

1- RC Wickins - 29 Sep 64

THE IDEOLOGIES OF LENIN AND MAO TSE-TUNG:
SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES



STAT



STAT

I

Mao Tse-tung is a Marx-Leninist in China. Mao's ideology, therefore, may be called an application of Leninism to China. Now, as China today is considerably different from Leninist Russia in various aspects -- historical, political, economic, and cultural -- Mao's ideology must have some characteristics that cannot be found in Russian Leninism. Whether Mao is an orthodox Marx-Leninist is not a question here. What we are interested in here is what aspects of Leninism he has stressed in applying it to China, what he has added, and what trends are apparent.

With these questions before us, it will be desirable, first of all, to identify those features common to both Russian Leninism and the Mao Tse-tung ideology in China. For, by recognizing their similarities, we shall be able to determine their differences more clearly.

II

As characteristics common to both Russian Leninism and the Mao Tse-tung ideology in China, I should like to mention the following three points:

A. Revolutionary Democratic Dictatorship of the Proletariat and the Peasants (Russia) and the Peoples Democratic Dictatorship (China)

Lenin understood the 1905 Russian Revolution to be a bourgeois revolution. But he categorically opposed the idea of letting the bourgeoisie take the leadership of this bourgeois revolution in Russia. According to him, it seems that in Russia the proletariat had the responsibility of achieving the

bourgeois revolution and establishing the "revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasants."

It seems curious that a bourgeois revolution should be achieved by the proletariat, and the idea of "revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasants" is rather unique. But these actually represent one of the characteristics of Leninism.

Explaining why the Russian revolution had to begin with a bourgeois revolution, Lenin said:

In a country like Russia, the working class is suffering more from the insufficient development of capitalism than from capitalism itself. Therefore, it is unconditionally to the advantage of the working class to let capitalism develop more extensively, more freely, and more quickly. It is unconditionally profitable to the working class to remove all vestiges of the past that are preventing such extensive, free, quick development of capitalism. A bourgeois revolution is such a change as will sweep out most thoroughly such vestiges of the old age and of serfdom [not merely autocracy but also monarchy are included in these vestiges] and will insure completely the most extensive, free, and rapid development of capitalism. 1/

Thrusting the responsibility to achieve this bourgeois revolution on the proletariat, Lenin also said:

Marxism does not tell the proletariat to turn away from the bourgeois revolution, or to refrain from participating in it, or to give its leadership to the bourgeoisie. On the contrary, it tells the proletariat to participate in the bourgeois revolution with all its might, to fight with the greatest determination and consistency for proletarian democracy, and to carry out the revolution to the very end. We cannot deviate from the framework of bourgeois democracy in the Russian revolution, but we can expand this framework. Within its limits we can, and must, fight for the interest of the proletariat, for achieving its immediate needs, and for creating conditions for training the proletarian forces in preparation for our eventual, complete triumph. 2/

When the proletariat achieved the bourgeois democratic revolution in Russia, it must mean, according to Lenin, that the "revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasants" had been established. Defining "decisive victory over Tsarism" as "revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasants," Lenin stressed the following three points in regard to the nature of this revolutionary dictatorship and its relationship to a world revolution:

1. The immediate Russian revolution was a bourgeois democratic revolution.
2. Nevertheless, the proletariat had the responsibility of taking the leadership of this revolution and carrying it out completely.

3. If, by the successful achievement of this revolution a revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasants was established in Russia, it would not merely help to touch off socialist revolutions in Europe but it would also create a rosy prospect for a socialist revolution in Russia.

Further summarizing these points, Lenin showed the general course for the Russian revolution, from a democratic revolution to a socialist revolution, in the following remarks:

In order to crush the resistance of autocracy by force and stabilize the bourgeoisie, the proletariat must bring the peasants at large to its side and carry out the democratic revolution to the very last. And in order to crush the resistance of the bourgeoisie by force and stabilize the peasants and the petty bourgeoisie, the proletariat must bring the semiproletarian masses to its side and carry out a socialist revolution to the end. 3/

The idea of mechanically separating the bourgeois revolution from the proletarian revolution and having the proletariat remain hiding behind the bourgeoisie until the latter achieved the bourgeois revolution was common to the rational Marxists, economists, and Mensheviks. The greatest feature of Leninism seems to lie in the fact that, in the face of this evolutionist, mechanical interpretation of Marxism, Lenin came out with the theory of transition from a democratic revolution to a socialist revolution under proletarian

guidance in the form of "revolutionary democratic dictatorship by the proletariat and the peasants."

At the end of the Communist Manifesto, Marx writes: "The Communists are paying their chief attention to Germany because Germany is on the eve of a bourgeois revolution, because Germany is under more advanced conditions in general European civilization than England in the 17th century or France in the 18th and has a much more advanced proletarian class to achieve such a change, and because, consequently, a bourgeois revolution in Germany may well be expected to become a direct prelude to a proletarian revolution." Here we may find Leninism in embryo. After this, however, Marx did not delve further into such transition from a democratic revolution to a socialist revolution in backward countries. His chief interest was in the analysis of capitalism itself. Lenin's theory of "revolutionary democratic dictatorship by the proletariat and the peasants" may be called an adaptation of Marx's "direct prelude" theory to the realities in Russia, in whose climate it was given a practical shape and developed.

In defining the Chinese revolution, Mao Tse-tung fully followed this Leninist theory on the Russian revolution. He understood the immediate revolution in China as a special bourgeois democratic revolution (neodemocratic revolution) and considered that, by achieving a bourgeois democratic revolution under proletarian guidance, his Party should create conditions for transition to a socialist revolution. In his 1939 essay entitled The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party (Chapter II, Section 5), he clarified the following view:

What is the nature of the present stage of the Chinese revolution? Is it a bourgeois revolution

or a proletarian socialist revolution? Evidently, it is the former, not the latter.

