

Reflection and Construction of the Discourse System With Chinese Characteristics in the New Era

GE Yao^{[a],*}

^[a] MD, Research Assistant, School of Marxism, Shanghai Normal University, Shanghai, China.

*Corresponding author.

Received 12 June 2025; accepted 30 July 2025
Published online 26 August 2025

Abstract

Developing a discourse system grounded in China's practices, developmental trajectory, and historical experiences constitutes a critical task for advancing socialist culture in the new era. This undertaking requires problem-focused methodologies that scientifically examine and appropriately reconcile discursive relationships across three key dimensions: tradition versus modernity, Chinese versus Western paradigms, and state versus societal frameworks. Historically, the evolution of this discourse system has progressed through three distinct phases: radical democratic-political discourse, economic rationalist discourse, and contemporary humanistic-legal discourse. Guided by the integrated principles of heritage-national character, originality-epochal relevance, and systematic-disciplinary rigor, the construction necessitates comprehensive conceptualization and implementation strategies.

Key words: Discourse system; Chinese-characteristic; Problem-oriented; Systematic thinking

Ge, Y. (2025). Reflection and Construction of the Discourse System With Chinese Characteristics in the New Era. *Canadian Social Science*, 21(4), 81-87. Available from: <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/css/article/view/13864>
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/13864>

A core mission for cultural development in China's new era is to accelerate the construction of a philosophy and social sciences framework with Chinese characteristics. This entails continuously advancing the development and innovation of its "disciplinary systems, academic

systems, and discourse systems" (Xi, 2023, p.478). Central to this effort is building a discourse system oriented toward China's practices, development trajectory, and historical experiences. The goal is to enhance China's discursive confidence, foster social consensus, and unleash reform momentum by effectively narrating and interpreting China's stories, path, and solutions for social transformation and national rejuvenation, thereby addressing the challenge of "having sound arguments yet failing to articulate them effectively or disseminate them widely" (Xi, 2023, p.486). Constructing this discourse requires a problem-oriented focus that prioritizes practical issues, along with scientifically reflecting on and appropriately handling discourse dynamics across three critical dimensions: tradition versus modernity, Chinese versus Western paradigms, and state versus societal frameworks. Among these, the dual discursive dimensions and modalities inherent to state-society relations — encompassing their construction, conflictual dynamics, and mutual recognition — constitute the most decisive relational paradigm within this tripartite framework.

1. PROBLEM-ORIENTED APPROACH AND CONTEXTUAL REALITIES IN CONSTRUCTING THE DISCOURSE SYSTEM WITH CHINESE CHARACTERISTICS

The discursive landscape of contemporary China is characterized by two fundamentally distinct discursive spaces and modalities: the official public opinion sphere (state ideological apparatus), comprising Party newspapers and journals, state and local news agencies, radio and television stations, official news websites, and verified social media accounts; and the non-official public opinion sphere (civic/public discursive platform), constituted by metropolitan newspapers, urban leisure spaces, online self-media platforms, WeChat groups, Douyin (TikTok),

Bilibili, and similar channels. These two spheres engage in historical narration, meaning production, and symbolic construction concerning the “China Story” through their respective discursive practices.

As the dominant ideological force, the state discursive system fulfills a crucial socio-educative function: it sublates private interests into universal interests, transforms individual primordial nature into a universal moral will, elevates subjective personal impulses into concrete spiritual freedom, and harmonizes individual life with the collective whole. Conversely, the non-official sphere provides individuals with a platform to articulate private interests, critique public affairs, and participate in national governance. Functioning as the inorganic medium for individual expression and embodying “public opinion”, this sphere aggregates elements of truth and falsehood, the absolute and the relative, the essential and the non-essential.

Consequently, within the structural hierarchy of discursive space, the state discursive system rightfully occupies the central and dominant position. Its role encompasses integrating societal demands while guiding and regulating the non-official discursive system and citizen participation towards constructive trajectories. However, the current reality in China reveals that these two discursive systems have not yet achieved fully effective connectivity and positive interaction. This deficiency stems partly from institutional misalignments at various administrative levels — evident in top-level design, resource allocation, benefit distribution, governance style, and discursive methods — and partly from the inherent diversity and fluidity of material interests, cultural values, and lifestyles within society.

