towards the modernisation of China's economy and society, as the supreme official line of the CCP.

Reevaluating Basic Principles

The debate on 'the criterion on truth', which had touched basic principles of the CCP's ideology, led the CCP leaders as well as official theorists and intellectuals to reexamine Marxism in general and its basic principles in particular, including historical materialism, political economy and socialism. This led to redefining the notion of 'class'. According to Marxism, history unfolds in a series of stages marked by increasing levels of economic development made possible by class struggle and revolution. But, in the post-Mao China, class struggle was in effect demoted in favour of economic progress, as reconceptualisation of class was linked to reassessment of the issue of class struggle in post-revolutionary society. Thus the basic assumptions of historical materialism began to be reconsidered. The Third Plenum's communiqué stated that 'the large-scale turbulent class struggles of a mass character have in the main come to an end' and decreed that the Party and people should shift their prime attention to socialist modernisation.

The reformers asserted that the production forces were the most active and revolutionary factor, and human society was determined by the development of material force, e.g., production forces – just as the superstructure essentially reflected the economic base. Whereas Maoists had over-emphasised class struggle as the motivating force in historical development, to reformers the development of the forces of production was primary; whether class struggle plays a role in society is determined by whether it can liberate the productive forces. As for the purpose of development, the reformers stated clearly that it was to improve material living standards. As Deng declared, 'Socialism is to put an end to poverty. Poverty is not socialism, nor is it communism.'
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Rethinking Marxism

In his commemorative address on the centenary of Marx’s death in March 1983, Hu Yaobang proposed treating Marxism as a ‘developing science’ and warned against isolating it from ‘other cultural achievements of mankind’. This meant Marxism should be integrated with other human knowledge and with indigenous conditions. The leading theorist Su Shaozhi stated that Marxism is a branch of the social sciences, but not an all-encompassing ‘science of sciences’. And he pointed out that due to the influence of dogmatism and sectarianism, many Chinese officials have understood Marxism in terms of specific words, specific conclusions, or specific quotations. In a way, Marxism is treated as a religion. Wang Ruoshui argued, ‘Marxism must constantly be supplemented, revised, developed through testing practice; as soon as it comes to a stop, its life is over; it will be Marxism no longer but dogmatism. Not only is dogma not Marxism, it is the antithesis of Marxism’. Chinese leaders and theorists placed priority on adapting established socialism to the requirements of reforms and on ‘developing’ Marxism under contemporary conditions. They encouraged a critical reassessment of established theory and practice, and permitted this effort to extend to China’s entire experience with Marxism.

These efforts have been so transformative that they have brought revolutionary changes in Chinese thinking of, and approach to, Marxism. They also spelled out the direction and manner of the theoretical shift in the 1980s. First, the development of Marxism was to be taken as a precondition to ‘upholding’ of Marxism. Second, the focus of development was to break away with those conclusions that had proved ‘out dated’ or ‘not entirely correct’ by practice. Third, development was to include incorporating ‘other cultural achievements of mankind’. More significantly, they investigated new questions that had arisen during the implementation of reform and modernisation in an attempt to bring new vigour to Marxism.

On the other hand, critics have been challenging the whole notion of restructuring Marxism. Some have gone further to suggest the futility of developing Marxism in China. Wang Shuochang’s remarks capture the mood, ‘Marx had no answers to many problems of our contemporary times; he was indeed unable to foresee or answer them. Classic Marxism was the theory of the impoverished proletarian class during the early capitalist period. Some of his conclusions are no longer applicable in our contemporary highly-developed capitalist society’. In his campus talks in 1986, Fang Lizhi asserted that Marxism had already proved to be a failure in theory from Marx to Mao and a failure in practice from China’s experience over the past 30 years. Similarly, Wang Ruowang attacked Chinese socialism as ‘utopian and fictional design’ that took fantasies for correct goals. For them, Marxism was not worth developing. In the wake of the student protests at the end of 1986, those discussions of developing Marxism were blamed for causing a values confusion among youth and for encouraging bourgeois liberalisation. Fang and Wang were accused of utilising the controversy to repudiate Marxism. Even radical reformers were criticised; Su Shaozhi lost his directorship of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS) Institute of Marxism–Leninism.

But Su Shaozhi remained a Marxist even when he took up the role of figurehead in the Democratic Front set up in Paris shortly after the Tiananmen Event of 1989. This is because, as prominent political theorist and chairman of the Democratic Front Yan Jiaqi admitted, Marxism had already taken root among the younger generation in China and could not be shaken. And ‘it successfully incorporated aspects of traditional culture, as well as nationalism, a more recent source of identity’.

