**УЛТРА-СИНОИЗМ" ДАВРИДА ХИТОЙ ХУСУСИЯТЛАРИ БИЛАН СОЦИАЛИЗМГА ЎТИШ**

**Аммар Юнас**Катта ўқитувчи  
Тошкент Халқаро Вестминстер Университети  
Email: [doctorammaryounas@gmail.com](mailto:doctorammaryounas@gmail.com)

**АННОТАЦИЯ:**

Ушбу мақола сўнгги Хитой сиёсий ва ҳуқуқий ислоҳотларни баён қилиш учун уринишни такдим етади. Давлат "Хитой хусусиятлари билан социализм"муқобил версиясини таклиф етади.  
**Калит сўзлар:** синоизм, Хитой хусусиятлари, социализм, ултра-синоизм, Хитой ислоҳотлари.

**ПЕРЕХОД СОЦИАЛИЗМА С КИТАЙСКИМИ ХАРАКТЕРИСТИКАМИ В ЭРУ "УЛЬТРА-СИНОИЗМ"**

**Аммар Юнас**Старший преподаватель  
Международный Вестминстерский Университет в Ташкенте  
Email: [doctorammaryounas@gmail.com](mailto:doctorammaryounas@gmail.com)

**АННОТАЦИЯ:**

Эта статья представляет попытку описать обоснование недавних Китайских политических и правовых реформ. В статье предлагается альтернативный вариант "Социализма с Китайскими характеристиками".  
**Ключевые Слова:** Синоизм , Китайские Характеристики, Социализм, Ультра-Синоизм, Китайские Реформы.

**TRANSITION OF “ SOCIALISM WITH CHINESE CHARACTERISTICS” TO THE ERA OF “ULTRA-SINOISM”**

**Ammar Younas**

Senior Lecturer

Westminster International University in Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Email: doctorammaryounas@gmail.com

**ANNOTATION:**

This paper is an attempt to describe the rationale behind recent Chinese Political-Legal Reforms. The article proposes an alternate to the “Socialism with Chinese Characteristics”.

**Keywords:** Sinoism, Chinese Characteristics, Socialism, Ultra-Sinoism, Chinese Reforms

**Background:**

While presenting our case, we have tried to unfold our argument in three major questions. First, “ Is socialism coming back?” , secondly, “ Do Chinese historical practices support CCP’s contemporary practices? ” and lastly, “ What can be the alternative of socialism with Chinese characteristics?”

On first level, we have tried to predict the future of socialism. For answering the question, “Is socialism coming back?”, we have referred to the latest interview of Francis Fukuyama and argued that the socialism will not survive in any of its classic forms in near future.

Secondly, by using examples of Belt and Road Initiative, Chinese investment strategy, Chinese foreign policy of noninterference and so on, we have built an argument that contemporary China has deviated from its original historical positions about economy, defense, politics and law . Thus, China can embrace a new and unprecedented ideology, if not then can harmonies a new ideological framework, with its current one. Belt and Road Initiative and Chinese open investment in foreign markets are vivid examples which are unprecedented in Chinese history and arguably set a new precedent that China is willing to embrace changes at all level.

Thirdly, we have elaborated that by doing political-legal reforms, China is trying to meet the western demands by answering them in the political jargon which is understandable by them. Rule of law, human rights, democratic governance and free and fair elections are liberal connotations which are of highly personalized nature to the west. Why China needs to do such reforms? Or label contemporary Chinese reforms with liberal/ western terminologies? China is trying to protect its socialistic image by referring its politics as “ Socialism with Chinese characteristics”.

In conclusion, we have presented our theory that Chinese Communist Party can claim that there is transitional stage between socialism and communism. This transitional stage is an adjustment stage in which state gives final touch to its socialistic structure before achieving communism. China has capacity to introduce its own theoretical model of modern socialism, parallel to the western political and economic models of capitalism and liberal democracy. China need not to put itself in Western philosophical or ideological shoes, but it should come up with a completely new concept to refer this “transitional stage from socialism to communism”.