When effective discursive connectivity and interaction between these spheres break down, society risks descending into discursive fragmentation, stalemate, and antagonism. The discursive practice of official positions may then lose its persuasive power and ideological leadership, potentially triggering a “Tacitus Trap” of discursive trust — a situation where the state or its institutions, having lost public credibility, find that their statements (whether true or false) and actions (whether good or bad) are uniformly distrusted. Tacitus, in his *Histories*, observed of a Roman Emperor: “When rulers have come to be hated, all their acts, be they good or bad, are held in equal detestation” (Tacitus, *The Histories*, Book 1, Section 7).

Therefore, investigating the construction process of the discourse system with Chinese characteristics across the revolutionary, construction, and reform periods, exploring the dual discursive dimensions and conflicts between the state and society, elucidating methods to overcome obstacles in state-society discursive interactions, as well as constructing shared symbolic systems and discursive modalities — thereby promoting discursive unity,

harmony, and trust throughout society — constitutes a critical research imperative posed by China’s socialist construction and reform practices in the new era to the fields of philosophy and social sciences.

Contemporary China has accomplished the historical progression from “standing up” to “becoming prosperous”, and is now actively engaged in the grand practice of national rejuvenation to “achieve strength”. Concurrently, during the unfolding of Chinese modernization, the nation confronts multifaceted manifestations of three systemic risk paradigms: the erosion of institutional credibility encapsulated by the Tacitus Trap, the economic stagnation dynamics of the Middle-Income Trap, and the geopolitical tensions inherent in the Thucydides Trap. These converging challenges have generated sustained academic inquiry and vigorous debate both domestically and internationally, thereby furnishing significant impetus and rich thematic material for constructing a discourse system with distinctive Chinese characteristics. From a theoretical perspective, the academic lineage and current research trends pertaining to this discourse system construction primarily engage with foundational contributions from Marx and Engels. They established historical materialism, which encompasses theories of language and intellectual production, thereby providing core perspectives and analytical methodologies for discourse studies. First of them is the theory about the essence and evolution of language, that is, language is conceptualized as the practical, real consciousness, which is fundamentally intertwined with the materiality of thought: “From the start, the ‘spirit’ is afflicted with the curse of being ‘burdened’ with matter, which here makes its appearance in the form of agitated layers of air, sounds, in short, in the form of language” (Marx & Engels, 1976, p.44).

Another theory is concerning the alienation or degradation of language: the logic of buying and selling, business mentality, and money worship within capitalist societal language, as well as an opposition between the direct language of essence and the alienated language of commodity value. As Jean-Jacques Lecercle elaborates:

Language, while being the very medium through which abstraction becomes possible (thereby enabling the conscious apprehension of social reality), simultaneously imposes an abstract fetishism — freezing the flux of the Real into the dead letter of signification, and masking the constitutive void of subjectivity. (2006, p.96)

The third one is the theory of “linguistic tricks” or pathological discourse patterns: In their critiques of Stirner and Dühring’s academic discourse, Marx and Engels classified the types of linguistic tricks. In *The Great Man During His Exile*, they criticized the popular generalities, revolutionary rhetoric used to deceive the public, and the vulgar style of writing at that time. Stalin’s *Marxism and the Linguistic Question* concisely expounded the relationship between language and the

economic base and the superstructure. Paul Lafargue's *The French Language Before and After the Revolution* and Mao Zedong's *Against the Stereotyped Party Rhetoric* provided classic analyses of the generation and distortion of language and discourse styles under specific political and cultural circumstances. Through the linguistic turn in Western philosophy in the 20th century, the Western academic circle systematically clarified the relationships among language, existence, power, and meaning at the theoretical level, reaching the overall symbolic and signification systems in terms of breadth and depth. Linguistics and semiotics have become important theoretical foundations and methods for contemporary Western scholars in cultural and ideological research. Saussure's linguistic theory, Barthes' semiotic theory, Foucault's discourse analysis theory, and Bourdieu's concept of "symbolic violence" have provided cognitive models and critical paradigms for reference. Marcuse and Adorno explored the repressed and manipulated language and discourse in post-industrial society and the cultural industry. Habermas's "ideal speech situation" theory provided the conditions for effective communication and trust in discourse among subjects.