Professor Colin Mackerras observed that ‘whatever the social results, there has clearly been a substantial broadening in the Chinese approach to Marxism since the Third Plenum. To judge from what they write, Chinese Marxists show greater familiarity with the works of Marx and Engels now than was ever the case during the decade 1966 to 1976. Far more scholars have written theoretical articles in a much wider range of journals and newspapers’. And ‘in any event, the Chinese still claim to be Marxists.'
Indeed they argue they are more so than ever, because primary authority in Marxist ideology has been transferred from Mao Zedong to Marx, where surely it rightly belongs. In his recent studies, David Shambaugh points out that the CCP has changed the role that ideology plays in the Chinese policy process while remolding Marxism–Leninism ideology. “Thus, ideology certainly did not die after the reforms began in 1978 – but its nature and functions fundamentally changed.”
3. Redefining Mao Zedong Thought

The formulation of the term ‘Mao Zedong Thought’ and the CCP’s formal adoption of it have evolved through a long, complicated process. When Mao became a convert to Marxism in 1920, many of the intellectual predispositions that were to mould his knowledge of communism and his concept of revolution were already present. Mao’s ideas were reinforced and developed later by his personal experiences as a CCP leader. The Yanan period (1936–47) constituted the highpoint of Mao’s political thinking as a Marxist theorist. The concept of ‘Mao Zedong Thought’ was first articulated in May 1945 when Liu Shaoqi said at the Party’s Seventh National Congress: ‘Mao Zedong Thought means the continuation and development of Marxism in the national, domestic revolution in a colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal country of our time; it is a fine prototype of Marxism with a given national character’.39

Sinification of Marxism

Mao Zedong Thought had first been defined as the integration of the ‘universal truth’ of Marxism–Leninism with the ‘concrete practice’ of the Chinese revolution when the CCP formally proclaimed it as the Party’s guiding ideology in its constitution of 1945, which was promulgated in Yan’an toward the end of the Second World War. The universal truth of Marxism refers to class struggle as the key to understanding the development of human history and the belief in the inevitable downfall of capitalism and the triumph of socialism–communism. For Leninism, it is the theory of building the vanguard of a proletarian party to lead the revolution and the nation. It is Mao’s adaptation and enrichment of these universal truths applying to Chinese circumstances that form the essence of Mao Zedong Thought. As Schurmann put it, Marxism–Leninism is the ‘pure ideology’ part of Chinese Communist, while Mao Zedong Thought is the ‘practical ideology’.

There have been vigorous academic debates among China scholars about the extent to which Mao Zedong Thought is based on Marxism–Leninism. One side argues that the core of Maoism is faithful to the fundamental principles of that ideology. The other side points out that Mao’s Thought, while employing communist terminology and rhetoric, deviates so sharply from Marxism–Leninism that it should be considered as an entirely different school of political thought, one more deeply influenced by other sources, such as Chinese philosophy and culture. Some see Mao Zedong Thought as an innovative amalgamation of Marxism and Chinese characteristics. According to Arif Dirlik, Mao’s thought is the articulation of a ‘Chinese Marxism’, at once Marxist and Chinese. It is Marxist not only because Mao himself has placed his thought unambiguously within a Marxist tradition, but more importantly because the categories of his philosophy are derivative of Marxism; indeed, we might suggest that there is no constituent conceptual element of Mao’s thought that is not traceable to Marxism. At the same time, there is something inclusively Chinese about Mao’s Marxism.

Critique of Radicalism

Stuart Schram concluded that Mao’s personality was many-sided and contradictory, and in his time Mao played many roles. Lucian Pye pointed out that Mao must be seen at various times and under various conditions. In 1981, the CCP issued a lengthy document called ‘Resolution on Certain Question in the History of Our Party since the Founding of the People’s Republic of China’.42 While the Resolution reaffirms that Mao’s ideology remains ‘the valuable spiritual asset of our Party’ and that ‘it will be our guide to action for a long time to come’, it stresses that the CCP must acknowledge that Mao made serious mistakes, especially in his later years, and that some of these were guided by parts of his ideology that simply were wrong.
Basically, as Deng Xiaoping remarked, Mao’s ‘patriarchal behaviour’ was a major shortcoming. Associated with this behaviour was Mao’s ‘smugness’ about his early success, that he became ‘overconfident’ and ‘arrogant’. But Deng emphasised that the late Chairman’s accomplishment outweighed his mistakes. Mao’s life was rated as ‘70 percent good, 30 percent bad’.

But Womack argued that this assessment is somewhat misleading. ‘He is viewed as 100 per cent right for 70 per cent of his career, and close to 100 per cent wrong for the last 30 per cent’. However, as Womack continued, the dichotomy between the ‘good’ and the ‘bad’ Mao is very convenient for post-Mao Chinese orthodoxy, allowing it to uphold Mao Zedong Thought (properly understood) and still reject Mao the leftist.