If socialism is not coming back in any of its classic forms, China is already taking radical and unprecedented steps on the name of economic development and legal-political progression then Chinese government can claim that there is a middle stage between Socialism and Communism, which is highly personalized with China which is successfully practicing socialism. This stage can be named as “Ultra-Sinoism”. Instead of saying that China has “Socialism with Chinese Characteristics”, Chinese government can say that we have “ Ultra-Sinoism”, a transitional stage between socialism and communism and that is required by the Chinese society to do personalized changes in its political, legal and economic systems before achieving communism. This kind of theoretical tactic can allow Chinese government to make any deviation from its classic socialist theory and to set an example for other pro-socialistic countries to use it as a model. CCP can strengthen its position in front of world community by saying that we have successfully achieved socialism and now we are moving towards communism. We are at a transitional stage of “ Ultra-Sinoism”. Thus, Chinese government and CCP don’t have to meet the demands of western ideological adjustment and to save its face but China can aggressively propagate its own version of modern socialism under the umbrella of Ultra-Sinoism.

China seems serious about modernization of its government system on pragmatic level and state’s governing capacity as a whole on philosophical level. Rule of law, human rights, democratic governance and free and fair elections, legal activism are some terminologies which are widely being used by state officials and Chinese media, now a days.

As China rose to become the world’s second largest economy in terms of GDP over the past three decades, new problems have emerged in Chinese society, such as a huge wealth gap, endemic corruption, social instability and a public distrust of the government. All these problems can only be solved with more and deepened structural reforms . But for the modern political reforms, the simple explanation given by academicians is that, China wants to make politics compatible with its economic reforms. But my concern is that even after doing all these political and economic reforms, will West stop its propaganda against Chinese government?

I think that besides pragmatic importance of these reforms in Chinese context, China is trying to meet the western demands by answering them in the political jargon which is understandable by them. Rule of law, human rights, democratic governance and free and fair elections are liberal connotations which are of highly personalized nature to the west. Why China needs to do such reforms? Or label these reforms with liberal/ western terminologies?

If the purpose is to gain the sympathy or to counter the western propaganda against the Chinese government, then I would say that it’s a useless effort. Because china cannot race with liberal philosophies which are being produced on a tremendous rate in western academia. There are generations after generations of human rights and west itself is unable to correlate them with its legal progression. Rule of law in west is static as compared to the dynamic progress of human rights. If China becomes a country where rule of law is ensured, tomorrow west will introduce a new terminology and start propagating it and will demand from China to introduce it. It will be very difficult for China to use this methodology of “doing reforms based on western terms” as a base for its political reforms. Moreover, If Chinese political reforms are said to be liberal, progressive and democratic then it is also a problem for China. Because China has to accept liberalism and Democracy as a full package. China cannot say that we are liberal in economy, but our legal-political system is conservative.

Secondly, China cannot escape from its claims which it had made on the behalf of socialism. Socialism is attached to the CCP’s identity. Although Chinese refer socialism as “Socialism with Chinese Characteristics” because referring it as “Socialism with Capitalistic characteristics” goes against the Marxists ideology. Socialism has stick to the China and it’s very difficult from any Chinese leader to abandon it.

So, what should be the nature of Chinese political reforms? What kind of reforms China should introduce in legal-political which can satisfy the demands of its own populates, can go hand in hand with its economic policies and meet the demand of the world, emerging from Western propaganda?

In this paper, I argue that the socialism will not come back in its any of classical forms. Secondly, there are a number of events where Chinese government and CCP has deviated from its historical and established positions and thirdly, it is possible that CCP can adopt a new version of socialism if they are not willing to abandon it.

I have tried to propose some Theoretical-Structural Reform in Legal-Political System which are purely of Chinese in nature and China could defend them without using Western/Liberal terminologies.

**Is Socialism making a comeback?**

A question, once again being debated by academicians and China is being quoted as a successful example. Not only this, some scholars are so overwhelmed by China’s economic growth that they are even predicting about different types of Chinese models of global governance.