In addition, the urgent need to enhance the credibility of public power and build a Chinese discourse system has made the domestic academic circle increasingly concerned about discourse conflicts, discourse trust, discourse power, and discourse styles. The academic community has keenly identified severe social linguistic disorders such as "language corruption" and "verbal violence", along with their manifestations. They have begun elevating the issues in discourse communication highlighted during reform practices — including online trolling and venting-style emotional expression — to theoretical frameworks and rational analytical approaches. The institutional discourse patterns, mainstream media news writing conventions, and communication models have been systematically compiled into classic parodies of "official language". Current research primarily focuses on three key areas: the "Faith, Belief, Confidence, and Trust" framework (as documented in Professor Hou Huiqin's seminal report "Investigation and Analysis of the Four Trusts"), the study of China's discourse system (with Professor Han Qingxiang's exploration of its seven core components and practical communication strategies), and the evolution of official discourse (as championed by Professor Han Zhen, who argues that reform-oriented rhetoric should be considered integral to China's comprehensive opening-up).

Language, or speech, functions as the archival repository of society and the cultural storehouse. Discourse constitutes the specific linguistic or verbal practice associated with particular social groups or institutional entities, embodying their power interests and value orientations. The complex interplay of power-interest

dynamics, social conflicts, societal transformations, and systemic pathologies is inextricably manifested in the realm of linguistic and discursive practices. Language, discourse, and their historical transformations constitute vital observational vantage points for comprehending and interpreting epochal contexts and societal shifts. Discursive conflicts, crises of discursive trust, and the prevalence of "hollow, grandiose rhetoric" serve as critical diagnostic entry points for assessing the maladies of an era and its society.

Consequently, the unique value of research on constructing China's contemporary discourse system lies in its capacity to: utilize the discursive trust predicament depicted by the "Tacitus Trap" (illustrative of challenges in state governance and governmental administration) to examine the historical transitions within China's discursive typology (across revolutionary, construction, and reform periods); reflect upon discursive conflicts and crises of discursive trust within Chinese society through the lens of the "Three Major Traps" (Tacitus, middle-income, Thucydides); and investigate the underlying social tensions and power-interest conflicts these phenomena refract.

Specifically, the ideological value of this research lies in its involvement in the intricate relationships between discourse, power, and interest within the ideological domain. Through analyzing the construction, conflictual dynamics and mutual recognition of discursive dimensions and modalities between the state and society, it elucidates the complex interconnections among language and ideology, symbol and meaning, discourse and power, as well as power and interest within the contemporary Chinese sociocultural context. This fosters advancements in the study of ideological discourse rhetoric and discursive operations, facilitates a critical re-examination of the classical Marxist perspectives on language and discourse production, and enriches contemporary Chinese research on semiotics and linguistics.

Whereas its practical significance resides in addressing three critical risks confronting contemporary China: the "Tacitus Trap", "Middle-Income Trap", and "Thucydides Trap". The crisis of discursive trust constitutes an urgent governance challenge demanding resolution by the ruling Party and governmental institutions at all levels. Therefore, focusing on the "Three Major Traps" and related debates, investigating the discursive conflicts and trust crises within contemporary Chinese society and their root causes, and exploring innovative transformations in official and governmental discursive practices hold profound practical implications. These efforts are essential for consolidating the Party's governance foundation and position, enhancing the public image and discursive competence of government officials, and fostering discursive communication and harmony throughout society.

2. GENEALOGICAL CONSTRUCTION AND ANALYTICAL ARCHITECTURE OF THE DISCURSIVE FRAMEWORK WITH CHINESE CHARACTERISTICS

The imperative to construct a discourse system authentically reflecting China's practices, developmental trajectory, and historical experiences necessitates concentrated scholarly engagement with the evolutionary continuum of this discursive formation. This research prioritizes examining the dynamic interplay between state and societal discursive dimensions, and the dynamics of construction, conflict, trust, and mutual recognition in discursive modes. The historical formation of the discourse system with Chinese characteristics, unfolding through its revolutionary, construction, and reform phases, constitutes a complex process that can be understood as the dialectical trajectory of intersecting discursive spaces. This trajectory manifests through three constitutive dimensions: the dynamics of convergence and divergence between China's dual public spheres; the continuous negotiation of discursive interests and communicative modalities; and the fundamental transformation of discursive typologies across distinct historical epochs.