Schram put it succinctly, ‘Welcomed by many in 1949 as a liberator from corrupt, oppressive, and ineffectual government of Kuomintang, and as the protagonist of a great revolution in the countryside, he came to be seen as a harsher tyrant than ever Chiang Kai-shek had been, and the bringer not of liberation but of slavery and starvation to the peasantry’.

Mao’s theoretical and practical errors included his over-estimating the role of subjective will, flouting objective economic laws such as in the Great Leap Forward, widening and absolutising class struggle, and mistakenly identifying the principle contradiction in socialist society as that between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, as happened in the Cultural Revolution. Shortly after the successful transition to socialism in the early 1950s, Mao began adopting a utopian approach as he became ‘smug and impatient’, as Deng put it. In his later years, Mao became increasingly radical, he ‘confused right and wrong and the people with the enemy’, which were not only at variance with Marxism, but also divorced from China’s realities. Mao wrongly criticised Peng Dehuai at the Lushan meeting of 1959 which seriously undermined democracy in the Party, and dramatically elevated the personality cult of Mao, as witnessed by Li Rui. As a consequence, the ‘Yan’an Round Table’ was cracked and an absolute cultural despotism reigned, under which anyone who was regarded as ‘opposed to Mao Zedong Thought’ could be punished and even sentenced to death.

Collective Wisdom

More significantly, as a way to depersonalise even the positive components of Mao Zedong Thought, the Resolution declares that the ideology of the CCP is ‘a crystallisation of the collective wisdom’ of the Chinese Communist Party, not the product of one person. Mao was thus ‘de-defied’, and the new orthodox view is that Mao Zedong Thought refers to accumulated wisdom through the whole process of the Chinese revolution, such as shishi qiushi (seeking truth from facts), qunzhong luxian (the mass line), and zili gengsheng (independence and self-reliance). Mao may have been the main individual who articulated or expressed the results of this collective endeavour, but there were other contributors to ‘Mao Zedong Thought’, such as Zhou Enlai, Zhu De and Liu Shaoqi. They are Mao’s close colleagues, the leaders of the first generation of the CCP and founding fathers of the PRC. They had also contributed quite significantly to the development of the Party’s doctrine.

This approach was in fact redefining and revising the official ideology. Thus it allowed two further important steps in framing a new orthodoxy. One was the selective use of Mao; the other was the flexibility it allowed by continuing additions to the official ideology. Mao Zedong Thought as a product of collective experience could continue to adopt and grow, as the revolutionary movement developed and assimilated new elements. This is especially useful for self-justification. It becomes easier to provide ideological explanations for new policies and practices, as responses to new conditions and experiences, without restraint by former ideological precepts.

Theoretically, such operations of enclosure and exclusion were possible precisely because of the definition of Mao Zedong Thought as a ‘method’, the very quintessence being ‘practice as the sole criterion for testing truth’. As Paul Healy and Nick Knight comment, the line of reasoning bears a striking similarity to that of Lukacs when he insisted that the ‘essence’ of Marxism relates not to any substantive proposition made by Marx, but to the dialectical method itself.
4. Promoting Deng Xiaoping Theory

Deng Xiaoping emerged as the paramount leader in the post-Mao era and he initiated reforms in 1978 under the banner of the Four Modernisations. Deng’s ideas and policies on the reform and opening-up have been collectively called the Deng Xiaoping Theory, which has been enshrined into the CCP’s constitution, along with Marxism–Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought, as the Party’s guiding ideology. Deng’s Theory is now regarded as ‘the outcome of the integration of the basic tenets of Marxism–Leninism with the practice of contemporary China and features of the times, a continuation and development of Mao Zedong Thought under new historical conditions; it represents a new stage of development of Marxism in China, it is Marxism of contemporary China and it is the crystallized, collective wisdom of the Communist Party of China’. (General Program of the Constitution of the Communist Party of China)

But Deng’s Theory contrasted starkly with the Maoist approach, and many of the changes and reforms were dramatic reversals of Mao’s later year policies. Deng had not only picked up where Mao had left off, but also explicitly identified where Mao had gone wrong, beginning in the mid-1950s. He provided the CCP with the theory that correctly addressed the ‘basic questions concerning the building, consolidation and development of socialism in China’, which is precisely where Mao failed. Thus, Deng’s Theory was described as the ‘developmental theory of Marxism’, applicable to a large and populous developing country like China. Deng’s achievement in economic reforms was compared to Mao’s in the war period in the sense that Deng was claimed to have found the right path for China’s socialist development, combining the universal principle of Marxism–Leninism with practice of the Chinese Second Revolution – economic construction, reform and integration with the outside world, leading China away from the stereotypes of the Cultural Revolution and bonds of the traditional feudal past, and embarking on the new Long March for modernisation.