Recently, George Eaton of Newstatesman has published an interview of Francis Fukuyama, the American political theorist, “who In 1992, at the height of post-Cold War liberal exuberance, wrote in The End of History and the Last Man: “What we may be witnessing… is the end point of mankind’s ideological evolution and the universalisation of Western liberal democracy as the final form of human government.” Fukuyama said to George, “What I said back then [1992] is that one of the problems with modern democracy is that it provides peace and prosperity but people want more than that… liberal democracies don’t even try to define what a good life is, it’s left up to individuals, who feel alienated, without purpose, and that’s why joining these identity groups gives them some sense of community.” According to Fukuyama, he did mention about potential threats to democracy at the end of his book [The End of History] which his critics might have not read.

Fukuyama said that if socialism is just ownership of means of production then it is not going to work but if socialism means redistributive programs that try to redress balance between incomes and wealth then there is a possibility of resurgence of the socialist left in the UK and the US. He said about this type socialism, “I think not only can it come back, it ought to come back”. In his reasoning, he said “In social equality, it’s led to a weakening of labour unions, of the bargaining power of ordinary workers, the rise of an oligarchic class almost everywhere that then exerts undue political power. In terms of the role of finance, if there’s anything we learned from the financial crisis it’s that you’ve got to regulate the sector like hell because they’ll make everyone else pay. That whole ideology became very deeply embedded within the Eurozone, the austerity that Germany imposed on southern Europe has been disastrous.” “At this juncture, it seems to me that certain things Karl Marx said are turning out to be true. He talked about the crisis of overproduction… that workers would be impoverished and there would be insufficient demand.” Yet the only plausible systemic rival to liberal democracy, Fukuyama said, was not socialism but China’s state capitalist model. “The Chinese are arguing openly that it is a superior one because they can guarantee stability and economic growth over the long run in a way that democracy can’t… if in another 30 years, they’re bigger than the US, Chinese people are richer and the country is still holding together, I would say they’ve got a real argument.” But he cautioned that “the real test of the regime” would be how it fared in an economic crisis.”

According to the George, Fukuyama is troubled by the potential for a US-China war (“the Thucydides trap”, as Harvard academic Graham Allison has called the clash between an established power and a rising one). “I think people would be very foolish to rule that out, I can think of lots of scenarios by which such a war could start. I don’t think it would be a deliberate attack by one country on the other – like Germany invading Poland in 1939 – it’s more likely to come out of a local conflict over Taiwan, over North Korea, possibly a confrontation in the South China Sea that escalates.” Fukuyama Said.

A lot of media outlets and scholars are quoting this interview and Fukuyama’s reversion from its original position mentioned in his book, but no one has tried to analyze the context in which Fukuyama has said all this. Fukuyama has defined the socialism before making his claim on the return of socialism. It is the demand of academic integrating and sympathy towards the emotions of liberal democrats to rightly present the Fukuyama’s statements in their original context. Fukuyama’s socialism and his reference about China, doesn’t indicate that he is in favor of somethings what Karl Marks said about the socialism as a system and Fukuyama is not accepting socialism as a full package in its classic form.

Well, China is becoming powerful day by day and it is obvious that it will continue like this for next one decade at least. I am confident that Chinese are doing risk management and feasibility analysis on regular intervals as Belt and Road Initiative is spreading its tentacles.

I think that very soon, we will see Chinese’s foreign investment diverting from infrastructure development strategy to the community development strategy. We will soon see China investing into education, healthcare and other social sectors and this investment will direct the attention of its original investment in infrastructure.

It is simply because of two reasons. First, Chinese are unable to gain the confidence of other states through their investments in infrastructures and results are not promising by now. It is not because China’s government to government relations are progressing but there are renowned politicians, academicians and think tanks openly criticizing China’s investment strategies. These scholars have influence in academia and ultimately on the policy making process and their opinion cannot be ignored. I think that China’s foreign policy of non-intervention is not favoring it at this point because people are too critical of anything with which word “Foreign” is attached and especially Post-Cold War era has made their mind of not trusting anyone. How is it comprehensible that billions of dollars are being donated and loaned just because one country wants economic development in another country? China should respond to these reactions and a silent is not in its favor.