Since Chinese society is still a colonial, semi-colonial, or semifeudalistic society, and since imperialism and feudalistic forces still remain the chief enemies of the Chinese revolution, what the Chinese revolutionaries must achieve is a nationalist revolution and a democratic revolution to beat these two chief enemies. The revolutions for beating these two enemies may sometimes be participated in by the nationalist bourgeoisie, and even if the big bourgeoisie turns against the revolution and becomes its enemy, the target of the revolution nevertheless will be imperialism and feudalism, and not capitalism in general or capitalistic private ownership. Hence the Chinese revolution at the present stage is not a proletarian socialist revolution but a bourgeois democratic revolution.

However, the bourgeois democratic revolution we have in China today is not the old, common type of bourgeois democratic revolution -- which is already outmoded -- but a new, original one. Such revolutions are currently going on in China and all colonial or semicolonial countries. We call them neodemocratic revolutions. These are part of the global proletarian socialist revolution, which is totally opposed to imperialism or international

capitalism. Politically, such a revolution means dictatorship exercised jointly by several revolutionary classes over the imperialists, national traitors, and reactionaries, and opposition to any attempt to turn Chinese society into one under bourgeois dictatorship. Economically, it means seizure and nationalization of big capital and big business in the hands of imperialists, national traitors, and reactionaries; division of land so far held by landlords among peasants and its ownership by the latter; and preservation of capitalistic business operated by ordinary individuals as well as the rich peasant economy. Such a neodemocratic revolution, therefore, clears the road for capitalism on one hand and paves the way for socialism on the other. The present stage of the revolution in China is a transitional one for putting an end to the colonial, semicolonial, or semi-feudalistic society preparatory to the establishment of a socialist society -- a neodemocratic stage of the revolution. 4/

There is a space of a third of a century between Lenin's theory of "revolutionary democratic dictatorship by the proletariat and the peasants" and Mao's neodemocratic revolution theory. The former was developed 12 years ahead of the October Revolution and the latter, 22 years after it. Also, the former came into being before Lenin formed his theory of imperialism, whereas the latter is based on this theory of imperialism. However, there is perfect agreement between Leninism and Mao Tse-tung's ideology in that

they both seek to achieve bourgeois democratic revolutions in backward countries under proletarian guidance and to obtain the best conditions for transition to a socialist revolution. And in this point, we may safely say, lies the theoretical and practical core of the Communist movement after Lenin.

Now, how "revolutionary democratic dictatorship by the proletariat and the peasants" should pave the way for transition from a democratic revolution to a socialist revolution has remained unanswered, for, after his April 1917 thesis, Lenin converted himself to the proletarian dictatorship theory without warning. Mao Tse-tung, on the other hand, made public a thesis entitled "On the Peoples Democratic Dictatorship" on 1 July 1949, right before the establishment of the Peoples Republic of China, and made clear (1) that the peoples democratic dictatorship should be based on an alliance of the workers, peasants, and urban petty bourgeoisie (primarily on an alliance of the workers and peasants) and (2) that under the peoples democratic dictatorship China would shift from neodemocracy to socialism. Mao Tse-tung's "peoples democratic dictatorship" is another name for Lenin's "revolutionary democratic dictatorship by the proletariat and the peasants," but one difference between them is that the former seeks not merely to achieve a democratic revolution and thus pave the way for a socialist revolution but also to achieve transition to socialism. This presumably comes from the fact that, whereas Lenin had the premise that a backward, agricultural country like Russia cannot alone shift to socialism, Mao had the conviction that his country's transition to socialism was possible with Soviet experience and assistance.

B. Guidance by a Vanguard Party and by Its Party Organs

Lenin's theory of "revolutionary democratic dictatorship by the proletariat and the peasants" and Mao Tse-tung's neodemocratic revolution theory

both have emphasis on proletarian guidance. Now, it is well known that the proletariat in fact does not have a single clearly defined common will. The actual proletariat has complicated ideologies. This is why various schools appear in Marxism, which calls itself the class ideology of the proletariat. Late in the 19th century and early in the 20th, Russia witnesses the emergence of Russian types of revisionism such as rational Marxism and economism. Lenin's What to Do? was written for the purpose of stressing the point of view of revolutionary Marxism against these Russian types of revisionism.

Branding rational Marxism and economism as results of succumbing to the spontaneity of the masses, Lenin emphasizes awareness in revolutionary Marxism. But how can revolutionary Marxism with its awareness prevail over the spontaneous trade unionism of the working class? The only way to achieve this end, says Lenin, is to bring revolutionary ideology into the working class from outside the working class. This intellectual aristocracy of Leninism is the ground on which he justified the vanguard party's guidance or dictatorship over the masses. In What to Do? he clarified the following view on the nature of the vanguard party:

(1) Without a firm, lasting organization of leaders, no revolutionary movement can be permanent. (2) The wider the variety of popular classes spontaneously drawn into our struggle to form the basis of our movement and to participate in it, the more urgent the need for such an organization and the most lasting it must be (for, then, it will be easier for various organizations to delude the untrained segments of the masses with their false propaganda). (3) This leader organization must

Approved For Release 2002/02/12 : CIA-RDP79T01049A002200050001-1

both have emphasis on proletarian guidance. Now, it is well known that the proletariat in fact does not have a single clearly defined common will. The actual proletariat has complicated ideologies. This is why various schools appear in Marxism, which calls itself the class ideology of the proletariat. Late in the 19th century and early in the 20th, Russia witnesses the emergence of Russian types of revisionism such as rational Marxism and economism. Lenin's What to Do? was written for the purpose of stressing the point of view of revolutionary Marxism against these Russian types of revisionism.

