

BOLSHEVISM AND THE CHINESE REVOLUTION:
THE CONCEPTUAL ORIGINS OF THE PROGRAM OF THE CHINESE COMMUNIST
PARTY AT THE TIME OF ITS FIRST CONGRESS,

1917-1921

by

TIMOTHY JOHN STANLEY

B.A., McGill University, Montreal, 1975

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
(The Department of History)

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

October 1981

© Timothy John Stanley, 1981

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the head of my department or by his or her representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of History

The University of British Columbia
2075 Wesbrook Place
Vancouver, Canada
V6T 1W5

Date October 20, 1981

Abstract

This is a study of the intellectual origins of the program of the Chinese Communist Party during the period between the October 1917 Bolshevik Revolution in Russia and the First Congress of the Chinese Communist Party in the summer of 1921. This study examines the positions put forward in Gongchandang ("The Communist"), the theoretical organ of the Provisional Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party. Although these positions were influenced by Lenin's theories to some extent, they were mainly influenced by the Chinese intellectual's reaction to the Bolshevik Revolution, understanding of classes and concepts of social change.

Specifically, the Russian Revolution was seen in terms of the anarchist concept of "social revolution". Marx's theories of historical materialism failed to alter the fundamental perceptions of reality of intellectuals, including those who considered themselves to be Marxists. Marx's theory of surplus value was seen as equivalent to the anarchist position "property is theft", and class struggle was seen as one among several methods of achieving "social revolution".

Nowhere was the influence of anarchism more evident than in class concepts. Anarchism had identified the existence of two classes in China--the rulers and the ruled. The influence of Bolshevism and Marxism on class concepts was limited to supplying an economic content to these anarchist classes. Essentially landlords and capitalists were seen as the class that owned the means of production, while peasants and industrial workers were seen as the class which did not own any

means of production. Consequently translations of the terms "proletariat" and "bourgeoisie" -- "wuchan jieji" and "you chan jieji" -- were understood as "unpropertied class" and "propertied class" respectively.

This perception of classes in turn led the Chinese Communist Party, at the time of its First Congress, to analyse Chinese society in terms of the "propertied" and "unpropertied" classes. Based on this analysis, it developed a strategy of revolution aimed at organizing and rousing the consciousness of the members of "the unpropertied class". The understanding of landlords and capitalists as a single class, and of workers and peasants as a single class, also suggests that class differences between peasants and proletariat, between landlords and capitalists, were not apparent, at least to Chinese intellectuals, between 1917 and 1921.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
INTRODUCTION	1
1. The Problem Of The Early Communist Movement	1
2. The Sources For This Study	5
3. A Comment On Western Historiography On 1917-1921	11
CHAPTER I. REVOLUTION: RUSSIA AND CHINA	20
1. Russia: The Concept Of "Social Revolution"	20
2. China: The Necessity Of "Social Revolution"	32
CHAPTER II. MARXISM: IDEAS, PROPERTY AND CLASS STRUGGLE ...	45
1. The Description Of Marxism, 1919-1920	45
2. The Materialist Conception Of History	50
3. The Theory Of Surplus Value	57
4. Classes And Class Struggle	66
CHAPTER III. THE BOURGEOISIE AND THE PROLETARIAT	76
1. The Polarization Of Society: The Concept Of "Class" ..	76
2. Two Great Camps: The Bourgeoisie And The Proletariat .	85
CHAPTER IV. COMMUNISM: THE GONGCHANDANG PROGRAMME	99
1. Communism And China	99
2. Revolution And Dictatorship: Critique Of Anarchism ...	106
3. The Analysis Of Classes In Chinese Society	114
4. Seize Political Power: The Revolutionary Road	122
CONCLUSION	131
Footnotes	136
Selected Bibliography	157

INTRODUCTION

1. The Problem of the Early Communist Movement

In August 1921, the First Congress of the Chinese Communist Party convened in Shanghai.¹ Before this Congress could be called, communist organizations which would serve as the structural nuclei of the future party had to be established in the major cities of China, and the party's program which mapped out its objectives and the means of their attainment had to be defined. In large part these two tasks were accomplished under the overall direction of the party's Provisional Central Committee which had been formed in Shanghai in May 1920.²

The first task was accomplished during the summer of 1920. Communist organizations were established in Peking, Shanghai and other Chinese cities, as well as in Tokyo and Paris.³ As Chow Tse-tsung has suggested, the months between April 1920 and the First Congress of the Chinese Communist Party, in the summer of 1921 marked "the transition to action" for those intellectuals who embraced communism.⁴

The second task was accomplished in the pages of Gongchandang ("The Communist"), the theoretical organ of the Provisional Central Committee. Gongchandang addressed two fundamental concerns of the early communist movement in China--what was communism and could it be achieved in China?

The second issue--how communist revolution could be achieved in China--required the presentation of a plausible strategy of revolution which would attract members to the new party. This strategy had to identify the friends and enemies of

the revolution, which classes were revolutionary and which not. Gongchandang also had to describe the method of bringing about communist revolution, and the means of awakening the consciousness of potentially revolutionary forces.

The first issue--what communism was--involved differentiating communism from other revolutionary philosophies, and especially from anarchism. This differentiation centred around three areas: 1) the objective of revolution--i.e. the dictatorship of the proletariat; 2) the nature of that revolution--one that merely sought political power or one that sought the transformation of social structures; and 3) given Marx's position that socialist revolution was the inevitable outcome of developed capitalist society, the possibility of such revolution in China.

But Gongchandang developed the program of the Chinese Communist Party at a time when there was limited access in Chinese to the works of Marx and Lenin.⁵ At the time of the First Congress, Marx's theories of historical materialism, class struggle and capitalism, were available in Chinese only through secondary, even tertiary, sources which had often been written by those hostile to Marxism. Of Marx's major works only his call for communist revolution, The Communist Manifesto, had been published in complete Chinese translation.⁶ Of the Leninist classics, early communists only had access to The State and Revolution which presented his analysis of the class nature of the state and the consequent need for the dictatorship of the proletariat after the communist revolution. Even this was only available in English,⁷ and its publication in Chinese

translation had only begun at the time of the First Congress.⁸ Lenin's two essential contributions to the theory of communist revolution--the "vanguard party" and his thesis on imperialism--were simply inaccessible. Lenin's blueprint for revolution, What is to be Done?, and his analysis of imperialism and the possibility of communist revolution in relatively economically backward countries, Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism, had yet to be translated. Thus the early communists in China only had indirect access to Leninism. Their knowledge of Leninism came from their understanding of the theory and practice of the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia.

Given such limited and often indirect access to Marxism-Leninism, the program of the Chinese Communist Party as set out in Gongchandang was in a certain sense neither Marxist nor Leninist. The program outlined in Gongchandang did nothing less than propose the wholesale importation into China of Marxism-Leninism as it had developed in Russia. In short, the early communists were Chinese Bolsheviks.⁹

Gongchandang's program was in large part a response to anarchism. Anarchism had enjoyed a substantially longer history in China than the Marxist approach to revolution.¹⁰ Consequently anarchist positions on revolution were much better known and shaped the positions presented in Gongchandang in two ways. First, it was the anarchist theory of revolution that Gongchandang spent most of its time attacking. Secondly, anarchist concepts subtly coloured the early communists' perceptions of their society, its problems and the solutions to these problems. Anarchism runs as a common thread through this

study of the intellectual origins of the program of the Chinese Communist Party at the time of its formation. The Bolshevik Revolution was seen in terms of the anarchist concept of "social revolution". Marxist economic theory was understood to establish the anarchist position that "property is theft". When intellectuals used class concepts to analyse their society, the classes they identified were in practice those which had been identified by anarchism. This contamination of concepts of the nature of society, economic theory and social change, seriously effected the new party's line.

The central concern of this study, therefore, is to trace the conceptual factors which shaped the Chinese Bolshevism of Gongchandang. Specifically, this study examines intellectuals' reactions to and understandings of the Bolshevik Revolution, their understanding of Marxism, their understanding and use of class concepts, and the Leninist influences on the program of Gongchandang.

The first three factors--Bolshevism, Marxism and class concepts--are examined in the first three chapters respectively. These chapters all cover the period between the Bolshevik Revolution in November 1917 and the publication of the first complete Chinese translation of The Communist Manifesto in April 1920. The fourth chapter examines the positions put forward in Gongchandang and is restricted to the period between the formation of the Provisional Central Committee in May 1920 and the First Congress of the Chinese Communist Party in August 1921.

2. The Sources for this Study

During the period between the mid 1910s and the early 1920s, there was an explosive increase in the number of journals published in China. Journals from this period, the era of the New Culture and May Fourth movements, have been the principle sources used in this study of the conceptual origins of the line of the Chinese Communist Party at the time of its formation.

The journals of the New Culture and May Fourth movements are not representative of all trends in Chinese thought between 1917 and 1921. The traditionalist, even reactionary, trend is not reflected in the intellectual publications of the period. Consequently I can only speculate with respect to the ruling elite's reception of the Russian Revolution and Marxist ideas.

The sources used in this study are also not representative of all of the progressive intellectual trends during the period under consideration, although they are representative of the leftist trends amongst younger intellectuals. For schematic purposes, progressive intellectual tendencies can be ascribed to three generations of intellectuals.¹¹ Although the concerns of these generations overlap to some extent, and some individuals, notably Li Dazhao, Chen Duxiu and Hu Hanmin, belong to more than one generation, each generation's approach to the problems that confronted Chinese society fundamentally differed from that of the others.

The central issue that confronted all three generations had been defined by the end of the nineteenth century. How could China attain the wealth and power of the West? The first generation of progressive intellectuals, essentially that of the

1911 Revolution, was concerned with solving this problem while at the same time preserving their country's Chineseness. The members of this generation, intellectuals like Liang Qichao and Sun Yat-sen, sought political and institutional forms which would allow China to overcome her relative weakness without fundamentally affecting the nature of Chinese culture.

I have not examined the thought of this generation of intellectuals. My main concern has been to trace the origins of the positions of the Chinese Communist Party at the time of the party's First Congress. Given their concerns for institutional solutions, it is doubtful that intellectuals such as Liang played major roles in formulating and disseminating the elements of Chinese Bolshevism. This was probably also the case with Sun Yat-sen. I have not examined his writings between 1917 and 1921. His appearance in this study is incidental in so far as his approbation of the Bolshevik Revolution helped to establish the legitimacy of Bolshevism in the eyes of progressive Chinese. Furthermore, the paucity of references to statements on Russia and Marxism that were made by Sun during this period suggests that he did not play a major role in disseminating communist thought. This would be consistent with Sun's politics during this period. Since he was repeatedly trying to ally with various warlord factions during this period, he would not have been in a position to say much on the disturbing events in Russia.

Intellectuals associated with the New Culture Movement constituted the second generation of progressive intellectuals. The New Culture Movement rejected political institutions as the best method of overcoming Chinese backwardness. Unlike the

preceeding generation which had been, and continued to be, active in the world of political parties, constitutions and conspiracies to gain control of the central government, the New Culture generation rejected direct political action in favour of mass enlightenment. Instead of trying to replace Chinese institutions with Western political forms, they sought to transform the Chinese view of the world through the dissemination of the most modern Western ideas. In particular they sought to replace Confucianism with "science" and "democracy". Consequently this generation was much less concerned with preserving Chineseness which it equated with backwardness.

This study has made considerable use of the journals published by New Culture intellectuals. Formost among these was Xin Qingnian (New Youth or "La jeunesse").¹² As the most influential intellectual journal of the day, and the most important forum for the expression of New Culture ideals, Xin Qingnian regrouped a number of prominent university intellectuals. These included Chen Duxiu, Xin Qingnian's editor; Li Dazhao, the first Chinese Marxist; Hu Shih, the originator of the vernacular literature movement; and Cai Yuanpei, the principle of Peking University and the first minister of education in the Chinese Republic. Another source used in this study was closely related to Xin Qingnian. While Meizhou Pinglun ("The Weekly Critic") was more directly oriented towards political commentary than Xin Qingnian, it appealed to the same audience and was published by members of Xin Qingnian's editorial board including Chen Duxiu.¹³

The third generation of progressive intellectuals, that of the May Fourth Movement, tended to be the students of the New Culture professors. After their radicalization by the Western Allies' betrayal of Chinese sovereignty at the Versailles peace talks, this generation rejected their teachers' concerns for mass enlightenment in favour of direct political action and overall solutions to social problems. To be sure, some of their teachers, notably Li Dazhao and Chen Duxiu, joined them in this concern for social problems. Indeed, interest in society was the direct consequence of the New Culture Movement's iconoclasm. Attacks on Confucianism led to interest in the family and the role of women in society. These were both problems which involved social structures as well as ideology. The appearance of this generation marked a split in the New Culture movement between those such as Li Dazhao who advocated social solutions, and those such as Hu Shih who continued to advocate the liberal approach of education and mass enlightenment.

The third generation's publications tended to be extremely sympathetic towards the Bolshevik Revolution and often played leading roles in disseminating Marxist ideas. Consequently, they are amongst the most important sources for the study of radical thought during this period, and I have relied heavily upon them. In particular, I have made use of the student journals Xin Chao (New Tide or "The Renaissance")¹⁴ and Guomin ("The Citizen").¹⁵ Xin Chao was the most influential student publication of the day. Guomin, the organ of the student "Society of National Salvation", was only slightly less influential but was more radical in orientation. My major source

for the line of the Chinese Communist Party-- Gongchandang ("The Communist")--can be included in the ranks of the publications of the third generation of Chinese radicals. Although Gongchandang was the official organ of the party's Provisional Central Committee, its most important ideologists, Zhou Fuhai and Shi Cuntong, were members of the May Fourth generation. The concern with methods of revolution shown by the contributors to Gongchandang properly reflects the general trend, although not necessarily the politics, of the third generation.

Gongchandang was not the only journal that put forward the views of the early communists before the First Congress. The Peking communist organization published Laodong Jie (The World of Labour) and Xin Qingnian was communist controlled after its June 1920 issue. But as the organ of the Provisional Central Committee, Gongchandang accurately reflected the views of the party centre on questions of strategy and tactics.

Dongfang Zazhi ("The Eastern Miscellany") has proven to be an invaluable source for this study.¹⁶ Unlike the other journals of the period which were aimed at a restricted intellectual audience, Dongfang Zazhi was essentially a newsmagazine aimed at the mass market of the new urban middle class. Every issue reproduced or published a variety of articles on the questions of the day which were written from a variety of political perspectives. Although Dongfang Zazhi had a liberal editorial policy, relative to the other journals used in the preparation of this study, it was conservative. Its conservatism can be seen in the fact that it continued to use the classical style of written Chinese until the end of 1919 which was long

after other journals of the period had converted to vernacular Chinese. Dongfang Zazhi's contents reflected what its editors believed the informed citizen should know. Its articles reflected the information available in the daily papers. Therefore, it is extremely useful as a source for determining what the average informed citizen was likely to have known about the Russian Revolution, Marxism, etc..

A major gap in the sources for this study is the absence of anarchist publications. Unfortunately, I have not had access to the anarchist publications of the May Fourth Era. The only access I have had to anarchist thought has come in secondary sources, or in articles written by anarchists, or about anarchism, in other journals such as Xin Qingnian and Dongfang Zazhi. Except in so far as the sources that I have examined appear to be responses to anarchist positions, or influenced by anarchist ideas, I am consequently not in a position to speculate on the positions being put forward by anarchists on the issues of the day. I.E. it is possible (although I suspect unlikely) that anarchist journals played the major role in disseminating Marxist ideas in China during this period.¹⁷

This study has found that a number of elements--concepts of classes, revolution, and understanding of Marxism-- were brought together in Chinese Bolshevism. These elements, along with Bolshevism itself, emerged in the course of sharp debates over the nature of the problems that afflicted Chinese society and their resolution. These debates took place between traditionalists and progressives, liberals and radicals, Marxists and anarchists. The positions that I have traced have

tended to be those taken by only one side in these debates. For example, I have examined the reactions of both liberals and radicals to the Russian Revolution, but after the New Culture movement split into two camps, I do not consider the liberals' positions. Thus I only examine Li Dazhao's response to Hu Shih's position in the Problems and "Isms" debate. To have looked at both sides in these debates would have certainly given a much more balanced picture of the conceptual flux that came together in the positions of Gongchandang, but that would have been a much longer, and substantially more complex study.

3. A Comment on Western Historiography on 1917-1921

My central argument is that the conceptions of reality and the nature of communist revolution which emerged in the New Culture/May Fourth Era determined the line of the Chinese Communist Party at the time of its formation. Western historiography on the Chinese Communist Party has tended to gloss over the period between the 1917 October Revolution and the First Congress of the Chinese Communist Party in 1921. Survey histories of the Chinese Communist Party usually begin with the party's First Congress and consequently only devote a few introductory pages, or even paragraphs, to the pre-1921 period.¹⁸ This is unfortunate since it has led to a tendency to see the line of the Chinese Communist Party at the time of the party's formation in the light of later line struggles. For example, one of the issues that dominated the history of the Chinese Communist Party before the 1930s was whether the party should organize peasants or industrial workers. My study of the

1917-1921 period has found that this was not an issue for Chinese communists before the First Congress. In fact, in the context of the general understanding of classes, this issue could not exist as a question of principle at this time.¹⁹ I have found that peasants and industrial workers were commonly seen as members of the same class--"the unpropertied". The Chinese term used to refer to this class was "wuchan jieji" **无产阶级** which today is taken to refer to the class of industrial workers, i.e. the proletariat.

It can be argued that survey histories of the Chinese Communist Party do not have to examine the intellectual origins of the party's political lines since their concern is not to trace the history of ideas. Among the works which do treat the party's theoretical positions as the subject of intellectual history is Maurice Meisner's Li Da-chao and the Origins of Chinese Marxism. Essentially, Meisner argues that the demands of nationalism and China's abject condition, coupled with previous intellectual experience, conspired to "transform" Marxist doctrine into "Chinese Marxism". He establishes this thesis through the examination of the evolution of Li Dazhao's perceptions of reality and concepts of social change. I am not in a position to prove or disprove Meisner's central thesis, but my study of this period suggests that some of Meisner's specific arguments can be questioned. For example, Meisner suggests that nationalism combined with Li's Marxism, led him to formulate the issue confronting China in terms of the confrontation between China as a "proletarian" country and the West as "capitalist" countries. Meisner suggests that this position was effectively

that the basic contradiction in Chinese society was between foreign imperialism and the Chinese nation. But if my thesis is correct, Li's identification of China as a "proletarian" country meant little more than that China was being impoverished by the penetration of foreign industry, i.e. that it was becoming "unpropertied", and would have been interpreted as such by his contemporaries.

This suggests that it can be dangerous to rely upon the development of a single intellectual's thought to establish a general thesis on how and why the Chinese Communist Party arrived at a given position. The problem with this approach, which has been taken a number of times,²⁰ is that it can result in isolating the thought of the particular individual from the general historically determined conceptual context. Therefore, I have purposely not concerned myself with the development of particular intellectuals' thought. Instead, I have attempted to approach the problem by examining the general social mix of ideas, and the effects that this mix had on the positions of a particular group of intellectuals--the contributors to Gongchandang. The heart of this approach is the view that ideas, whether those of an individual or a group of individuals, are social and not private entities. Even the ideas of an individual intellectual are social in so far as they are conditioned by the individual's social experience, and understandings (or misunderstandings) of other ideas which are themselves social. This approach to the history of ideas is essentially that taken by Arif Dirlik in History and Revolution.²¹ Except in so far as Dirlik's primarily concern is the origins of Marxist

historiography in China, he argues that the apparently academic issues that confronted Chinese intellectuals were reflections of real political concerns and that these concerns conditioned the positions put forward by various writers.

My study begins with the October Revolution in Russia and ends with the First Congress of the Chinese Communist Party. It can be argued that Marxist ideas were introduced into China before 1911 in the course of debates between the Tongmenghui and other revolutionary factions²² and consequently that Marxist thought does not originate with the October Revolution. My study of the 1917 to 1921 period does not question the fact that Marxism was discussed in China before 1911, nor does it question the fact that the people who discussed Marxism before 1911 were sometimes the same people who discussed it after 1917,²³ but my thesis does question the argument that there was any general conceptual continuity between these periods, i.e. that intellectuals in general were familiar with Marxism, even if they did not discuss it, before it was resurrected in the wake of the Bolshevik Revolution.

One of the arguments put forward by those who hold that there is conceptual continuity between the pre-1911 period and the 1917-1921 period is that Japan, not Russia, was Chinese Marxism's place of origin. This is the position taken by Li Yuning in the Introduction of Socialism into China.²⁴ Li argues that Marxism was introduced from Japan before the 1911 Revolution and that the terms used by Chinese Marxists establish this. She writes,

Thousands of Chinese intellectuals came to know the names of Marx and Engels at the beginning of this

century. There then took place what must be regarded as the earliest discussion on the nature of Chinese society from the Marxist standpoint and the appearance of several recurrent themes in later controversies. Chinese Marxism was stimulated by Japanese rather than Russian sources, a salient point in part evidenced by the widespread use of Japanese translations of Marxist terminology. . . .²⁵

I do not dispute that many Chinese intellectuals were exposed to Marxism before 1911. I also do not dispute the fact that Chinese intellectuals turned to Japanese sources when their interest in Marxism was rekindled by the Bolshevik Revolution. But I do question that conceptual continuity between the two periods can be seen in the use of Japanese terminology. For example, Li lists the modern Chinese terms for "struggle" and "bourgeoisie", i.e. "douzheng" 斗争 and "zichan jieji" 资产阶级, as being derived from the Japanese.²⁶ This is undoubtedly true, but if there was continuity between the pre-1911 period and the 1917-1921 period, why did Li Dazhao at first render the Marxist term "class struggle" (jieji douzheng 阶级斗争) as "class competition" (jieji jingzheng 阶级竞争)²⁷ while still others rendered it as "class war" (jieji zhanzheng 阶级战争).²⁸ Furthermore the vast majority of Chinese writers between 1917 and 1921, and especially after mid-1919, even though they were reading Japanese sources on Marxism, referred to that class which is the social opposite of the class of workers not as the "zichan jieji" 资产阶级 (bourgeoisie), but as "youchan jieji" 有产阶级 (propertied). Unfortunately, Li does not state when these terms were introduced into China.

The position that there was conceptual continuity in Marxist thought between the pre-1911 period and the New

Culture/May Fourth period is also put forward by Martin Bernal in Chinese Socialism to 1907.²⁹ This is the first volume of a proposed trilogy on the history of Chinese Socialism until 1919. However, the difficulty progressive intellectuals experienced in coming to terms with the Bolshevik Revolution and Marxist concepts suggests that they were ignorant of Marx's actual positions and consequently that there was no continuity in Marxist thought between the pre-1911 period and the 1917-1919 period. What the pre-1911 generation of progressive intellectuals may have known about Marxism was not necessarily known to the New Culture generation and certainly not known to the May Fourth generation.

Pending the completion of Bernal's trilogy, the best statement on this question of continuity in Chinese Marxist thought can be found in Meisner:

Marxism, in its pre-Leninist form, presupposed the existence of . . . a well-developed urban proletariat. In the absence of these conditions Marxism could not yet serve as a meaningful guide to political action. To many members of the intelligentsia who were attracted to socialism, Marx appeared as one among many Western socialist thinkers--indeed one who was held in considerably less esteem than Kropotkin and Bakunin or even Saint-Simon and Henry George. Thus Marx was known to Chinese intellectuals in the early years of the century, but his theory clearly failed to strike a responsive chord.³⁰

Since Marxism was seen as requiring an advanced industrial economy before it could be a "guide to political action," it was seen as essentially irrelevant to China. Thus, although intellectuals had heard of Marx, and were aware that he was an important Western socialist, they were not particularly interested in his theories, and preferred to study other schools

of socialism. This perception Marxism resulted in general ignorance of his theories. Chinese intellectuals in general only began to study Marxism when it became a "meaningful guide to political action", i.e when the Bolshevik Revolution proved that Marxist revolution was possible in a country like China.

Where there was continuity between the pre-1911 period and 1917-1919 was in the anarchist tradition. Anarchism runs as a common thread throughout the history of radical thought in China during the early twentieth century.³¹ Therefore it is argued that anarchism served as the Chinese equivalent of a social democratic tradition. The advantage of a social democratic tradition from the point of view of a Marxist-Leninist party is that social democracy makes large segments of society familiar with the terminology and concepts used by a communist party.³² Since China did not have such a tradition, anarchism served as the conceptual basis of Marxism. Concretely anarchism introduced Chinese intellectuals to such concepts as "class", "revolution" and even "communism", which facilitated their understanding of Marxist thought.

Although anarchism played an important role as the conceptual basis for the dissemination of Marxist thought in China, Chinese intellectuals confused Marxism and anarchism. Familiarity with anarchist definitions of terminology common to both anarchism and Marxism, led Chinese intellectuals to assume that anarchist and Marxist terms referred to the same things. Where historians have previously stressed anarchism's role as the conceptual basis for the dissemination of Marxism in China,³³ my study has concentrated on the role of anarchism as a

contaminant of Marxist ideology in China.

Anarchism and Marxism have fundamental and irreconcilable differences. Anarchism's essential thesis is that a communist, i.e. classless and stateless, society is possible immediately following the revolution which overthrows the modern state. The logical consequence of the anarchist thesis is that classes are political entities defined by their relationship to the state. Specifically, there are only two classes--the ruling class and the ruled. Once the state is abolished, since there are no longer rulers and ruled, classes automatically cease to exist.³⁴ This is the direct antithesis of the Marxist position that classes are fundamentally economic entities. The abolition of the modern state, therefore, does not necessarily result in the abolition of classes. There is nothing to stop the capitalists from continuing to exploit the workers. The object of Marx's revolution is not the immediate abolition of the state, but the destruction of the state which serves the interests of the capitalist class and the establishment of a state that serves the interests of the working class. This working class state, according to Marx, corresponds to a "political transition period" between communist society and capitalist society during which the capitalist class (and for that matter all classes) will be abolished because the capitalist method of production (private consumption, social production) will be abolished. Only then can communist society be implemented.³⁵

Chinese Marxists, and later Chinese communists, were well aware of this difference between communism and anarchism.

This is the reason that Gongchandang put a great deal of effort into anti-anarchist polemics which revolved around the theoretical need for the dictatorship of the proletariat. Anarchism defined the theoretical issues that Marxists and communists confronted until 1921. Up to the First Congress of the Chinese Communist Party, communists sought to win over intellectuals inclined towards revolution who otherwise would become anarchists. But at the same time that they were aware that anarchism was the most important issue which confronted them, anarchism had unconsciously affected their perceptions of Chinese society and revolution. Nowhere is this more evident than in the early communists' class concepts. Even though they defined classes in economic terms, when they looked at Chinese society they saw the same classes that had been identified by the anarchists. In practice the only differences between the communists' classes and those of the anarchists were that instead of calling these classes the ruling class and the ruled class, the early communists called them the propertied class and the unpropertied class. This perception of the class nature of society affected their strategic analysis of the path to communist revolution which in turn determined their subsequent practice.

Chapter One

Revolution: Russia and China

1. Russia: The Concept of "Social Revolution"

In the absence of a Marxist tradition in China, intellectuals experienced considerable difficulty in explaining the Bolshevik coup d'etat which overthrew Kerensky's Provisional Government. This difficulty was particularly evident on the part of those associated with the New Culture Movement. In the past, lack of interest in Marxism, on the grounds that it was only relevant to the advanced industrial countries of the West, meant that these intellectuals were much more familiar with other schools of socialist thought. Ignorance of Marx and Marxism was such that the Bolshevik Revolution could not readily be explained as the communist revolution heralded by Marx. Even if Chinese commentators were aware of the fact that the Bolsheviks claimed to be Marxists, a statement to this effect would not have been particularly revealing to their audiences.

As a result, there was a tendency to see the Bolshevik Revolution in terms of anarchism--the radical philosophy of revolution which was the best known to Chinese intellectuals. The first descriptions of the policies of the Bolshevik government, for example, catagorized them as resembling anarchism; for indeed, those policies did resemble anarchism to most Chinese intellectuals. Such descriptions, coupled with general ignorance of Marxism, resulted in the confusion between Bolshevism and anarchism, and later between Marxism and anarchism, which was to repeatedly manifest itself during the

next few years. In this context it is interesting to note that it was not until the first anniversary of the Bolshevik coup that Li Dazhao remarked that the Bolsheviks were followers of Karl Marx.

Despite this confusion between Bolshevism and anarchism, descriptions of the radical measures implemented by the Bolshevik government made it evident that the revolution was unprecedented in terms of its nature and scope. "Social Revolution" was the term Chinese intellectuals of various political persuasions used to refer to this new kind of revolution. Sympathy for the Bolshevik Revolution on the part of progressives, coupled with an awareness that Bolshevism was addressing many social, economic and political problems which were perceived as common to both China and Russia, led to repeated calls for Russian-style "social revolution" in China. Many of these calls predated general awareness of the Karakhan Declaration by which the Bolshevik government renounced all czarist claims on Chinese territory. Some even predated the demonstrations of May 1919 which protested the Western power's sellout of Chinese interests at the Versailles peace talks, and marked the transition from the the New Culture Movement's ideal of ideological transformation to nationalist and revolutionary political action.

