

Privatization Is the Right Way to Proceed and Parliamentary Democracy Conforms with the Times

By Cao Siyuan*

1. Privatization is the right way to proceed

There are two nice nicknames for journalists: "submissive tool" and "crownless king." Which one would you prefer? Okay, just what I figured: nobody wants to be a submissive tool. My speech runs along similar lines: should I say what I want to say or should I become a submissive tool? Of course I would choose, without hesitation, to say what I want to say. Today I am here to make friends with the future crownless kings. Once we have made this point clear, it will all be smooth sailing.

The most valuable kind of friend is a soul mate, somebody who really knows and understands you. Whether I can make myself known and understood here depends on whether I can "cast a brick to attract jade." My way of communicating with you will be to toss up a piece of white jade called "privatization is the right way to proceed" and a piece of red jade called "parliamentary democracy conforms with the times" (audience clapping). It seems that you know exactly what I am talking about.

Why do I say "privatization is the right way to proceed"? Let's start from the last year of the last century. In September 1999, the American magazine Forbes sponsored the Forbes Global Forum in Shanghai. On September 27, I, Cao Siyuan, gave my speech around 4 o'clock in the afternoon and Jiang Zemin gave his speech in the evening. I was standing about 30 meters from Jiang Zemin while he was speaking. When Jiang finished his speech and returned to his seat, I started to walk towards him. Under such strict security, I walked casually towards Jiang Zemin, holding one book in each hand. Why didn't I hold both books in one hand and put the other hand in my pocket? Because it would have been unclear what I was holding in my pocket and I could have been stopped. Therefore, my hand could not have been hidden in my pocket but had to be out in the open.

Jiang Zemin was seated and looking straight ahead. Out of the corner of his eye, he saw a rather stocky guy approach him so he turned to the right to look at me. Most of the people would either lower their heads or look away when meeting the eyes of the Chairman, but I didn't. I looked him straight in the eye as I walked towards him. I bet the thought going through his mind was: "Who is this guy?" I didn't want to introduce myself. That would have been too common. I just walked up to him and put the first book, *Storms of Bankruptcy*, on his table. On the cover of the book was "by Cao Siyuan." Jiang couldn't figure out who this "Cao Siyuan" was. At this time his mind was quickly sifting through information in his memory: "Do I know him? Where have I seen him? Or heard of him?" I gave him half a minute to search his memory. After half a minute, I started, "I am so grateful to Chairman Jiang for giving me all the support when I was investigating and studying the Law of Bankruptcy in Shanghai in 1986. You see I have quoted what you said to me here on page 111." I had book-marked that page in advance so I could turn

* This is a speech given by the author at the Beijing Broadcasting Academy around June 2000.

to it right away.

The normal reaction in this kind of situation would be, since he was quoted on page 111, he would assume that it most likely would be something good, not name-calling or bad-mouthing. So he appeared to be quite happy. Just when he put on a happy face, I took out the second book and put it in front of him. This one was *Privatization Is the Right Way to Proceed*. Future crownless kings, please note that from last century to this century, privatization has always been a forbidden zone. First of all, it's a forbidden zone for the media. The media once put forward, or rather, was ordered to put forward the view that China would never get involved in privatization. My book not only advocates privatization, it claims privatization is "the right way forward." In other words, refusal to privatize would be wrong. I didn't give Jiang Zemin this book just on an impulse. I had plotted this as early as January. At that time, there were two prevalent opinions at the Beijing Siyuan Research Center of Social Sciences regarding this plan. The first one was never to present this book to Jiang because he might lose his temper and "take us down." The second opinion was that if he didn't lose his temper and managed to read through the book and change part of his own thinking, then it would be a wonderful thing for this country's reforms. After many rounds of debate, we finally decided to take the high risk for a possible high return. The result was the scene that I had just described to you.

Some people might ask, what are the grounds for arguing that "privatization is the right way to proceed"? I say the grounds, the basis for my theory, lies nowhere else but in all of your minds. I believe everybody present is a patriot. You acknowledge that China as a nation has had over 5000 years of glorious civilization, and that civilization was created as a result of private ownership. There would have been no Chinese civilization without private ownership. Is this enough evidence to verify that privatization has been the right way forward for the Chinese all along? Suppose China had started this "big rice wok" policy 500 years earlier, where it made no difference to anybody regardless of what you did or didn't do or how you did it. Maybe China would have started its regression back then, and as a result, we would be back in a primitive society today.

