

MAO TSE TUNG: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF HIS THOUGHTS

The Chinese Revolution of 1949, like its precursor the October Revolution (1917), was a significant event. It led to the emergence of China as a great power, and tilted the balance of power not only in the Far East, but also in the World as a whole.

Mao was the principal architect of this Revolution. It is his ideas which dominated the Chinese scene for the last forty years and although the death of Mao is likely to change this position in the near future, his ideas would continue to play a significant role in China. His philosophy exercised some, though now declining, influence even in other countries where Maoist Groups have been formed leading to split in the Communist movement.

Since 1956-57 Maoists have been drifting away from the socialist and people's democratic camp and now they consider the Soviets as their main enemy and the Socialist countries and the Communist parties following Soviet Union, as also the communist leaders in China who differ from Maoists as 'revisionists' and 'capitalist roaders'.

In India two widely different schools of thought tend to accept Maoist Thoughts. The Naxalites, now split into over half a dozen groups, accept Maoist revolutionary philosophy of armed guerilla struggle. Similarly some Gandhians are attracted by Mao's emphasis on egalitarianism, decentralisation, moral incentives, and anti-bureaucratism.

It will therefore, be interesting to study Mao's thoughts. Mao's thoughts have been influenced by a number of factors such as the environment of the family and the country, history and tradition, Western thought, personal experience, and the Philosophy of Marxism-Leninism.

Coming from a poor peasant background in the province of Hunan, Mao had an understanding of the rural people among whom he had worked and whom he con-

sidered as the most important element for the Revolution. It is said that through hostility to his father who was opposed to his studies beyond the primary level he developed a rebellious temperament. Mao had studied Chinese history and classics. In his writings he often makes references to them. He drew inspiration from peasant rebellions and stories of great men and robin hoods. Although according to strict Marxist stand robin hoods cannot be regarded as the proper element for the Communist Party Mao did not hesitate to take advantage of their courage and experience and enrolled them in the Red or the People's Liberation Army. Mao had studied books on the Chinese art of war and had joined the army during the Revolution of 1911. While he was still a student Mao had become nationalist and like Sun Yat-sen he regretted the loss of Chinese Empire and its semicolonial status. He took part in the May 4 (1919) students' demonstrations against the treaty of Versailles which conceded the Japanese claims to German concessions in China.

Even though Mao was against Western imperialism he was influenced by the Western Liberal, idealist and anarchist thought. In his advocacy of freedom of thought allowing the hundred flowers to bloom and the different schools of thoughts to contend one finds the liberal ideas of Mill and Spencer and his call for decentralisation, attack on the party and state and in his emphasis on subjective activity one finds influence of individualism, anarchism and idealism.

But the most important factors which influenced him were the October Revolution and its underlying philosophy — Marxism-Leninism — and the Chinese environment of the 19th and 20th centuries.

Mao openly admits the debt which he owes to the October Revolution the salvoes of which roused China from her slumber. In the Semi-colonial conditions of China it was not easy to obtain Marxist Literature. Hence for a long time Chinese communists were not able to understand Marxism correctly or apply those ideas even though the

Communist Party of China had formally accepted the Marxist-Leninist philosophy. This has been admitted by Mao who also made many mistakes in his class analysis or in assessing the respective roles of the proletariat and the peasantry. But the fact that October Revolution was proletarian, anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist and that it stood for the freedom of colonies and had abrogated the unequal treaties which the Czarist Russia had concluded with China had tremendous impact on China. Further, the Young Soviets came to the rescue of Chinese nationalism which they supported with men, money and material. Similar assistance was rendered by the Soviets to Chinese Communism at different stages since its very birth. Mao admitted that the existence of revolutionary rear was a significant factor which contributed to the success of their Revolution. Even after the Revolution it is the Soviets which helped China in her reconstruction and even diplomatically. In fact at one stage Mao had visualised a situation in which the Chinese Soviets could join the Soviet Union.