Socialism with Chinese Characteristics

The theme of Deng’s Theory is ‘Socialism with Chinese Characteristics’ (zhongguo tese de shehui zhuyi), a decisive shift from Mao’s radicalism to modernisation models. Mao regarded socialism as a mere way-station on the road to communism, trying to ‘jump’ the capitalist stage of development straight into communism only to find that its economic conditions were not sufficiently developed to accommodate this final phase, as happened during the Great Leap Forward, in which the so-called ‘communist wing’ (gongchan feng) stirred up, creating a man-made disaster of a scale unprecedented in China. Since 1978, in contrast, the view has come to be accepted that China still has a long way to go to build socialism. In 1987, the Party under Deng’s leadership presented its new orthodoxy of socialism in what was called the ‘theory of the primary stage of socialism’, which gave its theoretical explanation of the socialist market economy.

Based on an orthodox Marxist view that history inevitably passes through a sequence of stages of development, the primary stage of socialism is that which follows immediately after the political overthrow of the capitalist system. For some period of time, it would be unavoidable – in fact, absolutely necessary – to use many aspects of capitalism while building socialism. Socialism is now regarded as a separate ‘mode of production’, which is characterised by three factors: public ownership of the means of production, distribution according to labour, and regulation of production primarily by the law of value. From capitalism to communism there are three stages: first, a transitional stage from capitalism to socialism (which is in turn divided into two sub-stages); then a ‘developed’ socialist stage, and finally the communist stage.
The Theory maintains that China, in terms of political arrangement and economic interpretation, has established a socialist society, which must be preserved. But China’s socialism is basically in the early or initial stage only. This means that the socialist system is limited by China’s poverty and backwardness. Scientific and technological levels remain low and much of the population is culturally deprived or lacks education. In the initial stage, therefore, it is necessary to bring about industrialisation, economic development and a drive towards modernisation. The central task of the initial stage of socialism is defined as socialist modernisation, thus necessitating some measures that are not consistent with the ideological orthodoxy. In other words, the CCP has to achieve this intermediate goal before it can proceed to the next stage, just as Marx himself prophesied that capitalism was the necessary penultimate stage of development because it created the material abundance necessary for the realisation of communist principles of distribution (‘from each according to his work to each according to his need’). The official timetable for socialism in China now sees the initial stage lasting at least until the middle of the twenty-first century, ending with the ‘basic realisation of socialist modernisation’. This Theory is certainly useful in officially justifying both present and future policies, especially in programs of economic reforms.56

Deng was adamant that China would not become capitalist even if it used many aspects of a capitalist market economy to promote development. Rather, he insisted that ‘we can develop a market economy under socialism … Developing a market economy does not mean practicing capitalism’. And he argued that the critical difference between a socialist market economy and capitalist economy seems largely to be a matter of who has political power in the country. In Deng’s view, in a capitalist country, the wealthy capitalists (owners of private property) dominate both the political and economic systems. In a socialist system, political power is in the hands of the vanguard communist party that represents the interests of the ‘people’. It is the party that will make sure that the socialist market economy does not lead to the kind of exploitation and inequalities that mar a truly capitalist system and that the market part of the economy ultimately serves the goal of building socialism and achieving communism.57 This argument has been widely adopted among Chinese scholars and theorists, and reflected in most textbooks in China.58

The Four Cardinal Principles

If ‘Building Socialism with Chinese Characteristics’ conveys the economic features of Deng Xiaoping Theory, the ‘Four Cardinal Principles’ express its political essence. The phrase ‘Four Cardinal Principles’ comes from Deng’s speech in March 1979 soon after he had consolidated his position as China’s undisputed leader. Deng laid out what he called the Four Cardinal Principles that were ‘the basic prerequisite for achieving modernisation’:

1. the socialist road;
2. the dictatorship of the proletariat;
3. leadership by the Communist Party; and

This shows that as a veteran revolutionary Deng genuinely believed in Marxist ideals, the vanguard role of the Party and a certain number of moral values he learned during the Yan’an period. Moreover, it symbolises the continuity of the Party’s official ideology, emphasises the need for ideological reinforcement against bourgeois liberalisation, and fosters socialist modernisation rather than promoting capitalism.59 Despite changes in, and as later developed away from the centralised, planned economy, Deng never abandoned a commitment to socialism, though necessarily his understanding of socialism was somewhat broader than had previously been the case.60