Fortunately we did not start eating out of the big wok until 1956. By 1958 it was said that the communist vision would be soon realized. Once at a village committee meeting in Henan Province, the village party-secretary said, "At this party committee meeting, we declare that this year we shall enter communist society. After the meeting, you can all go down the street and pick up whatever you like. Communism means taking what you need." In response to this order, people did the very minimum when working in the fields and stood up when they had a backache. When they ate, they ate quite a bit because the food was free. Therefore, a severe famine started and continued from 1959 to 1961, during which time many people died of starvation. Experts estimate the death toll to be 48 million.

The period was dubbed by the Party as "three years of natural disaster." But Liu Shaoqi said at an internal party meeting, "Thirty percent was caused by natural disaster and seventy percent by human errors." The human disaster was to cut off the tail of capitalism and rush into communism. An article published recently in *Methods* magazine says that hydro-meteorologists have studied the hydro-meteorological charts over the last 100 years and concluded that 1959 and 1960 should have been two of the best years in the past 100 years. It had offered the most

favorable weather for the crops. By that argument, the thirty-percent blame on natural disasters is not even valid.

You can imagine just how deadly the "communist" craze had been. The two atomic bombs dropped on two Japanese cities merely killed several hundred thousands, but our communist movement resulted in the death of several million. Don't you see that the 5000 years of civilization and the hunger-related death of several million people provide two opposite examples to illustrate that "privatization is the right way to proceed?"

It has been said that at the time nobody dared to tell Chairman Mao about the enormous number of famished people, because senior advisor Peng Dehuai had just been prosecuted as the ringleader of an anti-party gang for speaking his mind at the Lu Mountain meeting. At the time, Wang Dongxing, head of the Security Guards Bureau, was very worried. As a communist party member, he should report the truth; but he also needed to protect himself. So he thought of an idea. He sent all of the security guards home on vacation with one job assignment: to report to Chairman Mao in person, when they came back, about the bright situation in their home towns or villages. Of course Wang knew there was no bright situation to report on. So after the security guards came back to Zhong Nanhai, some went and knelt down in front of Chairman Mao and cried, "My grandmother has died of hunger," while some said, "All of my family members have died of starvation and I really had no family to visit." Mao collapsed after he heard this. He quickly summoned Liu Shaoqi, Zhu De, and Zhou Enlai and said, "Disaster has befallen our country. You go and clean up the mess." So the members of the Central Political Bureau started readjusting policies and issued an emergency guideline in 1961 to call back privatization. They were too embarrassed to invite privatization back openly in through the front gate, so they opened a little crack in the window, so to speak, to let privatization creep back. However, they still openly claimed that the People's Communes were the best socialist formula, but as a supplement to that, they said that the Commune members were also allowed to reserve a small piece of land for themselves. When the land belonged to everybody, nobody worked hard. But when land was farmed by the family and for the family, they worked day and night. From then on we started having full stomachs, eating the supplementary rice produced this way, for 36 years, from 1961 to 1997. In 1997, at the 15th National Congress of the Communist Party of China, privatization, originally in the form of supplements, was replaced by the "individual economy" and the "private economy," both of which now are part of the socialist economy.

If we look at the present situation we will find that the state-owned sector of the economy takes up 70% of the means of production, 20% of bank loans, and 28.5% of GDP. In other words, 70% of the resources produce 28.5% of yield, while the 30% non-state means of production generate 71.5% of production. So which end of the spectrum has higher efficiency? I, Cao Siyuan, call this phenomenon "an upside-down 30-70 ratio." Can you not tell which one is stronger, the state-ownership or privatization, with this 30-70 upside-down figure? The media naturally talks about trends and times, and the fact is, we have an upside-down 30-70 ratio.

This is the present situation concerning the economy. Now let's look at geographical differences. I went to Shan'xi Province not long ago. The Governor of Shan'xi Province was a very insightful man. He believed that the backwardness of Shan'xi Province was caused by the high percentage of state-ownership and the low percentage of private ownership. He said their

primary task was to boost the non-state economic sector. He claimed that by the end of 1999, the non-state sector of the economy would climb to 20% of the total economy in Shan'xi Province. When I was invited to give lectures in Zhejiang Province, I was told that 80% of their economy was non-state owned; and the goal for Shan'xi Province was to strive for only 20%. The geographical east-west difference is predominantly a difference rooted in the ownership of economic means. I think the reason the western region in China falls behind is its comparatively small private sector.

Historical facts, geographical discrepancies and the present economic situation in China all support the argument that privatization is the right way forward.