The political discourse system engendered by China's New Democratic Revolution crystallized the Communist Party's fundamental mission commitment during the revolutionary period: the imperative mobilization of popular consciousness. This historical imperative resonates profoundly with Sun Yat-sen's seminal reflection:

Having dedicated forty years to the national revolution with the objective of achieving China's freedom and equality, my accumulated experience conclusively demonstrates that this goal necessitates arousing the masses of the people and uniting with all nations that treat us as equals in common struggle. (2015, p.460)

Drawn from profound historical experience and ongoing practical struggle, Mao Zedong unequivocally asserted: "Unless intellectuals fundamentally integrate themselves with the workers and peasants, they shall achieve nothing of consequence" (1991, p.558). The New Democratic Revolution mobilized popular consciousness through distinct structural mechanisms and historical processes, wherein the political discourse's interpellative function fundamentally constructed the people as political subjects through its ideological address to the masses. This revolutionary mobilization culminated in the historic achievement encapsulated by "standing up" — a dialectical condition signifying both material autonomy and spiritual agency among the populace. This emancipatory state manifested a quadruple framework of recognition justice while simultaneously demonstrating how the Kuomintang regime under Chiang Kai-shek's leadership descended into the "Tacitus Trap", thereby precipitating its systemic disintegration and ultimate collapse.

Following the resolution of Cultural Revolutionary turmoil and attendant discursive conflicts, the nationwide debate on truth standards, the strategic reorientation toward economic construction, and the formulation of the reform and opening-up policy collectively engendered a gradual convergence of discursive interests and communicative modalities between state and society. This emergent alignment, however, yielded to significant discursive fragmentation and contention across Chinese society in the wake of the Soviet and Eastern European upheavals, manifesting particularly in fundamental disagreements regarding developmental pathways, political-economic institutional restructuring, and anti-corruption mechanisms.

Deng Xiaoping's "Southern Tour Discourse" established three definitive criteria for resolving discursive conflicts and unifying ideological cognition:

The fundamental standards of judgment should focus principally on whether a given action facilitates the development of the productive forces in a socialist society, whether it enhances the comprehensive national strength of the socialist state, and whether it elevates the people's standard of living. (1993, P. 372)

His speech effectively dissolved pervasive cognitive divergences and axiological conflicts across society, re-consolidating developmental consensus both within and beyond institutional frameworks, thereby inaugurating China's trans-formative phase of economic restructuring and social advancement under the socialist market economy paradigm.

Since the early 21st century, China's reform and development initiatives have progressively entered a critical juncture of structural transformation, wherein the uneven distribution of benefits from these transitional processes has precipitated the concentrated manifestation of social contradictions. This socio-political context has coincided with the ascendancy of internet-dominant new media ecosystems, collectively engendering a heteroglossic public sphere characterized by polyphonic deliberation and contentious discourse. Within this mediated environment, the official and non-official discursive fields articulate polarized positions while engaging in sustained dialectical exchange across five fundamental axes: distributive justice, institutional efficacy, exercise of public authority, humanistic-legal discourse, and developmental prospects.

Social maladies and systemic crises undergo dual processes of discursive mediation: they become superficially pathologized as manifestations of deficient Party conduct and literary style, while simultaneously being abstracted into the conceptual categories of linguistic pollution, discursive corruption, verbal violence, and the crisis of discursive trust. Tracing the historical trajectory of China's socialist revolution, construction, and reform through the methodological prism of "symptomatic reading" (a concept articulated by French scholars Louis

Althusser and Jacques Lacan, denoting the interpretive practice of excavating the deep structure or “hidden kernel” of texts or discourses through their symptomatic transformations) reveals how the interrogation of relational dynamics between state and societal discursive dimensions exposes the underlying matrices of competing interests, power hierarchies, and ideological significations concealed beneath surface-level linguistic pathologies. This constitutes a critical dimension in the reflexive examination of contemporary China’s discursive architecture.