As the Party’s ideology, there is an underlying continuity between Deng’s Theory and Mao Zedong Thought in terms of universal truth, philosophical absolutism and communist end-goal at a fundamental level. The Four Cardinal Principles are very similar
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to the ‘six criteria’ that Mao laid out in his 1957 speech, ‘On the Correct Handling of Contradictions among the People’ during the Hundred Flowers movement. Mao said that these criteria should be used to distinguish between ‘fragrant flowers’ (non-antagonistic contradictions) and ‘poisonous weeds’ (antagonistic contradictions) when judging how to treat criticism of China’s political system and leaders. Deng urged the whole party and people to counterbalance the influence of ‘bourgeois liberalisation’, and emphasised that ‘in order to realise the Four Modernisations in China, we must, in the fields of ideology and politics, uphold the Four Cardinal Principles. This is a fundamental prerequisite to the realisation of the Four Modernisations’. 61
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5. Jiang’s Three Represents

Jiang Zemin emerged as the CCP’s new leader in the wake of the Tiananmen crisis of 1989, but he came to leadership as neither a founder of the country nor a military hero like Mao and Deng. Rather, as Teiwes said, he came as a ‘chief engineer’, a term reflecting both his professional training and the manifold prosaic tasks facing him and his colleagues in building on the reborn edifice Deng had created. The full complexity of Jiang’s role, however, is better captured by the Western business term, ‘CEO’ – the manager with overall responsibility for a vast enterprise, which is to maintain the Party’s dominance in China. Besides political calculations, however, Jiang possessed a desirable set of qualities. He fit the profile for future generations of leaders that had been repeatedly employed throughout the 1980s – a younger, tertiary-educated technocrat. Jiang’s professional qualifications had been adapted to a career as a political leader at both the centre and in the localities, as he had been Minister of the Electronics Industry, and Mayor and Party Secretary of Shanghai. He had been soon designated by Deng Xiaoping as the ‘core’ of the ‘Third Generation’ of the Party’s leadership, following the generations of Mao and Deng himself. This gave Jiang an official status that few dared to challenge directly.

Jiang Zemin’s great contribution to the Party’s official ideology is his theory of the Three Represents (三代表). That is, as Jiang claimed, the CCP should represent most advanced productive forces, more advanced culture and the fundamental interests of the majority of the people. To most non-Chinese, Jiang’s three Represents appears as yet another piece of communist rhetoric, more Big Brother brainwashing of the cadres. Indeed, it was quickly dismissed by most Western analysts as just propagandistic cliché. Even the designated name, Represents, sounds syntactically odd in English. Yet in Chinese it has coherence, subtlety and political dynamite. And, upon closer examination, the Three Represents indicated an important, even radical, shift in Party philosophy, Party organisation and Party orientation.

What Jiang intended was to modernise the Party’s ideology. He argued that Communism, in its industrial age formulation, was not viable as a contemporary economic system. But the Communist Party, by ‘representing’ these three powerful principles, would be modernising Marxism, advancing with the times, and securing its place at the vanguard of society. So when Jiang for the first time put Three Represents at the top of his public agenda in February 2000, it immediately drew wide debates and soon became a buzzword in the Chinese media. In 2002, at the Party’s 16th National Conference, the Three Represents was enshrined in the CCP Constitution. It has been described as a continuation and development of Marxism–Leninism, Mao Zedong Thought and Deng Xiaoping Theory, thus placing Jiang Zemin on par with Marx, Lenin, Mao and Deng.

The Important Thought of the Three Represents

As the Party’s new guideline, Jiang’s Three Represents are rather complex but quite useful. The First Represent, ‘advanced productive forces’, extends the Marxist phrase ‘productive forces’ in a practically ideological way, and works to elevate the status of and bring into the Party the most dynamic strata of society: managers, entrepreneurs and business owners. Jiang declared that reform had created ‘new social strata’, and that most people in the private sector are engaged in ‘honest labour and work’, they obey the law, and contribute to society. These people, he asserted, are the driving force behind China’s ‘advanced productive forces’, working for building socialism with Chinese characteristics. He also redefined the historically loaded term ‘capitalist’ by inventing a new label as ‘private business owners’, and they are now to be known as the ‘new social strata’. To maintain the momentum of reform, he argued, these new social strata should
not be banned from Party membership. In doing so, Jiang echoed Deng Xiaoping’s reclassification (at the 1978 National Science Conference) of intellectuals as members of the working class. Thus, entrepreneurs and managers are grouped together with all types of professional employees to form a kind of white-collar elite without a particular ‘capitalist’ class background. Connotations of the ‘exploiting’, ‘capitalist’ class that used to be almost automatically associated with private business people in Marxist discourse are totally avoided. Based on this theoretical argument, the CCP’s ruling constituency is ideologically reconstructed to include the representation of private entrepreneurs and managers without giving up its original role as ‘vanguard of the working class’.66