Branding rational Marxism and economism as results of succumbing to the spontaneity of the masses, Lenin emphasizes awareness in revolutionary Marxism. But how can revolutionary Marxism with its awareness prevail over the spontaneous trade unionism of the working class? The only way to achieve this end, says Lenin, is to bring revolutionary ideology into the working class from outside the working class. This intellectual aristocracy of Leninism is the ground on which he justified the vanguard party's guidance or dictatorship over the masses. In What to Do? he clarified the following view on the nature of the vanguard party:

(1) Without a firm, lasting organization of leaders, no revolutionary movement can be permanent. (2) The wider the variety of popular classes spontaneously drawn into our struggle to form the basis of our movement and to participate in it, the more urgent the need for such an organization and the most lasting it must be (for, then, it will be easier for various organizations to delude the untrained segments of the masses with their false propaganda). (3) This leader organization must

be composed primarily of people professionally engaged in the revolutionary movement. (4) In a country under despotism the organization should admit only those people who are professionally engaged in the revolutionary movement and professionally trained in the art of fighting the political police. The narrower the range of its components, the harder it will be to exterminate this organization, and (5) the wider the variety of people, whether coming from the working class or from other classes of society, the better they will be able to participate in the movement and work actively in it. 5/

Marx and Engels say that "the Communist Party is not a special party as distinguished from other labor parties" and explain that "the Communists are, in practice, the most determined and constantly progressive entity among all labor parties in the world." Thus, in the proletarian dictatorship theory of Marx and Engels, the Communists were not considered a "special party" but were regarded as the vanguard of labor parties. Lenin developed the idea of a vanguard party composed of professional revolutionaries in his What to Do?, thus putting proletarian dictatorship in the form of dictatorship by the vanguard party.

Even after their separation from the Mensheviks on account of the theory of organizing a vanguard party, the Bolsheviks continued to have internal strife over a number of issues. For example, we can mention Kamenev's opposition to Lenin's April thesis, a hot theoretical dispute between the Lenin-Trotsky group and the Zinoviev-Kamenev group over the question of

uprisings, opposition from Bukhalin and other left-wing Communists, and the emergence of the military opponents, democratic centralists, and labor opponents among developments after the February 1917 Revolution. In 1920 and the following year, intersectional strife within the Central Committee was combined with a theoretical dispute over trade unionism, and the crisis in the Party reached its climax when the Kronstadt mutiny broke out in March 1921.

On the first day of the 10th Communist Party Congress, held in the heat of the Kronstadt incident, Lenin pointed out the fact that the Party had grown into a popular party with a membership of 500,000, with the result that developments outside the Party echelons now invariably were reflected in the Party and stressed that the Kronstadt incident was based on petty bourgeois, anarchist spontaneity.

Lenin found the root of the crisis in the fact that the proletariat at large had been swayed by petty bourgeois spontaneity. But it was not the proletariat outside the Party alone who were swayed by spontaneity. As the progress of the Kronstadt crisis showed, the Party itself was swayed by spontaneity. In the conclusion of his report to the Central Committee on the second day of the Party Congress, Lenin stated: "It is my opinion that there is a connection between these petty bourgeois, anarchistic, antirevolutionary thoughts and slogans and the slogans of the 'labor opponents!'"

Viewing the situation in this light, Lenin worked out his solutions -- a "proposed resolution on syndicalist and anarchist aberrations in the Party" and a "resolution on the unity of the Party." The resolution on syndicalist and anarchist aberrations stressed, first of all, that the syndicalist and anarchist "aberrations come from petty bourgeois spontaneity against the proletariat or the Russian Communist Party." 6/ "Marxism tells us," said Lenin,

"that the party for the working class, or the Communist Party, alone can unite, foster, and organize the vanguard of the proletariat and the working masses as a whole, and this vanguard alone can fight the perpetuation or recurrence of the inevitable petty bourgeois wavering of the working masses and trade unionist narrow-mindedness or professional prejudice among the proletarians and can guide the entire united activity of the proletariat as a whole -- that is, politically guide the proletariat and guide the entire working masses through the medium of the proletariat. Without this, proletarian dictatorship cannot be achieved." Finally, he declared, "Propagation of these thoughts is incompatible with membership in the Russian Communist Party." 7/

Paragraph 7 of the resolution on the unity of the Party provided the following emergency steps:

To establish strict discipline in the Party and in our entire Soviet activity and to fight the formation of any faction and thus achieve greater unity, the Congress shall take all kinds of disciplinary Party action, including dismissal from Party membership, against anyone violating discipline or causing or conniving at faction. In case a Central Committee member is involved, the Central Committee shall be invested with full power to demote such a member to alternate status or, in an emergency, even dismiss him from Party membership. 8/

Just as the guidance of the proletariat at large by the vanguard party was justified by the supremacy of awareness over spontaneity, so was the guidance

of the Party members at large by the Party organs justified by the supremacy of awareness over spontaneity.

Lenin's theory on the vanguard party and guidance by its organs has been fully acceded to by Mao Tse-tung. In his essay entitled The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party (Chapter II, Section 7), Mao declares, "No other party (whether bourgeois or petty bourgeois) than the Chinese Communist Party can guide to full implementation the two great revolutions in China, a democratic revolution and a socialist revolution." In the same section he also says, "No revolution whatsoever will succeed without the guidance of the Chinese Communist Party."

With regard to the leadership of the vanguard party organs in the Party, Mao stresses that "(1) individuals should submit to their organization, (2) minorities to the majority, (3) subordinates to their superior, and (4) all Party members to the central leadership." Liu Shao-ch'i also is emphatic on democratic centralism. We will discuss later how the democratic centralism of the Chinese Communist Party differs from that of the Soviet Communist Party. Nevertheless, regarding the Communist Party as the vanguard organization of the proletariat and stressing a high degree of guidance by the Party and its organs is common to both countries and seems to constitute the second feature of modern Communism.