The historical evolution of the discourse system with Chinese characteristics has principally traversed three constitutive phases: the radical democratic-political discourse, the economic rationalist discourse, and the contemporary emergence of humanistic-legal discourse. Building upon this tripartite developmental trajectory, and employing discourse analysis, discursive conflict, and discursive trust as primary conceptual apparatuses, scholarly inquiry proceeds through dynamic examination of state-society communicative praxis to establish an analytical framework of reverse ontological reduction — epistemologically modeled as the structural sequence: interest ← power ← discourse.

This analytical endeavor encompasses, first, a comprehensive investigation into the discursive typology inherent to the Chinese paradigm and its historical transmutations, coupled with rigorous examination of the contextual conditions enabling the emergence of dual state-society discursive dimensions and communicative modalities. Such scholarly inquiry fundamentally elucidates the formative historical milieu, practical foundations, and media-dissemination infrastructures that precipitated the crystallization of China’s bifurcated discursive spheres.

Another component entails a methodical historical investigation into the dual discursive vectors and communicative modalities operative between state and societal spheres, systematically tracing the genealogical development and dialectical interaction of these distinct discursive formations. Such scholarly archeology concurrently facilitates the diagnostic synthesis and taxonomic organization of primary manifestations characterizing contemporary discursive pathologies — notably linguistic pollution, discursive corruption, verbal violence, and the crisis of discursive trust.

The third analytical dimension involves a rigorous historical-phenomenological reduction of the constitutive interrelations among language, discourse, and power structures. This study critically examines pathological linguistic phenomena — encompassing linguistic pollution, discursive corruption, and verbal violence — as paradigmatic manifestations of deviant communication. Through systematic analysis of their operational mechanisms, it fundamentally reveals the

intrinsic relationships between material interests, value orientations, and power structures across their diverse manifestations, and further elucidates the concealed dynamics of repression and emancipation underlying institutionalized power hierarchies.

The final analytical dimension necessitates the systematic construction of an ideal discursive situation, achieved through dialectical interpretation of China’s historical trajectory from foundational sovereignty (“standing up”) through economic prosperity (“becoming prosperous”) toward comprehensive national strength (“achieving strength”). Concurrent critical reflection on the “Three Major Traps” encountered during socialist construction with Chinese characteristics — spanning revolutionary, developmental, and reform phases — must be fundamentally anchored in the complete realization of socialism. Such realization must be oriented toward emancipatory imperatives and universal interests, constituting the indispensable precondition for transcending discursive barriers both domestically (between state and societal spheres) and internationally, while simultaneously eradicating the pervasive pathologies of linguistic pollution, discursive corruption, verbal violence, and the crisis of discursive trust.

3. PRINCIPLE FORMULATION AND HOLISTIC FRAMEWORKS FOR CONSTRUCTING THE DISCOURSE SYSTEM WITH CHINESE CHARACTERISTICS

The paramount challenge that contemporary China’s reform and construction practices present to philosophy and social sciences fundamentally entails cultivating persuasive narratives of China’s stories and wisdom while constructing discursive systems and operational mechanisms co-owned by state and societal actors, thereby strategically circumventing the systemic risks encapsulated by the “Three Major Traps”. China’s rapidly advancing modernization paradigm simultaneously furnishes fertile social substrate for developing the discourse system with Chinese characteristics. Everyday discursive practices yield abundant and dynamic materials for linguistic innovation and performative operations, while concurrently generating substantive insights and practical methodologies for resolving discursive conflicts and the crisis of discursive trust.

Marxist canonical writers have established seminal theoretical frameworks for comprehending linguistic and discursive production, providing indispensable methodological approaches for discourse analysis. Concurrently, scholarly communities both domestic and international have achieved preliminary conceptual clarification regarding the intricate interrelationships

among language, being, power, and signification at the level of theoretical inquiry, thereby furnishing transferable conceptual resources amenable to scholarly adaptation within discourse system construction research. More proximately and significantly, when addressing the imperative to accelerate the development of philosophy and social sciences with Chinese characteristics — encompassing its discursive architecture, Xi Jinping explicitly emphasizes adherence to the “Three Embodiments” principle, which necessitates the dialectical integration of heritage and national character, originality and epochal relevance, alongside systematic and disciplinary coherence (2023, pp. 478-487).