The Bolshevik Revolution introduced a new concept into the Chinese intellectual universe--that of a revolution which not only sought a change in the ruling elite, but which sought the conscious transformation of social structures. This was the concept of "social revolution".

News of the Bolshevik coup d'etat against Kerensky's provisional government was published in Guomin Ribao on November 10, 1917, within three days after its occurrence. The next day, other Chinese papers also reported the coup.¹

Chinese revolutionaries were quick to grasp the revolution's significance. On New Year's Day, 1918, an editorial in the Guomindang newspaper Guomin Ribao stated, "This big reform [da gaige 大改革] in our near neighbour has caused us to be overcome with hope."²

The first major figure to herald the October Revolution was Sun Yat-sen. In a congratulatory telegram to Lenin he stated,

China's revolutionary party not only expresses the utmost respect towards the arduous and brilliant struggle of the members of your honourable country's revolutionary party, but also hopes that the revolutionary parties of China and Russia will unite together in their common struggle.³

Sun was to later add, "The October Revolution caused humanity to produce a great hope."⁴

Lauding of the Bolshevik Revolution was not restricted to nationalist circles. Early in 1918 the anarchist journal Laodong⁵ saw the revolution in the following light:

The European World War which has frightened people has already been going on for many years. The earthshaking Russian Revolution has also frightened people. Of the personages of the world none do not stare at it with concern, and examine its effects. Those who are bureaucrats and officials fear that its disturbance will expand, that their wealth and positions of power will not be preservable. Big landlords and the rich also fear that its disturbance will expand, that a communist world will one day be realized, and that their private property which was secured through exploitation will be gone. . . . Only the unfortunate labourers daily hope for the early success of the [Russian] Revolution, its

early extension, and the time when a great many people will enjoy the blessings of equality and live through happy days.⁶

Although Chinese revolutionaries were quick to herald the Bolshevik Revolution as the harbinger of a new age, intellectuals associated with Xin Qingnian did not comment on the revolution for several months. This was in sharp contrast to their prompt and favourable reaction to the earlier February Revolution which had overthrown the czar.⁷

The reason that Xin Qingnian failed to comment upon the Bolshevik Revolution is uncertain. This failure may either have been the result of the editors' desire to preserve the journal's "non-political" character, or as Meisner has suggested, the result of their view that the solution to China's problems lay with the Western Allies, the upholders of the international cause of democracy, and a consequently ambivalent attitude towards the Bolsheviks who were negotiating a separate peace with Germany.⁸ In any case, it also took a number of months for Li Dazhao, who did not support the Allies,⁹ to comment on the revolution.

Another possibility is that contributors to Xin Qingnian were simply confused by events in Russia. Where the February Revolution had been readily understandable as Russia's version of the 1911 Revolution, and had been described as such in Xin Qingnian,¹⁰ the Bolshevik Revolution was simply unaccountable. In the absence of a tradition of Marxist thought in China, the Bolshevik coup would have appeared to be little more than one political faction overthrowing another. Furthermore, these intellectuals did not accept a ready made political philosophy

which they could use as a yardstick for measuring the Bolshevik Revolution, or as a basis for explaining it.

Revolutionaries, on the other hand, could readily come to terms with the Bolshevik victory. Whether or not Sun Yat-sen sincerely believed that the Chinese and Russian people shared "a common struggle", his pragmatic search for possible allies dictated that he congratulate Lenin.

Anarchists saw the victory as the arrival of the anarchist millenium. Had not the oppressed masses overthrown their oppressors? Wasn't the Bolshevik programme just as radical as their own?

This confusion between anarchism and Bolshevism was to prevail for a number of years. As late as 1921, the First Congress of the Chinese Communist Party issued a directive expelling anarchists from the party.¹¹ This suggests that anarchists, as well as some communists, were not aware that their respective philosophies were antithetical in terms of approach and immediate objectives.

An examination of accounts of the Russian Revolution in popular journals of the period makes the difficulty encountered by Xin Qingnian commentators readily apparent. It was some time before the popular press pointed out that Bolshevism claimed to be the intellectual descendent of Marxism.

Typical of the early coverage of the revolution was Zhang Xichen's article, "A Further Report on the Present Situation in Russia", published in the January, 1918, Dongfang Zazhi ("The Eastern Miscellany").¹²

Like other writers of the period, Zhang referred to the

Bolsheviks as "guoji pai ", meaning "the radical (or extremist) faction."¹³ He gave the following reasons for the Bolshevik coup:

Because of the interference of the Workers' and Soldiers' Soviets [lao bing tuan 劳兵团], the proclaimed republican system of Mr. Kerensky could not be established. The Soviets called for: (1) the fixing of a democratic republican system; (2) the abolition of land tenure, and the granting of land and necessary agricultural commodities to the peasants; and (3) the ceding of all power over production and distribution to the labourers.¹⁴

According to Zhang, these policies could not be implemented by Kerensky because they conflicted with the interests of his supporters--the zhongchan jieji 中产阶级 (lit. "middle propertied class"). On the other hand, the Soviets, which were controlled by the Bolsheviks, could implement them because they were supported by the xiaceng jieji 下层阶级 (lit. "lower class").

After the revolution Lenin, the Bolshevik leader, brought out three major policies:

- (1) the new government would order the end of the war;
 - (2) land would be distributed to the peasants;
 - (3) . . . the domestic economic crisis would be resolved.
- He also proclaimed to the Soviets of all areas that political power would be granted to the Radical Faction.

. . .¹⁵

These policies, Zhang wrote, reflected the Bolshevik's underlying philosophy of "extreme egalitarianism" (jidian zhi junfuzhuyi 极端之均富主义 lit. "average wealthism"), and had developed out of the Russian socialist movement which wanted to end landlord oppression of the peasantry.¹⁶

While Zhang accurately listed Bolshevik policies, and even suggested that the upheavals of February and October were

revolutions supported by different classes, he did not point out that Bolshevism claimed to be Marxist. Furthermore, his categorization of the Bolsheviks as "extreme egalitarians" did not differentiate Bolshevism from anarchism.

In February 1918, Dongfang Zazhi added that "Lenin's Faction" was part of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party which had the slogan "Labourers of All Countries Unite."¹⁷ In March, the same journal described the Bolshevik programme as "the establishment of radical socialism resembling anarchism."¹⁸ Such descriptions, coupled with general ignorance of Marxism, if anything, generated further confusion concerning the differences between Bolshevism and anarchism.

In April, Dongfang Zazhi published an article entitled "The Evolution of the Russian Socialist Movement", which described the Bolsheviks as one of the two factions of the "Russian Social Democratic Party".¹⁹ According to this article, the principles of the Social Democratic Party, as stated by Plekhanov in its manifesto, were:

The supporters of despotism are the ignorant, incompetent [wuzhi wuneng 无知无能] peasants. The main force of the revolution is therefore the industrial labourer and not the peasants. The seizure of political power by the labourers can prevent reaction. Because the labourers must first grasp real political power the success of the revolution lies in the consciousness [zijue] of the labourers.²⁰

The Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks split over how this consciousness should be developed:

According to Mr Plekhanov, although the consciousness of the labourer is a logical premise [qiantian 前提], this consciousness has an appropriate sequence. If the revolution is foolishly pushed forward, this sequence will be destroyed. Further, during the period of the realization of ideals [lixiang 理想], the advocates of

radicalism must be opposed. This led to a conflict with Mr. Lining 李守 [Lenin] in the 1903 Congress which was won by the Lining Faction. From then on the Lining Faction was known as the Bolsheviks [duoshu pai 多数派, lit. "Majority Faction"] and the Plekhanov Faction as the Mensheviks [shaoshu pai 少数派, lit. "Minority Faction"].²¹

By the spring of 1918, it was evident that the October Revolution was a radical departure from previous revolutions. Published descriptions of the revolution's "radical" measures showed that its objective was not simply a change in government, but the fundamental transformation of the relations of power and property which existed in Russia.

It was also evident that Bolshevism was based upon a developed theory of revolution which held that industrial labourers were the main revolutionary force. Where other classes, particularly peasants, fit into this theory remained to be described.

The extent of the Bolshevik Revolution's departure from earlier revolutions was best seen when it was compared to the French Revolution. "The Evolution of the Russian Socialist Movement" suggested that the difference between the two revolutions was that

The Russian Revolution has a very social revolutionary colouration. You probably say that during the time of the French Revolution communism already existed. This cannot be denied, but the tenets of modern socialism and the communism of that time are completely different. Although the French Revolution appeared to be similar to today's social revolution, the appearance of socialist revolution, in fact begins with today's Russian revolution.²²

In the first article which was written after the Bolshevik Revolution solely devoted to a comparison of the two revolutions,²³ Li Dazhao also described the Bolshevik Revolution

as a "social revolution".²⁴ In "A Comparison of the Russian and French Revolutions", Li argued that the French Revolution was "a political revolution with a social revolutionary colouration", while the Bolshevik Revolution was "a social revolution [shehui geming 社会革命] that definitely has a world revolutionary colouration." The former was a "nationalist revolution", while the latter was a "socialist revolution".²⁵

The fact that Marxism was the ideological basis of this "social revolution" was not well established until the first anniversary of the October Revolution. It wasn't until November 1918, for example, that Li Dazhao linked Bolshevism and Marxism. In "The Victory of 'Bolshevism'",²⁶ published in Xin Qingnian, he described Bolshevism as follows:

Their 'ism' is that of revolutionary socialism. Their party is a revolutionary socialist party. They follow the German socialist Makeshi [马塞士] ('Marx'). Their objective is to destroy the modern limits on socialism of state boundaries, to destroy the capitalist system in which production only benefits individuals.²⁷

Even then, Li was more interested in Bolshevik institutions than in Marxist philosophy. This is evident in the rest of his description of Bolshevism.

They [the Bolsheviks] advocate that all men and women should work, that all working men and women should organize and enter into coalitions [lianhe 联合],²⁸ that each coalition should have a central ruling assembly, that these assemblies should organize all of the governments of the world. . . There will be no rulers, but there will be the assemblies of the worker's coalitions. Everything will be subject to their decisions. All productive enterprises will be owned by the workers of that enterprise, other than this there will be no rights of ownership. They will unite together the unpropertied common people [wuchan shumin 无产阶级] of the whole world, take their greatest strongest power of opposition and create a free country, and first create a European Democratic Union making it the basis for a World Union. This is the 'ism' of

'Bolsheviki'. This is the new creed of the twentieth century.³⁰

In other words, Li felt that what the system of soviets, not Marxism, was the most attractive element of Bolshevism.

In February 1919, Li's fascination with the soviet system led him to propose it as the form of social and political organization best suited to the needs of the modern world. In "Unionism and World Organization",³¹ Li proposed the Russian soviet system as the institutional model for both China and the rest of the world. He wrote that the Russian and German revolutions had created "a new kind of organization". According to Li,

This new organization is a new union [lianhe 联合], which increases the old organization one level, because each kind of individual, social, state, ethnic, and global, life has produced all kinds of new demands which cannot be adapted to, or satisfied by, the old organization.³²

In essence Li thought he was proposing a system of autonomous soviets extending from the local to the international level.³³

However, most intellectuals were not even interested in the system of soviets. They were interested in Bolshevism because it had produced a new kind of revolution--"social revolution".

The word "social" (shehui) in the term "social revolution" is not the result of confusion with the word "socialist" (shuhuizhuyi 社会主义) in the term "socialist revolution" (shehuizhuyi geming 社会主义革命). This is evident in both "The Evolution of the Russian Socialist Movement", and in Li's "A Comparison of the Russian and French Revolutions"

which were the first works to use the terms. Both used two completely different terms--shehuizhuyi geming and shehui

geming. The Bolshevik Revolution was simultaneously "social" and "socialist". Li opposed "social revolution" to "political revolution", and "socialist revolution" to "nationalist revolution". The term "social revolution" apparently referred to revolutions that sought changes in social or class structures, while "political revolutions" referred to changes in political structures or ruling elites, such as that involved in the 1911 Chinese Revolution. However, the use of the term "social revolution" to describe the Bolshevik Revolution suggests the extent of the confusion with respect to Bolshevism and anarchism. "Social revolution" was the anarchist term for the revolution that they wished to create.³⁴

The distinction between "social" and "political" revolutions was maintained by intellectuals of various political inclinations. There were those who agreed with Li Dazhao that the Bolshevik Revolution had unleashed "a tide of social revolution. . .[which]. . .must fill the world".³⁵ In the beginning of 1919, for example, a contributor to Xin Chao wrote,

Countries of Europe and China rise up in social revolution! Revolution of the Russian type has already reached Germany. From now on, revolutions of the French type--political revolutions--have, for the most part, become things of the past. Revolutions of the Russian type will spread everywhere.³⁶

Those who rejected social revolution as a premature solution to China's problems, also accepted the distinction between political and social revolutions. In May 1919, for example, a contributor to Meizhou Pinglun pointed out in "The Evils of the

Gentry Class" that there were two types of revolutions in history--French-style "political revolutions" in which the bourgeoisie" (youchan zhe jieji 有产者阶级 lit. "propertied class") overthrew "the aristocratic class" (guizu jieji 贵族阶级) and Russian-style "social revolutions" of "the proletariat" (wuchan zhe jieji 无产者阶级, lit. "unpropertied class") against "the bourgeoisie". China, the article continued, was not ready for "social revolution" because the 1911 "political revolution" had only overthrown the Emperor. China's equivalent of "the aristocratic class", "the gentry class" (shi daifu jieji 士大夫阶级) was still in power. China first had to complete her "political revolution" in order to reach the age of "social revolution". The second revolution would be relatively easy to achieve because of the weakness of the domestic bourgeoisie.³⁷

Chen Duxiu, who before the May Fourth Movement did not advocate either political or social revolution in China, also admitted that the Russian Revolution was a "social revolution".³⁸

Even in far off provincial Hunan, it was argued that there was a difference between French style "political revolutions" and Russian-style "social revolutions". In July 1919, writing in "The Great Unity of the Popular Masses",³⁹ Mao Tse-tung stated,

Since the victory of "the political reform" [zhengzhi gaige 政治改革] in France in which the great union of the popular masses overcame the great union of the followers of the king, all countries have followed them giving rise to many "political reforms". Since the victory of the "social reform" [shehui gaige 社会改革] in Russia last year, in which the great union of the popular masses overcame the great union of the aristocrats, and capitalists, countries like Hungary, Austria, Czechoslovakia and Germany, have followed it

giving rise to many "social reforms". Although its victory is not yet complete, it is conceivable not only that it will be completed but that it will spread throughout the world.⁴⁰

It is evident that Chinese intellectuals widely accepted the view that the Bolshevik Revolution was a new kind of revolution--"a social revolution", a kind of revolution which was substantially different from those of the past. At the same time, however, the mere fact that Chinese intellectuals used the term "social revolution" to describe Bolshevism suggests that they saw the revolution in the light of a non-Marxist philosophy--anarchism. To the Chinese, Bolshevism resembled anarchism because they were profoundly ignorant of Bolshevism's real ideological basis--Marxism.

2. China: The Necessity of "Social Revolution"

Within a few months of the Bolshevik Revolution, it was apparent that the world would never be the same, that the influence of Bolshevism would extend far beyond the borders of Russia. By early 1919, some intellectuals, most notably Li Dazhao, were becoming increasingly sympathetic to the Bolshevik Revolution. Bolshevism was seen as the solution to many of the problems that afflicted China. This perception of the situations in Russia and China led to repeated calls for Bolshevik-style "social revolution" in China.

In April 1918, "The Evolution of the Russian Socialist Movement" called the revolution "the most important event in the history of world civilization",⁴¹ while Li Dazhao added in June that

History is the record of common psychological expression. . . The French Revolution was not only an indication of the transformation of the sentiment of the the French people, but in fact was an indication of the the transformation of the common human psychology of the nineteenth century. The Russian Revolution is not only a sign of the transformation of the sentiment of the Russian people, but in fact is a clear sign of the transformation of common human psychological expression of the twentieth century.⁴²

By the summer of 1918, Li was sympathetic to the Bolshevik Revolution, but had not wholeheartedly accepted Bolshevism as the solution to China's problems. Li was not to recognize Bolshevism as the possible solution to Chinese problems until Bolshevik-style revolutions occurred in Austria and Germany.

In "The Victory of the Common People",⁴³ published in November, 1918, Li Dazhao pointed out that the defeat of Germany was not "the victory of the force of arms of the Allies; it is that of the new spirit of mankind." Politically, the surrender of Germany was the defeat of "Pan__ism" (da __ zhuyi 大__主义) and militarism. Socially it was the victory of democracy and of "the common people" (shumin). It was "the defeat of capitalism and the victory of labourism [laogongzhuyi 劳工主义]."⁴⁴

Li gave the following analysis of the war:

. . . The real reason for this war was the development of capitalism. Its productive forces [shengchan li 生产力] could no longer be contained within the boundaries of a state. The capitalist governments relied on war to establish world empires centred in their own countries so as to establish an economic organization which serves the interests of their domestic capitalist classes.⁴⁵

While the competing interests of the capitalist classes of the different powers had started the war,

The labour societies [laodong shehui 劳动社会] of Russia, Germany, and other countries, first saw through [the capitalists'] ambitions, and during the war rose up in social revolution, and repressed the capitalist governments' war.⁴⁶

In "The Victory of 'Bolshevism'", also published at this time, Li restated his view that the Allied victory was not the result of armed force.

Rather, it is the victory of German socialism over German militarism. . . . [It] is the victory of humanism; the victory of peaceful ideology; the victory of common right; the victory of socialism; the victory of 'Bolshevism'.⁴⁷

The Bolsheviks denounced the war as the Czar's, the Kaiser's, and the capitalists', and not that of the people.

. . . [The Bolsheviks'] war is class war; that is a war alongside the world unpropertied common people [wuchan shumin 无产阶级] against world capitalism.⁴⁸

In Li's view, the Bolshevik Revolution had unleashed an international tide of social revolution.⁴⁹ This view was widely shared at the beginning of 1919 as calls for revolution were made. In January, 1919, Xin Chao wrote that Bolshevik-style revolution was spreading throughout the world and called upon the people of China "to rise up in social revolution".⁵⁰

In February, the student journal, Guomin, expressed similar views:

The tide of new thought which started in Russia has reached Germany; its ripples are covering the Atlantic and Pacific and are even reaching our Asia.⁵¹

This "tide" was resulting in the creation of labourers' governments throughout the world.

. . . Russia and Germany have not only overthrown their uncaring bureaucrats, but have set up a labourer's government. If England, France, America, Italy, all have

a labour organization, the new world of the twentieth century will be put into effect, labourer's governments will cover the world.⁵²

Meizhou Pinglun joined the call for "international revolution" in an article published in February 1919.

The nineteenth century French people were not able to bear the authority [qiangguan] of the aristocrats, and accordingly rose up in domestic revolution. In the twentieth century, the people of all weak countries are unable to bear the authority of the strong countries, and will accordingly rise up in an international revolution. The object of revolution is authority. The hope of revolution is freedom.

No matter the level of development of politics in each country today, there is only one kind of authority on top of its people. Our China is even more pitiful. Aside from domestic authority, there is every kind of international authority. Domestic authority is further split up into the authority of the north and that of the south. Three kinds of authority are fixed upon the heads of our people. If we wish to abolish authority we must abolish all three.⁵³

By April 1919, sympathy for the Bolshevik Revolution on the part of the nationalist press was readily apparent. Guomin Ribao, the Guomindang organ, for example, published "Russia under the Rule of the Workers' and Peasants' Government--the Truth about Carrying out Social Communism,"⁵⁴ which favourably compared the situation in Russia with that in China. In terms of education, the system of land tenure, elections, government organization, social mobilization, production, unemployment insurance, military affairs, and sexual equality, it found Russia far superior to China.⁵⁵

On the eve of the May Fourth Movement even Chen Duxiu grudgingly admitted that

Contemporaries of the political revolutions of eighteenth century France, and the social revolution of twentieth century Russia severely cursed them; but later

historians will make them the keys to the transformation of human society and advancement.⁵⁶

Not all intellectuals shared this enthusiasm for the Bolshevik Revolution. Most still clung to the view that the solution to China's problems lay with the Western Allies. The much reprinted views of Cai Yuanpei were an example of this attitude towards the Allies. In his article, "The Great War and Philosophy", Cai suggested that, "the Great War in Europe is the most important world event since the French Revolution."⁵⁷ Just as the French Revolution had created an influential philosophy-- democracy, so had the First World War. In fact, the war was one of contending philosophies.

First is Nietzsche's philosophy of authoritarianism [qiangquanzhuyi 强权主义]. I will use Germany's principles as proof of this. Second is Tolstoy's philosophy of non-resistance [wu dikangzhuyi 无抵抗主义]. I will use the principles of the Russian Radical Faction as proof of this. Third is Kropotkin's philosophy of mutual aid [huzhu 互助]. I will use the Allies as proof of this.⁵⁸

Although he admitted that there were some differences between the Bolsheviks and Tolstoy, Cai said,

The leaders of the Radical Faction, Lining ('Lenine'), etc., embraced communism, just like Tolstoy, and naturally embraced non-resistance. Therefore, they separately talked peace with Germany and were unwilling to make war together with the Allies.⁵⁹

Cai concluded his discussion by suggesting that the victory of the Allies, who had co-operated with each other, proved that mutual-aid was the best of the three philosophies.⁶⁰

"The Great War and Philosophy" reveals the ambivalence that most intellectuals involved in the New Culture Movement felt towards the Bolshevik Revolution before May 4, 1919.

Although the article is dated June 1918 in Cai's collected works, it was reprinted at least twice in early 1919.⁶¹ A similar article with the same title appears in the November 1919 issue of Xin Qingnian.⁶² This suggests that editors liked to use Cai's article to refute Li Dazhao's view that the Bolsheviks were the real victors of the war. And yet, the article contains gross ideological distortions of the principles of the new government in Russia, and, for that matter, those of the Allies. It goes without saying that there are substantial differences between Tolstoy's Utopian socialism and the communism of the Bolsheviks. Tolstoy would have accepted neither the dictatorship of the proletariat nor violent revolution. It is equally doubtful that Kropotkin would have seriously argued that the Triple Entente was a "proof" of the superiority of mutual aid.

If Cai's article was indeed written in June, then his equation of Bolshevism with the utopian socialism of Tolstoy was excusable. Indeed, given the rather primitive analysis of Bolshevism that existed at that time, his identification of Bolshevism with "communism" was a significant advancement. But this would not account for the article's reproduction.

As has been remarked above, most intellectuals associated with the New Culture Movement supported the Western Allies. Cai was no exception. The fact that he was the keynote speaker at the November rally in Tiananmen square, which celebrated the Allied victory,⁶³ suggests that he was one of the chief partisans of the Allied cause. He must, therefore, have viewed Russia's separate peace with Germany as a disaster.

Furthermore, Cai held the view, shared by other New

Culture intellectuals including Li Dazhao, that education, not the putchism prevalent in Chinese revolutionary politics at the time, was the solution to China's problems.⁶⁴ Thus he would naturally be distrustful of the revolution in Russia.

Even then Cai's critique of Bolshevism was remarkably gentle. His thesis was that mutual aid (i.e the Allied cause) was more effective than non-resistance (i.e. Bolshevism) and not that the former was somehow morally superior to the latter. His equation of Bolshevism and the non-violence of the sainted Tolstoy was in effect a statement that Bolshevism was not all that bad. Furthermore, his analysis enabled him to explain the Russian withdrawal from the war without having to condemn it.

Thus not even Cai Yuanpei was willing to reject Bolshevism out of hand. Other intellectuals agreed that "social revolution" was inevitable in China but argued that the time was not yet ripe. This was the position taken in "The Reasons for the Lack of Success of China's Political Revolution and the Non-Occurrence of Social Revolution",⁶⁵ which was published in the April, 1919, Dongfang Zazhi. According to this article, political and social revolutions had been successful in Europe because they had united knowledge and action.⁶⁶ Society evolved through three stages. In the first stage labour was individual. Those whose military abilities, and those whose "knowledge power" (zhili 知力), were better than the social average became the aristocratic and intellectual classes respectively. As the aristocrats came to share the knowledge of the intellectuals, the two classes become a single class.

Society became organized into the two classes of the rulers and the ruled. The aristocratic class [quizu

jieji 贵族阶级] and the intellectual class [zhishi jieji 知识阶级] combined together becoming the ruling class [zhi zhe jieji 治者阶级]. The labouring class became the ruled class [beizhi zhe jieji 被治者阶级].⁶⁷

Eventually property appeared. This resulted in the "Political Revolution" and the second stage in which an intellectual class once again came into existence. Intellectuals' knowledge allowed them to invent new methods of producing property, or allowed them to manage existing enterprises more efficiently, thus they joined the ranks of the propertied class. Again,

Society became organized into the two classes of the managers and the managed. The propertied class [caichan jieji 财产阶级] and the intellectual class combined together to form the managing class [zhipei jieji 支配阶级]. The labouring class becomes the managed class [bei zhipei jieji 被支配阶级].⁶⁸

But property accumulated in the hands of the few, thus,

The middle class [zhongdeng jieji 中等阶级] which possessed property or knowledge, or those who had lost their property, or those who owned little property, were unable to preserve their lives, and could only enter the labouring world. This was the labourization [laodonghua 劳动化] of the intellectual class.⁶⁹

Meanwhile the labouring class, because of the spread of education, had become educated and its consciousness had been awakened. Workers and intellectuals, therefore would unite together and bring about the "social revolution" and the third period in which classes would be abolished and equality and freedom realized.⁷⁰

The article went on to point out that Europe and America were in the third stage while China was still in the second stage. Therefore China had not yet reached the stage of social revolution.⁷¹ This position--that social revolution was

inevitable but not immanent--was also taken by Meizhou Pinglun in "The Evils of the Gentry Class" published in May, 1919.⁷²

After the news reached Peking that the Western Allies did not intend to honour their propaganda about "democracy" and "national self-determination", the view that a major transformation of Chinese society was inevitable and necessary became widely held. In July 1919, Mao Tse-tung pointed out that social transformation was spreading throughout the world. The key to this transformation, he argued, was the establishment of unions of people, and unions of unions--thus echoing the position that his sometime teacher, Li Dazhao, had put forward in February of the same year.⁷³ Li himself argued for social transformation during this period. In the summer of 1919, he wrote in "Class Competition and Mutual Aid"⁷⁴ that "the spirit of mutual aid" was in complete contradiction with the existing "social organization". Therefore, to preserve the spirit of mutual aid, "class competition" had to be used.⁷⁵ In "Again on Problems and 'Isms'" he argued that the study of "isms" was essential to bringing about the fundamental transformation of social organization.⁷⁶ His views were shared by his fellow Marxist Zhou Fuhai who also identified two kinds of revolutions--political and social, and advocated the latter in China.⁷⁷

In September 1919, Jiefang yu Gaizao ("The Emancipation and Reconstruction Weekly"), the Jinbudang organ, recorded the following historical phenomena in its Manifesto:

At the very beginning of the history of civilization, the aristocratic class [guizu jieji 贵族阶级] got power. Later the market-merchant class [shishang jieji 市商阶级] (BOURGEOISIE) arose with the constitutional

movement thus getting power. Today the peasant-worker class [nonggong jieji 农工阶级] (PROLETARIAT) is arising and must inevitably attain power.⁷⁸

The manifesto went on to say that social transformation should be brought about by "all classes and nations" uniting together for the "common happiness of humanity".⁷⁹

By November 1919, the view was well established that a major social transformation was immanent. An example of this view can be found in "The Second Stage of World Transformation" which was published in the November 1919 issue of Dongfang Zazhi.⁸⁰ The first "transformation" had been the creation of the League of Nations. The second stage "will not rely upon the power of the state but will rely upon the power of the masses to fundamentally transform society." While the League of Nations had resolved the conflict between nations, it remained to resolve the conflict between "the upper class" (shangceng jieji 上层阶级) and "the lower class" (xiaceng jieji 下层阶级), between "the rich class" (fuzhe jieji 富者阶级) and "the class of the poor" (pin zhe jieji 贫者阶级), and between "the capitalist class" (ziben jieji 资本阶级) and the labouring class (laodong jieji 劳动阶级).⁸¹ The problem was that

Although the state as a unit of defense against foreign invasion, as a unit for the protection of the lives and property of the people, and as a unit of economic organization, has done a great deal for humanity, it has, at the same time, also brought the greatest misfortune upon humanity, most of which can be blamed upon the use of the state for its own ends by the upper class minority. The actions of the state in foreign affairs are determined by the opinion of part of the upper class. The people don't know this so they praise, or consent to, the interests of the state, i.e. from birth they answer the calls of the upper class, taking its interests as their own.

I dare not hope to subvert the government of every country, I dare not hope that every country will rise up

in social revolution to destroy the present order, but from now on society is advancing towards the active transformation of classes.⁸²

Therefore, the second stage of world transformation would see the abolition of classes.