Of course it is never easy to recognize and face the truth, even less easy to accept it, and most difficult to promote the truth. Obstacles abound.

I once made up a little doggerel entitled "Save the State Enterprises." The state enterprises have been suffering from extremely low efficiency and have created more losses than earnings. The total revenue of state enterprises in China has fallen into negative figures, generating a total debt of 1.8 billion *yuan* in 1996, 27.3 billion *yuan* in 1997 and 55.8 billion *yuan* in 1998. We used to think that the Marxist theory proclaimed that state enterprises were the best of all business forms, which would operate with the highest efficiency. Now that has been proven false. With business revenue lower than zero, what kind of credit have we done to Karl Marx?

In 1997, when I was invited to give lectures at Harvard, Columbia, New York University, I also took some time to travel around. I left New York on May 8 and arrived back in Beijing on June 9, which amounted to about a month. After Canada, I went to London. The first visit I made was to Highgate Cemetery where Karl Marx's tomb was, because I consider myself one of Karl Marx's students. I went to college at the Communist Party School of Jiangxi Province, and I received my graduate degree at the Research Institute of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought under the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (audience applause). Marxism-Leninism is my field of study, even if some leftists accuse me of other things. Standing in front of Marx's tomb, I talked to him in a sorrowful tone: "You never would have thought that in a socialist country the state enterprises could slip into a serious deficit." I could almost hear Karl Marx sigh heavily in his tomb, "What a false accusation!" Why? Because many of us claim that state ownership is the lifeline of socialism, a belief we attribute to Karl Marx.

Many say we are straying from Marxism when we sell the non-performing state enterprises to private business people or to foreign investors, because they believe it is Karl Marx who endorsed the creation of so many state enterprises. What I would say is that the more I think about it, the more I believe that Mao Zedong is not a Marxist. None of Marx's writings indoctrinates state ownership of assets. Marx never called for so many state enterprises, state-owned stores, or state banks. That's why he moaned about a false accusation. One of Marx's representative works is *Anti-Dühring*, in which he said: "With the dictatorship of the proletariat, all means of production will belong to the society, which is the first and last action the proletarian class will take as rulers of the state." Then, after all the means of production have been collected by the society, who will actually run the stores, factories, and banks? According

to Marx, they will be run by an alliance of free people; or, translated into today's language, they will be collectively run by the people.

Our country has always shown respect for the people; everywhere you look, you see the two words "*ren min*" (people). But the people are not trusted with running enterprises. The State will run them. At one point, the state-owned sector of the economy was as high as 98% of the entire economy. But if the people, as individuals, start running the enterprises, it is labeled "running on the capitalist road." Doesn't that sound ridiculous to you? If we elevate the status of people to such a height, why can't the people be trusted to run businesses? The doctrine of state-run enterprises belongs to one school of socialism called "state socialism," created and manufactured by none other than Hitler. The name, "German National Socialist Worker's Party" or "National Socialist Party" in short, is translated into "Nazi" in English. But state capitalism is not Marxism.

Here in China, we have a state capitalist country, wherein we have been trying everything we can to salvage and subsidize it, using the hard-earned money from the people to subsidize state enterprises, to give them so-called energy booster shots. If the enterprises themselves have no vitality, what good are the booster shots? In light of this, I wrote a little poem called "Farewell to Energy Booster Shots." The booster shots have only served to boost the state enterprises down the road of decline and collapse. What they really need is a complete change of blood if they can ever hope to rejuvenate, and the only right way to do that is through privatization.

The word "privatization" at one time was given a derogatory connotation. These days everybody could openly get involved in privatization activities if they wish. Privatization has turned the presumed public ownership into a real one. Once I witnessed a scene at Zhengzhou Railway Station. A peasant got into a fight with the ticket clerk and broke a glass window. The policeman said to him, "The glass is public property owned by all the people, so you must pay for it." The peasant retorted, "Since it's owned by all the people, then it's part of my property too. I don't want to own anything else but this piece of glass; this piece of glass is considered my property and I have decided not to pay for it myself." It shows that the ownership by all really means ownership by none.

Once I studied an enterprise's operations and concluded that it is really not that easy to make an extra ten million *yuan*, because the employees of the enterprise have no power over the money and suffer no ill effect if the enterprise runs into deficit. If gains or losses have no impact on the employees, who are supposed to be the masters of the company? Are they truly masters? Of course not. We have all been trying to educate the employees to establish a spirit of ownership, but is there such a need? If ownership has real substance and everybody in the enterprise exercises a certain degree of private ownership, then they will value that ownership and be motivated.