Secondly, it is very important to observe dynamics of China’s domestic issues including its political leadership’s attitude towards sustaining the ongoing foreign investment strategy, situation of minorities being highlighted by international media or China’s own citizens’ reaction towards converting China into a surveillance state etc. These tectonic plates can cause earthquakes whose effects can be felt in the whole world. Chinese will definitely try to paint a better image in advance for the international community and community development projects in other countries can help them for portraying this image.

If China’s investment strategy in future will be as I am thinking, then there is no question of the return of socialism. How can China compromise on domestic socialism on the price of global socialism (by investing in international community development projects)?

We also need to accept this reality that liberal democracy as a topic has saturated our academia. There were not many topics to write about for social scientists in general and particularly for political scientists, so as an alternate, we have a new lot of academicians whose bread and better is to write against liberal democracy. Some of them who didn’t want to play more mental acrobats have decided to affiliate themselves with socialism as they have the example of an economically progressed country “China”. These scholars are continuously writing about the world in 2050 where China will be dominating power. And for this, they give credit to the socialism on philosophical level. But I don’t think that these scholars are demonstrating any academic integrity. They are treating US foreign and economic policies as static in comparison to Chinese ones. I am sure that US is also investigating about the China’s strategic ambitions, Chinese intentions to sustain the present global order or to introduce a new one, and possible counter strategies if China seems to take a lead.

I think that the more important question is to study the gradual change in China at all levels. Will Chinese political system favor its current economic policy by 2050? Or we will see a new Chinese economic policy shaping its politics? Either way, I don’t think that socialism will survive in any of its classic forms.

**Do Chinese historical practices support CCP’s contemporary practices?**

In Chinese legends and mythology, Nuwa is the goddess who created the mankind. She also repaired the broken pillars of heaven which were damaged by Gong Gong, the God of Water, in his fight with Zhu Rong, the God of Fire. Some social scientists consider that China’s Belt and Road Initiative is coming to repair and stabilize the broken economies of poor Asian and African countries like Nuwa. Whereas many scholars argue that China is fighting like a Gong Gong with the USA (Zhu Rong) to claim the throne of heaven (Economic Hegemony). At least this what Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamad thinks about China. That is why he cancelled three Chinese-backed multi-billion infrastructure projects and warned against "a new version of colonialism happening because poor countries are unable to compete with rich countries in terms of just open free trade."

If we explore the pages of Chinese history, we can connect the dots that how contemporary Chinese political and economic policies are being shaped. There are many stories and incidents in Chinese history which can help us to break the code of Belt and Road Initiative.

The Ming Dynasty was the first Chinese dynasty interested in exploration and trade with the world. The Ming treasure voyages were the seven maritime expeditions by China's fleet between 1405 and 1433. The Yongle Emperor ordered the construction of the treasure fleet in 1403. The grand project resulted in seven far-reaching ocean voyages to the coastal territories and islands in and around the South China Sea, the Indian Ocean, and West Africa. Admiral Zheng He was commissioned to command the treasure fleet for the expeditions. Their sea routes are used for comparison with the Belt and Road routes, making a claim that China has a history of openness towards possible trade opportunities with anyone in the world. The explorations which were conducted under the Yongle Emperor were ended because they didn't profit the empire. Also, the fleets were extremely expensive because Ming China's main threats came from the Mongolians in the North, not from any sea borne threats. A story of giraffe is also mentioned here: according to it, Zheng He brought a giraffe from Africa on his return. The Yongle Emperor of Ming Dynasty had already conducted many wars and military campaigns during his reign and he was sapping away all the money. This was the time when Forbidden City was built. So finally, trade was restricted and a sea ban (Haijin) was imposed. The simple rationale behind this was that the Chinese expeditionary fleet was heavily militarized and carried great amounts of treasures, which served to project Chinese power and wealth to the known world. Emperor suffered a trade deficit because his imports exceeded the value of his exports. It is also interesting to note that this was the only option available for the Ming Emperors because the Ottomans dominated trade in Eastern Europe in the 1400-1500s. The Ottomans controlled the roads and the Mediterranean Sea, but the Ming had the South China or Indian Ocean as an available option. Moreover, Ming China was the world's most powerful country and there was essentially nothing they needed or wanted from the outside, "barbaric and uncivilized" world.