C. Primitive Accumulation in Socialism

To achieve transition from a democratic revolution to a socialist revolution in a backward agricultural country (such as Russia or China in the old days), it is impossible to accept without amendment the basic Marxist theory that "new, higher production relations cannot develop until material conditions for them mature in the womb of the old society." Lenin, Stalin, and

Mao Tse-tung had to create such "new, higher production relations" by using State power before "material conditions for them" matured "in the womb of the old society." State power was thus changed from being the midwife for the law of history to being its mother.

Creating such material conditions for new, higher production relations by State power means for the government to achieve what in advanced capitalist countries was achieved by the early form of capitalism -- original, or primitive, accumulation -- and because the primitive accumulation sought by the Communists is not for preparing material conditions for capitalistic production relations but for providing material conditions for socialistic production relations, it should be called socialistic primitive accumulation.

Socialistic primitive accumulation was first advocated by Trotsky, who urged the need for it at the fifth convention of the Communist Youth League on 11 October 1922. Marx explained in the first volume of Capital that early capitalism achieved primitive accumulation of capital by such means as yeoman exploitation, colonial plunder, piracy, and extremely low wages before normal production on a progressive scale could begin. But since it is apparent that socialistic primitive accumulation cannot rely on piracy or colonial plunder, exploitation of the peasants and workers will invariably be the chief means of such accumulation. Trotsky, however, was opposed to forcing such "self-exploitation" on the workers. He believed that it should come from the voluntary cooperation of the working class.

Trotsky's idea of socialistic primitive accumulation was further developed by Preobrazhensky. Contributing an article entitled "Basic Laws of Socialistic Accumulation" to the Communist Academy Bulletin, No. 8, published in 1924, he depicted the laws of socialistic primitive accumulation compared with those of

capitalistic primitive accumulation. According to him, primitive accumulation is impossible in a peasant country like Russia without taking a part of the surplus product of the peasants and craftsmen: "Undoubtedly, it is a reactionary, petty bourgeois utopian idea that a socialist economy can be developed without touching the economic resources of the petty bourgeoisie, including the peasants. What a socialist government is required to do is not to take less from the petty bourgeois producers than capitalism did but to take more out of the greater income guaranteed for the small producers by the rationalization of all production, including small-scale production, in the country."

Trotsky's theory of socialistic primitive accumulation, demanding the self-sacrifice of the working class, was not accepted by the Russian proletariat in the early days of the new economic policy (NEP). On the other hand, Preobrazhensky's theory of socialistic primitive accumulation, counting on the peasants' surplus product as the main source of such accumulation, was violently attacked by Stalin and Bukhalin as a challenge to Leninism, which attached the greatest importance to the alliance of the proletariat and the peasants. Indeed, it dug the grave for Preobrazhensky and his comrade Trotsky.

Stalin, however, wrote a thesis entitled Economic Conditions in the Soviet Union and the Policy of the Party in April 1926 and acceded to the idea of Trotsky and Preobrazhensky about socialistic primitive accumulation. In a section called "Problems in Socialistic Accumulation," Stalin writes as follows:

Therefore, the question of accumulation required for industrial development, or the question of socialistic accumulation, is a matter of the greatest importance to us today. Left alone, and without loans

from abroad, can we secure for our industry, on the basis of our own internal resources, the accumulation and reserve required for the execution of our industrialization policy and for the triumph of socialist construction in our country? Are we in a condition for securing it?

This is a vital question worth special attention. In history we can find various means of industrialization. England was industrialized because it had exploited its colonies for tens or hundreds of years, raked in "additional" capital from them, and invested it in its own industry to accelerate the tempo of its industrialization. This is one means of industrialization.

Germany's industrialization was facilitated because, as a result of its victory in the war with France in the 70's of the last century, it collected 5 million francs in reparations from the French and sank the money in its industry. This is the second means of industrialization.

Neither of these two means is available to us, for ours is a Soviet state, and colonial plunder and military aggression for plunder are foreign to the Soviet government.

Russia -- old Russia -- attempted to put itself gradually on the road to industrialization by granting

debt-slave concessions and accepting debt-slave loans. This is the third means -- a means which would make us debt-slaves and turn Russia into a half-colony. We cannot follow this course, either. We did not fight the civil wars for 3 years, beating all interferers, only to become debt-slaves to imperialists, voluntarily, in the day of our victory over the interferers.

Now, is it possible to industrialize our country on socialistic accumulation?

Have we enough sources for such accumulation to insure industrialization?

Yes, it is possible. Yes, we have such sources.

I can point to the facts that, in our country after the October Revolution, the landlords and capitalists were expropriated and the private ownership of land, factories, and manufacturing plants abolished and replaced by ownership by all the people. It is too clear to need any demonstration that this gives us a sufficiently reliable source of capital for accumulation.

I can also point to the fact that we canceled the Tsar's debts and took a burden of billions of rubles in debts off the nation's shoulders. Had these liabilities not been canceled, we would have been paying hundreds of millions a year in interest alone, which would have considerably affected our industry and jeopardized our national economy as a whole. Needless to say, this

circumstance has made it much easier for us to accumulate capital.

I can point, next, to our nationalized industries, which have already been reconstructed and are currently growing and producing some profit required for their further development. Here we have another source available for accumulation.

I can point to our nationalized foreign trade, which is producing some profit and thus providing a source for accumulation.

I can point to our nationalized internal commerce, which is organized to some extent and which also is producing some profit and thus providing a source for accumulation.

I can point to dynamic forces for accumulation like our nationalized banking system, which is producing a certain rate of profit and accordingly is nourishing our industry.

Finally, we have a weapon called State power, which is collecting funds for the future development of our national economy in general, especially of our industry, by allocating our national budget.