I have a former classmate who is a director of a factory. Once when there was a fire in the factory, nobody in the factory appeared to be bothered. Instead, they carried on singing and dancing as if nothing had happened. My classmate said, "What damage will a fire do? The government will allocate money to us. I have long ago sent up a request to rebuild this factory, but there was never a response. Now the fire has happened, which is great; it means we will get more funding. More fires mean more money coming this way."

In contrast, where I live there was once a massive fire that burned a whole street. Many old folks stood on the street crying and trembling with heart-felt pain. They couldn't retrieve their watches, bicycles and lots of other personal belongings. That explains the contrast between state enterprises that are in the red and private businesses that generate great profits. I admit that an isolated number of state enterprises may be profitable, but they are not representative of the whole. Therefore I have decided to call state enterprises "subsidized enterprises." We need to have certain state-owned sectors (i.e. the production of currency, the control of drugs, etc.) for reasons of social security and stability. All in all, the state-owned sector of the economy should not exceed 15% of the national economy. There won't be enough money to subsidize it if the percentage gets too high. The task of state enterprises is to produce wealth for the society. Constantly having to subsidize them will negate their benefits. The track of privatization is a natural way to proceed in our reforms as determined by objective laws. We have to face the inevitable and never look at a deer and call it a horse. Journalists will be more aware of this principle in the future.

2. Parliamentary Democracy Conforms with the Times

Political reforms should be divided into five compartments:

1. The urgency of political reforms has been intensified at present. The economic reforms in China, started almost 30 years ago, though still in need of improvement, have been progressing at a brisk pace. On the other hand, political reforms were proposed as early as the 13th National Congress of the Communist Party of China, but have created more noise than concrete results. Now even the noise has died down. At the 15th National Congress, political reforms were again a theme of discussion and given approval to continue, but so far nothing concrete has materialized. No set plans or measures have been formulated. Political reforms have been lagging seriously behind economic reforms. It's like the two legs of a person: if one moves forward and the other one doesn't follow, then the person might lose balance and fall. It's the same way with a society. At present, the issue at stake that everybody is concerned about is how to eliminate corrupt officials. The central government has taken some very decisive measures and arrested many corrupt officials. But, at the same time a phenomenon has emerged. Folks on the street describe it half-jokingly as "One Chen Xitong is down, but many thousands of Chen Xitong have stood up." A local saying in my Jiangxi Province goes like this: "You catch one thief stealing cows, other thieves immediately emerge to steal more cows from you." The speed at which we catch corrupt officials can't keep up with the speed at which corrupt officials emerge. Without thorough political reforms, we can't improve our efficiency enough to crack down on corruption, and the people will always have reason to complain. The possibility of two scenarios exists: the total collapse and subsequent burial of the whole system because of corrupt officials or the uprising of ordinary folks who can bear it no longer. Neither is the result we want to see happen. We are hoping to be able to make timely remedies through political reforms to avoid such results. It's an urgent task.

2. There is a need for debate regarding political reforms. So far, in terms of political reforms, there has been no overall planning regarding steps to be taken or measures for enforcing them. It demonstrates the degree of difficulty for carrying out political reforms. One person cannot do the mapping out and programming of political reforms of an entire country. It takes the wisdom of many people, who can sit down, brainstorm, and come up with ideas. Today I have come here as one advocate of political reform. Some people call me "Bankruptcy Cao," which I like and dislike. My first interest is political reforms, second interest is economic reforms, and third interest is the law of bankruptcy. But somehow I ended up with the last title. Of course now some people have started calling me "Constitution-Amending Cao" because I have made five proposals for amending our Constitution. And others also call me "Parliament Cao" because of my advocacy for parliamentary democracy, while still more others call me "Observer Cao" because I believe there should be a system for setting up an open public gallery to freely allow visitors and observers into the National People's Congress sessions. By the way, that last proposal has been adopted and written into law. Now local people's congress sessions allow ordinary citizens to visit and listen in. All in all, political reforms should permit and encourage discussion by the people, who should have the right to discuss them.