Besides starting a trade with the world and then putting it to a halt, there is a moral lesson in this story, at least for China.

According to the World Bank report, China is the world’s largest exporter and the second largest importer as well. Its import market is roughly the size of other BRICS countries, Japan and Turkey combined. China is leading in other economic dimensions such as investments. It is vivid that unlike Ming Emperors, current Chinese leadership is aware of trade deficit. They have much more to offer to the world, but they have expectations from the other countries as well. In 2013, China’s decision to adopt open market strategy is well planned in order to achieve the international consequences of China’s rise. If countries along the Belt and Road have nothing to offer but to take from China, the latter knows very well how to avoid any trade deficit this time.

In his Washington Post article Robert J. Samuelson has analyzed how the USA is going to lose its trade war with China. He refers to the Peter Navarro, director of the White House National Trade Council, who wrote in the Wall Street Journal: “The Chinese government . . . [has] audacious plans to dominate emerging technology industries. Many of these targeted sectors, such as artificial intelligence and robotics, have clear implications for defense. China seeks to achieve its goal of economic and military domination in part by acquiring the best American technology and intellectual property.” Robert said, by referring to the Michael Wessel of the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, a Congressional watchdog agency, “Hardly anyone doubts that China is on the hunt for advanced technologies by legal means if possible, and illegal means, if necessary.”

China has experienced wars with the British Empire over the trade of opium. The British East India Company was smuggling opium from India into China through various means and became the leading suppliers by the end of 18th century. This drug trade resulted in millions of Chinese addicts and devastated especially the large coastal Chinese cities. Now at this point, the Chinese know that they should not let anyone exchange giraffe or opium for their worthy exports. The countries along the Belt and Road claim that it is a win-win project for them. But at least for China, it is a win-win project even after investing billions of dollars in infrastructure of the relevant countries.

The China-Pakistan Economic Corridor which is the flagship project of Belt and Road Initiative will span the length and breadth of Pakistan. It will decrease the distance for China to reach to the Arabian sea through Gwadar Port, which is officially leased to China for 43 years or until 2059. Will it bring any benefit to Pakistan? One can predict, yes but we are not sure if its long-term benefits will be shared by both, Pakistan and China. In Central Asia, critics are openly writing about their concerns that the trains routes planned to be built by China will just go through Central Asia and bring Chinese goods to Europe or will help Central Asian economies as well?

When such questions emerge, the Chinese side refers to its foreign policy principle of non-interference in other country’s domestic politics and strategy of not indulging themselves into any dispute. The Chinese Communist Party which took over power from feudalism through revolution proudly follows the Marxist ideology. But Karl Marx in “A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy” clearly referred to “the economic structure of society, as the real foundation, on which arises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness.” Moreover, throughout the Chinese history, Confucians preferred to avoid conflicts. It was Confucius who considered that “taking legal actions against neighbors is a result of an incapacity to work things out in negotiations.” Bobby K Y Wong in his article “Dispute Resolution by Officials in Traditional Chinese Legal Culture” states that Confucians were not mere theorists. They took it as their mandate to create a Confucian utopia on earth. Whenever possible, they would put theory into practice. In handling disputes brought before them, the concern of Confucian officials was not to decide which party was right or wrong. Rather, the process was, as a means to achieve other more important objectives, given much more attention. The main objective was to keep society in harmony, the central theme of Confucianism and the traditional Chinese culture. Dispute resolution was never as important as dispute prevention. It was often used to teach the disputants the importance of keeping good relationships with others.

In conclusion, we can say that if Chinese foreign policy is following the principle of avoiding disputes in their dealings then it is not something which they have specially designed as a welcoming tactic for the Belt and Road countries. But it is the part of Chinese intrinsic legal system which is an integral part of their subconsciousness. In 2013, however, China deployed combat troops for the first time in its history in Mali. Its extensive economic investments have brought about the need to protect its investments and ensure the security and political stability of host countries. It is still a question whether it was Chinese dispute prevention strategy or dispute resolution tactic?

China also needs not to interfere directly into a country’s domestic politics. According to Marxist ideology, economy runs politics and as a part of Chinese foreign investment strategy, it is working very well.