The student journal Guomin also argued for "social transformation". In November 1919, one of its contributors, exhibiting the distaste that many young intellectuals felt for Chinese society, condemned it in the following terms:

What kind of society is the society of the world today? It is a society of parasitic life, a society with an advanced system of private property, a society in which warlords oppress the common people, a society in which capitalists oppress labourers, a society in which men oppress women. Alas, the society of today is a society without a path of life. It is an authoritiarian (qiangquan 强权) society that lacks reason. It is a society of evil spirits, darkness, a merciless heaven and of inhumanity.⁸³

The basic problem of this inhumane society lay in the relationship between labour and capital.

Let's look at the situation within today's society. The average labourer, who works more than twelve hours a day until hands and feet are calloused, sweats to produce everything. The bread earned by this labour is barely enough to avoid starving to death. The wages earned today are only enough for today's food. The wages earned tomorrow are only enough for tomorrow's clothes. When an unexpected event, such as drought and natural disaster or plague, happens, they cannot work and must sit awaiting death by starvation. The capitalists own banks, factories, and land, and are very rich. In business they add profit on top of profit, as landlords they use land to buy more land. They expend a few very low wages to hire countless workers to produce for them, thus reaping their profits several times over. They use this cleverly deceitful method of living to fulfil their parasitic lives. . . . The ordinary labourer becomes a labour machine whose sons and daughters become the slaves of the capitalist.⁸⁴

According to Guomin the source of this inequity was private

property.

This palpable distaste for the existing social order, was also evident in other journals. The November 1919 manifesto of Zhuguang, said,

Those of us who live in modern Chinese society, feel that the air all around us is dark and foul as if we were in the inner most circle of hell. How can it stay like this without being reformed and remain a human society? Therefore, we are not at peace with life today and wish to create a new life, we are not content with society today and wish to create a new society.⁸⁵

In December 1919, Xiaonian Shehui saw social transformation as the key to the realization of democracy

In our country, evil bureaucrats have political power, warlords have military power, capitalists have economic power. It is really unfair that this gang of people sacrifices the happiness of a majority for their own happiness even though they are a minority. A class like this is a social disease. If we want society to be healthy, we must move towards democracy, . . . in which case we must overthrow the evil bureaucrats, destroy the warlords, control the capitalists, in a word, eradicate classes, and work for the equality of all.⁸⁶

On the eve of the May Fourth Incident, sympathy for the Bolshevik Revolution was readily apparent on the part of some intellectuals. It seemed as if the millenia was at hand and that Bolshevik-style "social revolution" would soon unfold in China. Even those who rejected "social revolution" as premature given Chinese conditions, acknowledged that in the long run it was not only inevitable, but desirable.

Thus, it is evident that by the end of 1919 the Bolshevik Revolution was seen as a radical departure from previous revolutions. At the same time, Bolshevik-style "social revolution" was seen by at least some intellectuals as the

solution to Chinese social and political problems. This perception of Bolshevism as the solution to Chinese problems would shortly lead to the beginnings of the Chinese communist movement which would define Bolshevik "social revolution" as its objective, and Russia as its model. The basis of this perception that Bolshevism as a methodology of revolution could be directly applied to China was the belief that the social, economic and political conditions of China and pre-Bolshevik Russia were sufficiently similar as to be almost identical. This belief in the similarity of Russian and Chinese society would result in what was, in effect, the mechanical application of the Bolshevik model of communist revolution, in so far as the early Chinese communists understood it, to Chinese conditions. This meant that the early Chinese communists were totally unaware of the strategic problems they would encounter on the way to their victory. For the time being, their path of revolution was clear--that taken by the Bolsheviks in Russia. They could even justify the use of this path in China, on the grounds that it had worked in Russia.

After November 1918, Chinese intellectuals knew that Marxism, not anarchism, was the theoretical basis of Bolshevism, But they knew next to nothing of Marxism. This ignorance of Marxism had earlier led them to herald the Bolshevik Revolution as the anarchist millenium--the "social revolution". Now they found themselves in the odd position of having to learn more about Marxism if they were to bring about anarchism's much desired "social revolution".

Chapter Two

Marxism: Ideas, Property and Class Struggle

1. The Description of Marxism, 1919-1920

During the year between the publication of Xin Qingnian's "Special Issue on Marxism" in May 1919, and the publication of the first complete translation of The Communist Manifesto in April 1920, Marxist thought became widely disseminated in China. But Marxism did not have an immediate revolutionary impact upon the fundamental world-view of the Chinese intellectual. Intellectuals' understandings of Marxism were at best superficial, and were consequently contaminated by the non-Marxist ideas and theories already well known in China. This contamination was no less evident on the part of those who considered themselves to be Marxists than on the part of non-Marxists. Those who tried to apply Marx's materialist conception of history to the history of Chinese thought confused historical materialism with economic determinism, and in effect continued to hold to an idealist interpretation of history. The theory of surplus value was reduced to the anarchist position that Marx held that "property is theft". Class struggle was seen as one amongst many methods of bringing about social revolution. Chinese Marxists remained completely unaware of the complexity of class struggle in China, and in effect mechanically applied the European model of struggle between two classes to their own society.

As it became apparent that the Russian Revolution was no ordinary political upheaval, Chinese intellectuals became

interested in the philosophy of Karl Marx. Since the Bolsheviks were carrying out a Marxist revolution in a country whose economy, like that of China, was backwards, Marxism ceased to be a political philosophy that was only "relevant to the advanced societies of the West", and the way was clear for Chinese intellectuals, in their search for solutions to the problems which afflicted their society, to study Marxism.¹

Interest in Marxism was evident by April 1919. The April 1919 issue of Dongfang Zazhi published an outline of Marx's philosophy of "scientific socialism".² This outline listed Marx's theories as the economic interpretation of history, surplus value, and class struggle (jiejì zhì zhànzhēng 阶级之战争, lit. "class war") on the one hand, and the concentration of capital on the other,³ but the article did not describe these theories.

At the beginning of April, Meizhou Pinglun translated the section of The Communist Manifesto which outlines the immediate measures to be taken by a communist government once it gets into power.⁴ Such measures as the abolition of land tenure and the creation of a state bank must have sounded familiar to readers of this translation, for these were measures which they knew had already been taken by the Bolshevik government.

The most detailed description of Marxism before May 1919 was also published in April, in Meizhou Pinglun. "Anarchist Communism and State Socialism"⁵ compared the theories of Kropotkin and Marx. It gave the following description of Kropotkin's theory of mutual-aid:

Mutual-aid anarchism [As opposed to other schools of anarchism] is organized, positive, and constructive. It

seeks the overthrow of the extremely sorrowful society of today, creating in its place a fortunate new society. On the negative side, mutual-aid anarchism opposes all forms of authority [qiangguan 强权], whether that of the state, religion, society, or the family. In terms of its positive aspect, it seeks the creation of an extremely egalitarian society based upon mutual-aid. . . . In other words, [Kropotkin's] organizational idea departs from the authoritarian political rule of the minority and establishes autonomous bodies [zizhi tuanti 自治团体] appropriate to human existence without being burdened by a large state. In terms of economic organization, [he] advocates that organs of production (like land, machinery, etc.) and products (like agriculture produce, housing, etc.) should be communally owned by these social bodies, establishing a communal society [gongchan di shehui 共产的社会] based on the principle of from each according to his ability, to each according to his need.⁶

The article then found that Marxism was remarkably similar to Kropotkinism.

[Marxism] advocates class war which will see the labourers overthrow the capitalists, and themselves organize a government which controls all productive organs and centralizes control over transportation and communications. Because [it] makes much of the importance of the state, and makes political power very important, in terms of organizational ideas, it is completely different from the mutual-aid anarchism explained above. In terms of economic ideas, it advocates collective productionism--that is public ownership of the organs of production and private ownership of the things produced except for that which can be a means of production. . . .⁷

The article concluded:

. . . Mutual-aid anarchism and state socialism, are fundamentally dissimilar in terms of their political ideas. Since they both hold that organs of production, and products which can become means of production, should be publicly owned, they are in complete agreement in terms of their economic ideas.⁸

Even though Marxism and anarchism had fundamentally different approaches to revolution even if their goals appeared essentially the same, Chinese intellectuals saw anarchism and

Marxism as closely-related schools of socialist thought. Afterall, both claimed to be "scientific" and both sought "social revolution".

Confusion between anarchism and communism can be seen in the first detailed discussion of Marxism after the Russian Revolution--the "Special Issue on Marxism" of Xin Qingnian which was published under the editorial direction of Li Dazhao. The May 1919 issue of Xin Qingnian presented eight articles on Marxism: "Marx's Theory" by Gu Mengyu;⁹ "A Criticism of Marx's Theory" by Ling Shuang;¹⁰ "My Marxist Views" by Li Dazhao ;¹¹ Two biographies of Marx;¹² "Marx's Materialist Conception of History and the Problem of Female Virtue" by Chen Baoyin,¹³ which was an attempt to apply Marx's theory of historical stages to an analysis of "female virtue"; and "Marx's Materialist Conception of History", a translation from the Japanese of an article by the Marxist scholar Kawakami Hajime.¹⁴ The eighth article was a biography of Bakunin which suggests that even Li Dazhao, who claimed to be a Marxist by this time, was ignorant of the differences which separate anarchism and communism. The articles in the May 1919 Xin Qingnian were mainly academic elucidations of Marxist philosophy--i.e of the materialist conception of history, the theory of surplus value, and class struggle. Since distortions of Marx's philosophy which did occur in these elucidations tended to be made by everyone, there is no evidence of deliberate distortions of Marxism on the part of the anarchist contributors to this issue.

Xin Qingnian's commentaries on Marxism included a number of excerpts from Marx's own works, The Communist Manifesto, "A

Preface to A Contribution to a Critique of Political Economy", the preface to Capital, and The Poverty of Philosophy.¹⁵ The same excerpts from these works were translated and re-translated during the next months. For example, the same passages from The Communist Manifesto were presented by Li Dazhao in "My Marxist Views" and by Kawakami Hajime in the May 1919 issue of Xin Qingnian, as were presented by Hu Hanmin in "A Criticism of the Criticism of the Materialist Conception of History"¹⁶ which was published in the November 1919 issue of Jianshe. Hu's article also excerpted the "Preface to A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy", The Holy Family, The Poverty of Philosophy, Wage, Labour and Capital, "The 18th Brumaire of Louis-Napoleon, and the preface to Capital."

After May 1919, Marx's own pamphlet, Wage, Labour and Capital, was published in the Jinbudang newspaper, Chen Bao between May 6, and June 1, 1919.¹⁷ Karl Kautsky's commentary on Capital, The Economic Doctrines of Karl Marx, was published in the same journal from June 2, to November 11, 1919, as well as in Jianshe from November 1919 to July 1920.¹⁸ A Chinese translation of Kautsky's The Class Struggle was also published in late 1919.¹⁹

Interest in Marx and Marxism culminated with the publication, in April 1920, of the first complete Chinese translation of The Communist Manifesto. The fact that this translation was made by an anarchist, Chen Wangdao, is indicative of intellectuals' eclectic approach to theories of revolution.

2. The Materialist Conception of History

During the New Culture Movement, the Chinese intellectual world was dominated by the theme that ideas were the keys to social transformation. Bankrupt Confucianism was to be replaced with modern ideals of "science" and "democracy". Ideas reflected in a new and popular culture were to lift the Chinese masses out of their backwardness. Marx's materialist conception of history was the direct opposite of the New Culture's fundamentally idealist world-view. According to Marx, social change causes conceptual change, and not the other way around. Consequently Confucianism was bankrupt because Chinese social structures had been altered by Western capitalism. Xin Qingnian's anti-Confucian polemics, therefore, did not defeat Confucianism, but merely reflected the fact that Confucian ideology no longer conformed to the needs of Chinese society.

Given the New Culture prejudice for ideas, it was not surprising that Gu Mengyu went to great pains to point out in his article in the May 1919 Xin Qingnian that

"The Materialist Conception of History" definitely does not negate the function of ideals [lixiang 理想]. No matter whether it is in the past, or the future, man's social ideals may be the immediate cause of the reform of law and the reform of social structure. However, man's ideals of good and evil do not exist independently of the material world. . . . These ideals are not the final cause of social evolution, but are a kind of reflection [yingzi 影子] of social economy.²⁰

It is also not surprising that interest in ideas, and their relationship to social economy, dominated the first attempts to use the materialist conception of history as a tool of historical analysis.

The first attempt to make use of the principle that

"social being determines consciousness" was published in the May Xin Qingnian. Chen Baoying's article, "Marx's Materialist Conception of History and the Problem of Female Virtue", applied the materialist conception of history to the development of social ethics, particularly to the concept of "female virtue".²¹

Chen suggested that history could be divided into four stages. In the first stage, because there were relatively few human beings, nature was able to supply the needs of humanity directly. There was no need for work, nor for human action upon nature. This period, therefore, had a "natural" as opposed to "artificial" social ethic. Gradually, as the population grew, nature was no longer able to supply the needs of humanity. In this, the second stage, work appeared. Because most people did not have any experience with work, they did not wish to work. Relatively intelligent people skilled in the martial arts established "an artificial morality of absolute submission to coerce the weak and foolish to work and thus produce the material means of life."²² This stage saw the development of a morality of complete submission. In the third period, production was once again unable to meet the needs of the population. This stage required the use of more labour, and its method of production was much more complex than that of the second period. Therefore, the absolute coercion of labour was ineffective. In order to get humanity to produce with its entire strength and in more complicated ways, it was necessary to create a morality which would "cause people to have a mind that desired to work." Therefore this stage saw the development of a morality of individual initiative and individual benefit. But once again

population growth outstripped production. This led to the fourth period in which it had become necessary "to calculate the situation as a whole and carry out distribution on the largest scale."²³ The morality of this period was that of collectivism, mutual aid and socialism. Chen then outlined society's attitudes towards women in each period.

It is immediately apparent that Chen's rather fanciful outline of history reduces the materialist conception of history to Malthus' thesis of population pressures. While Malthus was in some ways a primitive historical materialist, his thesis fell substantially short of Marx's view that ideas are determined by the manner in which a society produces its means of material existence. It is also evident that Ch'en's four stages are not Marx's four modes of production--primitive communism, slave society, feudalism, and capitalism. Chen did not seem to be aware of these modes. In fact, Chen's stages were essentially the same as those outlined by Kropotkin in Mutual Aid.²⁴ This suggests that there was a tendency to confuse Marx's approach to history with decidedly non-Marxist approaches.

This tendency can also be seen in the first attempts to apply the materialist conception of history directly to Chinese history. Once again, these attempts-- Hu Hanmin's "Materialist Researches on the History of Chinese Philosophy" and Li Dazhao's "An Economic Explanation of the Recent Ideological Changes in China"--focused on ideas.²⁵ These two works, along with an earlier essay by Dai Jitao,²⁶ were the first attempts to apply historical materialism to Chinese history.

"Materialist Researches on the History of Chinese

Philosophy" argued that social relations could not be in contradiction with the means of production, that ideas are determined by previous knowledge and the material conditions of social life, and that these determine the thought of a period. Since the major problem in Chinese thought was that of "practical virtue" (daode 道德), Hu analysed the evolution of "practical virtue" and found that changes in philosophical systems were the result of economic disorder.²⁷

According to Hu, the philosophies of Confucius, Lao Tzu, and Mo tzu, were all responses to the economic chaos caused by the destruction of primitive communal society--the well field system--which resulted in a shortage of land and wars between states. Subsequent changes in philosophy were also responses to economic disorder, but they had to stay within the limits established by these first philosophies.²⁸

Li Dazhao took a similar approach in January 1920. Writing in "An Economic Explanation of Recent Ideological Changes in China", he suggested that traditional China was an agricultural society based on the extended family system. The ideology of this system was Confucianism. However, under the impact of Western imperialism, this system was being destroyed:

. . .China's agricultural economy cannot withstand the oppression of foreign industrial economy, her cottage industry cannot withstand the oppression of foreign factory industry, her handicrafts production cannot withstand the oppression of foreign mechanized production. Most domestic industry has been destroyed, imports surpass exports, the people of the whole country are becoming part of the world unpropertied class [wuchan jieji 无产阶级], all life is filled with sorrow.²⁹

This "proletarianization" of the country by foreign capital made

the condition of China, according to Li, even more pitiable than that of the proletariat of the western countries.³⁰

Recent intellectual changes were anti-Confucian, directed against the theory and practice of the extended family. Thus,

China's labour movement is also a movement to destroy Confucian classism [jiejizhuyi 阶级主义]. The doctrine of the Confucianists always places them in the position of the ruled, becoming the sacrificial lambs of the rulers. . . . Modern economic organization raises the consciousness of the labouring class [laogang jieji 劳工阶级], according to the new demands of society, creates a new theory of "The Sanctity of Labour", which is also the necessary result of the new economic organization.³¹

Neither Li nor Hu succeeded in writing materialist history. Both reduced the materialist conception of history to economic determinism. Neither fully recognized the class nature of ideology nor the implications of Marx's view that the relationship between social groupings plays an important role in shaping historical development. Li, for example, reduced Confucianism to the ideology of the extended family system, not to the interests of the traditional ruling class. Hu, on the other hand, attributed all changes in philosophical systems to economic chaos, instead of ideological reflections of changes in the alignment of class forces. In effect, Li and Hu were still writing idealist history.

Idealism was also evident when it came to formulating the principle of historical materialism. In "Preface to A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy", Marx stated that

The mode of production of material life conditions the social, political and intellectual life-process in

general. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but on the contrary it is their social being that determines their consciousness.³²

When this principle was translated from Kawakami Hajime in the May 1919 issue of Xin Qingnian, it became,

The method of production of material life may [keyi 可以] determine all political and spiritual life processes. Man's consciousness cannot determine his life; rather man's social life may determine his consciousness.³³

This formulation suggests that social being, as well as other factors, determines consciousness. Although Li Dazhao stated "social existence determines consciousness" in "My Marxist Views" in May 1919, in December 1919 he wrote:

Material conditions and economics may [keyi 可以] determine ideology, 'isms', philosophy, religion, virtue, law, etc.³⁴

It appears that Li was not willing to accept materialism as an absolute principle. Hu Hanmin, on the other hand, was quite consistent in his usage. In October and December, 1919, he wrote, "It is not consciousness that determines life, but social life that determines consciousness."³⁵ This suggests that Hu was more willing than Li to accept the materialist conception of history as being theoretically absolute.

Li's attitude can also be seen in "Again on Problems and 'Isms'", published in August 1919. Arguing for "basic resolution" (genben jie jue 根本解决) of social problems, he wrote,

According to Marx's materialist conception of history, the laws, politics, theories and other spiritual structures of society are all superficial. Economic structures are their underlying basis. As soon as economic organization changes, they also change. In

other words, the resolution of economic problems is basic resolution. When economic problems are resolved, all problems of politics, law, the family system, the liberation of women, the liberation of workers, can be resolved.³⁶

In other words, economic change creates the conditions for the solution of social problems.

In "Materialist Researches on the History of Chinese Philosophy", which was published in late 1919, Hu Hanmin showed that his understanding of Marxism was more sophisticated than Li's. He wrote,

All social relations change with the change in the method of material life. All of the feelings, imaginings, beliefs and views of life of humanity, are based on the situation of social life. They arise from the material organization of society and the corresponding social relations.³⁷

In other words, ideas are conditioned by "social" as opposed to "economic" interactions.

Although, in practice, both Li and Hu had difficulty applying historical materialism, their works represented the first uses of Marxism to defend the New Culture Movement from its critics. The effect of Hu's "Materialist Researches on the History of Chinese Philosophy" was to show that ideologies change because of the disruption of economic systems. He wrote:

Recently as the result of international trade, China has felt the influence of the industrial revolution, and its economic oppression without being able to resist it.³⁸

China was consequently undergoing an intellectual transformation which resembled that caused by the breakdown of primitive communal economy.

In "An Economic Explanation of Recent Ideological

Changes in China", Li concluded his discussion by pointing out that the "new ideas" were not created by "a few youths out of thin air," but were reflections of material changes. Therefore, all that those who found the "new ideas" objectionable had to do was to stop economic development, restore the old system, and destroy Western capitalism.³⁹

It wasn't until after April 1920 that intellectuals like Li Dazhao turned away from this fascination with ideas and started to work towards communist revolution.

3. The Theory of Surplus Value

The theory of surplus-value was first described in Gu Mengyu's article, "Marx's Theory", in the May 1919 issue of Xin Qingnian. According to Gu, Marx held that when two commodities are exchanged, the same amount of socially averaged labour is in fact changing hands. The only thing that any two commodities have in common is that they are the result of work (gongzuo di jieguo 工作的结果).⁴⁰

Therefore, the value [jiazhi 价值] of all commodities is determined by the amount of "socially necessary" or "averaged" work necessary to manufacture it.⁴¹

In order for someone to produce a commodity, two things are necessary--tools, and the material necessities required to sustain the life of the producer. In modern society, very few people have these two requirements. Therefore, the worker must sell "work power" (gongzuo li 工作力) to the capitalist who owns the tools and other material necessities. "Work power" becomes a commodity like any other. Its value, like that of any other commodity, is the amount of "work" which goes into its creation,

i.e. the value of those commodities which are necessary to maintain the life and family of the labourer from day to day. Since the capitalist forces the labourer to work longer hours than is necessary to meet the labourer's own needs, "surplus value" is created. The capitalist, wishing to increase his surplus value, makes use of various methods to increase the amount of time the labourer works. This results in a conflict between the worker and the capitalist over the length of the working day, child labour, mechanization, etc. Because of the capitalist's desire to reap the maximum possible profit, capital becomes progressively concentrated. This results in the destruction of the small producer, and the creation of a larger working class, until the point is reached when it is easy for the working class to overthrow the capitalists."²

Gu's description of surplus value was supplemented during the next few months by translations of Wage, Labour and Capital, The Economic Doctrines of Karl Marx, and The Class Struggle. Marx wrote Wage, Labour and Capital before he had completed his critique of political economy, and before he had formulated his theory of surplus value. The principle concern of Wage, Labour and Capital was to describe "the economic relations which constitute the material foundation of the present class struggle,"³ i.e. the economic relations between labour and capital.

It therefore remained for the works of Karl Kautsky to present a description of the theory of surplus value as it was understood by Marx. The Economic Doctrines of Karl Marx ⁴ was one of the first commentaries on Capital, and is generally

considered to be accurate. The two translations of The Economic Doctrines of Karl Marx made detailed descriptions of the theory of surplus value available to Chinese readers.

Another influential work of Kautsky's which was published in 1919 was The Class Struggle (Erfurt Program),⁴⁵ Kautsky's commentary on and justification of the "Erfurt Programme" of the German Social Democratic Party. This programme was adopted at the party's congress held in Erfurt, Germany, in 1891. At the Erfurt Congress, the party abandoned violent revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat for a parliamentary electoral platform. Although Lenin later severely criticized this programme as non-Marxist, The Class Struggle did present a description of the class relations of bourgeois society in traditional Marxist terms. In particular, the first section described the origins of the capitalist mode of production, and of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

By the end of 1919, Chinese intellectuals had considerable access to Marx's theory of capitalist production. However, this access was probably not complete because of the poor quality of translations. The Economic Doctrines of Karl Marx had to be translated twice within a year; moreover the second translation, that of Dai Jitao, was from a Japanese translation of an English translation of the original German.⁴⁶ Since both translations were only partial, it is likely that much was lost in these translations.

The partial nature of these translations contributed to a relatively vague understanding of the theory of surplus value. Like their understanding of the materialist conception of

history, intellectuals' understanding of the theory of surplus value was coloured by non-Marxist economic theories--in this case by anarchism.

This contamination can readily be seen in "A Report on Socialism" which was published from September, to November 1919, in Dongfang Zazhi.⁴⁷ "A Report on Socialism" was essentially interested in presenting a critique of Marxism which, it said, "is recognized by the majority of socialists as the truth of the world."⁴⁸ Its description of Marxist economic theory was as follows:

All wealth is produced by labour, therefore all wealth should belong to labour."

How do people feel when they come into contact with this principle? There should be a great many of us who know the instinct for righteousness and the instinct for greed and yet welcome this principle. It can be deduced as follows: "All wealth is the result of labour. To own this wealth without having laboured for it is in the nature of theft. Only further labour can restore this stolen wealth."⁴⁹

According to the author, Marx added "an investigation of the history of production" to this principle. Therefore:

In primitive communal society [yuanshi zhi shehui 原始社会], each person made his own material necessities for life, supplying personal needs and consumption. After a little while each person would exchange the things that he had made for the things made by another, so as to fulfill each others' necessities. However, today the things made by labour do not supply the use and consumption of the labourer, whose labour time is not limited to making the things needed for their own consumption, but goes to the capitalist.⁵⁰

Since the capitalist gains wealth without having laboured to produce it, everything owned by the capitalist is "stolen" from the labourer.

The view that Marx held that "property is theft" was

made more explicit in the section 'The Dawn of Capitalism', which gave the following description of Marx's analysis of the class nature of capitalist society:

Society is divided into two classes. On the one hand is the majority group, the class of labourers [laodong zhi jieji 劳动之阶级], which is the real possessor of the social forces of production, but which is unable to own the tools necessary for production--machines and capital--because these are solely owned by the other group, a minority, the capitalist class [zibenjia zhi jieji 资本家之阶级]. The real producers in society, the majority of men and women, must hire themselves out and daily engage in factory production and other bitter labour, for otherwise they would starve to death. Against them is the minority which owns the machinery of production. As the owners of factories [gongchang zhu 工厂主] and landlords [dizhu 地主], they wield the power of hiring and firing, of life and death, over their labourers. Aside from giving their labourers the bare minimum of life necessities, all products belong to them. All value is created by the labouring class, but, aside from that which goes for wages and other costs of production, it pours into the purses of the capitalist class. Therefore, capital, interest and profit, without exception, are stolen from the labourers and the things that they have created.⁵¹

Society becomes polarized because small producers and the middle class are "swallowed up by the big capitalists."⁵² Therefore, "today, those who are not capitalists are pitiful labourers."⁵³ But, according to the author, Marxism holds that "the day must come when that which was stolen . . . is returned." After which, "labourers will live forever communally, and the world will be eternally rich."⁵⁴

In essence "A Report on Socialism" reduced Marxist economic theory to the position that property is "stolen" by the capitalists. Its critique of Marxism was that property was not stolen, but was earned through the capitalist's genius as an inventor and organizer of production.⁵⁵ But "property is theft" was not Marx's position on capitalist economy.

Marx, who filled three volumes describing the dynamics of capitalist economy in Capital, would not have accepted that his theory of surplus value established that property is theft. In Capital, Marx claimed that that only socially useful products of human labour are valuable in the economic sense. When two qualitatively different commodities are exchanged the only characteristic they share in common is that they are products of human labour. Therefore, the relative values of commodities are determined by the amount of socially averaged "labour-power" which went into their creation. But capitalism seems to contradict this conclusion. The capitalist invests a certain amount of capital in machinery, raw materials, etc., and a further amount in labour-power, i.e. hires workers to transform the raw materials. Magically an extra value, i.e. profit, emerges out of this transaction (that is if the capitalist is successful). The question is, therefore, where does this surplus originate. Marx established that it can only be the result of the fact that labour-power, as a commodity, is purchased for less than its real value, i.e. that the profit is the result of the exploitation of the labourer. No matter how fair that capitalist is in establishing the price he pays for labour-power, if a profit is made, the labourer is being exploited. This system is possible in capitalist society because labour power is a commodity subject to market forces. Since the supply of labour outpaces the demand, i.e. there is unemployment, the capitalist can get away with artificially reducing its price. In effect, the theory of surplus value argues that capitalists economy has two necessary conditions--the ability of the

capitalist to use accumulated wealth to amass still greater wealth, and the ability of the worker to sell his or her labour-power. Labour and capital, proletariat and bourgeoisie, are intimately related. One cannot exist without the other. But this system is doomed, because the production of capital takes the efforts of the entire society while only a minority reaps its rewards. The solution, therefore, is to abolish that minority's grip on the economic system, i.e. by abolishing the capitalists as a class.⁵⁶

In a certain sense, the basis of Marx's critique of capitalism was that it is people, and not material objects, which should be valued. This rather Aristotelean view of economy, i.e. that economy is the social extension of ethics, cannot be reduced to the position that "property is theft" without also reducing its central criticism, and political implications. "Property is theft" implies that the exploitation of labour is the sole condition necessary for the existence of capitalist economy. The position that exploitation is the sole prerequisite for the existence of capitalism contradicts both the essence of Marx's analysis of capitalism--that capitalism is conditioned by both exploitation and the existence of a labour market--as well as the thrust of his criticism of capitalism. The implication of Marx's analysis of capitalism is that in order to reach a communist, i.e. classless, society a means of preventing the accumulation of wealth by the capitalist, and preventing labour-power from acting as a commodity, is required. In other words, that communist society cannot be achieved overnight because some form of state is needed. The implications

of "property is theft", however, is that the ability of the capitalist to expropriate the product of others labour is the sole criteria for the existence of capitalism. The capitalist is able get away with the expropriation, i.e. theft, of the fruits of the labour of others because of the existence of the state. State and capitalism co-exist. Consequently, the abolition once and for all of the state makes possible the immediate abolition of the capitalists as a class in so far as they no longer have access to an instrument of robbery--a state. "Property is theft", therefore, is consistent with the anarchist position that classes are essentially political entities, that there are two classes--the ruling class and the ruled class. According to this position, communist society is possible because once the state is overthrown, there can no longer be any classes, since there is no longer a ruler and a ruled. Therefore, it is evident that "property is theft" was essentially an anarchist position.⁵⁷

The position that "property is theft" can also be found in Yang Yiceng's article, "Why Must Society be Transformed", which was published in the November 1919 issue of the student paper Guomin.⁵⁸ Yang identified "private property" as the fundamental problem in Chinese society.