3. To set up a goal for political reforms. The goal for our economic reforms must be clear: build a socialist market economy. But what about the goal for political reforms? Democracy? What kind of democracy? There are three kinds of democracy. One is democracy bestowed as an imperial favor from the above: let him speak; if he says nice things, it's fine. If not, let's send him to jail. Bestowed democracy is an imperial favor to allow you to speak, but if you don't speak in the right tone, you get arrested. What kind of democracy is this? Another kind of democracy is anarchist democracy, which means nobody rules and everybody fights and loots and robs. There is no security without legality in this kind of democracy. What we want is parliamentary democracy, which is an inevitable trend for the human race and goes well with the current tides. What is parliament? Parliament is the legislative body of a country. It is called the Congress, made up of the Senate and the House of Representatives, in the United States. In Britain it is called the House of Lords, or the Upper House, and the House of Commons, or the Lower House. In the former Soviet Union, it is called "the Soviet" and "Duma" in today's Russia. It is called Ikh Hural (Greater People's Hural) in Mongolia, and in China, we call it the People's Congress. They are all parliaments by nature but with different names. In China they keep saying it is not parliament; it's the People's Congress, as if to say, "My son is not a person; he is called Zhang Three."** The parliament might be referred to by different names but the nature is all the same: it's a legislative body for the country. As a regulatory body watching over the executive body of the state, the parliament is chosen by a general election in regularly terms, to check on the performance of the government. A system that continually improves its administrative function is the system of a parliamentary democracy. We have this system in China. The Second Chapter of our Constitution stipulates that "All the rights of the People's Republic of China belong to the people. The legislative body of the people is the National People's Congress and the

** Zhang Three is the Chinese equivalent of John Doe.

People's Congresses of different local levels. People are presumably the highest body of authority with the role to supervise the government. But in actual fact, are the people in China really the supreme body of power? Of course not. They are a big thick rubber stamp - which is the nickname for the People's Congress. It used to be that when the Congress was in session to discuss draft laws, the representatives would all raise their hands in unison, without an exception and unanimously, with cheers and enthusiastic clapping, pass them into laws. This is called "eat your steamed buns and raise your rubber stamps." If they let you stamp, you stamp. If they don't let you, you are not allowed to stamp. The purpose of establishing parliamentary democracy for a socialist China is to transform the People's Congress from a powerful institution in name to an actually functioning legislative body of the highest authority. This is a move to protect and enforce the Constitution. A government should not have the executive power forever. There should be different terms for the governing body, supervised and monitored by the People's Congress, and accountable to the People's Congress. One important function of the People's Congress is to review and examine the Government Work Reports. The present government went into effect in January 2000, and the People's Congress approved it on March 5th. With execution first and approval second, can we really say the People's Congress reviewed and approved the forming of the government? In regard to the annual financial budget, I proposed at this session of the Congress that the meeting on the government expenditure should be rescheduled for the end of each year. We can't always have execution without approval and approval after execution. Our goal is to establish a socialist parliamentary democracy.

4. Our approach is that of a peaceful, gradual progression. Some people hate the corrupt and greedy officials with such a vengeance that they say: "We simply can't carry out political reforms leisurely and slowly. We must resort to a violent revolution and not be afraid to topple those currently in power and break their rice bowls." To that I said: whether you want to break your own pots and pans is your own decision. Whether the general public want to break their pots and pans should be up to them. You can't take the liberty to break theirs. You might want a violent revolution, but the ordinary folks just want to have a peaceful life and won't follow you in your pursuit of a violent revolution. Then you will have no followers to your revolution, and you will not be able to achieve your goal. For instance, after a violent revolution, Zhu Yuanzhang made himself an emperor, established his authority, beheaded those who helped and supported him in his cause, and did everything he could to suppress public opinion. It won't work to substitute violence with violence. The political reforms have to go along with the wishes of the majority. We should have a peaceful gradual progression.
5. Measures to be adopted.
 - A. Reform the system of the People's Congress.
 1. The People's Congress should mainly focus on the congress, not the small sessions. But our media seems to always report on small-sized meetings and

group discussions. Group discussions should be held at local levels and then have the discussion minutes submitted to the congress for debate. "Congress" means "assembly"—people getting together for discussions. To have small group meetings rather than assemblies is against the very nature of the People's Congress.