The Second Represent, ‘advanced culture’, combines morality, civil behaviour, progressive social attitude and shared beliefs. As the Party’s complementary goal for rejuvenating China, it sought to restore the values and virtues of Chinese civilisation, integrating them with Marxism. It signified the building of ‘spiritual civilisation’ together with ‘material civilisation’. It saw that to bring forth an advanced socialist culture, the Party must not dogmatically cling to the Marxist classics, but rather develop Marxist theory with the times and enrich it with modern elements of patriotism, nationalism, science, social morals, community-mindedness and a law-abiding mentality. It also seemed to signal greater openness to modern Western culture. The Third Represent, ‘the fundamental interests of the majority of people’, is a reaffirmation of the Party’s role in serving the masses. It reaches out to all Chinese society. More significantly, it superseded key elements of the Party’s founding theories – class struggle, the vanguard of the working class and the dictatorship of the proletariat – with a concept of an all-encompassing party that brought in advanced or elite members from all sectors of society.67

I ideological Revisions

Ideologically, the Three Represents created an important breakthrough, since here Jiang revised classic Marxist doctrine – the labour theory of value – interpreting its notion of ‘exploitation and surplus value’. In short, ‘labour’ should be defined as a ‘factor of production’, just as capital, technology and managerial expertise are. This equation of labour with other factors of production hardly strikes the Western ear as strange, and that is just the point: Jiang revised classic Marxist doctrine to the point where it seems familiar to those raised on free-market economics. Thus, the CCP has totally changed its doctrine on labour and the development of a middle class in China.68

Politically, co-option of entrepreneurs and other new social strata into the Party was designed not only to benefit the Party by tapping new sources of support, but also to pre-empt a potential source of opposition, maintaining political stability and Party leadership. Defending Jiang’s theory against the implicit accusation that the CCP had betrayed its original class nature, some theorists argued pragmatically that only by incorporating the new economic and social elites and allowing them to participate politically can the Party adequately expand its ‘mass base’ and uphold its ruling position.69 It was also a theoretical attempt to come to grips with three phenomena that were affecting China and the Party: globalisation and the advance of science and technology; the diversification of Chinese society, social organisations, and lifestyles; and lax Party organisations and the need to improve the CCP rank and file.70

Jiang’s ideas of the Three Represents ran into significant political opposition from conservative Party leaders who were particularly unhappy with such an open embrace of private entrepreneurs (they are never officially referred to as ‘capitalists’) by the Party. The Party’s orthodox leftists used a series of open letters to rebuke Jiang’s proposal to admit those capitalists into the Party. Not only did they challenge the ideological propriety of admitting capitalists into a communist party, but also they compared him to Mikhail Gorbachev and Lee Teng-hui, leaders who are widely criticised in China for betraying their parties’ interests. They laid down their challenge: ‘We hereby 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'. They argued that 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’. And ‘this in no way constitutes a “creative renewal” of Marxism, but rather, an outright negation of its basic principles’. They then added the rhetorical question, ‘How could a capitalist, as a member of the exploiting class, be expected to devote his or her lifetime to struggle for the realisation of Communism?’ and concluded, ‘Comrade Jiang Zemin’s views do not make any sense in this respect’.”
6. Hu’s Harmonious Society

Hu Jintao succeeded Jiang Zemin in the posts of general secretary of the CCP in 2002 and president of the state in 2003, respectively, and became ‘the core’ of the so-called ‘fourth generation’ of Chinese leaders. Like his predecessor, Hu is a trained engineer, a befitting CEO figure, but he is certainly more than that. He is chiefly a very experienced and skilled politician. Hu emerged as a national figure in the early 1980s when he became president of the All-China Youth Federation, and in 1985, aged 43, Hu was appointed Party secretary of Guizhou, the youngest provincial Party secretary in PRC history. In 1992 Hu was hand-picked by Deng to be appointed a member of the powerful Politburo Standing Committee, becoming part of the ‘Third generation’ of the CCP leadership team headed by Jiang. In 1998 Hu became vice-president, ranking fifth in the Party’s hierarchy. Obviously, Hu had been Jiang’s heir apparent for a decade.

Ideological Initiatives

His most significant contribution for developing the Party’s ideology and policy is his concept of Harmonious Society, which was first put forward in his speech at the Central Party School in February 2005. Hu defined his idea thus: ‘The socialist Harmonious Society we want to build should be a society featuring democracy, the rule of law, fairness, justice, sincerity, trustworthiness, amity, full vitality, stability, orderliness, and harmony between mankind and nature’. Though some may dismiss this as propaganda, it is nevertheless the vision articulated by China’s new paramount leader for his nation and society, rooted both in traditional Confucian concepts like datong (great harmony) and in more contemporary socialist precepts.