These are roughly the main sources for our internal accumulation. 9/

Stalin did not use such plain expressions as "self-exploitation of the proletariat" or "seizure of the surplus product of the peasants" but gave

State authority the rather modest role of "collecting funds for the future development of our national economy in general, especially of our industry, by allocating our national budget." Considering, however, that the source of capital for accumulation brought about by the cancellation of the Tsar's debts consisted of "surplus value" produced by the proletariat and the peasants, it is apparent that the Soviet Government took the place of the Tsar and the old landlords and capitalists in doing the exploiting. Here we find a new task which the dictatorial Soviet Government took upon itself.

On the question of socialistic primitive accumulation, also, Mao Tse-tung faithfully accepted the historical experience of the Soviet Union. In a report, "Problems in Farm Collectivization," made on 31 July 1955, he stated: "The great historical experience of the Soviet Union in achieving socialist construction is inspiring our people and giving us confidence as to the construction of socialism in our own country." He also explained a little later: "In other words, we must accumulate in the field of agriculture a considerable part of the large funds required for national industrialization and for the technical improvement of agriculture. In addition to the imposition of direct agricultural taxes, we must develop light industries to produce large quantities of daily necessities for the peasants, and by exchanging these goods for the foodstuffs and the light industry raw materials held by peasants, we not only can satisfy the commodity needs of both the State and the peasants but also can accumulate funds for the State." ^{10/} Thus the establishment of a Communist-led dictatorial regime in a backward agricultural country and the forcible carrying out of quick industrialization with socialistic primitive accumulation on the strength of State power constitutes the third feature of modern Communism.

III

Differences between Leninism in Russia and the ideology of Mao Tse-tung in China may be found, in my opinion, on the following three points. We will consider these in detail mainly through the analysis of Maoism.

A. Emphasis on the Heritage of China

One of the major features of Maoism is an emphasis on the fact that China has a history of thousands of years and peculiarities of its own and therefore a stress on the need for adapting the theories of Marx-Leninism to the actual circumstances of China. In a report entitled "The Position of the Chinese Communist Party in the National War," made at a general meeting of the Central Committee in October 1938, Mao Tse-tung asserted that the Chinese Communists "should not merely understand the conclusions on general laws drawn by Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin from the analysis of their wide experience in actual life and revolutions but also should learn from what viewpoints and in what manners they studied and solved their problems." 11/ He also said a little later, speaking emphatically for the historical heritage and peculiarities of China:

Our people have a history of thousands of years. We have distinct characteristics of our own and many other things of value. So far as these things are concerned, we are as yet mere schoolchildren. Present-day China is a phase of historical China. We believe in Marxian history. We should not cut up history. We should sum up all things between Confucius and Sun Wen and succeed to this priceless heritage, which contains much that would be useful to us in guiding the great movement now underway. Communists are international

Marxists. But Marxism can be achieved here only in connection with the actual peculiarities of our country and in a manner well suited to our people. Marx-Leninism is powerful because it finds itself in harmony with the actualities of a revolution in any country. As for the Chinese Communist Party, it must learn to apply the theories of Marx-Leninism to the real environment in China. If any Chinese Communist, who is part of the Chinese people and their flesh and blood, talks about Marxism without regard to the peculiarities of China, his must be only academic, empty Marxism. 12/

In his theory on neodemocracy, made public in January 1940, Mao discusses neodemocratic culture and says that it "fights imperialist oppression and speaks for the dignity and independence of the Chinese people." The fact that the Chinese revolutionaries had to fight desperately for the dignity and independence of the Chinese people against the aggression of imperialist powers, especially Japanese imperialism, must be the basic reason for Mao's emphasis on the historical heritage and peculiarities of China.

Liu Shao-ch'i, one of Mao's best disciples, said something very significant in this connection in a report entitled "On the Party," made before the 7th Party Congress on 14 May 1945. In the first place, Liu defined Maoism as follows:

Mao Tse-tung's ideology is one in which the theories of Marx-Leninism and the actual experiences in the Chinese revolution are united. It is Chinese Communism, or Chinese Marxism.

It is a type of Marxism developed to a higher stage through a national-democratic revolution in a colonial, semicolonial, or semifeudal country in the present day, a marvelous example of nationalized Marxism. It has grown and evolved out of the long revolutionary struggle of the Chinese race and the Chinese people through three great revolutionary wars in China -- the Northern Expedition War, the Land Revolution War, and the present Anti-Japanese War. The ideology is Chinese and yet perfectly Marxian. It has been established by the application of the Marxist views of the world and society -- dialectical materialism and historical materialism -- that is, on the basis of Marx-Leninism with the national peculiarities of China taken into consideration, together with abundant experience in modern revolutions and the peoples struggle led by the Chinese Communist Party and through careful scientific research. 13/

In Leninism, also, there was awareness that it was adapted to the peculiarities of Russia. Such awareness may be found in a considerable measure in the following remarks by Lenin at the 4th convention of the Comintern on 13 October 1922: "At the 3rd convention in 1921 we adopted a resolution on the organizational structure of the Communist Party and what activities it should conduct and how. This resolution is a wonderful one, but it is almost consistently Russian -- that is, everything in it is taken from the Russian environment." 14/

In spite of this self-analysis by Lenin, Stalin's view that "Leninism is Marxism in the stage of imperialism and the proletarian revolution" became the official definition of Leninism. Before making this definition, Stalin criticized the other definition that "Leninism is Marxism adapted to the peculiar conditions of the situation in Russia" and stated:

This definition contains some truth but not the whole truth. It is true that Lenin applied Marxism to the realities in Russia, and that ingeniously. But if Leninism were nothing more than an application of Marxism to the special environment in Russia, Leninism would be purely a one-nation ideology and nothing more than that, or purely Russian and nothing more than Russian. We know, however, that Leninism is an international ideology with roots in international developments as a whole and not a simply Russian ideology. In my opinion, therefore, this definition is partial and faulty. 15/

Although in the case of Leninism the emphasis is thus on internationality and universal applicability, the peculiarities and historical heritage of China are stressed in Maoism. Even in Maoism the international nature of the ideology is not neglected, for it "will make important, useful contributions to the peoples liberation efforts in other countries, particularly to the liberation of Asian peoples." 16/ But whereas Leninism, as the guiding theory for the first Communist revolution in the world, had to stress emphatically its international universal applicability, particularly through the Bolshevization or Stalinization of the Communist Parties of the Comintern

member countries, Maoism has been developed into an original theory for the Chinese revolution, although from time to time it has had to resist the guiding policies of the Comintern or the Soviet Communist Party Politburo. This historical difference between the two is very important.