2. The congresses should be open to the public. The Presidium of the Congress has the authority to decide whether there is the need to hold closed-door meetings. The norm should be open congresses. Closed-door meetings should be for special occasions only. Whether to hold a closed-door session should be voted on and approved with a two-third majority of the representatives through special procedures. Also, there should be regulations about the system of the People's Congress (e.g. deadline by which they should have dealt with all the motions). Last year several motions were brought to the floor and a few of them were discarded, a few are still being debated, and some are being implemented. It appears that most of the time motions are just for discussion and the result of the debate won't come out until the next year. The ugly truth is that they are simply giving representatives the run-around. So here I suggest that a rule be set up that motions of common concern be brought in for immediate discussion and voted on before the end of the Congressional session. Of course, not all motions can be covered in one session; so they should number all the motions and pass them around to the representatives for each to choose three priority motions. The three motions to have received most votes will be established as motions of common concern and be open for immediate debate. Technically speaking, this method is plausible.
- B. To use amendments to the Constitution as the catalyst carrier. The political system of China mainly resides in the Constitution. Therefore reforming the political system is comparable to amending the Constitution. A constitution is the fundamental set of laws for a country. Without a workable constitution, everything else becomes difficult. In 1981 I made a ten-point proposal on amendments to the Constitution, which was published in the second edition of the 1981 *Democracy & Legality*. In February 1988, I made another ten-point proposal on amendments to the Constitution, published in the Shanghai *World Legal Forum* newspaper. What's the percentage of hits of my proposals? The suggestion that we restore the position of the President of the country has been adopted, with Li Xiannian as the first benefactor to take up the Presidency, followed by Yang Shangkun. (Who is the third one?) None of the Presidents ever expressed a hint of gratitude to me. I also raised the point that we should have a diverse economy, with sectors other than those that are state-owned or collectively owned. This proposal was accepted and put into practice in 1998. We used to have a distribution system of "each receives according to his labor." In 1998, I proposed to have the "each receives according to his labor" as the main distribution system while allowing other forms of distribution to coexist. This was also implemented in 1998. You mustn't think that an individual citizen's words carry no weight. As long as what you say is right, is in line with the objective laws, and can benefit the society, your point will be accepted.

- C. There should be internal reforms within the Communist Party itself. This is the key to reforming the political system. As a party, we have been accustomed to working with a planned economic system for a long time. How should the party operate under a market economy?
1. Name change: to call it "Socialist Party of China" or "Social Party of China" in short. The reason has already been made clear in Jiang Zemin's Report at the 15th National Congress. "Socialism will take a long and protracted period of time and take the hard work and arduous strive of several dozens of generations to achieve." If we say 30 years forms one generation according to the Chinese calculation. There will be 600 years if it takes 20 generations, or 2,700 years if it takes 90 generations. There are only 2,476 years from the time when Confucius lived, 551 BC, till the time when Dr. Sun Yat-sun died, in 1925. That's less than 2,700 years. So how much longer will China's socialism take? And communism will not happen until after socialism is realized. Will China enter communism after 2,700 years? Whatever we say now doesn't make any difference anyway. It will be up to the People's Congress of that time. Since we are going to be involved in socialism for such a long time, why don't we change the name to Socialist Party? For one thing, it will be conducive to maintaining stability (there will be no change in policies or guidelines) so that people can work on socialism with peace of mind. In addition, it will be good for discarding historic baggage, to learn lessons from history (i.e. the Great Leap Forward of 1958), and be able to make impartial judgment of the historical events as a socialist party.
 2. Allow competition within the party. Now the selection of party leaders is made gradually, step by step, from the level of local party branch, to the district party committee, to the city party committee, to the National Party Representatives so that nobody knows exactly who elected the leaders. I propose to elect the General Party Secretary to be chosen among three to five candidates through a general election, one party member giving one vote. Only open competition can produce the best leader.
 3. Allow competition from outside the party. Be it an economic principle or political principle, only through open competition can errors be corrected and weaknesses overcome. If one ruling party has an endless term, then it becomes too weak to reconcile with its own mistakes. Our party has corrected many mistakes over time but remedies have come too late. Mao's mistakes were upheld for over twenty years. A leader, just like anybody else, is understandably human and prone to making mistakes. That's not the problem. The problem is, in our present system, the leader's mistakes can not be made right in time. The costs are too hefty if mistakes can only be corrected after his death. From 1956 to 1976, China wasted 20 years. How many 20 years can a person have? A country? A party? Why couldn't we have corrected the leader's mistakes in time? This is a question for scientific study on the political system. Clinton's scandal almost landed him an impeachment. Nixon's "Watergate" scandal, a little "bugging event," toppled his presidency. We need to have a scientifically-designed political system to be able to timely remedy mistakes. Only then can our party and country pay less in cost and be able to move forward more efficiently.

Here ends my proposal.

**

Source: { HYPERLINK

<http://intellectual.members.easyspace.com/economic/caosiyuan%20on%20privatization%20and%20democracy.htm> }