On the one hand private property causes the capitalists to be lazy, arrogant, and to not engage in production; on the other hand, it causes the labourers to pass their days in bitter labour so that they cannot live.⁵⁹

Since private property is the root cause of China's many social ills, how does it come about? According to Yang,

Private property originates in theft: the rich steal the poor's means of production, the capitalist steals

the labourer's products. The more that the system of private property has advanced, the more bitter the labourer's lot has become.⁶⁰

But modern economic theory, which claims that land, labour and capital are the three key ingredients in production, cannot explain how "private property originates in theft." This is because "modern economic theory is a theory that completely serves property ownership."⁶¹ In fact, only labour is a key element in production since only it can create value. Therefore, "to use capital as the most important product is theft." This was "clearly shown by Marx," Yang claimed.⁶² According to Marx,

In modern society only a small minority own the tools of production and have accumulated products (that is to say capital), the remainder, the vast majority, only own their own work power [gongzuo li 工力]. If they wish to live they must definitely sell their work power to the capitalists.⁶³

Thus Yang made use of Marxist economic theory to discredit "modern economic theory", but Yang's understanding of that theory was that "property is theft". This was the same position as that of "A Report on Socialism".

Marxist economics, then, was understood to prove that "property is theft". In reality this was an anarchist understanding of the functioning of modern industrial society, and was a reflection of the confusion between the non-Marxist positions that intellectuals already knew and Marxist theory. This does not mean, however, that Marxist economic theory had no impact on Chinese thought at this time, for it did lend an economic content to social relations, a position which was consistent with the understanding of the materialist conception of history.

4. Classes and Class Struggle

Class struggle was the third element of Marxist theory that drew the attention of Chinese intellectuals in 1919-1920. During this period intellectuals of a variety of political inclinations acknowledged the existence (although not necessarily the desirability) of class struggle. Those who were inclined towards communism were primarily interested in class struggle as the best amongst many means of creating social revolution. But even here, their understanding of class struggle was confused with anarchism. They were also unaware of the complexity of social relations in China, and the consequent complexity of Chinese class struggle.

As one of the intellectuals most interested in Russian-style social revolution in China, Li Dazhao played a major role in disseminating Marx's doctrine of class struggle. Class struggle was one of Li Dazhao's primary concerns in his article "My Marxist Views". Li wrote,

Mr. Marx felt that one social group relies upon the monopoly of the productive means [shengchan shouduan 生产手段] in order to plunder the surplus labour and surplus value of another group. However, these two kinds of classes, at the beginning, do not consider themselves to be classes, in fact the class in itself [jiejì dì bēnshēn 阶级的本身] has not yet become a class, it is still not class conscious. Later when it becomes a class, and knows that it is in a different position from other classes, class competition [jiejì jìngzhēng 阶级竞争] is its unavoidable fate. That is to say, where there is class consciousness, competition occurs between classes. Of course, at first there is only economic competition over economic interests, later it advances to political competition over political power, until the economic structure established on this class opposition itself advances, and a new kind of transformation occurs.⁶⁴

Thus Li was aware that before classes could struggle, and even

in a certain sense exist, they had to be conscious. Since consciousness could be induced through education, the doctrine of class struggle did not preclude the pedagogical thrust of the New Culture Movement. Despite this, Li was still rather apologetic about class struggle. He wrote,

In this regard, Mr Marx does not acknowledge that class competition occurs throughout all of human history, he only applies his theory of class competition to previous human history, not through all of the past, the present, and the future. ⁶⁵

In "My Marxist Views" Li was also concerned with the apparent contradiction between Marx's theory of productive forces and his theory of class struggle. According to Li,

This contradiction between the materialist conception of history and the theory of class struggle counts as a very important point. Mr. Marx, on the one hand, asserts that the motive forces . . . of history are the forces of production; on the other hand, he also says that all previous history is the history of class competition, that is to say that class competition is the ultimate method of history; the creator of history is none other than class competition. On the one hand he negates the activities of classes, no matter whether those activities are directly economic or indirect, since the limitations of property and other ordinary laws can often have an effect in determining economic direction; on the other hand, he says that the activities of class competition may produce the essential facts of history, and determine the direction of advancement. ⁶⁶

Li resolved this contradiction by pointing out that

As soon as the forces of production undergo a change, the social relations change accordingly. But the change in the social relations depend upon the activity of the class that is in the economically disadvantaged position. In this regard, Mr. Marx really placed class activity in the framework of natural change within the economic process. ⁶⁷

Li's view that there was no contradiction between the doctrine of class struggle and the materialist conception of

history was supported by Hu Hanmin. In "A Criticism of a Criticism of the Materialist Conception of History", Hu examined the positions of Marx's critics and pointed out their errors.⁶⁸

As has been pointed out above, when it came to the historical analyses of both Li and Hu, an understanding of the centrality of the doctrine of class of class struggle in Marx's thought failed to inform their understanding of the materialist conception of history. In effect, they failed to realize that Marx saw class struggle as a universal historical phenomenon, and saw class struggle in a fundamentally more limited manner. They saw it as a means of, a device for, the creation of social revolution. They were willing to admit that it was not the only such means, but Li Dazhao at least held that it was the most effective means.

The other methodology of social revolution was anarchism. Since anarchism was the better known philosophy of revolution in China, and because it rejected class struggle in favour of gradual advancement towards mutual aid, Li tried to establish that there was no contradiction between the anarchist objective of a society based on mutual aid, and the Marxist means of class struggle.⁶⁹ In "Class Competition and Mutual Aid", published in July 1919, Li suggested that class struggle was the only means of realizing mutual aid:

In the world of today, darkness has reached an extreme. To be able to continue the history of humanity, we must give rise to a great transformation. This transformation is like Noah's great flood: it will wash clean the old world of class competition giving rise to the brand new bright world of mutual aid. The path of this final class struggle is that of the self-destruction of class society. It must be taken and cannot be avoided.⁷⁰

Class struggle would make possible the material transformation which in turn would produce the spiritual transformation of mutual aid.

The final class competition is the means for the transformation of social organization. The principle of mutual aid is the creed of this transformation of the human spirit. We advocate material and spiritual transformation, a complete transformation.⁷¹

Thus, for Li, class struggle was a means to an end. This understanding of class struggle as a device was also evident in the definition of class struggle that Li presented in "Class Competition and Mutual Aid". Li agreed with the anarchists that "social transformation must be brought about by the majority of people within a society," but pointed out that

The force which is the basis of a social movement must come from that class which does not profit from the existing social organization. That class which is in a position to profit, with the exception of a few individuals with noble aspirations, must oppose this transformation. One class pushes transformation, one class opposes it. This is the essence of class competition.⁷²

In other words, class struggle was caused by the dominant class's resistance to social change. Class struggle then becomes the means of achieving social change.

When it came to further identifying the nature of class struggle, however, Li made it evident that he only recognized the existence of struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. He wrote,

So-called classes are fiercely opposed economic classes. Concretely, landlords and capitalists are the class which owns the means of production, workers and peasants are the class which does not own the means of production. In primitive communal society, because economic techniques were not very developed, an individual's labour was only enough for self-

sufficiency, no surplus was produced and classes did not exist. Later, as techniques became more refined, the economy rapidly developed and an individual's labour became more than enough. This extra, then, is surplus labour. From then on, surplus labour gradually increased until it was seized by those who owned the means of production creating a society based upon class opposition.⁷³

I.E. the class that owns the means of production, the bourgeoisie, expropriates the surplus labour the class which does not own the means of production, the proletariat. This, and only this, gives rise to "class opposition", that is class struggle.

Not all Marxists agreed with Li's analysis that class struggle only occurs between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Zhou Fuhai, for example, argued in "China's Class Struggle" that class struggle took several different forms⁷⁴. Writing in Jiefang yu Gaizao in December 1919, Zhou gave the following description of class struggle:

Why must classes struggle? Simply put, it is because one class stands in a socially dominant [zhipei 支配] position, and at the same time, one class stands in a socially dominated position. Their positions are not only different, but vastly different. In order to serve its own interests, the dominated class must carry out a social movement against the dominant class. This is the major reason for class struggle.⁷⁵

Thus Zhou agreed with Li that class struggle was the result the conflict of interests between two classes, but Zhou went on to argue that there were, in general, two kinds of class struggles. The first, as in the French Revolution, was between "the middle class" (zhongliu jieji 中流阶级) and "the aristocratic class" (guizu jieji 贵族阶级). The second form was the result of "the industrial revolution" and occurred between "the labouring

class" (laodong jieji 劳动阶级) and "the bourgeoisie" (zichan jieji 资产阶级).⁷⁶ The 1911 Revolution was an example of the former kind of class struggle. The present form of class struggle in China was not the latter, however, because both the labouring class and the bourgeoisie in China were too small. Chinese class struggle, therefore, was between the "parasitic class" (qisheng jieji 寄生阶级) which was composed of warlords, bureaucrats and officials, and the "self sufficient class" (zigei jieji 自给阶级). Although Zhou had rejected the applicability of European-style classes to the analysis of Chinese society, he still embraced class struggle as the key to social change in China. He wrote:

To transform society, we must first eliminate the obstacles. The obstacle is the parasitic class. Therefore, we must first eliminate the parasitic class. To remove the parasitic class, we must be united with the self-sufficient class and carryout class struggle with them.⁷⁷

Thus Zhou Fuhai was aware of the fact that Chinese social structure did not conform to that of Europe. It is unfortunate that a debate between Chinese Marxists over the nature of Chinese social structure did not emerge at this time. Such a debate could have made those inclined towards communism aware that the mechanical application of European and Russian models to Chinese society was highly problematic. In any event, no such debate materialized, and in less than a year Zhou was putting forward Li's position on class struggle in China.⁷⁸

The document which seems to have played the major role in establishing the credibility of Li's position on Chinese class struggle was oddly enough written by Marx himself and was

his most forceful statement on the inevitability of communist revolution arising from the struggle between the proletariat and bourgeoisie-- The Communist Manifesto. In April 1920, Chen Wangdao published the first complete Chinese translation of The Communist Manifesto.⁷⁹ It is unlikely however that this translation substantially departed from earlier partial translations such as the translation of the first chapter of The Communist Manifesto, "Bourgeois and Proletarians", which was published in the November 1919 issue of Guomin.⁸⁰ This section of The Communist Manifesto presented Marx's view that all history is a history of class struggle. Modern bourgeois society, which originated in feudal society, has a class structure which is simpler than all previous societies. It is increasingly becoming polarized into "two great camps"--the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The bourgeoisie has played a positive creative role in history. It has created forces of production which surpass those of previous modes of production. In a certain sense, it has even created the world. But, according to Marx, it has ceased to play a positive historical role, and has become a hinderance to production. Therefore it will be overthrown by the proletariat just as the bourgeoisie overthrew the feudal system when the latter had become a hinderance to economic development.⁸¹

While this translation did make Marx's clearest statement of the inevitability of class struggle available to Chinese intellectuals, it was not free of problems. For example it said,

The society of the propertied [youchanzhe], which sprang from the destruction of feudal society, cannot

avoid class confrontation [jieji zhi duizhi 阶级之对峙]. It has again created a new kind of class [jieji 阶级], a new means of oppression, new forms of struggle to replace the old.

In our era, which can be called the era of the propertied, class confrontation has become much simpler. The whole of society has become divided into two mutually antagonistic great camps, two confronting great classes: the propertied class [youchanzhe jieji 所有者阶级] and the unpropertied class [wuchanzhe jieji 无所有者阶级].⁸²

Thus, this translation of The Communist Manifesto translated "bourgeoisie" and "proletariat" as the "propertied" and "unpropertied" classes respectively. The effect of this translation was to justify Li Dazhao's position that there were two classes, one which owned the means of production, i.e. was propertied, and one which did not, i.e. was unpropertied, and consequently that the European class struggle between propertied and unpropertied was universal.

The existence of class struggle was not only recognized by Chinese Marxists during this period. This is readily apparent in Dongfang Zazhi. In February and March 1920, Dongfang Zazhi published an article by Lu Hongyu, called, "The conscript Labour System".⁸³ In this article Lu argued that forced labour, as opposed to socialism, was the solution to China's problems. Forced labour would allow the mobilization of large forces which would enable China to overcome her weakness in the face of industrialized West. According to Lu class struggle originated with the industrial revolution in Europe:

In the industrial countries of Europe, when cottage manufacture moved to factory manufacture, a kind of mutual opposition between the labouring class [laodong jieji 劳働阶级] and the capitalist class [ziben jieji 资本阶级] appeared.⁸⁴

In China this "oppression" had only recently appeared.

Therefore:

In order to nip evil in the bud, the state must make use of the conscription of labourers. . . preventing the future antagonism of the two classes of labourers and capitalists.⁸⁵

In other words the system of forced labour could be used to prevent the class struggle which accompanies industrialization.

The editor of Dongfang Zazhi also made use of class terms and spoke of class struggle by the end of this period. For example, in an editorial in April, he traced social problems to an economic level:

In the world today, all kinds of economic problems cause temporary disturbances, and class struggle is clearly becoming more urgent. Class struggle is caused by nothing more than the system of private property, so the system of private property should be reformed. . . If the problem of property is resolved, all problems can be resolved.⁸⁶

Thus it is interesting to note that even non-Marxists tended to see class struggle as occurring between labour and capital, unpropertied and propertied, proletariat and bourgeoisie.

The early communist movement would share this view of class struggle as a device for achieving revolution which arises from the confrontation between owners and non-owners of property. The contributors to Gongchandang would argue that class struggle was the means of attaining social revolution. Like their contemporaries, they would only be aware of the existence of struggle between two classes--the propertied and the unpropertied.

Thus it is evident that although Marxist ideas were

widely disseminated in China between May 1919 and April 1920, Chinese intellectuals had rather limited understandings of these ideas. They confused historical materialism and economic determinism, Marxist and anarchist economic theory, and class struggle in China with that of Europe. These understandings, even on the part of the most sophisticated of Chinese Marxists, were overwhelmingly mechanical. The inevitable result of this was an equally mechanical approach to the Chinese revolution on the part of the early communist movement. Intellectuals' understandings of Marxism lent little more than a veneer, a smattering of Marxist terminology, to already existing concepts. Nowhere is this more evident than the understanding of classes shown by progressive intellectuals between the Bolshevik Revolution and the beginnings of the communist movement.

Chapter Three

Classes: The Bourgeoisie and the Proletariat

1. The Polarization of Society: The Concept of "Class"

Between the October Revolution and the publication of the first complete Chinese edition of The Communist Manifesto, the term "jieji" ~~阶级~~, which today is usually translated "class", became widely used in China. Although there was little agreement amongst intellectuals on the question of which classes existed in Chinese society, or even, when they did agree, little consistency in the terms they used, there were several positions on classes, and the class composition of society, which were generally accepted during this period. However, class concepts, more than any other facet of the thought of the period, reflected the influence of the anarchist tradition.

Most intellectuals tended to divide Chinese society into two basic classes. Whether they referred to these two classes as the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, the labouring class and the gentry class, or in some other manner; intellectuals recognized the existence of two classes corresponding to a class of oppressors and a class of oppressed. Moreover, they identified their interests with the interests of the oppressed masses. Secondly, they tended to define classes in economic terms, identifying one class which owned the means of production and one class which laboured. Although the economic definition of classes was an important theoretical advancement relative to anarchist class concepts, in practice intellectuals only recognized the existence of what were, in effect, the same

classes earlier identified by anarchism. Instead of describing classes in terms of their economic positions, in actuality they included landlords as well as capitalists in the ranks of the "bourgeoisie", and peasants as well as industrial workers in the ranks of the "proletariat".

At the same time that they were becoming aware of the implications of the Bolshevik Revolution, many Chinese intellectuals became conscious of the polarization of their society into the labouring masses on the one hand, and the parasites, bureaucrats, and exploiters on the other. Furthermore, they identified themselves with the labouring masses. By 1919, this division of society into oppressor and oppressed was expressed in class terms.

Anarchist thought had been widely disseminated in China before the Bolshevik Revolution.¹ Not surprisingly, therefore, it was anarchism that provided the conceptual basis for the articulation of this polarization. The anarchist influence is readily apparent in an article published in Dongfang Zazhi on the eve of the Bolshevik Revolution.² This article, "Labourism", described a Utopian society in which there would be neither parasites nor exploited. It pointed out that the source of all wealth was land, capital, and "labour-power" (laoli 劳力). According to "Labourism" for something to be of value it had to be transformed by labour. Those who owned land, or held capital, and who did not labour, were parasites whose wealth was derived from the labour of others. This resulted in social inequality. The solution was "labourism" (laolizhuyi 劳力主义)--a economic system in which everyone would engage in labour to meet their

daily requirements. Labourism would have the following results:

(1) the division of labour would be abolished; (2) all occupations would be equal; (3) social pressure would be the work incentive in a non-exploitative system; (4) all people would have equal opportunity.³

"Labourism" continued to be popular throughout this period, as was the highly romantic image which intellectuals had of their role as enlighteners of the labouring masses. For example, the journal Laodong (Labour), which was founded in March, 1918, was devoted to nothing less than

The reverence of labour, the promotion of labourism [laodongzhuyi 劳动主义], the cultivation of the morality of labour, the bringing of world knowledge to the labourer, the recording of the actions of the world labour movement, the explanation of the truth about social questions, and the expedition of the resolution of the social problems of labourers in our country and the world.⁴

Laodong's attitude towards labour was shared by many others, of whom Cai Yuanpei and Li Dazhao were perhaps the best known and most influential. In his speech at the rally held at Tiananmen square in Peking to celebrate the Allied victory in the First World War, Cai pointed out that despite the fact that no Chinese citizens (except for a few labourers in France) had directly participated in the war effort, the Chinese should celebrate:

This is not a strange thing. The world, from now on, is the world of labour (laogong 劳工).

That which I call labour is not only metal and wood work, etc. On the contrary it is the use of one's labour for the benefit of others. No matter if one uses physical or mental labour, both are labour. Therefore, agriculture is the labour of planting crops. Commerce is the labour of transportation. The staff of schools, authors and inventors, are educational labourers. We are all labourers. We must each recognize the value of

labour. The Sanctity of Labour (laodong shengui
劳动神圣)!⁵

Labour, Cai continued, should not be seen as the object of exploitation, but as something that should be valued in its own right.

Cai's views on "The Sanctity of Labour" were shared by a number of prominent intellectuals.⁶ In November 1918, for example, writing in "The Victory of the Common People", Li Dazhao agreed that the war was "the defeat of capitalism and the victory of labourism".⁷

This romantic identification on the part of intellectuals with the labouring masses led to Russian-style populism, and calls for students to go down to the countryside and become "one" with the masses. This call was clearly stated by Li Dazhao in February 1919. In "Youth and the Countryside", he wrote,⁸

Although the present situation in our China is in many ways different from that of Russia, our youth should go to the countryside, taking the spirit of the Russian youths in the propaganda movement in the countryside, to develop the countryside. . . . Our China is an agricultural country, the vast majority of the labouring class [laogong jieji 劳工阶级] are peasants. If they are not liberated, the whole people of our country will not be liberated; their misery is the misery of the whole people of our country; their darkness is the darkness of the whole people of our country; the meanness of their lives is the meanness of our whole government. Go develop them, cause them to know the desire for liberation, explain their misery, relieve their darkness. . . . Off with you our few youths, our whole nation is sleeping, who else is there?⁹

In February 1919, Chenbao ("The morning post") expressed similar views:

Those who are outside the labouring world and loudly scream cannot do better than to enter the labouring

world and carry out reform. Because they stand outside the labouring world, what they imagine to be in the best interests of the labourers is not necessarily in the labourers' best interest. If they personally enter the labouring world, they can then know the true happiness and bitterness of the labouring world.¹⁰

Thus, intellectuals, particularly young intellectuals, were urged to go down to the masses in order to truly appreciate the problems and conditions of the working people.

As the direct consequence of their identification with the labouring masses, intellectuals denounced the ruling elite as parasitic oppressors. This attitude towards the elite can be seen in the writings of Chen Duxiu. In 1917, his approval of the February Revolution as a victory for anti-militarist democratic forces¹¹ had been indicative of his view that militarism, and the lack of democracy, were the major political problems in China. In February 1919, he held a similar position. In "Eliminate the Three Vermin",¹² he described militarists, bureaucrats and corrupt politicians as the three enemies of democracy in China.

At first oppression was not seen in well-defined class terms. Rather a generic term, "qiangquan" 强权, was used to describe oppression. The term "qiangquan" literally meant "strong power" and is the anarchist term for "authority".¹³ It was used much as we would use the term "tyranny". Cai Yuanpei used the term qiangquan to describe German militarism.¹⁴ Li Dazhao used it to describe Japan's "pan-Asianism".¹⁵ Meizhou Pinglun saw it as "the object of revolution".¹⁶

Beginning in late 1918 the polarization of society into oppressors and oppressed came to be seen in terms of classes. In

November 1918, Li Dazhao pointed out in "The Victory of the Common People" that the war ended because of "the defeat of capitalism and the victory of labourism".¹⁷ He also identified the capitalists as a class and equated "labourism" with the interests of "the unpropertied common people" (wuchan shumin 无产庶民), which was probably an attempt to render the term "proletarians" in Chinese.

At the same time that Li was beginning to express social polarization in terms of classes, he was bubbling with enthusiasm for the Bolshevik Revolution. In "The Victory of 'Bolshevism'", also published in November, he wrote that the Bolsheviks "advocate that all men and women should work,"¹⁸ i.e. that they advocated "labourism". By February 1919, Li saw class-liberation as an integral part of the general movement towards liberation.

The present era is an era of liberation, modern civilization is a civilization of liberation. The people wish to be liberated from the state, localities wish to be liberated from the centre, colonies wish to be liberated from the metropolis, weak small nationalities wish to be liberated from strong large nationalities, peasants wish to be liberated from landlords, workers wish to be liberated from capitalists, women wish to be liberated from men, children wish to be liberated from parents. Modern political and social movements are all liberation movements.¹⁹

In "Youth and the Countryside", also written in February, Li identified the "labouring class" as that class which had to be liberated.²⁰

At the same time that Li was identifying the oppressed as a class, the oppressors were being described as a class. In February 1919, Chen Duxiu described the rulers of China as "the three vermin"---warlords, bureaucrats, and corrupt

politicians.²¹ In May 1919, Meizhou Pinglun described the rulers of China as "the gentry class".²²

As has been mentioned above, intellectuals identified their interests with those of the oppressed masses. But as the editor of Peking's Chen Bao had pointed out in February, Chinese intellectuals were not, strictly speaking, part of the working masses. By April 1919, this view was being expressed in class terms.

"The Reasons for the Lack of Success of China's Political Revolution and the Non-Occurrence of Social Revolution" was one of the first attempts to apply a class analysis to China's political situation.²³ Although this article's main concern was to establish that China had not yet reached the era of "social revolution", it, in effect, demonstrated that intellectuals have a determining role to play in history. Historical development is conditioned by the intellectual class's alliances. According to the article, China had not reached the era of "social revolution" because intellectuals had still not joined the working masses, and added that the time had come for intellectuals to ally with the labouring class. The sole difference between this view and the earlier populism was that it was now being expressed in class terms.

This view was reinforced by a translation from the Japanese which analysed social problems in terms of classes. "On the Middle Class",²⁴ published in the July, 1919, issue of Dongfang Zazhi, argued that "the intellectual class" (zhishi jieji 知识阶级) or modern "middle class" (zhongdeng jieji

中等阶级). had become part of the "unpropertied class" (wuchan jiejie 无产阶级, i.e. proletariat), and that consequently intellectuals were playing the key role in the "labour and social movements".²⁵ In other words, intellectuals as a class had come to have the same interests as the class of labourers.

The view that society was divided into two classes was even more explicitly stated by Chinese Marxists. This is quite consistent with the description of classes presented in the May, 1919, Xin Qingnian. Gu Mengyu's commentary on Marxism, and Kawakami Hajime's excerpts from The Communist Manifesto made it abundantly clear that Marx held that society is divided into two classes--the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, and that all societies are composed of classes.²⁶

It is not surprising, therefore, that Li Dazhao, writing in "Class Competition and Mutual Aid" in July 1919, divided society into two classes:

. . . Landlords and capitalists are the class which owns the means of production, workers and peasants are the class which does not own the means of production.²⁷

In effect Li recognized the existence of two classes--one which owned the means of production and one which did not.

The fact that Zhou Fuhai did not uncritically apply Western models of class structures to Chinese society suggests that his Marxism was more sophisticated than Li's, but Zhou still recognized the division of society into two basic classes. Writing in "China's Class Struggle" in December, 1919, Zhou rejected the idea that class struggle in China was between "the labouring class" (laodong jiejie 劳动阶级) and "the bourgeoisie" (zichan jiejie 资产阶级). Instead, he wrote that Chinese class

struggle was between "the parasitic class" (qisheng jieji 寄生阶级) and "the self-sufficient class" (zigei jieji 自给阶级).²⁸

The view that society was divided into classes was also recognized by those who did not accept the Marxist approach to China's problems. For instance, in September 1919 Jiefang Yu Gaizao recognized the division of Chinese society into the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.²⁹ In November 1919, the student journal Guomin acknowledged the same division when it reduced the oppression of the masses by warlords, labourers by capitalists, even women by men, to the system of private property.³⁰ Guomin described this system in terms of class relationships between labour and capital. I.E. it reduced the relationship between oppressor and oppressed to a class relationship.

In December 1919, Shaonian Shehui referred to the oppressors--the bureaucrats, warlords and capitalists--as a single class.³¹ It is probable that the journal would have also referred to the oppressed as a single class. By December, when he was still advocating institutional modification along the lines of England and America, Chen Duxiu had begun to use class-terminology. He argued that class distinctions had to be eliminated in order to establish the social basis of democracy.³²

In February 1920, Lu Hingyu, writing in Dongfang Zazhi, proposed the conscription of labour as the best means of avoiding the otherwise inevitable antagonism between the labouring class (laodong jieji 劳动阶级) and the capitalist

class (zibenjia jieji 资本家阶级).³³

By May 1920, even the editor of the relatively conservative Dongfang Zazhi was using class terminology. In an editorial, he pointed out that there were two classes in Chinese society--"the official class" (guanliao jieji 官僚阶级), and "the people". "The official class" helped the capitalists to oppress the labourers. Only the full institution of democracy, he concluded, could create a society in which capitalists would be unable to exploit labourers.³⁴

Thus by the time that the first complete Chinese translation of the The Communist Manifesto was published in April 1920, class terminology had become widely used in China. The perception of the polarization of society into oppressor and oppressed, which had been reflected earlier in labourism and populism, was now expressed in class terms.

2. Two Great Camps: The Bourgeoisie and the Proletariat

Given the complexity of Chinese society, it is not surprising that there was little agreement on which classes existed in China. What is surprising, however, was that all of the writers of the period recognized the existence of only two, or at most three, classes. Even those who identified intellectuals as a separate class quickly pointed out that intellectuals were victimized by the oppressor class and therefore had the same interests as the labouring class.

The reason for this simplification of Chinese class structure was that classes were looked upon as purely economic entities. Specifically, there was one class--the oppressor

class--which owned the means of production, and there was another class--the oppressed class--which laboured. Before October, 1917, the term "jieji" seems to have meant little more than the distinction between inferiors and superiors. In July, 1917, for example, Xin Qingnian published an article--"The evils of the class system advocated by the Confucianists"³⁵--which described the Confucian "class system" (jieji zhidu 阶级制度) as the Five Relationships--ruler and subject, father and son, elder brother and younger brother, husband and wife, and friend and friend.³⁶ With the exception of the last relationship, all of these relations are between superior and inferior. Furthermore, all five of the relationships are between individuals. It is difficult to understand, therefore, how the term "jieji" in its modern and social sense of "class" could be used to describe these relationships. It seems that "jieji" meant little more than distinctions between levels of rank or importance.³⁷

After the Bolshevik Revolution, the term "jieji" was increasingly used in its modern, i.e. social, sense. In January 1918, for example, Zhang Xichen used it to differentiate between the February and October Revolutions in Russia.³⁸ The former, he argued, was a revolution of the "zhongchan jieji", i.e. "the middle class", while the latter was of the "xiaceng jieji", i.e. "the lower class". These are clearly social, not individual, concepts. Moreover, the fact that Zhang's term for "middle class"--zhongchan jieji 中产阶级 -- literally meant "middle-propertied class" suggests that his concept of "class" was at least partially defined by economic position, and consequently his classes were social entities.