B. Atheism Versus Self-Reformation and "Mind-Training"

It is well known that Marxism sprang from the atheism of the leftist Hegelians, especially Ludwig Feuerbach. Before turning Marxist, Lenin was under the influence of atheism and materialism in the Russian revolutionary movement. How much importance he attached to atheism and materialism may be seen from the fact that in 1908 he wrote a fairly voluminous book entitled Materialism and the Critique of Experience. In it he said, "Once you deny the objective reality given to us through our senses, you will be without any weapon to fight religionism, for you will then be captivated by agnosticism or subjectivism, which is the only thing needed for religionism. If the sensitive world is the objective reality, we have no access to other 'realities' or pseudo-realities." This statement shows that Lenin's materialism had atheism as its practical consequence.

Lenin admitted that, in places like Western Europe where the bourgeois revolution was over and freedom of faith was more or less established, the struggle with religion should submit to the struggle for socialism. "But in Russia," says Lenin, "the situation is entirely different. The proletariat is the leader of our bourgeois democratic revolution. The proletarian party must be the ideological leader in struggles with all medieval institutions, including struggles with the old national religion and against all attempts to revive such religion or give a new or different basis to it." 17/

Whereas Lenin thus had much emphasis on atheism, Maoism seems to pay little attention to atheism. In his representative work Practice (July 1937), in which he clarified his dialectical materialist stand, and again in Differences (August 1937), he made attacks on "metaphysics serving the reactionary ruling class" but did not call for atheism. 18/

In spite of Leninist interest in atheism, Maoism does not refer to atheism, presumably because religion has a different place in China from that in Russia. In Tsarist Russia the Greek Orthodox Church allied with Tsarism and served as a sort of military police in the spiritual world. Hence it was only natural that the Leninists, like the Narodniks, put on a militant atheist attitude.

In contrast, there was no monotheistic religion in China except an imported, feeble Christianity, and Confucianism, Taoism, and Buddhism were already ceasing to be powerful organized religions. The Chinese were one of the rare secular peoples in the world. Under these circumstances, Mao Tse-tung naturally did not have to assume a strongly militant atheist attitude.

Although not including atheism, Maoism greatly stresses self-reformation and mind-training, which are essentially Confucian ideas. This tendency is clearly seen in a speech on "The Mind-Training of Communists" made by Liu Shao-ch'i at the Marx-Lenin Institute in Yen'an on 7 August 1939. Asking himself, "Why must Communists train their minds?" he answered himself as follows:

For revolutionaries to make personal efforts to train their minds and to study while engaged in revolutionary struggles is quite necessary and indispensable for their self-reformation and improvement.

A revolutionary trained through many years of revolutionary struggles does not always grow into a distinguished, skilled revolutionary. That depends chiefly on the effort and self-training of the revolutionary himself. A real, distinguished, skilled revolutionary is made through many years of training and mind-cultivation in the revolutionary struggle. Therefore, we Communists should train ourselves and cultivate our minds through various difficulties and hardships in the extensive popular revolutionary movement and at the same time keep ourselves sensitive to new things and improve our brains so that we can be revolutionaries with noble character and firm political conviction.

Confucius says, "I began my studying at fifteen, became independent at thirty, learned not to be troubled at forty, knew my Heaven-assigned mission at fifty, learned to listen to anything at sixty, and found myself acting at will without going to extremes" (The Analects of Confucius, Book on Government). This is one course of self-training and mind-cultivation, and Confucius here does not profess himself to be a born wise man.

Mencius says, "So, when Heaven is about to entrust a man with a vital mission, it first always tortures his heart, works his body hard, famishes his flesh, deprives him of his means, and frustrates his plans, all for the

purpose of training his mind, strengthening his character and making him learn to do what he has been poor at doing" (Discourses of Mencius, Book for Children). This also shows that one needs a course of training and mind-cultivation in order to be a great man. The Communists, entrusted with the "vital mission" of achieving a world reformation unprecedented in history particularly need such training and mind-cultivation. 19/

Liu Shao-ch'i, of course, did not forget to point out that such training for Communists, while drawing inspiration from the traditional Chinese idea of training, must have some completely different aspects. He said:

There are many ways and types of mind-training. For instance, many of our comrades are keeping diaries, thus checking on their daily activities and thoughts. Others decorate the walls of their working or living places with pieces of paper on which their weaknesses or goals are written, or the picture of persons they adore are drawn, so that their comrades will look at them and give them advice or guidance. Many methods of mind-training have been known in China since ancient times, such as "reflecting upon oneself three times a day," suggested by Tseng-tsu; "training oneself, as it were, by cutting, grinding, rounding, and polishing" in The Book of Songs; "reflecting upon oneself and asking oneself"; "hanging one's motto on the right wall of

one's seat"; and "putting down one's thoughts." The Confucians had many ways of training their minds and bodies, and in many religions there are specific methods and types of mind-training called for. It is also mentioned in Higher Education, one of the classics in China, which refers to "right knowledge, wisdom, sincerity, and a sense of justice for properly managing the affairs of oneself, one's family, one's country, and the whole world." All this tells us that all of us must try hard and carefully train ourselves and study if we are to make any progress. However, many of these conventional methods and types of training cannot be adopted by us, for most of them are too academic, formalistic, abstract, and removed from our actual activities in society. They exaggerate the functions of subjective action. They believe that, in a condition removed from the actualities of the social revolution, we can change our realities, our society, and ourselves if only we have honest minds -- if only we close our eyes and pray. This is nonsense, of course. We should never follow such a way of mind-training. We are materialists. Our self-training should not be removed from our practical activities.