China was the Middle Kingdom and China’s foreign policy increasingly looks like an effort to win back for itself an imagined position where China was the center of East Asia and other nations largely submitted to its will. “The key for the current Chinese leader is to give itself and Chinese people the sense that China is back in its natural place in the world order, which means as the regional hegemon and at least one of the top few countries in the world.”

History, arts and literature provide a reasonable underlying context for the contemporary events. They help us understand the underline philosophies and articulations of the events including political and economic policies made by a country. If a country’s policies are not following the ideological footprints of their forefathers, one can observe a deviation and then try to explore the reason behind this deviation. History can be a good source of reference for comparison as well. Chinese economic and foreign policies are a hope for the world. In many markets, China is representing more than 50 percent of global demand. Therefore, China’s policies will impact on the rest of the world and especially on its neighboring countries. Even Africa and Latin America are very hopeful for long term consequences of Belt and Road Initiative. There is a hope that potential effects of this initiative will be positive not only for China but for these countries as well.

We can say that China has significantly deviate from its historical practices and they are for good. Moreover, it proves that China has confidence to absorb, accommodate and preparade unprecedented modernization.

**What can be the alternative of “ Socialism with Chinese Characteristics” ?**

The interplay between rule of law and political governance, the social demands and maintenance of public order, providing good and services and balancing the economic resources etc, all require a strong managerial system which should be powerful and legitimized. In China, the governance system appears to be efficient and legitimate because there is an apparent consensus of populates on the selection of the public representatives. Moreover, China is able to justify its position related to its political system in contrary to western concerns that Chinese government does what it wants to do. I would say that Chinese government does what is required to do in Chinese context. China has its own customized system of governance which very well goes hand in hand with the demands of populates.

Keping Yu, Deputy director Compilation and Translation Bureau Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party had written in 2014 that the modernization of state governance will requires a change in the current relationship between the government, the market and the society. From a western perspective, during last three decades, we cannot see a change in terms of multiparty competition, general elections and separations of powers between different institutes. But as for state governance is concerned, there has been vivid changes. There is a significant improvement in the situation of rule of law, public participation, democratic decision making, social governance, public services, government accountability, political transparency, administrative efficiency, government approval procedures, decentralization and the development of social organizations.

He further said “State governance fails if the government becomes too powerful and also if it becomes too weak. However, the allotment of powers between the government, the market and society in state governance should be expected to vary between different countries and within the same country at different stages when national conditions differ. Today, in China, the CCP and the government play an overwhelming role in the country’s governance.” In short, the best of form of government is that which tries to maximize the public interests. State, market and society should harmonize which is essential for the progression of social and political lives. “However, governments have always been without question by far the most powerful segment of society, and no other can be considered their equal. Therefore, in modern state governance, the government, still plays a larger role than the market and society. In other words, the key to good governance is good government, and if you want to have good governance you must first have good government.” This position is the exact position of the CCP, the state officials and Chinese academicians that “we are feeling the riverbed while crossing the river.”

Previously in China, there was no consensus between powerful decision makers on political reforms which lead to corruption and emergence of different interest groups. According to the Globaltimes China, in 2016, President Xi presided over the 25th meeting of the Central Leading Group for Deepening Reform Comprehensively. One line from a statement released after the meeting was very eye-catching: “Reform is a revolution that aims to rectify the system and challenge vested interests. There is no way to do it other than using real swords and spears.” The seriousness of the matter can be estimated from this fact that these reforms are not less than a revolution itself. Current reform which are in process are striving to make political system accommodating a smooth transitional process towards economic development while eliminating the class struggle. Socialism is being rethought to make it more pragmatic rather than a conceptual fairytale. The role of mercantile class in the politics and separation of government from business and management is also under consideration. Whereas one of the most important political reforms would the role of socialist party itself. In addition to that, rule of law, democracy, decentralization of state services, protection of human rights and to contextualize these reforms in the contemporary global demands, cannot be neglected.

So, what should be the nature of Chinese political reforms? What kind of reforms China should introduce which can satisfy its own populates and meet the demand of the world, emerging from Western propaganda?