Building upon these foundational premises and principles, the systematic conceptualization for constructing the discourse system with Chinese characteristics calls for a holistic integration of objectives, contextual parameters, and innovative paradigms. This comprehensive undertaking encompasses four primary orientations:

The first one to consider is excavating and systematizing the Historical Materialist Conception of Consciousness and theories of discursive production articulated by canonical Marxist writers, thereby consolidating the theoretical bedrock for contemporary Chinese discourse studies.

Another aspect resides in examining the typological evolution and historical transmutations of the discourse system with Chinese characteristics while cultivating persuasive narratives of China’s developmental experience — from foundational sovereignty (“standing up”) through economic prosperity (“becoming prosperous”) to comprehensive national strength (“achieving strength”) — alongside its distinctive wisdom and experiences.

Of equal importance is methodically clarifying the primary manifestations and generative mechanisms underlying current discursive pathologies, including linguistic pollution, discursive corruption, verbal violence, and crises of discursive trust, coupled with critical analysis of the ontological nature and societal perils inherent in the trust deficit between official and non-official discursive spheres.

The final orientation of goal lies in exploring viable pathways to circumvent the “Three Major Traps” while resolving discursive conflicts and trust crises, thereby elucidating the constitutive relationship between establishing an ideal discursive situation and the complete realization of socialism with Chinese characteristics.

The research focus fundamentally resides in examining the discursive architecture during China’s critical juncture of structural reform, wherein rigorous analysis of the construction, conflict, and negotiation processes inherent in dual state-society discursive vectors and communicative modalities serves to elucidate the intricate interrelations among language and ideology, symbols and signification,

discourse and power, as well as power structures and their underlying interests within contemporary Chinese socio-cultural contexts. This scholarly endeavor concurrently explores the ideal scenario for achieving normalized discourse communication in contemporary Chinese society as well as viable pathways toward eliminating pathologies of linguistic corruption, symbolic violence, and discursive trust deficits. It further interrogates the mechanisms through which discursive hegemony of mainstream ideology may be institutionally anchored and consolidated across public deliberative spaces and digital discourse platforms.

Whereas the principal methodological difficulties manifest through four dimensions: to begin with, the absence of dedicated theoretical treatises on linguistic and discursive production within the Marxist canon necessitates compiling scattered insights across diverse texts spanning multiple historical periods — a considerable challenge for developing coherent linguistic theories and discourse analysis frameworks. In addition, determining the causal mechanisms and nature underlying the dual discursive vectors and communicative modalities operative between state and societal spheres presents persistent analytical complexities. Furthermore, comprehensive symptomatological analysis of contemporary discursive pathologies — specifically the polymorphous manifestations of linguistic pollution, discursive corruption, verbal violence, and crises of discursive trust — requires thorough investigation. Similarly challenging is that, conceptualizing the constitutive relationship between constructing an ideal discursive situation and advancing socialism with Chinese characteristics involves navigating complex theoretical-practical interfaces.

The systematic conceptualization for constructing the discourse system with Chinese characteristics rests upon four interconnected contextual premises: a) Contemporary China has fundamentally entered an era characterized by discursive polyphony, marking a historical phase where discourse formation and linguistic analysis assume paramount significance. This epoch manifests most distinctly through the proliferation of heterogeneous semiotic systems — where diverse discursive spaces, communicative modalities, and symbolic frameworks undergo continuous innovation — accompanied by intensified mobilization of language’s political attributes and ideological functions. Consequently, language, discourse, and symbols emerge as pervasive phenomena demanding rigorous theoretical inquiry, positioning linguistics and semiotics as prominent academic disciplines within China’s contemporary intellectual landscape; b) Language fundamentally operates as a reflective medium of the lived social reality. Within this framework, discursive pathologies — specifically linguistic corruption, verbal violence,