This thinking expressed by Liu Shao-ch'i is an important feature of Maoism. Marxism did not overlook the fact that reformation of people is indispensable in a social reformation. Stalin, especially, emphatically stressed the

educational function of proletarian dictatorship. In Stalin's mind, however, the educational function of proletarian dictatorship was conceived as something given from outside, or from above, whereas in Maoism the emphasis is on self-reformation. Here we can find another major difference between the ideology of Lenin and Stalin and that of Mao Tse-tung. Especially noteworthy is the following statement by Mao about his own self-reformation:

In the process of construction of a socialistic society, people must be reformed, both the exploiters and the workers. No one is saying that the working class need not be reformed. But, of course, the reformation of workers is different in nature from that of exploiters. They cannot be discussed on the same basis. The working class, while reforming society as a whole through their class struggles and struggles with Nature, must also reform themselves. In their work, they must constantly learn and continue to overcome their weaknesses, step by step, without cease. Among the people of our own class, there are very many people who are making progress year after year -- that is, reforming themselves year after year. As for me, I used to have various non-Marxian thoughts before, and I adopted Marxism later in my life. I learned a little of Marxism from books and reformed my ideology roughly, but my reformation has been made chiefly through my long participation in the class struggle. Moreover, I must continue to learn, and even if I do

so, all I can expect to achieve is a little more progress. If I do not, I will lag behind my comrades. 20/

There seems to be no doubt that Mao Tse-tung's idea of self-reformation or mind-training has a connection with Chinese thinking, especially Confucian thinking. In Christianity, which finds salvation in the grace given from above by transcendental God, there is no idea of self-reformation or mind-training as contemplated in Confucianism. Atheism, as the antithesis of Christianity or as the negative of Christianity, considers human nature good and regards all evil as coming from social or historical evils like private ownership of property. Therefore, it devotes itself to overcoming social or historical evils and does not attach much importance to the self-reformation or mind-training of people. Atheism by its nature calls for struggles against "old customs, habits, conventions, and prejudices inherited from the old society" and stresses education given from outside or from above by the vanguard party. In Maoism, on the other hand, the Party head himself admits he must constantly reform and train himself. This sort of thinking can be found neither in Christianity nor in its antithesis, atheism. There must be an inevitable connection between the lack of emphasis on atheism in Mao Tse-tung's ideology and his heavy emphasis on mind-training and self-reformation.

C. Differences Among the People

In Marxism, capitalist society is analyzed with emphasis on the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, or between the exploiters and the exploited. According to Marxism, the State is a bourgeois means of exploitation and oppression, and it is supposed to be overthrown by the proletarian revolution and perish through proletarian dictatorship. But after

the October Revolution, even after the Russian bourgeoisie and landed class were completely expropriated by the Soviet regime, the Soviet State did not perish but even had to be strengthened. To solve this contradiction between theory and reality, Stalin explained, "The dying classes resist not because they have grown stronger than we but because socialism has grown faster than they and made them weaker than ourselves. Just because they are getting weaker, they instinctively sense the end of their days and thus are compelled to resist with all their might by every means available to them." 21/ He also maintained, "The death of the State will be achieved not by weakening State power but by strengthening it to the maximum, which is necessary to thoroughly wipe out what is left of the dying classes and to organize defenses against the capitalist encirclement, which is far from destroyed as yet and will not be destroyed in the near future." 22/

There are many conceivable reasons why Stalin emphasized the desperate resistance of the "dying classes" and invented many antirevolutionary plots on the pretext of strengthening the "defenses against the capitalist encirclement." Accepting the Marxian doctrine regarding State power merely as a means of class oppression, Stalin probably had no alternative but to use the above excuses for strengthening the power of the Soviet State; and once he invented an antirevolutionary plot by conspirators with foreign countries, he could not help going as far as physically blotting out his opposing factions.

In contrast, Maoism frankly admits that there can be differences among the people. On 27 February 1957, Mao made a speech before the 11th expanded session of the Supreme State Affairs Council under the title "How to Rightly Deal With Differences Among the People." Mentioning two kinds of differences -- differences with the enemy and differences among the people -- he spoke as follows:

Our country today is better united than at any time in the past. By the triumph of our bourgeois democratic revolution and socialist revolution and the success of our socialist construction, the old China has rapidly been converted. A much brighter future for our fatherland is now before us. The national division and confusion detested by the people are gone forever. The 600 million people of China are engaged in socialist construction in full unity under the guidance of the proletariat and the Communist Party. National unity, unity of the people, and unity of all the races in the country -- this is the basic guarantee for the inevitable triumph of our undertaking. However, this does not mean that there are no differences any more in our society. Such an idea is too simple and does not agree with objective facts. There are two kinds of social differences before us -- differences with the enemy and differences among the people, which are clearly distinguished from each other in nature Differences with the enemy are hostile. Within the workers, differences among the people are nonhostile, and differences between the exploiters and the exploited have both hostile and non-hostile aspects. Differences among the people, which have always been, have characteristics in each stage of the revolution and socialist construction. Under the present conditions of our country, "differences among the

people" include those within the proletariat; within the peasant class; within the intelligentsia; between workers and peasants; among workers, peasants, and intellectuals; between the proletariat and other working classes on one hand and the nationalist bourgeoisie on the other; and within the nationalist bourgeoisie. Our peoples government represents the true interest of the people and is the servant of the people. But even between this government and the people at large there are differences. These include differences between national or collective interests and individual interests, between democracy and centralism, between the leaders and the guided, and between some government agency members with their bureaucratic ways and the public. These differences are part of the differences among the people. Generally speaking, differences among the people grow from the ground of basic agreement in interest among the people. 23/

Among the various differences among the people enumerated here by Mao Tse-tung, special attention must be given to differences between the "government representing the true interest of the people" and the people at large and to differences between the leaders and the guided. Openly admitting such differences is against the tradition of Marxian theory on the State. If differences between the peoples government and the people at large or between the leaders and the guided can be admitted, it will be unnecessary to justify the strengthening of the Communist regime by inventing antirevolutionary differences.