By the first anniversary of the revolution, Li Dazhao was beginning to use class concepts to analyse world affairs. In "The Victory of the Common People" and in "The Victory of 'Bolshevism'", Li blamed World War One on the interests of the capitalists whom he identified as a class.³⁹ At the same time, he identified Bolshevism, and the Bolshevik-style revolutions in Germany and Austria which ended the war, with the interests of "the unpropertied common people" (wuchan shumin 无产庶民). In effect, Li was beginning to make use of social concepts of economic strata--i.e. classes defined by ownership of property.

The first attempt to make explicit use of class concepts to analyse Chinese politics--"The Reasons for the Lack of Success of China's Political Revolution and the Non-Occurrence of Social Revolution", published in the April 1919 issue of Dongfang Zazhi--also recognized that classes were economic entities. For example, it said,

Society becomes organized into the two classes of the managers and the managed. The propertied class [caichan jieji 财产阶级] and the intellectual class combine together to form the managing class [zhipei jieji 支配阶级]. The labouring class becomes the managed class [bei zhipei jieji 被支配阶级].⁴⁰

Thus classes either "labour" or own "wealth", either "manage" or "are managed", i.e. have different economic roles.

By the summer of 1919, Li Dazhao was making explicit use of classes defined in economic terms. In "Class Competition and Mutual Aid", he pointed out that "classes are fiercely opposed economic" entities and that there were two classes--one that owned the means of production and one that did not.⁴¹

Even sources hostile to Marxism accepted economic

definitions of classes. In September 1919, Jiefang Yu Gaozao translated "bourgeoisie" as "the market-merchant class" (shang jieji 市商阶级) and "proletariat" as "the peasant-worker class" (nonggong jieji 劳工阶级).⁴² "A Report on Socialism", published in the fall of 1919, did not question the economic definition of classes, just the idea that "property is theft". It pointed out: "A Report on Socialism" defined classes in economic terms. It identified two classes--"the class of labourers" (laodong zhi jieji 劳动之阶级) and "the capitalist class" (ziben jia zhi jieji 资本家之阶级). It identified the labouring class as that class which "is the real possessor of the social forces of production" and the capitalist class as that class which "owns the machinery of production."⁴³

By the Spring of 1920, the view that classes were economic entities was well established. Even the editor of the relatively conservative Dongfang Zazhi admitted this in an editorial in April, when he pointed out that class struggle is caused by "the system of private property."⁴⁴

Foreign sources tended to reinforce this definition of classes. For example, "The Second Stage of World Transformation" identified "the class of the rich" (fuzhe jieji 富者阶级) and "the class of the poor" (pinzhe jieji 贫者阶级).⁴⁵

Finally, the relatively detailed translations of Marx and Kautsky which became available during 1919 would not have necessarily disabused intellectuals of the notion that there were only two classes in China with different economic roles. These translations tended to suggest that Marx held the view that all societies are divided into two groups--the oppressors

and the oppressed--merely adding that the former always exploit the latter through the creation of surplus value. The prime concern of Marx's own pamphlet, Wage, Labour and Capital, for example, had been to establish that there is an economic basis for the struggle between bourgeoisie and proletariat. The theory of surplus value, explained by Kautsky in The Economic Doctrines of Karl Marx, would only add to this view by describing the dynamics of the relationship between labour and capital. Even in The Class Struggle, Kautsky presented definitions of the bourgeoisie and proletariat in terms of their social role in production.

Of course, both Marx and Kautsky maintained that there were earlier modes of production characterized by different classes, and that the class structures of these pre-capitalist modes tended to be more complex.⁴⁶ But their works which were translated during this period would not necessarily have led Chinese intellectuals aware to perceive that China did not necessarily have the same form of society as the modern West.

Wage, Labour and Capital only described the capitalist mode of production. It did not mention the existence of earlier modes of production. Although Kautsky's works did mention these earlier modes, they did not describe them in any detail. For example, in his description of the rise of the capitalist mode of production in The Economic Doctrines of Karl Marx, Kautsky concentrated on the political struggle between the feudal nobility and the rising bourgeoisie, as well as on the origins of the modern proletariat from handicrafts labourers and dispossessed peasants. He did not describe the feudal mode of

production except in so far as he said:

The wealth of the feudal noble was based on the personal services or contributions in kind of the dependent peasants. With him money was scarce. He tried to steal what he could not buy.⁴⁷

Since China no longer had a nobility, it would not have been immediately clear that Chinese class structure was not composed of a bourgeoisie and a proletariat. In The Economic Doctrines of Karl Marx, Kautsky described the capitalist mode of production as that mode which had recently appeared in Europe and European-derived nations, but,

In recent times our mode of production has taken root among other nations, for example, the Japanese and the Hindoos.⁴⁸

This did not necessarily exclude China from the list of nations where the capitalist mode of production had recently taken route.

The Class Struggle would have further reinforced the view that China was a capitalist country with a bourgeoisie and a proletariat. In the discussion on rent, for example, Kautsky pointed out that landed capitalists are in a much better position than their counterparts, for their monopoly does not easily disappear. The only mitigating factor in this monopoly is that not all land is owned by someone, or used productively. "Even in China," Kautsky wrote, "there are still wide stretches of unproductive land,"⁴⁹ thus implying that capitalism based on land was the landlord economy of rural China.

These examples suggest that it would have been possible for Chinese intellectuals to believe that Marx's theory of surplus-value directly applied to China, and thus to hold that

Chinese society in 1919 was divided into two classes--the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

In other words, all that these works were likely to have added to the understanding of classes was that Marx, himself, viewed classes as purely economic entities and only recognized the existence of two classes in modern society--one which owned the means of production and one which did not.

This economic definition of classes, coupled with the tendency to see Chinese society as polarized into two classes, implied that when the terms "bourgeoisie" and "proletariat" were translated into Chinese, or used by Chinese intellectuals, their readers, and they themselves, understood "the bourgeoisie" to refer to that class which owned the means of production and acted as oppressors, and "the proletariat" to refer to that class which owned no means of production and was oppressed. This would further imply that landlords, as well as capitalists, made up the bourgeoisie, while peasants, as well as industrial workers, made up "the proletariat".

The terms "bourgeoisie" and "proletariat" were usually translated as slight variations of "you chan jieji" 有产阶级 and "wuchan jieji" 无产阶级. Variations of "capitalist class" (zibenjia jieji 资本家阶级) and "labouring class" (laodong jieji 劳动阶级) were used interchangeably with "you chan jieji" and "wuchan jieji" respectively.

In fact, Chinese intellectuals understood "you chan jieji" and "wuchan jieji" in a manner closer to the literal sense suggested by the characters than in the manner that "bourgeoisie" and "proletariat" are understood today. They

understood these terms to mean "having property class" and "without property class", or in slightly better English-- "propertied class" and "unpropertied class". This is evident when the actual usages of these terms are examined, since intellectuals tended to lump together peasants and workers on the one hand, and landlords and capitalists on the other.

In February 1919, for example, Li Dazhao identified peasants as "the vast majority of the labouring class (laogong jieji 劳工阶级)" in China. In July 1919, he explicitly stated that, "workers and peasants are the class which does not own the means of production".⁵⁰ Li's views were shared by Jiefang yu Gaizao which translated the term "proletariat" as "the peasant-worker class" (nonggong jieji 农工阶级).⁵¹

In November 1919, Guomin identified the problem of Chinese society as the relationship between "labour" and "capital". Referring to the bitter lot of labourers, it pointed out, "when an unexpected event, like a drought or natural disaster, happens, they cannot work and starve to death."⁵² Very few industrial workers are unable to work because of "droughts". Thus this statement clearly placed peasants in the ranks of "labour", i.e. "the labouring class".

Although "A Report on Socialism", which was published in the Fall of 1919, did not specifically state that such was the case, it did not preclude the possibility that peasants, as well as industrial workers, were part of "the labouring class". In its discussion of Marxism, "A Report on Socialism" pointed out that the members of the "laodong zhi jieji" (劳动之阶级, lit. "the class of labourers"), "daily engage in factory production

and other bitter labour."⁵³

The class of landlords and capitalists was the dialectical opposite of the class of peasants and industrial workers. Indeed the term "capitalist" (zibenjia 资本家) often referred directly to landlords. Li Dazhao, for example, referred to "landlords and capitalists" as "the class which owns the means of production," in July, 1919.⁵⁴

In the fall of the same year, "A Report on Socialism", referring to "the capitalist class" (zibenjia zhi jieji 资本家之阶级), pointed out that, "as owners of factories [gongchangzhu 工厂主] and as landlords [dizhu 地主], they wield the power of hiring and firing, of life and death, over their labourers,"⁵⁵ i.e. that both landlords and capitalists made up "the capitalist class".

Finally, Guomin pointed out in November:

The capitalists own banks, factories and land, and are very rich. In business they add profit on top of profit as landlords they use land to buy more land.⁵⁶

In other words, "landlords" are "capitalists".

Two important articles of this period are virtually unitelligible if "you chan jieji" and "wuchan jieji" are not taken to mean "propertied class" and unpropertied class.

First is the rather enigmatic translation from the Japanese, "On the Middle Class", which was published in the July 1919 issue of Dongfang Zazhi.⁵⁷ This article defined classes in terms of ownership of the means of production as well as in terms of their social role in production. According to "On the Middle Class", "the labouring class" (laodong jieji 劳动阶级) was composed of those who,

directly carry out production, are hired by the entrepreneurial class, selling them their labour power, and therefore, getting wages according to the price of their labour. . . . The labouring class is diametrically opposed to the capitalist and entrepreneurial classes. It is a key element in carrying out production on the one hand, and in supplying it on the other. Therefore, its salaries come from interest, profit, or labour-power.⁵⁸

"The middle class" (zhongdeng jieji 中等阶级) was distinct from "the labouring class".

[The middle class] is composed of bureaucrats, officials, teachers and those who engage in the free professions and do not directly engage in production. They own more than labourers and therefore they are in a slightly different position than labourers. . . . The middle class is different in so far as it is opposed to the aristocratic class in terms of its social position . . . and its members either get a monthly salary or engage in the free professions.⁵⁹

The problem of the middle class was that its income was not directly tied to production.

On the contrary, everything that they earn comes for the division of profits by those who directly engage in economic production and they are therefore subservient to these people.⁶⁰

Consequently in times of economic crisis the middle class is unable to maintain its independence and becomes impoverished, i.e. "propertyless".

This modern middle class is distinct from the middle class of the pre-capitalist era:

The economic position and condition [of the new middle class] is not that of the old middle class because it lacks the necessary property qualification of being in the middle. As explained above, their problem is the same as that of the labourer. The vast majority of people who make up the middle class have no capital [wu zichen zhe 无资产者, lit. "without-capital-ist"] and have no source of income other than relying on their own abilities. Their situation is like that of the labourer who relies on his own strength to make a living, except

that labourers rely upon the physical strength of their own bodies. Although the form of labour is different the difference is not very great. In general terms, both are unpropertied [wuchan zhe 无产者, lit. "without property ists"] relying upon their own strength to make a living. Therefore, the so-called middle class is in the same position as the unpropertied class [Wuchan jieji 无产阶级].⁶¹

In other words, "the middle class" is part of the proletariat because it is "unpropertied". And again it states,

. . . I of course know the difference between the property owning middle propertied class [youchan zhe zhi zhongchan jieji 有产者之中产阶级] and the unpropertied class. At the same time I know that the problem of the unpropertied class is of the most research value in modern society, and that the problem of the labouring class and of the middle class which make up the unpropertied class is the most important and profound in the situation of modern Japan. The importance of the unpropertied middle class, the so-called intellectual class [zhishi jieji 知识阶级], is shown by the labour and broad social movements of other countries.⁶²

In other words, the author of this article knows the difference between the class that owns some property (the petty bourgeoisie) and that which owns none (the proletariat). The modern "middle class" (zhongdeng jieji 中等阶级 lit. "middle level class"), however, is not part of the petty bourgeoisie, but part of the proletariat. In any event, it is evident that the term "wuchan jieji" in this article did not solely refer to the class of industrial workers.

At the same time that the author of "On the Middle Class" identified the middle class as being "unpropertied", he consistently maintained a distinction between the "zhongdeng jieji", which is literally "the middle level class", i.e. "the middle class", and the "zhongchan jieji", literally "the middle-propertied class".

The "zhongchan jieji", or the medieval bourgeoisie, was originally composed of,

. . .artisans, middle and small shopkeepers, independent farmers, etc. Before the establishment of modern capitalist economic organization, they were the preservers of the economy as well as its organizers. They belonged to the class of burgers [shimin 市民, lit. "city dwellers"] and were the nucleus of social organization.⁶³

This "zhongchan jieji" became "the capitalist class".

Modern capitalist economic organization was established for their benefit, and the capitalist class which preserves this organization was, in fact, produced from this class. . .⁶⁴

That is to say, they have become the "you chan jieji", the class which Marx calls "the bourgeoisie".

However, we find that the "zhongchan jieji", or the "middle propertied class", was originally the "zhongdeng jieji", or "the middle level class", i.e. "the middle class".

Because of the independent economic position of the old middle class, and because it owned a fair amount of property, it could also be called the middle propertied class. In fact, it was the middle class of society, and the middle propertied class of the economy.⁶⁵

In other words it was in the "middle" both in terms of economic position and in terms of the ownership of property. The new middle class is not.

Although it is extremely suitable if the new middle class is called the middle class of society, because it is not independent economically, and moreover, does not have the corresponding property, it cannot be called the middle propertied class.⁶⁶

Since it does not own "property" it is not part of "the propertied class".

Although "On the Middle Class" defined classes on the

basis of their social as well as economic positions, in effect its argument forcibly implied that the term "wuchan jieji" did not refer to the class of industrial workers, but to all unpropertied in general. This in turn suggests that the term "you chan jieji" did not refer to the class of capitalists, but to all owners of property in general.

The second argument that suggests that the term "wuchan jieji" meant little more than "unpropertied class" was presented by Li Dazhao in January, 1920. In "An Economic Explanation of Recent Ideological Changes in China", he wrote that

. . .China's agricultural economy cannot withstand the oppression of foreign industrial economy, China's cottage industry cannot withstand the oppression of foreign factory industry, China's handicrafts production cannot withstand the oppression of foreign mechanized production. Most domestic industry has been destroyed, imports surpass exports. . .⁶⁷

China was being pauperized by foreign imperialism. Therefore, as Li wrote,

. . .The people of the whole country are becoming part of the world unpropertied class [wuchan jieji 无产阶级]. . .⁶⁸

I.E.this pauperization was making China "unpropertied", and therefore part of the "wuchan jieji" or "unpropertied class."

This view of classes--1) as economic entities defined by ownership of the means of production, 2) as the result of the polarization of society into oppressor and oppressed, and 3) as the bourgeoisie including both landlords and capitalists on the one hand, and the proletariat including peasants as well as industrial workers, on the other--was to have grave consequences

for the early communist movement. Like their contemporaries, the early communists essentially understood classes in the manner described above. On the basis of this understanding they formulated a strategy of revolution which in the long run was to result in disaster.

Chapter Four

Communism: The Gongchandang Programme

1. Communism and China

The formation of the Provisional Central Committee in May 1920, marked the actual beginning of the Chinese communist movement.¹ Before the loose collection of individuals who considered themselves to be communists could be formally welded into a political party, a basis of unity had to be reached. This basis of unity had to define the party's program, its goals and the means of their attainment. At the same time, as many potential revolutionaries as possible had to be rallied to the communist cause.

These tasks were taken up, to no small degree, by the theoretical organ of the Provisional Central Committee--Gongchandang²--when it began publication in November 1919. By the time it stopped publishing--August 1921--Gongchandang had outlined the party's program. But this program was uniformed with respect to the essence of Leninism. The contributors to Gongchandang knew nothing of Lenin's thesis on imperialism, and the need for a disciplined army of professional revolutionaries, i.e. the need for a "vanguard party". This is not to say that they were totally ignorant of Lenin's positions on a number of issues. In fact, where they were aware of his positions, they made use of them. Where they were not, they fell back on the general concepts which were already well known amongst progressive intellectuals.

In the first issue of Gongchandang, Zhou Fuhai defined

communism, i.e. "Communist party (Bolshevik) ism" (Gongchandang (duoshupai) zhuyi 共产党(多数派)主义) as "the amalgamation of collectivism [jichanzhuyi 集产主义] and the dictatorship of the unpropertied class [wuchan jieji di zhuanzheng

无产阶级专政]." ³ In "Marking the Third Anniversary of the Founding of the Russian Communist Government", Zhou wrote that communism was "neither anarchism nor syndicalism", because the former "opposes all central power," while the latter "calls loudly for central power." Communism, however, "has many similarities with guild socialism and orthodox Marxism." ⁴

According to Zhou, communism and guild socialism were the same in terms of "social organization", but differed in terms of "political organization." Both communism and guild socialism allowed "the labourer to organize so as to completely carry out the right of self-rule in the sphere of production," but the latter "does not recognize the existence of political organization." Guild socialism unnecessarily caused economic and political organization "to be opposed". Communism, on the other hand, "believes that the individual is a producer, and at the same time is definitely a consumer." Production and consumption "merely represent two aspects of an individual's social activities, and it is not necessary for these two aspects to be opposed." ⁵

Communism, according to Zhou, was orthodox Marxism, "because both advocate the direct operation of class warfare and the dictatorship of the unpropertied class." For the realization of "real democracy", the dictatorship of the proletariat was essential:

This is what Marx said during his later years in the Critique of the Gotha Programme: "Between capitalist social organization and communist social organization, there is a revolutionary transition period during which social organization moves from one to the other. Corresponding to this period is a political transition period which is characterized by the revolutionary dictatorial government of the unpropertied class." It is obvious that in order to reach the objective of real socialism, the dictatorship of the unpropertied class cannot be left out.⁶

The dictatorship of the proletariat, according to Zhou, was in fact true democracy. He wrote,

Lenin said, "The so-called equality in which there are no distinctions on the basis of sex, religion, race or national origin, is what the capitalist class often says it wishes to realize. However, under capitalism it has never been achieved. But the power of the labourers' and peasants' assemblies [Workers' and Peasants' Soviets], in other words, the dictatorship of the unpropertied class, completely realized it in one blow." Therefore, the dictatorship of the unpropertied class is not only not in contradiction with the principle of universal democracy, but is the only means of realizing it.⁷

Like other early Chinese communists, Zhou was well aware that Marx, in The Communist Manifesto, had argued that developed capitalism must inevitably give rise to communism, but as Gongchandang had itself admitted: "capitalism has just started to develop" in China.⁸ As Shi Cuntong wrote in June 1921,⁹

The first condition for the realizing of communism is "the socialization of all productive enterprises." In other words, all productive enterprises must be controlled by society, and absolutely must not be controlled by individuals. . . . The fundamental weakness of capitalism is "social production, private ownership." Communism wants to eliminate this illogical contradiction. Marx clearly saw this contradiction, knowing that the capitalists already had lost the ability to manage productive enterprises and that direct control by society was needed. . . . He saw that the material forces of production were already advancing towards the social organization of communism, and therefore dared to conclude that communism is the advent

of necessity. If communism does not have this economic base, it definitely cannot be realized.¹⁰

To counter this very effective argument against organizing a communist party in China, it was essential for the communists to establish that communism was a realistic objective in China. The contributors to Gongchandang essentially presented three arguments on this question.

First, they argued that since communist revolution had succeeded in Russia, it would work in China. This was the position taken by Zhou Fuhai in November 1920..In "Marking the Third Anniversary of the Founding of the Russian Communist Government," he wrote,

According to my own investigation, the condition of China is simply the same as that of Russia. (Of course, there are some differences, but these are very small.) Today, they are both agricultural countries, and their industry is not very developed. . . Their situations in other respects are also quite similar. In what way are the militarists, officials, and property-owning bosses of China different from the aristocrats, clergy, capitalists, and landlords of Russia? In what way are the crimes of the small politicians, petty officials, and of the average shameless, educated, office-seeker of China different from those of the Russian small propertied class and intellectual class? In what way is the lack of consciousness, the lack of training and the lack of organization of the the Chinese unpropertied class different from that of Russia? The situations are the same.¹¹

In other words, Zhou argued that since the socio-economic conditions of China and Russia were the same, their paths of revolution must also be the same.

The second argument, at first glance, appeared to echo Lenin's thesis on imperialism. Capitalism and communism are mutually exclusive international systems, the argument ran, therefore, superior communism must inevitably replace

capitalism.

This argument was presented by Shi Cuntong in "How Do We Make Social Revolution?",¹² in June 1921. Shi readily admitted that communism would be "an idle dream" without the appropriate economic base,¹³ but even though Chinese capitalism was not very developed, world capitalism was:

. . . Capitalism is international in nature, and wants to conquer the world. Communism is similar. It, too, is international in nature and wants to conquer the whole world. These two 'isms' are fundamentally opposed and cannot co-exist in the same world. The unpropertied class of each country must rise up and overthrow the propertied class, and with the assistance of our Russian comrades establish a communist world. China is part of the world. The unpropertied class that lives in this part of it, also wishes to rise up and, with the sympathetic assistance of the unpropertied class of the whole world, make a social revolution, and together create a "human world". If we don't rise up and do this, I fear that this "human world" will not be attained. To sum up, although Chinese capitalism has not developed, world capitalism has ripened to the point of collapse. There is no way in which world capitalism can die out and Chinese capitalism exist alone. From the point of view of great world influences, this is why China will realize communism.¹⁴

In fact, this argument was not related to Lenin's position on imperialism. In Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism, Lenin argued that monopoly capitalism leads to imperialism. This adds a new set of contradictions--that between the colonized nation and the monopoly capitalist class of the metropolis--to the traditional capitalist contradiction between bourgeoisie and proletariat. In other words, imperialism causes the interests of the vast majority of the people of the world to be opposed to capitalism. This creates the possibility of communist revolution in relatively unindustrialized countries like Russia. Where Marx believed that communist revolution would

occur in the most "advanced" and "democratic" countries of Europe, imperialism makes communist revolution possible in those countries which are "the weakest links" in the global chain of imperialism, i.e. where the people are the most aware of the problems created by imperialism.¹⁵

Lenin's thesis on imperialism was his essential addition to Marxist theory and constituted the theoretical justification for proletarian revolution in countries such as Russia and China which were economically backward relative to the advanced countries of the West. The fact that this "weakest link" argument was never used in Gongchandang suggests that the early communists were unaware of it.

However, the argument that capitalism and communism are international in scope does seem to reflect a position put forward by Lenin. In "Economics and Politics in the Era of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat", for example, Lenin wrote,

The class of exploiters, the landowners and capitalists, has not disappeared and cannot disappear all at once. . . . The exploiters have been smashed but not destroyed. They still have an international base in the form of international capital, of which they are a branch.¹⁶

Shi Cuntong's thesis, that the Chinese capitalist class cannot survive the destruction of its international base, seems to be a mirror-image of Lenin's position that the exploiters survive in Russia because their international base still exists.

Shi Cuntong also presented the third argument in "How Do We Make Social Revolution". In essence, Shi's argument held that only communism could create a socialist economic base. As Shi wrote,

. . . If the Chinese unpropertied class is to leave its "inhuman life" and live a "human life", production and material commodities must be increased. Using capitalism to develop production not only cannot give "human life" to the unpropertied class, but will give a great many of them the most frightening misery. This is something that the advanced countries of Europe and America have already shown us. It is also something that Shanghai and other metropolitan areas have shown us.¹⁷

In other words, capitalism could not improve the material conditions of the proletariat, but Shi believed communism could,

. . . All of the benefits of the capitalist mode of production are preserved within the communist method of production. That which is different is that every kind of contradiction inherent in the capitalist method of production is resolved. The forces of production under the communist method of production can only increase in comparison to those of capitalism, and cannot decrease in comparison to it. . . . Add to this equitable distribution and it will not be difficult to cause all members of the unpropertied class to live a "human life".¹⁸

In other words, communism was the only means of improving the conditions of the vast majority of the people of China--the unpropertied.

Thus, although Gongchandang's arguments on the possibility of communist revolution in China did not make use of Lenin's theory of imperialism, they did make use of his view that the capitalist class was international in scope. In effect, Gongchandang argued that communism was possible in China because it had worked in Russia and in the final analysis was the only means of "saving" China.

2. Revolution and Dictatorship: The Critique of Anarchism

Communism was not the only revolutionary philosophy that existed in China between 1920 and 1921. There were several others ranging from Sun Yat-sen's nationalism to anarchism. Of these, anarchism was the philosophy of revolution that was the closest to communism. Like communism, it sought the fundamental transformation of society. Given the confusion that surrounded communism and anarchism between 1917 and 1921, it was essential for the early communists to differentiate their program from that of anarchism. Furthermore, since anarchism was an established political force in China,¹⁹ it was essential for the early communists to prove that communism was far more realistic. Therefore, it is not surprising that Gongchandang contains a large number of anti-anarchist polemics.²⁰ For the early communist movement, anarchism was the key issue.

Gongchandang's anti-anarchist polemics centred around two issues--the nature of the revolution which would overthrow capitalism, i.e. whether the revolution would be "political" or "social", and secondly the reasons that the revolution had to institute the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The question of the nature of the revolution had been defined by the Chinese response to the Bolshevik Revolution which they had seen as a "social revolution". Since "social revolution" was the anarchist objective, Gongchandang had to differentiate their communist "social revolution" from that of the anarchists. In the course of distinguishing their "social revolution" from that of the anarchists, Gongchandang introduced a new concept. The communist revolution would be simultaneously social and

political. In discussing the second question--the dictatorship of the proletariat-- Gongchandang made use of use of the favourite argument against anarchism of Marxist revolutionaries stretching back to Marx himself. Although the dictatorship of the proletariat as instituted in Russia had been described earlier on a number of occasions,²¹ Gongchandang's presentation of the theoretical justification for the dictatorship of the proletariat was the first such exposition in China. It is also in its discussion of the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat that Gongchandang was the most faithful to the positions of Lenin.

Responding to anarchism was one of the main concerns of Shi Cuntong in "How Do We Make Social Revolution?". Shi argued that although anarchism and communism shared the same objective--"social revolution", they differed on the question of how to bring about this social revolution.

According to Shi, the anarchist or "gradualist method" wished

To get rid of politics and is active in terms of society. It waits until the vast majority of society believes in the particular 'ism', and only then rises up in revolution abolishing governments forever.²²

The communist or "radical method" was

. . . active both in terms of society and politics. Having a few people who believe in the particular 'ism', it seizes the opportunity to rise up, grasps political power in its hands, and takes advantage of superior political power to complete the revolution.²³

The "gradualist method", he said, presupposed that the vast majority of society already agreed with the revolutionary philosophy. For example, it assumed that "freely organized

producers' associations" existed before the revolution.

According to Shi, this was not possible in a country like China in which capitalism was not highly developed, because there were no opportunities for producers to come together, let alone for them to establish "free associations".²⁴ It would also take a great deal of time before such a large number of people agreed with the revolutionary philosophy which, in any event, would probably be impossible before the revolution had already occurred.²⁵ Shi saw the gradualist method as particularly unsuited to Chinese conditions.

To wait until the vast majority believe and then rise up in social revolution in fact absolutely cannot be done: (1) the vast majority of independent peasants cannot be incited to rise up in revolution; (2) the majority of handcraft labourers also cannot be incited to rise up. How can there be a majority if it does not include these two kinds of people? Chinese industry is not developed. As yet, in the whole country, there are less than one million labourers in mechanized industry. . . . From this it is clear that a majority revolution is impossible. . . . Before the revolution only (1) factory labourers and (2) landless peasants can unite. Except for these two kinds of labourers, unity is very difficult.²⁶

The objective situation, therefore, meant that the anarchist "majority revolution" was unworkable in China. Only a highly conscious minority, what Lenin referred to as a "vanguard", could bring about "social revolution" in China.