and crises of discursive trust — emerge as symptomatic indicators of underlying societal tensions. Through systematic symptomatic reading, we discern the obscured interrelations of material interests, significations, and power structures embedded within these phenomena; c) The efficacy of the Communist Party of China in leading democratic revolution and national governance fundamentally hinges on precise self-positioning and authentic identity commitment — specifically, embodying the era's spirit and universal interests while pioneering a new model for human civilization and a community with shared future for mankind. When this identity becomes ambiguous or unstable, such indeterminacy inevitably manifests linguistically through formulaic discourse and constrained communicative practices; d) Overcoming the “Three Major Traps” and establishing ideal communicative conditions must fundamentally serve the construction of a harmonious society — namely, the complete realization of socialism. This requires grounding language and discourse in the bedrock of human social practice and essential needs, thereby restoring them to their authentic role as expressions of humanity's real, lived, sensible existence. The theoretical development of the discourse system with Chinese characteristics constitutes a profoundly complex historical undertaking. Within this context, promising theoretical innovations emerge: Initially, leveraging the historical progression from “standing up” to “becoming prosperous” and ultimately “achieving strength”, alongside the governance challenges reflected in the “Three Major Traps”, enables critical reassessment of contemporary discursive dynamics, conflicts, and trust deficits. These phenomena signify underlying tensions in international relations and state-society interactions, where communicative efficacy directly reflects the ruling party's leadership capacity, public image, and governance legitimacy. At a more fundamental level, language and discourse serve as both a prism and critical vantage point for examining the lived realities of individuals within modern society.

In addition, four pioneering propositions are presented: Contemporary China has entered a historical phase, in which discourse system construction and critical analysis have become imperative; Linguistic corruption, verbal violence, and discursive trust deficits now signify profound societal tensions and systemic crises; Ambiguity in the ruling party's self-identity inevitably manifests through formulaic discourse patterns and constrained communicative practices; Overcoming the “Three Major Traps” and establishing ideal speech conditions thus necessitates building a socialist harmonious society oriented toward emancipatory interests and universal benefit — the complete realization of socialism.

Ultimately, this research employs three interconnected methodological approaches: Historical-genetic analysis examines the evolution of China's discourse typologies to identify the formative conditions and interactive dynamics of dual state-society discursive dimensions; Building on this, historical-phenomenological investigation utilizes symptomatic reading of linguistic corruption, verbal violence, and discursive trust deficits to establish a historical materialist framework tracing the “interest ← power ← discourse” link; Furthermore, linguistic-semiotic analysis treats language as unified sign systems — encompassing signifiers, signifieds, and signification processes — enabling critical examination of ideological rhetoric embedded within communicative practices.

REFERENCES

- Deng, X. P. (1993). *Selected Writings of Deng Xiaoping* (Vol. 3, p.372). Beijing: People's Publishing House.
- Han, Q. et al. (2015). *Basic principles of socialism with Chinese characteristics: Research on Chinese discourse system*. Beijing: Higher Education Press.
- Han, Z. (2013). Ideological emancipation and the transformation of discourse modes. *Social Sciences in Higher Education Institutions*, (1).
- Hou, H. et al. (2003). Investigation and Analysis of the “Four Trusts”— The “Four Trusts” of the Basic Masses. *Journal of Huaiyin Normal University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition)*, (6).
- Lecerle, Jean-Jacques. (2006). *A Marxist Philosophy of Language*. London: Koninklijke Brill NV.
- Liu, Y. (2023). *Marx's philosophical discourse revolution and the construction of China's academic discourse system*. Beijing: China Social Sciences Press.
- Lukács, G. (2014). *History and class consciousness* (D. Zhang et al., Trans.). Beijing: The Commercial Press. (Original work published 1923).
- Mao, Z. D. (1991). *Mao Zedong's Collected Works* (Vol. 2, p.558). Beijing: People's Publishing House.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1976). The German ideology. In *Marx & Engels Collected Works* (Vol. 5, p. 44). New York: International Publishers.
- Saussure, F. d. (1980). *Course in general linguistics*. Beijing: The Commercial Press.
- Tacitus, C. C. (1969). *The Histories* (C. H. Moore, Trans.). Harvard University Press. (Original work published AD 109).
- Xi, J. P. (2023). *Xi Jinping's Selected Writings* (Vol. 1, pp.478-487). Beijing: People's Publishing House.
- Zhang, P., & Zhang, L. (Eds.). (2015). *The Modern Chinese Thinkers Series: Sun Yat-sen volume*. Beijing: China Renmin University Press.