More importantly, it presents a programmatic solution to China’s ‘performance dilemma’ and an innovative model of political legitimisation. It serves as a popular starting-point for a critical analysis of the last two decades of economic reforms. As some illustrate vividly, the reforms have produced a disturbing degree of social inequality and injustice, reflected in an alarmingly high and still increasing Gini coefficient. The situation is made more precarious by the prospect that even with sustained economic growth, the satisfaction of material needs will be followed by satisfaction of immaterial ones. Growing demands for political participation, the pluralisation of ideas and lifestyles, the formation of a civil society, and advent of the Internet put increasing pressure on Party rule and foreshadow a crisis of confidence, if not an outright crisis of CCP legitimacy. If the social ills are not remedied, Chinese society might fall back to the level of development of the pre-reform period. Apparently, Hu’s Harmonious Society represents a dramatic shift away from the growth-at-all-cost of the developing model of his predecessors.

The central feature of Hu’s goal of creating a harmonious society is his ‘Scientific Development Concept’ (kexue fazhan guan), a new model of development. Two elements emerged as the core of the concept: ‘taking people as the basis’ and ‘comprehensive development’. Both seemed to be deft but substantial modification of Jiang’s priorities. Unlike Jiang’s emphasis on the recruitment of the ‘advanced productive forces’ into the Party, Hu now has distinctly shifted the emphasis of the Three Represents to the third ‘represent’: the interests of the majority of the people. This ideological reorientation was politically very astute, for the Three Represents which in their original formulation had a conspicuously elitist background are now given a populist reinterpretation. In a way, the Three Represents are translated into Hu’s ideas of the ‘Three Peoples’: the Party must ‘exercise its power for the people, have passion for the people and seek benefits for the people’. Without explicitly criticising the elitist concept of the Three Represents, Hu’s concept has subtly but unambiguously transformed into a formula of populist legitimisation. But Hu’s brand of populism is very different from Mao’s,
which was mostly a matter of mobilising the mass to take action in support of his agenda. In contrast, Hu is populist in the sense of advocating policies that address some of the socioeconomic downsides of China’s rapid developments.76

Hu Jintao’s ideological initiatives were formally endorsed at the 17th CCP Congress in late 2007. They were written into the Party constitution with statements such as ‘The Communist Party of China leads the people in building a harmonious socialist society’ added to the preamble. They go as far as saying this is ‘a scientific theory that is in the same line as Marxism–Leninism, Mao Zedong Thought, Deng Xiaoping Theory and the important thought of Three Represents, and keeps up with the times’. In practice, they have turned it into an umbrella theory, under which numerous policies can be encompassed.77

Harmonious World

Hu’s theory also includes how to build a harmonious world, and take advantage of globalisation to promote peace, development and common prosperity. The Chinese leader has been aware that China’s rapid development has attracted worldwide attention in recent years. The implications of various aspects of China’s rise, from its expanding influence and military muscle to its growing demand for energy supply, are being debated heatedly in the West, and particularly in the US. A rising China has inspired increasing wariness, fear and suspicion from the world. Thus those realists who see China as a competitor have been advising the US government to adopt a new containment strategy to counterbalance the ‘China Threat’. In response the Chinese government proposed ‘peaceful development’, which has become a new way of thinking in Chinese foreign policy under Hu’s leadership. This strategy seeks to reassure the US and other countries that China’s rise will not be a threat to peace and stability in the region and the world, and that the US and other countries can benefit from China’s peaceful development. China’s development is mutually beneficial to China and the world in the process of globalisation. In his programmatic speech to the UN in September 2005, Hu called for even greater international cooperation based on the five principles of peaceful coexistence, and he dismissed the ‘clash of civilisations’ in favour of harmony between different civilisations on the basis of ‘seeking common ground while reserving differences’.78 In that year, China issued a white paper entitled ‘China’s Peaceful Development Road’.79

The CCP leaders even embraced globalisation willingly early in the 1990s, They have identified in the writings of Marx and Lenin the origins of globalisation theory which can be used to confirm the correctness of the Party’s policy of opening up and engagement with the world community.80 Some Chinese scholars even argue that globalisation is not intrinsically capitalist, regardless of its capitalist origins. Rather, globalisation can be defined as a new mode of economic, political and cultural association between peoples and states; it is thus similar to a market economy, which can be used for socialism as well as capitalism. When globalisation integrates with a socialist nation such as China, it can become socialist globalisation; and China’s persistence as a socialist nation constitutes the guarantee that globalisation will not forever be capitalist globalisation, but will be transformed into a socialist globalisation that will pave the way for the eventual realisation of Marxism’s historical promise – communism. The CCP has thus found in Marxism an ideology that can justify its turn to capitalism and embrace of globalisation, but that also encompasses a vision of a socialist world very different from the world in which it now operates.81
7. Conclusion

The CCP’s ideology has undergone remarkable changes in the past three decades as a result of systematic and comprehensive reforms. First, the Party has restructured Marxism, as the great debate in 1978 on ‘the criterion of truth’ and the National Theory Conference of 1979 showed how the Party started criticising Maoist radical policies, rethinking orthodox ideology, and eventually restructuring its official doctrine, shifting to the modernisation of China’s economy and society. The Party leaders and theorists proposed treating Marxism as a ‘developing science’ and a branch of the social sciences, but not an all-encompassing ‘science of sciences’. They encouraged a critical reassessment of established theory and practice, and permitted this effort to extend to China’s entire experience with Marxism. These efforts have been so transformative that they have brought revolutionary changes in Chinese thinking of, and approach to, Marxism. The Party has also changed the role that ideology plays in the Chinese policy process while remolding its doctrine.