. . . Revolutions are always the affair of a minority. This minority of mine is not one of a few hundred, or a few thousand, but is one of several hundred thousand. . . . In my view, Russia's social revolution was also a minority revolution. My so-called revolution is made by a conscious minority, and does not need to wait until the majority is conscious before it occurs. . . . Minority revolution is a revolution of radicals. . . .²⁷

Shi further argued that this "revolution of radicals"

must combine "social" and "political" revolutions. According to Shi,

In simple terms, social revolution transforms economic organization. (In simple terms, political revolution transforms political organization.) . . . Naturally social revolution wishes to transform political organization at the same time, but the transformation of economic organization is its primary objective.²⁸

I.E in order for "social revolution" to succeed, it had to be simultaneously a "political revolution".²⁹

This thesis that "political revolution" was the vehicle for "social revolution" was remarkably similar to Mao Tse-tung's later thesis on New Democratic Revolution. Like Mao, Shi believed that the 1911 Revolution was incomplete and could only be completed under the rule of the communist party. Once in power, both held that the communist state could complete this revolution and establish the developed material base for what Mao called socialism and Shi called "social revolution".³⁰ As Shi wrote,

China's [1911] political revolution did not succeed. Chinese labourers did not get political freedom. Therefore, the revolution which we now seek to bring about combines together political revolution and social revolution. Our first step is to overthrow the present government and ourselves take the ruling class's position in order to use superior political power to transform economic organization.³¹

In effect, Shi's critique of anarchism boiled down to the position that the anarchist revolutionary program was unworkable in China. The major ideological weapon used by Chinese communists against anarchism was the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat. In "Marking the Third Anniversary of the Founding of the Russian Communist

Government," Zhou Fuhai had argued that the dictatorship of the proletariat was the sole means of establishing "real socialism" and "universal democracy".³² In April 1921, Zhou used the dictatorship of the proletariat to develop a critique of anarchism. In "Why Do We Advocate Communism?",³³ he argued that anarchism, in holding that the revolution can abolish the state, "sees classes as too unimportant and social revolution as too easy."³⁴ Even though "the old ruling class" would have been overthrown, the revolution would not have abolished classes immediately. "A class," Zhou pointed out, "is not like an animal which once killed immediately dies and doesn't need a method of preventing its resurrection."³⁵ Although the old social structure will have been basically destroyed in the revolution, "the deep roots of the old social organization" would remain. Because everyone will be free to act as they wish after the anarchist revolution, communist society would be unattainable if the capitalist class does not voluntarily surrender its property.³⁶

This did not mean that communist society was impossible, but rather that the existence of classes had to be fully "recognized". According to Zhou,

Communism takes the dictatorship of the labourers [laodong di zhuanzheng 劳动的专政] as its basic principle. That is to say, it uses the dictatorship of the labourers to prevent restorationist movements on the part of the old ruling class, and to dig up the roots of the old social organization, so that it can never interfere with our construction.³⁷

He then cited an excerpt from a letter written to the International Workers of the World by the Communist International which pointed out the importance of a workers'

state:

To smash the capitalists' state, to destroy the capitalists' helping hand, to eliminate the weapons of the capitalist class, to be free of the capitalists' property, to place everything under the common control of the collective working class--many things must be done which are impossible without a government, without a state.³⁸

Zhou concluded his discussion of the dictatorship of the proletariat by re-emphasizing that without it "the influence of the capitalist class (today's ruling class) cannot be eliminated and the roots of the capitalist system (today's social organization) cannot be dug up."³⁹ In other words, according to Zhou, anarchism could not attain communist society, because it sought the immediate abolition of the state.

The most sophisticated treatment of the dictatorship of the proletariat was in Shi Cuntong's article, "How Do We Make Social Revolution?". He saw the dictatorship of the proletariat as the necessary consequence of the class nature of society.

Class struggle is something that necessarily occurs under a class system, and is something that is only suitable to a class system. . . . The dictatorship of the unpropertied class is also something that occurs under a definite society, and moreover, is only suitable to a society in which classes are irreconcilably opposed. The dictatorship of the unpropertied class is a kind of revolutionary means, and is definitely not the objective of the communist party. The objective of the communist party is to realize communism.⁴⁰

Of course, communism was also the objective of anarchism, but according to Shi, only the dictatorship of the proletariat could create a classless, stateless, i.e. communist, society:

Communists definitely advocate the establishment of a state of the unpropertied class after the overthrow of the state of the propertied class [youchan jieji 有产阶级], otherwise the revolution cannot be completed and communism cannot be realized. According to Marx, the

state is the mechanism by which one class oppresses another, only when classes cease to exist can the state also naturally cease to exist. Our ultimate objective is . . . that there be no state. Before classes have ceased to exist, we not only forcefully advocate a state, but the powerful state of the dictatorship of the unpropertied class.⁴¹

In other words, the overthrow of the bourgeois state does not necessarily result in the abolition of classes, but,

As classes day by day cease to exist, the state, also day by day, loses its effectiveness. Our objective is not to use the state to consolidate the privileges of the unpropertied class, but is to use the state to abolish all classes.⁴²

Moreover, the dictatorship of the proletariat is the means of completing the revolution. According to Shi:

The dictatorship of the unpropertied class is the means by which social revolution is completed and communism is reached. After all classes have ceased to exist, communism is completely realized and the dictatorship of the unpropertied class naturally loses its usefulness. Lenin said that the dictatorship of the unpropertied class has three purposes: (1) to oppress the propertied class; (2) to coerce the small propertied class and the intellectual class; (3) to train the unpropertied class. I believe that this can be divided into two purposes: (1) to deal with the opposing classes; (2) to deal with our own class. The former is to oppress the opposing classes so that they gradually cease to exist. The latter is to train our own class so that each member of the unpropertied class becomes a revolutionary who can take charge of the enterprises of communist society. Simply put, the dictatorship of the unpropertied class is the only means of creating the economic organization of communism. If the dictatorship of the unpropertied class is not put into effect, communism cannot be realized.⁴³

Thus, according to Shi, only the replacement of the bourgeois state with the proletarian state could realize communism.

The anarchists charged that this dictatorship would not be exercised by the people but by the party. Shi answered that this was only realistic. In practice,

The so-called dictatorship of the unpropertied class is at first the dictatorship of a minority. This is something which cannot be, and need not be, avoided. . . . How can the unconscious, untrained, unorganized, majority be called upon to exercise dictatorship? If they are called upon to exercise dictatorship, how could communism not be in a mess? Therefore, so as not to endanger communism, at first, dictatorship must be carried out by a minority of conscious, trained, organized, unpropertied [wuchanzhe, i.e. proletarians].⁴⁴

As the number of conscious, trained, and organized, members of the unpropertied class increased, dictatorship would be carried out by progressively more and more people, until it would be carried out by all and no longer needed.⁴⁵

Gongchandang's arguments against anarchism were in effect that anarchism was unworkable because it did not fully appreciate China's true situation. On the one hand, China's backwardness dictated that few people were capable of uniting together into collectives--either because of their own lack of consciousness or lack of opportunity. But the argument that carried the most weight was that anarchism did not fully recognize the existence of classes, while communism did. Communism, therefore, admitted the need for a state--the dictatorship of the proletariat--after the bourgeois state was overthrown. This position, as at least some of the early communists were aware, had been put forward by Lenin in The State and Revolution.⁴⁶

3. The Analysis of Classes in Chinese Society

The class composition of society is central to a communist party's strategy of revolution. Which classes are the friends of the revolution? Which are its enemies? Which classes can be won over to the revolutionary cause? Which cannot? The answers to these questions determine the road that the communist party follows, because it determines which classes it fights, and which it organizes--i.e. its strategy of revolution.

Although Marx never defined what he meant by the term "class", Lenin did. To Lenin classes were defined by the relationship to the means of production (ownership), socially by their role in the system of production (overseeing, labouring, expropriating, etc.), and belong to a specific historical period. Although the early communists seem to have heard of some Lenin's class terms, they remained essentially uninformed with respect to his definition of classes. Consequently their general understanding of classes did not depart from that of their contemporaries.

Gongchandang did not present a class analysis of Chinese society in any single article, but a composite of separate articles suggests that the early communists agreed on the existence of several classes in China.

"A Call to the Peasants of China"⁴⁷ presented one of the most detailed descriptions of classes in Chinese society. The author of this article, which was published in April 1921, argued that any successful "social revolution" had to include peasants.

Some people say that the lives of Chinese peasants

are not completely sorrowful, and that they are not completely oppressed. Because peasants all own land which they cultivate themselves, they do not solely rely upon rented fields to make their living. Even if the produce from rented fields is divided in half, it is divided evenly, and there isn't, therefore, any inequity in distribution. Because of this, you cannot develop their consciousness by propagandizing them.⁴⁸

The author of "A Call to the Peasants of China" said that this argument was "completely false".⁴⁹ He used the situation of peasants in his "hometown" to present a class analysis of rural society.

The author pointed out that while it may have been true that many peasants owned some land, this did not mean that the conditions of all peasants were the same, or that some peasants were not oppressed.

Some people say that all Chinese peasants own land. This is partially true but it is a bit too sweeping. A three-person household which owns a thousand mu counts as owning land, as does a ten-person household which owns one mu. On the basis of this kind of ownership can you say that the lives of all peasants are the same and that there is no exceptional suffering?⁵⁰

In other words, even if all peasants owned land, it did not follow that they were all well off.

He saw the miserable condition of some peasants as the result of the class nature of rural society. He suggested that a careful examination of the actual conditions of peasants would reveal that:

. . . There are several classes [ji ceng jieji 几层阶级, lit. "several levels of classes"] amongst peasants: (1) There are those who own most of the land, do not cultivate it themselves, and either hire cultivators or rent it out to cultivators, and who receive rent. These kinds of people do not count as pure peasants and are called "the landed rich" [tu caizhu 土豪] in my hometown. (2) Second are those who own their own land, cultivate it themselves, and are able to support their

whole family with its produce. Aside from owning their own land, they also rent land to other people to cultivate. These kinds of people are called middle peasants [zhongdeng nongmin 中农]. (3) Third are those who own some land, but cannot support their whole family by relying upon its produce. Therefore they can only rely upon cultivating other people's land in exchange for some of their produce. These kinds of people can be called lower peasants [xiaji nongmin 下农]. (4) Fourth are the "paupers" [qiong guang dan 穷光蛋]. They have no land whatsoever, and are completely dependent upon cultivating other people's land in order to make a living.⁵¹

Thus, "A call to the peasants of China" identified four classes in rural society--"the landed rich", middle peasants, lower peasants, and "paupers".

Of these four classes, the first two classes were relatively small and led fairly comfortable lives. Accordingly, they were not "the object of our question". The third and fourth groups, the vast majority of Chinese peasants, were the object, however:

The situation of the fourth kind of peasant is simply extremely terrible. Working every day until late, after a year of bitter toil, they are still not sufficiently clothed nor have enough to eat. When the landlord is stubborn, they more or less starve to death. Therefore, the lives of these peasants are extremely sorrowful. Although peasants in the third category own some land, they still rent other people's land, but because their cost of living keeps rising, they frantically borrow goods, and are unable to maintain the lives of their whole families. Therefore, a whole year's income cannot go into the peasant's household, some must go to the creditor to pay back some of the principle or the interest. For these reasons, the little land that you own can only gradually be sold or given to "the landed rich" or middle peasants. . .and you ultimately end up in the fourth category of peasants. Therefore, these peasants' lives are completely sorrowful.⁵²

The terminology that "A Call to Peasants" applied to rural classes, in particular "middle peasants" and "lower

peasants" was suggestive of Lenin. But upon closer examination it is evident that the middle peasants of "A Call to Peasants" were different from those of Lenin. For example, Lenin gave the following partial definition of middle peasants:

In the economic sense, one should understand by "middle peasants" those small farmers who, (1) either as owners or tenants, hold plots of land that are also small but. . .are sufficient not only to provide, as a general rule, a meagre subsistence for the family and the bare minimum needed to maintain the farm but also produce as certain surplus. . .; (2) quite frequently. . .resort to the employment of hired labour.⁵³

Thus according to Lenin, the essential characteristic of middle peasants was that they produced a surplus over what they required to meet their needs. But for "A Call to Peasants" the essential characteristic of middle peasants was that they owned sufficient land to support their families, and not that they produce a surplus. Thus "A Call to Peasants" defined its rural classes solely in terms of ownership of the means of production, i.e. ownership of land. Consequently its understanding of classes was not consistent with that of Lenin, but was consistent with the earlier understanding of classes in China as economic groupings defined by ownership of the means of production. Thus it appears that while the author of "A Call to the Peasants of China" was familiar with the terminology Lenin applied to rural classes, he was ignorant of Lenin's actual definitions of these classes.

"A Call to the Peasants of China" also saw the phenomenon of increasing polarization between its four rural "classes". As more and more land accumulated in the hands of the landlords, more and more of the lower peasants became landless.

Land was becoming concentrated into the hand of a progressively smaller group of people. Therefore, "class differences are becoming clearer, and the life of the average peasant is becoming more bitter."⁵⁴ Because of this, there was a growing tendency for class consciousness to appear amongst the peasants. Accordingly, lower and poor peasants were potentially revolutionary. But "A Call to Peasant's" view of the polarization of rural society into the class which owned land and the class which did not, closely paralleled Marx's description of the concentration of ownership in industrial capitalist society. This suggests that it is possible that "A Call to Peasant's" statement that class differences were becoming more evident in rural society meant that the class distinctions between "propertied" and "unpropertied" were becoming more apparent in the countryside, and that consequently the author of "A Call to Peasants" did not recognize any real differences between classes in the countryside and in the cities. If this was the case, it reinforces the argument that the author of "A Call to Peasants" was ignorant of the fact that Lenin held that rural and urban classes were distinct in all but the most advanced of capitalist economies.⁵⁵

The terms "proletariat" and "labouring class" were used interchangeably. Zhou Fuhai, for example, used the term "the dictatorship of the unpropertied class" in November 1920,⁵⁶ and the term "the dictatorship of the labourers" in April 1921,⁵⁷ to describe the political system after the revolution. Some articles used the term "labouring class", others the term "unpropertied class", to refer to the class which would do the

overthrowing in this revolution.⁵⁸

Whatever term used, it is evident that peasants, at least poor peasants, were included in this class. Consider Shi Cuntong's definition of "the unpropertied class":

The scope of the unpropertied class is very broad. It includes factory labourers, mine labourers, shop labourers, communication labourers, barge labourers, tenant farmers [dianhu 佃户], agricultural hired hands [nongye gugong 农业雇工], unskilled labourers, disbanded soldiers, and all other unpropertied [wuchan zhe 无产者].⁵⁹

Thus "tenant farmers" and "hired hands" are clearly included within the ranks of "the unpropertied class".

This was consistent with the position of "A Call to Labour"⁶⁰ which said:

The labourers of all industries and all places must become conscious that the capitalists of all industries in all places are a class, and that the labourers of all industries in all places, are a class.⁶¹

But this "labouring class" did the following things:

Grain is planted by you. Cloth is woven by you. Clothes are sewn by you. . . .⁶²

Therefore, planters of grain, i.e. peasants, are part of this class of labourers.

From these examples it is evident that the terms "labouring class" and "unpropertied class" included all labourers who owned little or no property, i.e. both urban proletariat and poor peasants. The "wuchan jieji", which today is usually translated as "the proletariat", included peasants and industrial workers in a single class.

A class, however, is always one of a pair of opposites. If one class is exploited, there must be another which exploits.

The contributors to Gongchandang referred to this exploitative class as "the propertied class" (youchan jieji 有产阶级), or "the capitalist class" (ziben jieji 资产阶级).

Landlords, and industrial capitalists, were both seen as members of this class. In fact, "A call to labour" explicitly identified landlords as capitalists:

Those who run factories are big capitalists. Those who receive rent and charge interest are small capitalists. Their size may differ, but the evil that they make is the same.⁶³

This implies that landlords, those who rent out land and make high interest loans, were seen as "small capitalists". The "landed rich" of "A Call to the Peasants of China" were also identified as those who rent out land and make loans,⁶⁴ while "A Call to Labourers, Peasants and Soldiers"⁶⁵ identified "land, machinery, houses, and other tools of production" as that which is owned by "the capitalists".⁶⁶

Thus it is evident that landlords, the dominant class of Lenin's "semi-feudal" rural economy, were not seen as a separate class, but as members of the dominant class of capitalist society--the capitalist class. Youchan jieji, the term usually translated as "the bourgeoisie" today, referred to "the propertied class", which included both landlords, and industrial capitalists. This view of landlords and capitalists, on the one hand, as a single class, and workers and peasants, on the other hand, as a single class was consistent with the understanding of classes, as social groupings defined by ownership (or non-ownership) of property, which had appeared in China in 1919.

There was also some agreement upon the existence of a

two "middle classes"--"the small propertied class" (xiao youchan jieji 小资产阶级) and "the intellectual class" (zhishi jieji 知识分子).

Both Zhou Fuhai and Shi Cuntong identified these two classes in their discussions of the stages, or purposes, of the dictatorship of the proletariat.⁶⁷ Only Zhou, however, defined these classes. He wrote that after the dictatorship of the proletariat had eliminated the capitalist class,

. . . Those who actively destroy socialist construction are the small propertied class and the intellectual class. In concrete terms this class is composed of such kinds of people as craftsmen, teachers, specialists, and doctors.⁶⁸

This "definition", however, was ambiguous. It is not clear whether Zhou referred to both "the small propertied class" and "the intellectual class" as "this class" or just "the intellectual class". He did, however, go on to say that "the masses of the unpropertied class are led by the intellectuals."⁶⁹

The class of intellectuals according to Gongchandang would ally with the proletariat during the period of the revolution which was directed against the bourgeoisie. In a remarkable echo of "On the Middle Class" published in July 1921,⁷⁰ "A Call to Labourers, Peasants and Soldiers" explained why intellectuals were revolutionary:

. . . Intellectual work . . . is also a kind of commodity . . . In today's society intellectual work counts as high level but those with knowledge more often than not work for other people. The lives of those who work with their minds are impoverished.⁷¹

Thus in the final analysis, Gongchandang's description

of classes in Chinese society did not significantly depart from previous understandings of classes in China. This suggests that the contributors to Gongchandang were fundamentally unaware of Lenin's analysis of classes. But based on its class analysis of Chinese society, Gongchandang developed a strategy of revolution. Essentially, the revolution would be brought about by "the unpropertied class" and "the intellectual class". It would be directed against "the propertied class" and "the small propertied class" would, for a time at least, ally with "the unpropertied class".

4. Seize Political Power: The Revolutionary Road

In What is to be Done?, Lenin described the general approach of, the organizational form of, problems encountered by, and central tasks of the revolutionary party. Essentially, he argued that proletarian revolution could only be brought about if the proletariat was conscious. Therefore, the central task of the revolutionary party was to educate the proletariat so as to rouse its latent consciousness. Since such education could only be carried out by those who were themselves class conscious, the revolutionary party had to consist of those who were the most class conscious, i.e. those whom Lenin referred to as the "vanguard" of the proletariat.

Although Gongchandang dealt with questions of consciousness, and even came close to the concept of the vanguard party, there is no evidence which suggests that the contributors to Gongchandang were aware of Lenin's thesis on the vanguard party.

By the spring of 1921, Gongchandang started to describe the path which the early communists thought would lead to a successful "social revolution".

Writing in June 1921, Zhou Fuhai made it clear that only the seizure of state power could bring about socialism. In "Seize Political Power",⁷² Zhou wrote that political power could only be gained through violent revolution:

First is to seize political power. . . . Our so-called seizure of power does not make use of parliamentarianism to fool around with the propertied class, spreading a little righteousness in government. That is to say, we must use revolutionary means to overthrow the propertied class, and to place political power in the hands of unpropertied class.⁷³

Since this article was primarily a critique of anarchism, Zhou continued by arguing that "common sense" dictated that it was necessary to seize political power and establish a new state. He did not describe the nature of these "revolutionary means".⁷⁴

"A Call to Labourers, Peasants and Soldiers" in May 1921, had been a little more specific in describing this revolution, which would not simply be an armed insurrection.

You must not be afraid of this word revolution. To leave the bitter life of today, we must have our own power, and revolution cannot be avoided. I assure you that our revolution does not call upon you to take up arms. This old-style revolution cannot be used today. Revolution calls upon you to unite, to unite together so as to consistently resist your enemies.⁷⁵

In other words, the communist revolution would not simply be an armed insurrection or the kind of extended military campaign being pushed by the Guomindang. This revolution would have a relatively long period of preparation.

In order to resist an enemy, according to this "Call",

it was first necessary to identify the enemy. There were three enemies in China:

First are officials. Take a look at the petty officials of your villages and you can know the crimes of all officials. Second are the militarists. Officers lead troops into your villages, they rape your wives, beat your parents, and demand your money. These militarists are abetted by the officials. They are evil in the same way that officials are evil. Third are the capitalists.⁷⁶

This was the first step of the revolution--"to recognize your enemies".⁷⁷

These enemies would not stand idly by and allow themselves to be overthrown. They would use all sorts of "lies" to prevent the unity of the masses. Therefore, the second step of revolution would expose their manoeuvres, i.e. it would carry out ideological propaganda."⁷⁸ Echoing Shi Cuntong's thesis of the international nature of communism and capitalism, this "Call" pointed out that the third step of revolution would "unite the labourers of the whole world". This unity was necessary because the enemies of Chinese labourers were supported by the foreign powers and foreign capitalists.⁷⁹

The fourth step was to mobilize military units for the actual seizure of power.⁸⁰ Only after all of these steps could "the dictatorship of labour" be instituted and socialism be realized.⁸¹

"A Call to Labourers, Peasants and Soldiers" did not deal with the issue of class conscious, but "A Call to Labour", published in June 1921, described class consciousness as a necessary pre-condition for revolution. First, it pointed out to labour that it creates all wealth and asked:

All of the things of the world are made by you. All of the things of the world should be controlled by you. Then why is it that you have such suffering? Do you know where your suffering comes from? It is not necessary to say that your suffering comes from the fact that you are all oppressed labourers. Land, machines, houses, and other tools of production are all privately owned by the capitalists. If you want to work so that you can eat, but do not own any land, machines, houses, or other tools, you can only sell your physical labour power to the capitalists becoming their unskilled labour. The wages given to unskilled labourers by the capitalists are only enough to fill our mouths dragging out our miserable existences, while most of the profits pour into the coffers of the capitalists. Because of this the capitalists grow richer day by day, while the labourers grow poorer day by day. If you wish to end your suffering, the privately owned land, machines, houses, and other tools of production owned by the capitalists, must be transformed into the common property of all labourers.⁸²

In other words, capitalist exploitation was responsible for the abject condition of the labouring masses, and socialism was the only means of changing this situation. According to "A Call to Labour", in order to achieve socialism,

The labourers of all industries and all places must become conscious that the capitalists of all industries in all places are a class, and that the labourers of all industries in all places are a class, and that these two classes are forever incompatible. . . . Unless the labourers of all places and industries organize themselves into a class, they will never have the strength to resist the powerful capitalist class. Without the strength to resist the capitalist class, it will be impossible to transform the capitalists' privately owned tools of production into the common property of the labourers. Unless the tools of production are commonly owned by the labourers, their suffering can never be eliminated. This, then, is called class consciousness.⁸³

In other words, class consciousness on the part of the "labouring class" was the awareness that the interests of the capitalists as a class were inimical to those of the labourers as a class and that only collective ownership of the means of

production could ultimately improve their condition. Only when the labouring class had this consciousness could communist revolution occur.

"A Call to Labour" did not describe the manner in which consciousness develops. This question was examined in April 1921, in "A Call to the Peasants of China" which pointed out that a successful revolution in China required that peasants be class conscious.

The peasants are the great majority of the Chinese population. They are very important during the period in which revolution is prepared, as well as during the period in which it is carried out. If they are class conscious so that they can rise up and carry out class struggle, our social revolution, communism, is completely possible.⁸⁴

Without the peasants, the revolution could not succeed, and the peasants would only take part in the revolution if they were class conscious. Class consciousness develops naturally:

Class consciousness . . . is completely consistent with the natural tendencies among masses. If it is not induced from the outside, it is something that a mass itself will one day discover. Class struggle necessarily occurs as the natural result of the fierce conflict between two completely irreconcilable masses reaching its limit, when the suffering of the ruled is at its greatest.⁸⁵

Although class consciousness may be a "natural result" this article went on to point out that its development could be encouraged.

. . . If you await its natural development, it will occur a little later. Because this tendency exists anyways, if you add on artificial means to promote it, it will happen a little sooner.⁸⁶

In other words, although the development of class consciousness was inevitable, its development could be stimulated by an

external agent. All that was needed to encourage the development of class consciousness amongst the peasants was "to think of a way to propagandize them."⁸⁷

In "How Do We Make Social Revolution?", Shi Cuntong argued that only a highly conscious minority, in effect what Lenin called a "vanguard", could bring about "social revolution".⁸⁸ According to Shi, this vanguard, or group of "radicals", was to be composed of "the three-cornered alliance of the unpropertied class, soldiers and students". All three were needed because

The people who are the strongest in making a social revolution in China are the unpropertied class and soldiers, but these two kinds of people are not conscious today and do not understand socialism. To make them conscious and to believe in socialism, conscious students must enter their organizations and carry out propaganda. When more of the unpropertied class and soldiers believe in socialism, the alliance of the three can seize its opportunity to suddenly rise up, creating a social revolution by grasping political power in our hands and using it to create the economic organization of communism.⁸⁹

Therefore, this revolution would be brought about by workers and soldiers who had been made conscious by the propaganda activities of students.

Thus, according to Shi, students bore the major burden of bringing about revolution. Only students could play the role of propagandists.

Because the situation of students is better than that of most members of the unpropertied class and most soldiers, it is easier for consciousness to occur amongst them. It is easier for them to be affected by socialism, and to be willing to make sacrifices for socialism. Although there is a minority which is corrupt, the vast majority of students is honest and innocent. Today, most of those who read socialist books and newspapers are students. Many of them are believers in socialism. I believe that the students' task, to make

a social revolution in China, is very heavy. Without them, social revolution cannot possibly succeed. Why? Because in China today, only students can become propagandists. It can be said that students are the catalysts for the unpropertied class and soldiers. Without students, they cannot unite under one "ism".⁹⁰

Shi continued by pointing out that students would first have to organize themselves in order to carry out this task. This organization would extend from each school to the national level, and would allow students to research socialism and the condition of the labouring people.⁹¹

Shi wrote that organization, in itself, was not sufficient to raise the consciousness of the workers and soldiers. Students had to physically enter factories and military units to carry out their propaganda tasks effectively. This would allow them to earn the trust of the workers and the soldiers, and to tell them about socialism.⁹²

Those who were best able to bring about socialism, according to Shi, were the factory workers. Particular emphasis, therefore, had to be placed upon "propagandizing" them. Students had to enter the factories and cause the workers to have "consciousness, training, and organization." In particular, students should organize labour unions and other organizations.

Unions have two purposes: one is to improve the life of the labourers by struggling with the capitalist class; one is to prepare labourers to control industrial enterprises in the future by training them. In order for us to make social revolution, unions must quickly be organized.⁹³

Therefore, students not only had to tell workers about socialism, they had to organize them into trade unions.

Shi was well aware that there were relatively few

factory workers in China at this time. He therefore felt that workers did not have sufficient strength to carry out revolution on their own. The most powerful people in China were soldiers. Therefore, students also had to join ranks with them, become their friends and show them that their interests lay with the workers, join with them, seize power, and bring about the desired revolution.⁹⁴

The path of revolution which Shi Cuntong described was very clear. He proposed a revolution which would be brought about by "the direct action of the three cornered alliance of the unpropertied class, students and soldiers."⁹⁵ Only students had a sufficiently developed understanding of Chinese society, and of socialism, to be able to raise the consciousness of the workers and soldiers. They therefore had to go down to the workers and soldiers, join with them, raise their consciousness, and bring about a revolution. According to Shi, this was the only way in which a communist revolution could be brought about in China.

Shi's description of the path of revolution was consistent with the positions of his colleagues. They all saw the need to develop "class consciousness". They felt that this development could be stimulated by effective propaganda.⁹⁶

Nowhere in "How Do We Make Social Revolution?" does Shi point to the necessity of organizing the conscious minority into a political party. For that matter, none of the contributors to Gongchandang ever made this point. This suggests that the early communists were unaware of the Leninist concept of a "vanguard party".⁹⁷ It is possible, of course, that the early communists

were so preoccupied with organizing a "vanguard party" that they never bothered to mention it, but this is unlikely. If this was the case, then it is highly probable that one of the contributors would have used the term "vanguard", but we find that Shi Cuntong, for example, never applies this term to his conscious minority.

The revolutionary path described in Gongchandang was not that which ultimately succeeded in China. It would take as great deal more practical experience, and substantial theoretical re-evaluation , before that strategy emerged. The early communists, however, were aware that if their revolution was to succeed, they, that is students and young intellectuals, had to go down propagandize, and organize, the masses. And that, more or less, is what they did.

CONCLUSION

The program of the Chinese Communist Party as presented in Gongchandang was conditioned by concepts which had appeared in China before 1920. In particular concepts of revolution and classes strongly influenced Gongchandang's analysis of revolution, concepts which are neither Marxism nor Leninist in origin but were, in fact, anarchist concepts.

According to anarchism, "Social Revolution" would lead to communist, i.e. classless and stateless, society. The Bolshevik Revolution had been understood as such a "social revolution" and Bolshevism itself was confused with anarchism. At the same time that the Bolshevik Revolution came to be seen as a "social revolution", there was an increasing awareness of the need for such a revolution in China. These two elements--Bolshevism as "social revolution" and the need for such a revolution in China--were brought together in Gongchandang. Russian-style social revolution was the declared objective of the early Chinese communist movement. Gongchandang distinguished its "social revolution" from that of the anarchists by arguing that the communist "social revolution" would use the seizure of political power, i.e. "political revolution", as the means of realizing the social revolution. In effect, Gongchandang argued that only communism could realize the anarchist dream.

Class struggle was the method of bringing about the communist revolution. Gongchandang claimed, in a remarkable echo of earlier populist sentiments, that this class struggle would occur as the result of the stimulation of the development of class consciousness. Thus students should go down to,

propagandize and organize, the masses of peasants and industrial workers.