Approved For Release 2002/02/12 : CIA-RDP79T01049A002200050001-1

Also, if differences among the people can simply be admitted, it will be unnecessary to physically blot out opposers. If the latter's existence reflects differences among the people, what is required will be patient persuasion and indoctrination. On the question of how to deal with differences among the people, Mao Tse-tung says:

We call for guided freedom and centrally guided democracy. But this does not mean in any way that ideological problems among the people -- about matters involving the judgment of whether a thing is right or wrong -- may be settled by coercive means.

In 1942 we formulated our democratic means of solving such differences within the people and called it "unity-criticism-unity." In more practical terms, this means that we should start with a desire for unity, solve the difference in question through criticism or struggle, and achieve new unity on a new basis. According to our experience, this is the right way of solving differences among the people. In 1942 we used this method and successfully solved differences within the Communist Party -- that is, between parrotists and the Party members at large, or between parrotism and Marxism. The types of struggles within the Party adopted by the "ultraleftist" parrotists were called "fierce struggles and relentless attacks." This was not the right way. When we criticized the "ultraleftist" parrotists, we did not follow their way but adopted a new method, which

consisted of starting with desire for unity, deciding what is right through criticism or struggle, and achieving new unity on a new basis. This was the method adopted during the reformation movement in 1942. When, several years later, the Chinese Communist Party held the 7th Congress of National Representatives in 1945, it was found that the unity of all the Party had been achieved, which marked a great victory for the peoples revolution. What is necessary here is to start with desire for unity, for if there is no desire for unity in our hearts, struggle will inevitably lead to confusion, and it will be impossible to save the situation. There will be nothing but "fierce struggles and relentless attacks" and no unity of the Party whatsoever. From this experience, we discovered the formula "unity-criticism-unity." We also call it "criticizing the past and giving advice for the future; curing the sickness and saving the patient." We popularized this formula outside the Party, too. At every anti-Japanese base, we always used this formula with success in handling relations between leaders and the public, between troops and inhabitants, between officers and men, among different sections of the Army, and among groups of leaders. We can look further back in the history of our Party. In 1927 we started organizing a revolutionary army and revolutionary bases in the South, and since then we have always used this method in dealing with relations between the

Party and the public, between the Army and the people, between officers and men, and other relations between different groups within the people. However, after the period of the Anti-Japanese War began, we became more aware of this process and finally formulated it. After the entire country was liberated, we used the same "unity-criticism-unity" formula in dealing with the various democratic parties and commercial and industrial circles. It is our duty now to continue to popularize this formula among the entire people; to use it more effectively; and to call upon all factories, cooperatives, shops, schools, agencies, and organizations -- in short, all the 600 million people of China -- to adopt this method to solve their internal differences. 24/

Mao Tse-tung's admission of differences within the people was indeed an epoch-making development in the history of the Marxian theory on the State. "In ordinary cases, differences within the people do not involve hostility," he says. "But if they are improperly handled, or if we are careless about them and become apathetic to them, they may turn into hostility." 25/ This statement needs special attention. It may be said that the impracticality of the Marxian theory that the State is bound to disappear if only class conflicts are removed has been overcome by Mao Tse-tung's open admission of differences within the people.

It will be too evident to need any explanation that there is a close connection between Mao's emphasis on self-reformation and mind-training and his admission of differences among the people. For a full comparison of Leninism

and Maoism, not merely the abovementioned points but also differences between the kolkhoz and the peoples commune and differences and similarities between the views of Moscow and Peking on peaceful coexistence will have to be discussed. I should like to consider these two latter points at some future opportunity.

SOURCES

1. Lenin, V.I. Works (Russian, 4th ed), vol IX, p. 34.
2. Ibid., p. 36.
3. Ibid., p. 81.
4. Mao Tse-tung. Works (Japanese ed), vol IV, p. 196-197.
5. Lenin, V.I. Works, vol V, p. 433.
6. Ibid., vol XXXII, p. 221.
7. Ibid., p. 222.
8. Ibid., p. 220.
9. Stalin, I.V. Works (Russian ed), vol VIII, p. 123-125.
10. Mao Tse-tung. Works (after the Second World War) (Japanese ed),
p. 136-137.
11. Mao Tse-tung. Works (Japanese ed), vol IV, p. 30.
12. Ibid., p. 31.
13. Liu Shao-ch'i. Works (Japanese ed), vol II, p. 40-41.
14. Lenin, V.I. Works, vol XXXIII, p. 393.
15. Stalin, I.V. Works, vol VI, p. 71.
16. Liu Shao-ch'i. Works, vol II, p. 42.
17. Lenin, V.I. Works, vol XV, p. 380.
18. Mao Tse-tung. Works, vol III, p. 53.
19. Liu Shao-ch'i. Works, vol I, p. 16-17.
20. Mao Tse-tung. Works (after the Second World War) (Japanese ed), p. 186.
21. Stalin, I.V. Works, vol XII, p. 38.
22. Ibid., vol XIII, p. 211.
23. Mao Tse-tung. Works (after the Second World War) (Japanese ed), p. 164-165.
(Mao's speech on 27 February 1957)

24. Ibid., p. 169-171.

25. Ibid., p. 171.