Second, the CCP has redefined Mao Zedong Thought, which is now regarded not only as a sinification of Marxism, but also as a collective wisdom of the Party. While the 1981 Resolution reaffirms that Mao’s ideology remains ‘the valuable spiritual asset of our party’, it stresses that the CCP must acknowledge that Mao made serious mistakes, especially in his later years, and that some of these were guided by parts of his ideology that simply were wrong. Mao was thus ‘de-deified’, and the new orthodox view is that Mao Zedong Thought refers to accumulated wisdom through the whole process of the Chinese revolution. This approach was in fact redefining and revising the official ideology. Thus it allowed two further important steps in framing a new orthodoxy. One was the selective use of Mao; the other was the flexibility allowed to by continuing to make additions to the official ideology.

Third, the CCP has been promoting Deng Xiaoping Theory as the Party’s new doctrine, which has been enshrined into the CCP’s constitution, along with Marxism–Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought, as the Party’s guiding ideology. Deng picked up not where Mao had left off when he died in 1976, but where he had gone wrong, beginning in the mid-1950s. It provided the CCP with the theory that addressed the ‘basic questions concerning the building, consolidation and development of socialism in China’, which is precisely where Mao failed. Thus, Deng’s Theory has been said to be the ‘developmental theory of Marxism’.

Fourth, successive Party leaders such as Jiang Zemin and Hu Jintao have gone to considerable lengths to put their personal stamp on the official doctrine by continuing to adapt Marxism to changing historic situations. Jiang’s theory of the Three Represents indicated an important, even radical, shift in party philosophy, party organisation and party orientation. What Jiang intended was to modernise the Party’s ideology. He argued that Communism in its industrial age formulation was not viable as a contemporary economic system, but the Communist Party, by ‘representing’ these three powerful principles, would be modernising Marxism, advancing with the times, and securing its place at the vanguard of society.

Fifth, the current leadership has been active in developing official doctrine, shaping political culture, and guiding the nation to accomplish its historical mission. Hu’s notion of socialist Harmonious Society presents a programmatic solution to China’s ‘performance dilemma’ and an innovative model of political legitimisation. It indicates a dramatic shift away from the growth-at-all-costs of the development model of his predecessors, emphasising the ‘Scientific Development Concept’, a new model of development. Hu’s theory also includes how to build a harmonious world, and take advantage of globalisation to promote peace, development and common prosperity.
Thus, instead of declining, the CCP’s ideology has been revitalised and reoriented, guiding the Party to undergo a remarkable transformation in its adaptation to rapid changes of socioeconomic situations, both internally and externally. Also, the Party is attempting to revitalise itself, advancing with the times and involving from a ‘revolutionary party’ into a more modern and more sophisticated ‘governing party’ with considerable support among the Chinese people. Moreover, China’s unique Party-state apparatus has been institutionalised, and thus, achieved to some extent the rule of law and democratisation despite difficulties and weaknesses in both theory and practice. Therefore, the CCP today appears better qualified and technically more competent than at any other time in the post-Mao period, and its political system is now able to generate significant degrees of regime legitimacy.

Contrary to what the CCP has achieved in its political reforms, mainstream scholars in the West still assume that Marxism–Leninism–Mao Zedong Thought is dead, ‘the Party is over’, China’s one-party political system will inevitably collapse. They assume that political legitimacy in contemporary China is precarious and the current regime suffers from a legitimacy crisis covered only superficially by economic development and nationalist politics. Consequently, the impact of political reforms on the current regime’s legitimacy has been overlooked. This is to be attributed not only to methodological or practical problems, as most researchers have focused on the centrifugal forces in Chinese society rather than on the forces that hold the system together and make it work. Apparently, the size of the Chinese political system and the scale of the social transformation it is undertaking are simply too big and too complicated to fit into any one of the theoretical paradigms. New approaches and new perspectives are needed to analyse the characteristics of Chinese experience. This is why some scholars recently proposed a new research agenda in China Studies, taking seriously the CCP’s reforms. Only when we have a better understanding of how the Party has been changing its ideology can we have a better idea of why and how the CCP remains in power.
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