This program of revolution was also conditioned by Gongchandang's analysis of classes. The revolution would be brought about by the alliance of the intellectual class and the unpropertied class. This view of intellectuals as sharing the same class interests as the oppressed masses was a common theme of the period. Another common theme was the understanding of classes seen in the wake of the Bolshevik Revolution. This view of classes--social groupings defined by ownership of the means of production, i.e. of property--added an economic content to those classes which had been previously described by anarchism. Where anarchists had identified oppressor and oppressed classes, exploiter and exploited, i.e. "propertied" and "unpropertied", classes were now seen. Gongchandang shared this understanding of classes in so far as it identified a class composed of landlords and capitalists, as well as a class composed of peasants and industrial workers, as the basic classes of Chinese society.

Gongchandang's perception of society was also conditioned by limited access to, and consequent fragmentary knowledge of, Marxism and Leninism. Although intellectuals were familiar with the basic formal elements of Marx's theories, in practice their understandings of reality remained essentially unchanged. This can be seen in the idealist interpretations of Chinese history found in Li Dazhao's and Hu Hanmin's examinations of the history of Chinese thought. Both were familiar with the principle of the materialist conception of history, but in practice confused it with economic determinism

and Malthus. Marxism's failure to change basic perceptions was also evident in the understanding of the theory of surplus value as equivalent to "property is theft", and can even be seen in the concept of class struggle as a kind of device or means of achieving social revolution.

There is no evidence which suggests that the contributors to Gongchandang were familiar with Lenin's theories. Specifically, they failed to use his theory of revolution to justify communist revolution in China, and instead argued that since Chinese and Russian society were of the same nature, Bolshevism could bring about revolution in China. In so far as they were aware of Lenin's concept of the vanguard party, the contributors to Gongchandang never mentioned this, nor used the term, nor discussed the importance of regrouping the most conscious elements of the unpropertied in the party.

Since the First Congress of the Chinese Communist Party did adopt Leninist principles of organization, it is likely therefore that whatever the early communists did know about the vanguard party had originated with the Comintern. Assuming that Comintern agents were familiar with Lenin's theories of imperialism and vanguard party, Gongchandang's failure to deal with these questions seems to suggest that there was not much Comintern input into the positions of the pre-Congress communist movement in China.

Finally, although Gongchandang's programme was in many ways a response to anarchism, anarchist conceptions of reality influenced its positions. "Social revolution" was after all an anarchist term. But the influence of anarchism was particularly

evident in Gongchandang's class concepts. In effect, Gongchandang saw society in terms of two classes--the propertied and the unpropertied--which corresponded to the anarchist's oppressor and oppressed classes. Landlords and capitalists, who made up the ruling class, i.e. the target of the anarchist revolution, were seen as the propertied class, the target of the communist revolution.

This view of classes, i.e. a single class composed of landlords and capitalists and a single class composed of workers and peasants, also implies that Chinese intellectuals before 1921 were completely unaware of class differences between the landlords and the bourgeoisie, and between the peasantry and the proletariat. In the urban world of progressive intellectuals, as far as they were aware, some landlords owned land and some factory owners owned land. Industrial workers and peasants were equally poor, talked alike, dressed alike, and ate the same foods. The differences between these classes are essentially political. Chinese factory owners, faced with direct competition from foreign-owned enterprises, had an objective interest in opposing imperialism. Landlords, on the other hand, had no such interest unless they were faced with direct expropriation which was rare. Industrial workers were more concentrated together than peasants, and were easier to organize and easier to propagandize. Poor peasants like industrial workers had nothing to loose by supporting the communist revolution. Their most immediate interest was not the socialization of ownership of the means of production, however, but ownership of land. Thus, the revolutionary party's approach to poor peasants could not be the

same as that to industrial workers.

These differences between landlords and capitalists, between peasants and industrial workers, were not evident in 1921. In 1921, communist intellectuals' experience of Chinese society was too limited. They would only become aware of these differences after considerable effort and much re-evaluation of their understandings of Marxist-Leninist theory.

FOOTNOTES

Introduction

1. There is some dispute as to the actual date of this Congress. Until recently July 1919 was the generally accepted date. See the discussion of this question in Jerome Ch'en, p. 79, n.32. However, the CCP now officially gives August, 1921, as the date of the Congress. The fact that Gongchandang, the pre-party organ, suspended publication in August 1921, would seem to support the view that the Congress was held in August and I have consequently given this date.

2. James Pickney Harrison, The Long March to Power: A History of the Chinese Communist Party, 1921-1973 (New York and Washington: Praeger Publishers, 1972), p. 28.

3. For more information on the activities of these communist groups see, Chow Tse-tsung, The May Fourth Movement: Intellectual Revolution in Modern China (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960), pp. 248-249; Jerome Ch'en, Mao and the Chinese Revolution (London: Oxford University Press, 1965), pp. 72-73, 77-79; Maurice Meisner, Li Ta-chao and the Origins of Chinese Marxism (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1967), pp. 114-119; Ding Shouhe and Yan Xuyi, Congwusi qimeng yundong dao Makesizhuyi di chuanbo [From the May Fourth enlightenment to the transmission of Marxism] (Peking: Sanlian Shudian, 1963), pp. 277ff.

4 Chow, p.248.

5. For a list of those works of Marx, Lenin, and Engels, which were translated in this period, and their dates of publication, see Zhongguo chu ban shi liao bu bien, [Supplement to Historical materials on publishing in China], ed. Zhang Jinglu (Peking: Beijing Chonghua Shuju, 1957), pp. 442 ff. See also Ding Shouhe, Yin Xuyi, and Zhang Pozhao, Shiyue geming dui Zhongguo geming di yingxiang, (The influence of the October revolution on the Chinese revolution), (Peking: Renmin Chubanshe, 1957), pp. 81-82.

6. Ibid.

7. According to Meisner, Li Dazhao admitted in 1921 that he had only read a collection of speeches by Lenin, Lenin's Outline of the Soviet Government, and The State and Revolution, and furthermore that Li had read all of these works in English. See Meisner, pp. 139-140.

8. The last issue of Gongchandang, dated August 7, 1921, contained a translation of the first chapter of The State and Revolution.

9. Throughout this thesis, "Marxism" refers to Marx's

theories of surplus value, historical materialism and class struggle. "Leninism" refers to the theories of the vanguard party and imperialism. "Bolshevism" refers to Marxism-Leninism as practiced in Russia before 1921. "Communism" is used to refer to the theories of a Marxist-Leninist party, but is often used interchangeably with "Bolshevism".

10. For a discussion of the anarchist tradition, see Martin Bernal, "The Triumph of Anarchism over Marxism, 1906-1907," China in Revolution: The First Phase, ed. Mary C. Wright (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1968). See also Martin Bernal, Chinese Socialism to 1907 (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1976) which is the most complete examination of early Marxist thought in China. Robert Scalapino & George Yu, The Chinese Anarchist Movement (Berkeley, California: University of California Center for Chinese Studies, 1961) and Li Yu-ning, The Introduction of Socialism into China (New York & London: Columbia University Press, 1971).

11. The term "generation" is used metaphorically. This discussion of generations of progressive intellectuals follows Dirlik, except that where Dirlik uses the term "radical" to refer to these generations. I use the term "progressive" on the grounds that each generation was not radical relative to subsequent ones, but were progressive relative to the rest of Chinese society. See Arif Dirlik, Revolution and History: The Origins of Marxist Historiography in China, 1919-1937 (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1978), pp. 36-41.

12. See Chow Tse-tsung, Research Guide to the May Fourth Movement (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963), p. 29.

13. Ibid., p. 40.

14. Ibid., p. 43.

15. Ibid., p. 44.

16. Ibid., 124.

17. As a revival school of revolution, it is unlikely that anarchist journals would spend much time describing Marx's theories. Again, there is a lack of references in secondary works in Chinese which suggest that anarchist publications played major roles in disseminating Marxism between 1917 and 1921. See, for example, Ding and Yan.

18. See, for example, Harrison.

19. See Chapter Three below.

20. For eg, it has been taken by Benjamin Schwartz, Chinese Communism and the Rise of Mao (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951) and by Jerome Ch'en, Mao and the Chinese

Revolution (London: Oxford University Press, 1965).

21. See especially Dirilik, pp. 3-4.
22. For descriptions of these debates see Bernal, "The Triumph of Anarchism Over Marxism" and Chinese Socialism to 1907. See also Scalapino and Yu, and Li Yu-ning.
23. Zhou Fuhai participated in the pre-1911 debates as well as in the 1917-1921 debates.
24. See note 10 above.
25. Ibid., p. 1.
26. See Li's list of Chinese terms dervied from the Japanese.
27. See Chapter 2, Section 4, "Class Struggle".
28. Ibid.
29. See Note 10 above.
30. Meisner, p. 54.
31. This position is put forward in Scalapino and Yu.
32. This is not to deny that there are disadvantages to a social democratic tradition from the point of view of a Marxist-Leninist party.
33. See Scalapino and Yu
34. See, for example, Alexander Berkman, Now and After: The ABC of Communist Anarchism (New York: Vanguard Press, 1929).
35. See V.I. Lenin, The State and Revolution (Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1975), p. 102.

Chapter 1. Revolution: Russia and China

1. Wang Chengli, "Wusi shiqi dashi ji" [A record of the major events of the May Fourth period], in "Wusi" yundong yanjiu lunji [Research essays on the "May Fourth" Movement], ed. Zhou kangxie, (Hong Kong: Chong Wen Shudian, 1975), pp. 299-307. Originally published in Lishi jiaoxue wenti [Probelms of teaching history] 1959,4.
2. Liu Wenying, "Shiyue geming yu wusi yundong" [The October Revolution and the May Fourth Movement], "Wusi" yanjiu lunji, 74. (Originally published in Lishi Jiaoxue Wenti 1959,4.) All translations are mine.

3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
5. According to Ding, Yan, and Zhang, p.40., Laodong had "a tendency towards anarchism". This probable means that this was, in fact, an anarchist publication.
6. Ibid., p. 41.
7. See, for example, Chen Duxiu, "Eluosi geming yu wo guomin di juewu," [The Russian revolution and the determination of our country's people], Duxiu Wencun [Selected Works of Chen Duxiu], 3 vols (Hong Kong: Yuan Dong Tu Shu Gongsi, 1965) I:143-144. Originally published in Xin Qingnian 3,2(April 1, 1917). For Li Dazhao's reaction, see Meisner, p. 60.
8. Meisner, p.60.
9. Ibid.
10. See Xin Qingnian 3,2(April 1, 1917):1 in "The record of important foreign events section." This view of the importance of the Russian Revolution was apparently not shared by the editors of Dongfang Zazhi, which was the longest lived publication of this period. In their calendar of events, they list the overthrow of the czar as the third item for the date concerned. cf. Dongfang Zazhi 14,5(April, 1917):216.
11. James Pickney Harrison, The Long March to Power: A History of the Chinese Communist Party, 1921-1973 (New York and Washington: Praeger Publishers, 1972), p. 28.
12. Zhang Xichen [Gaolao], "Xu ji Eguo zhi jin kuang" [A further report on the current situation in Russia], Dongfang Zazhi 15,1(January, 1918):37-42.
13. Ding Shouhe and Yan Xuyi, Cong Wusi qimeng yundong dao Makesizhuyi di chuanbo [From the May Fourth enlightenment to the transmission of Marxism] (Peking: Sanlian Shudian, 1963), p. 94.
14. Zhang, p. 37.
15. Ibid., p. 39.
16. Ibid., p. 42.
17. Yu Zhongying [Junshi], "Eguo xianzai zhizhengdang" [Political parties of Russia today], Dongfang Zazhi 15,2 (Feb., 1918):161-164.
18. Shan Ji, "Xu Eguo guojipai zhi lingxiu Lining" [The story of Lenin, the leader of the Russian extremist faction], Dongfang Zazhi 15,3:61-65. This article was written in response to the argument that Lenin was a German agent. Essentially it

found that his policies before going through German controlled territory and his later policies remained the same.

19. Yu Zhongying [Jun Shi], "Eguo shehuizhuyi yundong zhi bianqian" [The evolution of the Russian socialist movement], Dongfang Zazhi 15,4:61-65.

20. Ibid., p. 64.

21. Ibid.

22. Ibid., p. 61.

23. An article comparing the two revolutions was also published in Dongfang Zazhi, but the fact that it does not refer to both the February and October Revolutions, suggests that it was written before October, 1917. See Xie Yingbai, "E Fa geming yi tong lun" [On the differences and similarities of the Russian and French revolutions], Dongfang Zazhi 15,8(August, 1918):31. This article was translated from The Japan Foreign Times.

24. Li Dazhao, "E Fa geming bijiao guan" [A comparison of the Russian and French revolutions], Li Dazhao Xuanji [The selected works of Li Dazhao] (Peking: Renmin Chubanshe, 1959), pp. 101-104.

25. Ibid., p. 102.

26. Li Dazhao, "Bolshevism di shengli" [The victory of 'Bolshevism'], Li Dazhao Xuanji, pp. 112-118. Originally published in Xin Qingnian 5,5(November 15, 1918).

27. Ibid., p. 114.

28. Li was trying to describe the soviet system. The term "soviet" is transliterated in modern Chinese. The term "lianhe", means "coalition" or "union".

29. This is probably an attempt to translate "proletarians" which is translated today as wuchan zhe, lit. "propertyless".

30. "Bolshevism di shengli", pp. 114-115.

31. Li Dazhao, "Lianzhizhuyi yu shijie zuzhi" [Unionism and world organization], Li Dazhao Xuanji, pp. 130-134, esp. p. 130. This article was originally published in Xin Chao, 1,2(Feb. 1, 1919).

32. Ibid., p. 132.

33. Although Li makes it quite clear that he believes that this is the Russian system, he confuses it with a federated system. He comments favourably upon the Canadian system and its ability to reconcile French and English. He also comments upon the Union of South Africa's ability to reconcile English and

Dutch. These comments are omitted in Li Dazhao Xuanji. Compare Li Dazhao Xuanji, p. 122 and Xin Chao, 1,2(Feb.1, 1919.):153-154.

34. See Berkman, Now and After, p. 217. See also Peter Kropotkin, The Conquest of Bread (London: Chapman and Hall, 1906), p. 30.

35. Li Dazhao, "Zhan hou di shijie chaoliu" [The world tide after the war], Li Dazhao Xuanji, p. 135. This article was originally published in Chen Bao (The morning post), Feb. 7-8, 1910. Li expressed similar views throughout this period.

36. Meng Zheng, "Shehui geming--Eguo shi di geming" [Social revolution --Revolution of the Russian type], Xin Chao 1,1(Jan.1,1919):128-129. This article is dated Nov. 20, 1918.

37. "Zhongguo shi daifu jieji di zui'en" [The crimes of China's gentry class], Meizhou Pinglun 20 (May 4, 1919):1-2.

38. Chen Duxiu, "Ershi shiji Eluosi di geming" [The twentieth century Russian revolution], Meizhou Pinglun, 18 (Apr. 20, 1919). Reprinted in Wusi zai Shanghai Shi Liao Xuanji [Selected historical materials on the May Fourth Movement in Shanghai] (Shanghai: Shanghai Renmin Chubanshe, 1960), p. 114.

39. Mao Tse-tung [Zidong], "Minzhong di da lianhe" [The great union of the popular masses], Xiangjiang pinglun ["The Shian Kian Weekly Review"], no.2 (July, 21, 1919), (July 28, 1919) and no.4 (Aug. 4, 1919). Also reprinted in Mo taku-to shu [The works of Mao Tse-tung], 10 vols. (Tokyo, 1972) I:57-70.

40. Xiangjiang Pinglun no. 2, p. 1.

41. Yu Zhongying, "Eguo shehuizhuyi yundong zhi bianqian" [The evolution of the Russian socialist movement], Dongfang Zazhi 15,4(April, 1918):61.

42. Li, "E Fa geming bijiao guan", Li Dazhao Xuanji, p. 104.

43. Li Dazhao, "Shumin di shengli" [The victory of the common people], Li Dazhao Xuanji, 109-111. Originally published in Xin Qingnian 5,5 (November 15, 1918).

44. Ibid., p. 109.

45. Ibid., p. 110.

46. Ibid.

47. Li, "Bolshevism di shengli", Li Dazhao Xuanji, p. 113.

48. Ibid., p. 114.

49. Li, "Zhan hou di shijie chaoliu", Li Dazhao Xuanji, p. 135.

50. Meng Zheng, p. 128.

51. "Guomin sixiang yu shijie chao" [Citizen's thought and the world tide], Guomin (The citizen), 1,2 (Feb., 1919). Cited in Ding, and Yan, p. 8.

52. Ibid.

53. Ruo Yu, "Guoji di geming" [International revolution], Meizhou Pinglun 10 (Feb. 13, 1919): 3.

54. "Lao nong zhengfu xia zhi Eguo--zhixing shehui gongchanzhuyi zhi Eguo zhenxiang" [Russia under the workers' and peasants' government--the truth about carrying out social communism], Guomin Ribao April 12-28, 1919, reprinted in Wusi Yundong zai Shanghai Shi Liao Xuanji, pp. 80-93.

55. Ibid.

56. See, footnote number 37, above.

57. Cai Yuanpei, "Da zhan yu zhexue" [The great war and philosophy], Cai Yuanpei Xiansheng Yiwen Leichao [The literary estate of Mr. Cai Yuanpei] (n.p.: n.p., 1961), pp. 167-172.

58. Ibid., p. 167.

59. Ibid.

60. Ibid., 169-150.

61. This article is dated June, 1918, in Cai Leichao, see p. 172, and was published in Dongfang Zazhi 16,1 (January, 1919) and Xin Chao 1,1 (Jan. 1, 1919).

62. See Xin Qingnian 5,5 (November, 1918).

63. See Xin Qingnian 5,5: 438.

64. Meisner, pp. 87-88.

65. Shi Fu, "Zhongguo zhengshi geming bu cheng jiu ji shehui geming bu fasheng zhi yuanyin" [The reasons for the lack of success of China's political revolution and the non-occurrence of social revolution], Dongfang Zazhi 16,4 (April, 1919): 1-9.

66. Ibid., p. 1.

67. Ibid., pp. 1b-2a.

68. Ibid., p. 2b.

69. Ibid., p. 3a.
70. Ibid., p. 3b.
71. Ibid., p. 8.
72. "Zhongguo shi daifu jieji", Meizhou Pinglun 20:1-2.
73. Mao, "Minzhong di da lianhe", Mo taku-to shu, I:57-70.
74. "Jieji jingzheng yu huzhu" [Class competition and mutual aid], Li Dazhao Xuanji pp. 222-225. Originally published in Meizhou Pinglun 29 (July 6, 1919).
75. Ibid., p. 224.
76. "Zai lun wenti yu zhuyi," [Again on problems and isms], Li Dazhao Xuanji, p. 233. Originally published in Meizhou Pinglun, 34 (Aug. 17, 1919).
77. Zhou Fuhai, "Zhongguo di jieji douzheng" [China's Class Struggle], Jiefang yu gaizao ["The Emancipation and Reconstruction Weekly"], 1,7 (Dec. 1, 1919): 114-120.
78. "Xuanyan" [Manifesto], Jiefang yu gaizao, 1,1 (September, 1919):1. "(BOURGEOISIE)" and "(PROLETARIAT)" appear in the original. The use of English terms supplementing Chinese terms was quite common during this period. See, for example, Xin Qingnian 6,5(May, 1919).
79. Ibid.
80. "Dier duan zhi shijie gaizao" [The second stage of world transformation], Dongfang Zazhi 16,11(November, 1919):15-19.
81. Ibid., p. 16a.
82. Ibid., pp. 18a-18b.
83. Yang Yiceng, "Shehui weishenma yao gaizao", Guomin 2,1:13.
84. Ibid.
85. "Xuanyan", Zhuquang, Nov. 1, 1919. Reprinted in Wusi shiqi qikan jieshao I:407.
86. Cited in Ding and Yan, p. 138.

Chapter 2. Marxism: Ideas, Property and Class Struggle

1. Meisner, p. 54.
2. "Fenpei wenti faduan" [The origins of the distribution problem] Dongfang Zazhi 16,4(April 1, 1919):593-602.
3. Ibid.
4. "Gongchandang di xuanyan" [The Manifesto of the Communist Party], Meizhou Pinglun 16(April 4, 1919).
5. "Ruo Yu, 'Wuzhenfu gongchanzhuyi yu guojia shehuizhuyi'" [Anarchist communism and state socialism], Meizhou Pinglun 18(April 20, 1919):2ff.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid.
8. Ibid.
9. Gu Mengyu [Gu Taoxiong], "Makesi xueshuo" [Marx's theory], Xin Qingnian 6,5(May 4, 1919): 450-465. Meisner, p. 279, n.1, identifies him as "Li Ta-ch'ao's colleague on the history faculty at Peking University, . . . a leading member of the Kuomintang and for many years a follower of Wang Ching-wei."
10. Ling Shuang, "Makesi xueshuo di piping" [A criticism of Marx's theory], Xin Qingnian 6,5:456-469.
11. Li Dazhao, "Wo di Makesizhuyi guan", (shang)" [My Marxist views, pt. I], Li Dazhao Xuanji pp. 173-195. Part II was published in Xin Qingnian 6,6 (November, 1919).
12. The presence of the biography of Bakunin is indicative of the extent of the prevailing confusion between Marxism and anarchism.
13. "Makisi di weiwu shiguan yu zhencao wenti" [Marx's materialist conception of history and the problem of female virtue], Xin Qingnian 6,5:500-505. This article appears under the section heading "Marxist research" (Makisi di yanjiu). Meisner identifies the author as Chen Baoyin also known as Chen Qixiu, who "although the first to translate a portion of Capital into Chinese, apparently did not regard himself as a Marxist and was never a communist." Meisner, pp.279-280, n.1.
14. Kawakami Hajime, "Makesi di weiwu shiguan" [Marx's materialist conception of history], tr. Yuan Quan, Xin Qingnian 6,5:509-516.
15. See, for example, Gu Mengyu, "Makesi xueshuo", Xin Qingnian 6,5:450-465 and Li Dazhao, "Wo di Makesizhuyi guan", Li

Dazhao Xuanji pp. 173-195.

16. Hu Hanmin, "Weiwu shi guan zhi piping zhi piping" [A criticism of the criticism of the material conception of history], Jianshe 1,5 (December, 1919):945-954.

17. Chow Tse-tsung, The May Fourth Movement: Intellectual Revolution in Modern China (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960), p. 290. The translation was published under the title, "Laodong yu ziben" [Labour and Capital].

18. Ibid., p. 299. The second translation was by Dai Jitao.

19. Ibid.

20. Gu Mengyu, Xin Qingnian 6,5:454a.

21. Chen Baoying, Xin Qingnian 6,5:500

22. Ibid., p. 502.

23. Ibid., pp. 504-505.

24. Peter Kropotkin, Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution (London: William Heinemann Co., 1902).

25. Hu Hanmin, "Zhongguo zhexue shi zhi weiwu di yanjiu" [Materialist research on the history of Chinese philosophy], Jianshe 1,3 (Oct. 1, 1919):513-534, 1,4(November 1, 1919):655-691, and Li Dazhao, "You cong jingji shang jieshi Zhongguo jindai sixiang biandong di yuanyin" [An economic explanation of recent ideological changes in China], Li Dazhao Xuanji 295-302. Originally published in Xin Qingnian 7,2 (Jan. 1, 1920).

26. Dai Jitao, "Cong jingji shang guancha zhongguo di luan yuan" [Examination of the origins of disorder in China from the economic perspective], Jianshe 1,1(September 1, 1919):1-19. I have not had access to this work. For a discussion of its contents see Arif Dirlik, Revolution and History: The Origins of Marxist Historiography in China, 1919-1937 (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 1978), pp. 25-29.

27. Hu Hanmin, "Zhongguo zhexue shi", Jianshe 1,3:513-314.

28. See esp. Jianshe 1,4:690.

29. Li Dazhao Xuanji p. 299.

30. Ibid.

31. Ibid., p. 300.

32. Marx, "Preface and Introduction to A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy" (Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1976), p. 3.

33. Kawakami, Xin Qingnian 6,5:512a-512b.

34. Li Dazhao, "Wuzhi biandong yu daode biandong" [Material change and change in virtue], Li Dazhao Xuanji, p. 261. Originally published in Xin Chao 2,2 (Dec. 1. 1919). My Emphasis.

35. Hu, "Zhongguo zhexue shi", Jianshe 1,3:520, and "Weiwu shi guan", Jianshe 1,5:947.

36. Li Dazhao Xuanji, p. 233.

37. Hu, "Zhongguo zhexue shi", Jianshe 1,3:513.

38. Ibid., Jianshe 1,4:690.

39. Li Dazhao Xuanji, p. 300.

40. Gu, "Xueshuo", Xin Qingnian 6,5:458a.

41. Ibid.

42. Ibid., pp. 457b-461b.

43. Marx, "Wage, Labour and Capital", p. 1. Emphasis in the original.

44. See Karl Kautsky, The Economic Doctrines of Karl Marx, trans. H.J.Stenning (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1936).

45. Karl Kautsky, The Class Struggle (Erfurt Program), trans. William H. Bohn (Chicago: Charles H. Kerr and Co., 1912).

46. See Jianshe 1,4.

47. Yu Zhongying [Jun Shi], "Shehuizhuyi di jiantao" [A report on socialism], Dongfang Zazhi 16,9 (September, 1919):100-105; 16,10 (October, 1919):100-111; 16,11 (November, 1919):101-109.

48. Dongfang Zazhi 16,9:102b.

49. Ibid., pp. 102b-103a.

50. Ibid., p. 103a.

51. Dongfang Zazhi 16,10:100a.

52. Ibid., p. 100b.

53. Ibid.

54. Ibid.

55. See Dongfang Zazhi 16,10:101a ff. and Dongfang Zazhi 16,11:101-109.

56. See Karl Marx, Capital; vol. 1, A Critical Analysis of Capitalist Production edited by Frederick Engels (New York: International Publishers, 1967), Chapter 1, "Commodities", pp. 35-85.

57. This position is argued by Berkman, pp. 9-15. He writes, "The employers keep that wealth as their profit, while the worker gets only a wage, just enough to live on so he can go on producing. . . Is that not cheating, robbery? . . . The whole capitalist system rests on simple robbery." (p. 15)

58. Yang Yiceng, "Shehui weishenma yao gaizao," Guomin ["The Citizen"] 2,1 (November, 1919):13-22.

59. Ibid., p. 13.

60. Ibid.

61. Ibid., p. 14.

62. Ibid.

63. Ibid.

64. "Wo di Makesizhuyi guan", Li Dazhao Xuanji, p. 189.

65. Ibid.

66. Ibid.

67. Ibid., p. 190.

68. Hu Hanmin, "Weiwu shi guan", Jianshe 1,5:954-989.

69. "Jieji jingzheng yu huzhu" [Class competition and mutual aid], Li Dazhao Xuanji pp. 222-225. Originally published in Meizhou Pinglun no.29 (July 6, 1919).

70. Ibid., p. 224.

71. Ibid.

72. Ibid., p. 223.

73. Ibid.

74. Zhou Fuhai, "Zhongguo di jieji douzheng" [China's Class Struggle], Jiefang yu gaizao ["The Emancipation and Reconstruction Weekly"], 1,7 (Dec. 1, 1919): 114-120.

75. Ibid., p. 14.
76. Ibid., pp. 116-118.
77. Ibid., pp. 119-120.
78. See Chapter 4 below for Zhou's use of class terminology starting as of November, 1921.
79. Chow Tse-tsung, p. 299. The Communist Manifesto was published under the title U Gongchandang xuanyan [The communist party manifesto]. See Ding, Yan and Zhang, p. 81.
80. "Makesi he Engesi gongchandang xuanyan" [The communist party manifesto of Marx and Engels], trans. Li Zizhang, Guomin 2,1:45-53.
81. See "Bourgeois and Proletarians" in Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, The Communist Manifesto, with an introduction by A.J.P. Taylor (Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1967), pp. 79-94.
82. "Gongchandang xuanyan", Guomin 2,1:46.
83. Lu Hongyu, "Zhengggong zhidu" [The conscript labour system], Dongfang Zazhi 17, 3 (Feb. 10, 1920):9-14; 17,4 (Feb. 25, 1920):26-32; 17,5 (March 10, 1920): 12-20.
84. Ibid., Dongfang Zazhi 17,3:9.
85. Ibid., 13b.
86. "Caichan zhidu" [The system of private property], Dongfang Zazhi 17,7(April 10, 1920):1.

Chapter 3. Classes: The Bourgeoisie and the Proletariat

1. For a discussion of the anarchist tradition, see Martin Bernal, "The Triumph of Anarchism over Marxism, 1906-1907," China in Revolution: The First Phase, ed. Mary C. Wright (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1968). See also Martin Bernal, Chinese Socialism to 1907 (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1976) which is the most complete examination of early Marxist thought in China. Robert Scalapino & George Yu, The Chinese Anarchist Movement (Berkeley, California: University of California Center for Chinese Studies, 1961) and Li Yu-ning, The Introduction of Socialism into China (New York & London: Columbia University Press, 1971).
2. Qian Zhixiu, "Laolizhuyi" [Labourism], Dongfang Zazhi 14,10 (Oct, 1917):1-6.
3. Ibid.