I think that China should introduce its own version of political and economic expressions. Chinese version is already unique, but China should project it to the world with new terminologies. There is no need to be apologetic about it if West doesn’t consider China to be non-democratic or conservative. China has capacity to build its own model, parallel to the western political and economic models. One of the greatest examples is the Chinese Belt and Road Initiative. World has never seen such a huge investment and economic tactic by any other country which spreads its tentacles on the whole world. Interestingly, this is against the Chinese classic understandings of foreign investment. Never in history, China took such a giant step of this sort. It also proves that China can come up with its own version of any policy and can implement it.

I see China standing at that point of history where any classic philosophical terminology cannot completely comprehend the Chinese version of political and economic system. China has reached to the era of “ Ultra-Sinoism”. China need not to say that we are getting rid of socialism, rather can claim to revolutionize the old socialism in the new of Ultra-Sinoism. Under the umbrella of Ultra-Sinoism, China can do its political reforms and it has no need to justify in front of anyone that why are they doing so? Chinese government can simply say that it is Chinese new version of political system. China also need not to put itself in someone’s else philosophical or ideological shoes but should come up with a completely new concept to set an example for others.

In 2015, while studying at American University of Central Asia, I got a chance to meet with the US Assistant Secretary Nisha Biswal and I asked her the question that why US is so aggressively ignoring the feeling of ordinary people of countries with which it deals? And she said that we have shown to the world that our system is functional, and we have demonstrated it many times that it works very well. US wants liberty and freedom for everyone as it wants for its own citizens. So, China should also introduce its own system (which it already has) with its new customized terminologies and show to the world that it is functional as well.

If China will stick to the old terminologies, then it will never be able to fulfil the demands of these philosophies. But if it introduces its own legal-political jargons to explain its personalized versions of classic ideologies and to elaborate its political reform and implement them in China and show to the world that they are functioning then no one would dare to criticize on Chinese government. That is appreciable that China is very serious about its political reforms, but It should take full credit of it. It shouldn’t be for the sake of satisfying the demands of so called liberal and progressive philosophies. And It is only possible when Chinese government will introduce these modern reforms in customized modern terminologies personalized with China.

For example, instead of refereeing its political-legal reform as “ Socialism with Chinese Characteristics”, CCP can refer it as “ Ultra-Sinoism”. This term explains that China’s ideological framework is personalized to China. As an explanation, it can be said that the China is at a transitional stage from Socialism to Communism and this transitional stage of “ Ultra-Sinoism” demands the government to make final adjustment before gaining its idealized form of communism.

Besides this theoretical tactic, I strongly believe that on pragmatic level, the era of Socialism, Socialism with Chinese Characteristics, Post Socialism or Sino-Socialism has passed, and world is waiting for Ultra-Sinoism.

**Conclusion:**

At present, the rationale behind Chinese Political-Legal Reforms can be enshrined in two explanations. First, Chinese political-legal reforms have pragmatic importance and they are the demand of modern China’s proper and smooth functioning of state chores. Secondly, some reforms are purely of theoretical nature through which CCP wants to project a liberal, democratic and progressive image of the party. In both cases, CCP has deviated a lot from the classic Marxist and Socialist ideology. Moreover, CCP cannot completely withdraw its claim of being a socialist party, that’s why they are using a term “ Socialism with Chinese Characteristics”. The sole purpose of this term is to legitimize the deviations which they have done from the original socialism.

We claimed that the return of socialism seems impossible and CCP has already deviated a lot from its original positions and claims which they had made on the name of socialism. Moreover, Chinese society and market have more tendency to adopt western style market, political and legal systems.

It would be better for CCP to introduce a new ideology or at least an extension to the old socialism. This can provide an explanation to the current CCP’s practices and a justification within the framework of Classic Socialism. Such an ideology or a term which can refer to the current CCP’s practices can be “ Ultra-Sinoism”. Ultra-Sinoism can be introduced as a transitional phase between Socialism and Communism and as a justification of current CCP’s practices. The terminology, “ Socialism with Chinese Characteristics” seems apologetic in nature where as “ Ultra-Sinoism” seems more personalized in nature with contemporary practices of CCP.
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