4. Cited by Ding and Yan, p. 28.
5. Cai Yuanpei, "Laodong Shengguai" [The sanctity of labour], Xin Qingnian 5,5(November, 1918):438-439. Also in Cai Chao, p.469.
6. Meisner, pp. 86-87.
7. Xin Qingnian 5,5: 438-439.
8. Li Dazhao, "Qingnian yu nongcun" [Youth and the countryside], Li Dazhao Xuanji, pp. 146-150. Originally published in Chen Bao, Feb. 20-23, 1919.
9. Ibid., pp. 146-147.
10. "Xuesheng yu laodong" [The student and labour] Chen Bao, Feb. 25-28, 1919. Cited in Ding and Yan, p. 29.
11. See Chen Duxiu, "Eluosi geming yu wo guomin di juewu" [The Russian revolution and the consciousness of our country's people], Duxiu Wencun [Selected Works of Chen Duxiu], 3 vols (Hong Kong: Yuan Dong Tu Shu Gongsi, 1965) I:143-144. Originally published in Xin Qingnian 3,2(April 1, 1917).
12. Chen Duxiu, "Chu san hai" [Eliminate the three vermin], Duxiu Wencun, 2:587-591.
13. I am indebted to Arif Dirlik for pointing this out.
14. Cai Yuanpei, "Da zhan", Cai chao, p. 167.
15. Li Dazhao, "Da Yasiya zhuyi yu xin Yasiya zhuyi" [Pan-Asianism and new Asianism], Li Dazhao Xuanji, pp. 119-121. Originally published in Guomin Zazhi 1,2(Jan. 1, 1919).
16. Ruo Yu "Guoji di geming" [International revolution], Meizhou Pinglun, 10(Feb.13,1919):3.
17. Li Dazhao Xuanji, p. 109.
18. Li Dazhao Xuanji, p. 118.
19. Li Dazhao, "Lianzhizhuyi yu shijie zuzhi" [Unionism and world organization], Li Dazhao Xuanji, pp. 130-134, esp. p. 130. This article was originally published in Xin Chao 1,2(Feb. 1, 1919).
20. Li Dazhao Xuanji, p. 146.
21. Chen Duxiu, "Chu san hai"[Eliminate the three vermin], Duxiu Wencun, 2:587-591.
22. Yi Hu, "Zhongguo shi daifu jieji di zui'en" [The evils of China's gentry class], Meizhou Pinglun 20 (May 4,

1919):1-2.

23. Shi Fu, "Zhongguo zhengshi geming bu cheng jiu ji shehui geming bu fasheng zhi yuanyin" [The reasons for the lack of success of China's political revolution and the non-occurrence of social revolution], Dongfang Zazhi 16,4(April, 1919): 1-9.

24. "Zhongdeng jieji lun", Dongfang Zazhi 16,6:22b.

25. Ibid., p. 23b.

26. See Gu Mengyu, "Xueshuo", Xin Qingnian 6,5:450-465.

27. Li Dazhao Xuanji, p. 223 and Kawakami, "Shi guan", Xin Qingnian 6,5:510b-511.

28. Zhou Fuhai, "Zhongguo di jieji douzheng" [China's Class Struggle], Jiefang yu gaizao ["The Emancipation and Reconstruction Weekly"] 1,7 (Dec. 1, 1919): 114-120.

29. "Xuanyan" [Manifesto], Jiefang yu Gaizao 1,1 (September, 1919):1.

30. Yang Yiceng, "Shehui weishenma yao gaizao," Guomin ["The Citizen"] 2,1 (November, 1919):13-22.

31. Ding and Yan, p. 138.

32. Chen Duxiu, "Shixing minzhi di qichu" [The basis for realizing democracy], Xin Qingnian 7,1(December 1, 1919):115-116.

33. Lu Hongyu, "Zhenggong zhidu" [The conscript labour system], Dongfang Zazhi 17, 3 (Feb. 10, 1920):9-14; 17,4 (Feb. 25, 1920):26-32; 17,5 (March 10, 1920): 12-20.

34. "Wu guo zhi jieji douzheng" [Our country's class struggle], Dongfang Zazhi 17,9(May 10, 1920):5.

35. Wu Yu, "Rujia zhuzhang jieji zhidu zhi hai" [The evils of the class system advocated by the Confucianists], Xin Qingnian 3,4(July 1, 1917):1-4.

36. Ibid., p. 1.

37. This is one of the definitions given the term in the Cihai dictionary.

38. Zhang, "Further report", Dongfang Zazhi 5,1:37.

39. Li Dazhao Xuanji, p.110 and p. 114.

40. Shi Fu, Dongfang Zazhi 16,4:2b.

41. Li Dazhao Xuanji, p. 223.

42. "Xuanyan" [Manifesto], Jiefang yu gaizao 1,1 (September, 1919):1.
43. Dongfang Zazhi 16,7:23a.
44. "Caichan zhidu" [The system of private property], Dongfang Zazhi 17,7(April 10, 1920):1.
45. Dongfang Zazhi 16,11:16a.
46. This position was put forward by Marx in The Communist Manifesto.
47. Economic Doctrines, pp. 234-235.
48. Ibid., pp. 1-2.
49. Class Struggle, p. 54.
50. "Qingnian yu nongcong", Li Dazhao Xuanji, p. 146.
51. "Xuanyan" [Manifesto], Jiefang yu Gaizao 1,1(September, 1919):1.
52. "Shehui weishenma yao gaizao", Guomin 2,1:113.
53. Dongfang Zazhi 16,10:100a.
54. "Jieji jingzheng yu huzhu", Li Dazhao Xuanji, p. 223.
55. Dongfang Zazhi 16,9:102b.
56. Guomin 2,1:14. My emphasis.
57. "Zhongdeng jieji lun" [On the middle class], trans. Zhang Xichen [Gao Lao], Dongfang Zazhi 16,6 (June, 1919):19-23.
58. Ibid., pp. 19a-19b.
59. Ibid.
60. Ibid., p. 20a
61. Ibid., p. 19b-20a.
62. Ibid., p. 23b.
63. Ibid., p. 20a.
64. Ibid.
65. Ibid., p, 22b.
66. Ibid.

67. Li Dazhao Xuanji, p. 299.

68. Ibid.

Chapter 4. Communism: The Gongchandang Programme

1. Harrison, p. 28. See also Jerome Chen, pp. 72-73.

2. Other publications which propagated communist philosophy were Xin Qingnian, which was a communist-controlled organ after the June, 1920, issue, and Laodong jie [The world of labour], which was published by the Peking communist organization. I have not had access to the latter source. Although communist controlled, Xin Qingnian did not necessarily present the official views of the party and I have consequently not used it as a source on the line of the party.

3. Zhou Fuhai, "Eguo gongchandang zhengfu chengli san zhounian jinian" [Marking the third anniversary of the founding of the Russian communist government], Gongchandang ["The Communist"] 1(November, 1920):2-13.

4. Ibid., p. 3.

5. Ibid., pp. 2-3.

6. Ibid., p. 8.

7. Ibid.

8. "Duan Yan" [Prolegomena], Gongchandang 1:1.

9. Shi Cuntong, "Women zenma yang gan shehui geming?" [How do we make social revolution?], Gongchandang 5(June 6, 1921):9-32. Also in Shehuizhuyi taolun ji (Canton: Xin Qingnian She, 1922), pp. 381-426.

10. Ibid., pp. 12-13.

11. Zhou, "Eguo", Gongchandang 1:11.

12. Shi, "Shehui geming", Gongchandang 5:9-32.

13. Ibid., p. 16.

14. Ibid., p. 13.

15. See V.I.Lenin, Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism (Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1975).

16. V.I.Lenin, "Economics and Politics during the Era of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat", V.I.Lenin: Selected Work, 3. vols, (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1971), III:296.

17. Shi, "Shehui geming", Gongchandang 5:13-14.
18. Ibid., p. 13.
19. For sources on the anarchist tradition in China, see Chapter 3, note 1.
20. In Addition to Shi, "Shehui geming", See also, Zhou Fuhai, "Women weishenma zhuzhang gongchanzhuyi" [Why do we advocate communism], Gongchandang 3(April 7, 1921):23-30 (reprinted in Shehuizhuyi taolun ji, pp. 285-298); Zhou Fuhai, "Duoqu Zhengquan" [Seize political power], Gongchandang 5:3-9 (also in Shehuizhuyi taolun ji, pp. 299-311); and Li Da, "Wuzhengfuzhuyi zhi jiepei" [A dissection of anarchism], Gongchandang 4(May 7, 1921):14-22 (and Shehuizhuyi taolun ji, pp. 219-237).
21. Examples of articles on the Bolsheviks which discussed the dictatorship of the proletariat are: "Guojipai zhi lixiang ji qi shibai" [The ideals of the radical faction and its failure], Dongfang Zazhi 16,5 (May, 1919):29-43; "Guoji sixiang yu qi fangzhi ce" [Radical ideology and the principles of preventing it], Dongfang Zazhi 16,6 (June, 1919):11-17. "Guojizhuyi yu minzhuzhuyi zhi duikang" [The incompatibility of radicalism and democracy], Dongfang Zazhi 16,8 (August, 1919):54-56. All of these articles argued that "radicalism", i.e. Bolshevism, was not a democratic system, and involved the dictatorship of "the lower classes" over "the middle classes".
22. Shi, "Shehui geming", Gongchandang 5:18.
23. Ibid.
24. Ibid., pp. 18-19.
25. Ibid., p. 19.
26. Ibid., pp. 19-20.
27. Ibid., p. 20.
28. Ibid.
29. Ibid.
30. See, Mao Tse-tung, "On New Democracy", Collected Works of Mao Tse-tung, 5 vols. (Peking:Foreign Language Press, 1967-1977), II:339-384.
31. Shi, "Shehui geming", Gongchandang 5:20.
32. Zhou Fuhai, "Eguo", Gongchandang 1:2-13.
33. Zhou Fuhai, "Women weishenma zhuzhang gongchanzhuyi", Gongchandang 3:23-30

34. Ibid., p. 25.
35. Ibid.
36. Ibid.
37. Ibid.
38. Ibid., pp. 25-26.
39. Ibid., p. 26.
40. Shi, "shehui geming", Gongchandang 5:10.
41. Ibid., pp. 11-12.
42. Ibid.
43. Ibid., p. 20.
44. Ibid.
45. Ibid., p. 21.
46. V.I.Lenin, The State and Revolution (Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1975).
47. "Gao Zhongguo zhi nongmin" [A call to the peasants of China], Gongchandang 3:2-7. The first page of this "Call" is missing. It was censored by the French concession police in Shanghai, where Gongchandang was published.
48. Ibid., p. 3
49. Ibid.
50. Ibid.
51. Ibid., pp. 3-4.
52. Ibid., p. 4.
53. V.I.Lenin, "Preliminary Draft Theses on the Agrarian Question", V.I.Lenin: Selected Works, III: 441.
54. "Gao zhongguo zhi nongmin", Gongchandang 3:4.
55. See for example Lenin, "Draft Theses".
56. See Zhou Fuhai, "Eguo", Gongchandang 1:2.
57. See Zhou, "Gongchanzhuyi", Gongchandang 3:25.
58. Shi Cuntong used both terms in "Shehui geming", see Gongchandang 5:9-32.

59. Ibid., p. 31.
3. 60. "Gao laodong" [A call to labour], Gongchandang 5:2-
61. Ibid., p. 2.
62. Ibid.
63. Ibid.
64. "Gao Zhongguo zhi nongmin", Gongchandang 3:3.
65. "Gao lao bing nong" [A call to labourers, peasants, and soldiers], Gongchandang 4:4-13.
66. Ibid., p. 5.
67. See Zhou Fuhai, "Eguo", Gongchandang 1:9, and Shi, "Shehui geming", Gongchandang 5:20.
68. Gongchandang 1:9.
69. Ibid.
70. "Zhongdeng jieji lun" [On the middle class], trans. Zhang Xichen [Gao Lao], Dongfang Zazhi 16,6 (June, 1919):19-23.
71. "Gao lao bing nong", Gongchandang 4:8.
72. Zhou Fuhai, "Duoqu Zhengquan", Gongchandang 5:3-9.
73. Ibid., p. 3.
74. Ibid., pp. 4ff.
75. "Gao lao bing nong", Gongchandang 4:9.
76. Ibid.
77. Ibid.
78. Ibid., pp. 9-10.
79. Ibid., p. 10
80. Ibid., p. 12.
81. Ibid., pp. 12-13.
82. "Gao laodong", Gongchandang 5:2.
83. Ibid.
84. "Gao nongmin", Gongchandang 3:2.

85. Ibid., p. 3.
86. Ibid.
87. Ibid.
88. Shi never uses the terms "vanguard" or "vanguard party".
89. Shu, "Shehui geming", Gongchandang 5:27.
90. Ibid., p. 28.
91. Ibid.
92. Ibid., pp. 28-29.
93. Ibid., p. 29.
94. Ibid.
95. Ibid., p. 20.
96. This was also the position taken in "Gao laodong" and "Gao Zhongguo zhi nongmin".
97. I.E. The concept that the most "conscious" elements of the working class must be organized into a communist party.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Primary Sources

"Caichan zhidu" 财产制度 [The system of private property].
Dongfang Zazhi 17,7(April 10,1920):1-6.

Cai Yuanpei 蔡元培. "Da zhan yu zhexue" 大战与哲学 [The great war and philosophy]. In Cai Yuanpei xiansheng yiwen leichao 蔡元培先生遗文辑录 [The literary estate of Mr. Cai Yuanpei], pp. 167-72. n.p.:n.p., 1971.

_____, "Laodong shenguai" 劳工神圣 [The Sanctity of Labour].
Xin Qingnian 5,5(November, 1918):438-439.

Chen Duxiu 陈独秀. Duxiu Wencun 独秀文存 [The known writings of Chen Duxiu]. 2 vols.
Hong Kong: Yuan Dong Tu Shu Gongsi, 1965.

_____, "Chu san hai". Duxiu Wencun. II:587-591.

_____, "Eluosi geming yu woguo min di juewu" 俄罗斯革命与我国民的觉悟 [The Russian Revolution and the consciousness of our country's people]. Duxiu Wencun. I: 143-144. Originally published in Xin Qingnian 3,2(April 1,1917).

_____, "Ershi shiji Eluosi di geming" 二十世纪俄罗斯的革命 [The twentieth century Russian Revolution]. Reprinted in Shanghai Shehui Kexue Xueyuan Lishi Yanjiu Suo 上海社会科学研究所历史研究所 [The historical research department of the Shanghai Social Sciences Institute] (Editors). Wusi yundong zai Shanghai Shi Liao Xuanji 五四运动在上海史料选集 [Selected Historical Materials on the May Fourth Movement in Shanghai]. Shanghai: Shanghai Renmin Chubanshe, 1963. Originally published in Meizhou Pinglun 20(May 4,1919).

_____, "Shixing minzhi di jichu" 实行民治的基础 [The basis for realizing democracy].
Xin Qingnian 7,1(December 1,1919):115-16.

Chen Baoying 陈宝莹 [Chen Qixiu 陈启修]. "Makesi di weiwu shiguan yu zhencao wenti" 马克思的唯物史观与道德问题 [Marx's materialist conception of history and the problem of female virtue].
Xin Qingnian 6,5(May 1919):500-505.

"Duan yan" 短言 [Prolegomenon].
Gongchandang 1(November 7,1920):1.

"Fenpei wenti faduan" 分配问题的发端 [The Origins of the the distribution problem].

Dongfang Zazhi 16,4(April 4,1919):593-602.

"Gao lao bing nong" 告劳兵农 [A call to workers, peasants and soldiers]. Gongchandang 4(May 7,1921):4-13.

"Gao laodong" 告劳动 [A call to labour].
Gongchandang 5(June 7,1921):2-3.

"Gao Zhongguo zhi nongmin" 告中国之农民 [A call to the peasants of China].
Gongchandang 3,2(April 7,1921):2-7.

"Gongchandang di xuanyan" 共产党的宣言 [The communist party manifesto]. Meizhou Pinglun 16(April 6,1919).

Gu Mengyu 顾孟雨 [Gu Taoxiong 屠兆熊]. "Makesi xueshuo" 马克思学说 [Marx's theory]. Xin Qingnian 6,5(May 1919):450-465.

Hu Hanmin 胡汉民. "Weiwu shiguan piping zhi piping" 唯物史观批评之批评 [A criticism of a criticism of the materialist conception of history].
Jianshe 1,5(December 1,1919):949-954.

_____, Weiwu shiguan yu lunli zhi yanjiu 唯物史观与伦理之研究 [Research on the materialist conception of history and ethical theory]. Shanghai, 1925.

_____, "Zhongguo zhhexue shi zhi weiwu di yanjiu" 中国哲学史之唯物论的研究 [Materialist researches on the history of Chinese philosophy]. Jianshe 1,3(October 1,1919):513-14 and 1,4(November 1, 1919):655-91.

Kawakami Hajime 何上肇. "Makesi di weiwu shiguan" 马克思的唯物史观 [Marx's materialist conception of history].
Translated by Yuan Quan.
Xin Qingnian 6,5:509-516.

"Lao nong zhengfu zhi xia zhi Eguo--Shixing shehui gongchangzhuyi zhi Eguo zhenxiang" 劳农政府之下俄国--实行社会生产主义之俄国 [Russia under the rule of the workers' and peasants' government--The truth about carrying out social communism]. Reproduced in Shanghai Shehui Kexue Xueyuan Lishi Yanjiu Suo 上海社会科学史研究所 [The historical research department of the Shanghai social sciences institute] (Editors). Wusi yundong zai Shanghai shiliao xuanji 五四运动在上海史料选集 [Selected historical materials on the May Fourth Movement in Shanghai]. Shanghai: Renmin Chubanshe, 1960.

Jiong Ru 纲加. "Dier duan zhi shijie gaizao" 第二段之世界改造 [The second stage of world transformation].
Dongfang Zazhi 16,11(November 1919):15-19.

Li Da 李达 [Jiang Chun 江亢]. "Wuzhengfuzhuyi zhi jiepei" 无政府主义之解剖 [A dissection of anarchism].

Gongchandang 4(May 7, 1919):14-22.

Li Dazhao 李大钊. "'Bolshevism' di shengli" Bolshevism 的胜利
[The victory of "Bolshevism'". In Li Dazhao Xuanji pp.
112-118. Originally published in Xin Qingnian
5,5(November 1918).

_____, "E Fa geming bijiao guan" 俄法革命比较观 [A Comparison
of the Russian and French Revolutions].
Li Dazhao Xuanji pp. 101-104.

_____, "Jieji jingzheng yu huzhu" 阶级竞争与互助 [Class
competition and mutual aid]. Li Dazhao Xuanji pp. 222-
25. Originally published in Meizhou Pinglun 29(July
6, 1919).

_____, Li Dazhao Xuanji 李大钊选集 [The selected works of Li
Dazhao]. Peking: Renmin Chubanshe, 1959.

_____, "Lianzhizhuyi yu shijie zuzhi" 联治主义与世界潮流
[Unionism and World Organization]. Li Dazhao Xuanji pp.
130-134. Originally published in Xin Chao 1,2(February
1, 1919).

_____, "Qingnian yu nongcun" 青年与农村 [Youth and the
countryside]. Li Dazhao Xuanji pp. 146-150. Originally
published in Chen Bao [The Morning Post]. February 20-
23, 1919.

_____, "Shumin di shengli" 庶民的胜利 [The victory of the
common people]. Li Dazhao Xuanji pp. 109-111. Originally
published in Xin Qingnian 5,5(November 15, 1918).

_____, "Wodi Makesizhuyi guan" 我的马克思主义观 [My Marxist
views]. Li Dazhao Xuanji pp. 173-195. Originally
published in Xin Qingnian 6,5(May 1919) and 6,6(November
1919).

_____, "You cong jingji shang jieshi Zhongguo jindai sixiang
biandong zhi yuanyin" 由从经济上解释中国近代思想
变动之原因 [An economic explanation of recent
ideological changes in China]. Li Dazhao Xuanji pp. 295-
302. Originally published in Xin Qingnian 7,2(January
1920).

_____, "Zai lun wenti yu zhuyi" 再论问题与主义 [Again on
problems and isms]. Li Dazhao Xuanji pp. 229-234.
Originally published in Meizhou Pinglun 35(August
17, 1919).

_____, "Zhan hou di shijie chaoliu" 战后的世界潮流 [The world
tide after the War]. Li Dazhao Xuanji pp. 135-138.

Ling Shuang 凌霜. "Makesi xueshuo di piping" 马克思学说批评 [A Criticism of Marx's theory].
Xin Qingnian 6,5(May 1919):456-69.

Lu Hongyu 卢鸿瑜. "Zheng gong zhi du" 徵工制度 [The labour conscript system]. Dongfang Zazhi 17,3(February 10,1920):9-14, 17,4(February 25, 1920):26-32, and 17,5(March 10,1920):12-20.

"Makesi he Enggesi di gongchandang xuanyan" 马克思和昂格斯
的共产党宣言 [The communist party manifesto of Marx and Engels]. Translated by Li Zizhang 李季彰.
Guomin 2,1(November 1919):45-53.

Mao Tse-tung 毛泽东 [Zedong 泽东]. "Minzhong di da lianhe" 民众的
大联合 [The great unity of the popular masses].
Xiangjiang Pinglun ["The Shian Kian Weekly Review"]
2(July 21,1919), 3(July 28,1919) and 4(September 1919).

Meng Zhen 梦贞. "Shehui geming--Eguo shi di geming" 社会革命 --
俄国大革命 [Social Revolution--revolution on the Russian
type]. Xin Chao 1,1 (January 1, 1919):1.

Qian Zhixiu 钱知修. "Laolizhuyi" 劳力主义 [Labourism].
Dongfang Zazhi 14,10(October 1917):1-6.

Ruo Yu 若愚. "Guoji di Geming" 国际的革命 [International
revolution].
Meizhou Pinglun 10(February 13,1919):3.

"Wuzhengfu gongchanzhuyi yu guojia shehuizhuyi" 无政府
共产党与国家社会主义 [Anarchist communism and state
socialism]. Meizhou Pinglun 18(April 20,1919):2ff.

Shan Ji 善斋. "Xu Eguo guojipai zhi lingxiu Lining" 述俄国
过激派领袖列宁 [The story of Lenin the leader of
the Russian radical faction].
Dongfang Zazhi 15,3(March 1918):61-65.

Shehuizhuyi Taolun Ji 社会主义讨论集 [Collected debates on
socialism]. Canton: Xin Qingnian She, 1922.

Shi Cuntong 施存统 [C.T.]. "Women zenma yang gan shehui geming?"
我们怎么样干社会革命? [How do we make social
revolution?]. Gongchandang 5 (June 7,1921):9-32.

Shi Fu 德文. "Zhongguo zhengzhi geming bu chengjiu ji shehui
geming bu fasheng zhi yuanyin" 中国政治革命不成功及
社会革命不发生之原因 [The reasons for the lack
of success of China's political revolution and the non-
occurrence of social revolution].
Dongfang Zazhi 16,4(April 1919):1-9.

"Xuanyan" 宣言 [Manifesto].
Jiefang Yu Gaizao 1(September 1,1919):1.

Wu Yu 吴虞. "Rujia zhuzhang jieji zhidu zhi hai" 儒家主张
阶级制度之害 [The evils of the class system advocated
by the Confucianists].
Xin Qingnian 3,4(July 1,1917):1-4.

Yang Yiceng 杨开云. "Shehui weishenma yao gaozao?" 社会为什么
要改造? [Why must society be transformed?].
Guomin 2,1(November 1919):13-22.

Yi Hu 一户. "Zhongguo shi daifu jieji di zui'en" 中国士大夫阶级
的罪恶 [The evils of China's gentry class].
Meizhou Pinglun 20(May 4,1919):1-2.

Yu Zhongying [Jun Shi 君史]. "Eguo shehuizhuyi yundong
zhi bianqian" 俄国社会主义运动之变迁 [The evolution of
the Russian socialist movement].
Dongfang Zazhi 15,4(April 1918):61-65.

_____, "Eguo xianzai zhi zhengdang" 俄国现在之政党 [Political
parties of Russian today].
Dongfang Zazhi 15,2(February 1918):161-164.

_____, "Shehuizhuyi zhi jiantao" 社会主义之探讨 [A report on
socialism].
Dongfang Zazhi 16,9(September 1919):100-105,
16,10(October 1919):100-111 and 16,11(November
1919):101-109.

Zhang Xichen 章锡堦 [Gao Lao 高劳]. "Xu ji Eguo zhi jin kuang"
续记俄国近状 [A further report on the current
situation in Russia].
Dongfang Zazhi 15,1(January 1918):37-42.

"Zhongdeng jieji lun" 中等阶级论 [On the middle class].
Translated by Zhang Xichen 章锡堦 [Gao Lao 高劳].
Dongfang Zazhi 16,6(June 1919):19-23.

Zhou Fuhai 周佛海 [Wu Xie 无懈]. "Eguo gongchan zhengfu chengli
san zhounian jinian" 俄国共产政府成立三周年纪念
[Marking the third anniversary of the founding of the
Russian communist government]. Gongchandang 1(November
1921):2-13.

_____, "Duoqu Zhengquan" 夺取政权 [Seize political power].
Gongchandang 5 (June 7, 1921): 3-9.

_____, "Women weishenma zhuzhang gongchanzhuyi?" 我们为什么
主张共产主义? [Why do we advocate communism?].
Gongchandang 3(April 7,1921):23-30.

Zhou Fuhai. "Zhongguo di jieji douzheng" 中国的阶级斗争 [China's
class struggle].
Jiefang yu gaizao 1,7(December 1,1919):114-20.

Other References

Berkman, Alexander. Now and After: The ABC of Communist Anarchism. New York: Vanguard Press, 1929.

Bernal, Martin. Chinese Socialism to 1907. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1976.

_____, "The Triumph of Anarchism over Marxism, 1906-1907". In China in Revolution: The First Phase. Edited by Mary C Wright. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1968.

Ch'en, Jerome. Mao and the Chinese Revolution. London: Oxford University Press, 1960.

Chow Tse-tsung. The May Fourth Movement: Intellectual Revolution in Modern China. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960.

_____, Research Guide to the May Fourth Movement. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963.

Ding Shouhe 丁守和 and Yan Xuyi 殷叙彝 Cong Wusi qimeng yundong dao Makesizhuyi di chuanbo 从五四启蒙运动到马克思主义的传播 [From the May Fourth Enlightenment Movement to the Dissemination of Marxism]. Peking: Sanlian Shudian, 1963.

Ding Shouhe, Yan Xuyi and Zhang Pozhao 张伯昭. Shiyue geming dui Zhongguo geming di yingxiang 十月革命对中国革命的影响 [The Influence of the October Revolution on the Chinese Revolution]. Peking: Renmin Chubanshe, 1957.

Dirlik, Arif. Revolution and History: The Origins of Marxist Historiography in China, 1919-1937. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1978.

Haimson, Leopold H. The Russian Marxists and the Origins of Bolshevism. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1967.

Harrison, James Pickney. The Long March to Power: A History of the Chinese Communist Party, 1921-1973. New York and Washington: Praeger Publishers, 1972.

Kautsky, Karl. The Economic Doctrines of Karl Marx. Translated by H.J. Stenning. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1936.

Kropotkin, Peter. The Conquest of Bread. London: Chapman and Hall, 1906.

_____, Mutual Aid: A Factor in Evolution. London: William Heinmann Co., 1902.

Lenin, V.I. Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism.
Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1975.

_____, The State and Revolution.
Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1975.

_____, V.I. Lenin: Selected Work. 3 vols.
Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1971.

Li Yu-ning. The Introduction of Socialism into China.
New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1971.

Marx, Karl. Capital. 3 vols. Edited by Frederick Engels.
New York: International Publishers, 1967.

_____, "Preface and Introduction to A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy".
Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1976.

_____, Wage, Labour and Capital.
Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1973.

Marx, Karl and Engels, Frederick. The Communist Manifesto.
Introduction by A.J.P. Taylor.
Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1967.

Meisner, Maurice. Li Ta-chao and the Origins of Chinese Marxism.
Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1967.

Price, Don C. Russia and the Roots of the Chinese Revolution, 1896-1911.
Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974.

Scalapino, Robert and Yu, George. The Chinese Anarchist Movement. Berkeley, California: University of California Centre for Chinese Studies, 1961.

Schwartz, Benjamin I. Chinese Communism and the Rise of Mao.
Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951.

Wusi Shiqi Qikan Jieshao 五四时期期刊介绍 [An introduction to the periodicals of the May Fourth Period]. 3 vols.
Peking: Renmin Chubanshe, 1958.

'Wusi' Yundong Yanjiu Lun Ji. Edited by Zhou Kangxie. 周康贤
Hong Kong: Chongwen Shudian, 1975.

Zhongguo Chubanshiliang Buzhan 中国出版史料补编 [Supplement to materials on the history of publishing in China]. Edited by Zhang Jinglu 张静庐.
Peking: Beijing Zhonghua Shuju, 1957.