Mao and his comrades had to apply Marxism-Leninism to China where conditions were different from those obtaining in Russia at the time of October Revolution or in India. Whereas Czarist Russia was an independent Centralised Empire State in which some capitalist development had taken place, China in the latter half of the 19th and first half of the 20th Century was a semi-colony dominated by a number of imperial powers in their respective spheres of influence. Hence the Central Government in China was weak and the provincial war lords supported by their respective imperial powers tended to be autonomous. This situation did not allow the growth of a strong national bourgeoisie which remained weak. Chinese feudal and compradore bourgeois classes betrayed the national interest. Under the circumstances the Chinese Communists emerged not only as custodians of social and economic reforms but also of nationalism. In their fight for liberation from the Japanese yoke, the Chinese could take advantage of the inter-imperial

contradiction and get support from some imperial powers and their bourgeois supporters in China specially during the anti-Japan War. Since China did not have much industrial development the industrial working class formed only five per cent of her population. The Chinese Communist Party was, therefore, dominated by the Urban petty-bourgeois and rural peasant element which coupled with its ideological backwardness influenced its character and the method of achieving the goal by means of armed guerilla struggle. This explains the important part which peasantry played in the Chinese Revolution.

The Maoists hesitated to characterise the ideas of Mao as Maoism because these are not so systematic as those of Marx and Lenin who had enough time for study and for organising their ideas. Mao had time for study only at the end of the Great March in 1935 when they had settled in the Shensi-Kansu-Ningsia border district with its capital at Yen-an and when he had been elected the leader of the Party. But of late the Maoists have gained confidence and regard Mao's thoughts as even more important than those of Marx or Lenin and the present period since 1935 as one dominated by the thoughts of Mao Tse Tung. According to them the era of Marx which began in 1848 came to an end in 1898 and that of Lenin in 1935.

It may also be mentioned that whereas until 1956 Mao was in general adhering to and was interpreting and expounding orthodox Marxist-Leninist thoughts, in 1957 he came out with certain new formulations which are in conflict with Marxism-Leninism as it is understood and practised in the Soviet Union and in other Socialist countries which follow her lead. Two factors appear to have influenced Mao. In 1956 the Communist Party of China dropped the thoughts of Mao Tse Tung which had been declared as the basis of its ideology along with Marxism-Leninism in 1945. They retained only Marxism-Leninism. This signified the weakening of Mao's hold on the Party which controlled the Government also. In the international sphere also he came to have differences with the Soviet

Communist Party and other Parties which followed the Soviet lead. This was in 1957 when he challenged Khrushchev's ideas which he called as 'Revisionist'. Thus Maoist leadership was being challenged at home as well as in the international field.

The thoughts of Mao Tse Tung are defined as "the Marxism-Leninism of the age of the Universal collapse of imperialism and the triumph of socialism throughout the world." It is also defined as Marxism-Leninism of the age of declining imperialism and People's Revolutions. This is not very different from Stalin's definition of Leninism. Stalin had defined Leninism as Marxism of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions. Lenin had defined imperialism as moribund capitalism. Thus the adjectives 'Universal Collapse' or 'declining' before 'imperialism' do not mean anything more than "moribund capitalism" because if capitalism dies imperialism as defined by Lenin cannot survive and as a necessary corollary the Liberation of the colonial world would follow. Proletarian revolutions which are to bring about this collapse are nothing but socialist revolutions. But Mao and his followers seem to lay emphasis on "people's revolutions" which are not the same as the proletarian revolutions though they may lead to socialism as an ultimate goal. People's Revolutions are primarily bourgeois democratic revolutions which are achieved by the United fronts of different classes including the national bourgeoisie though they are under the leadership of the proletariat and are directed against imperialism. Thus Maoists lay less stress on the proletarian and more on the national, i.e., bourgeois democratic revolutions which are to take place in the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America and are to precede the proletarian (socialist) revolutions in the developed countries of the West. Thus they propound the view that the world village, i.e., the predominantly rural developing countries by achieving the Bourgeois Democratic and later Socialist Revolutions would surround the world city, i.e., the developed countries which will then follow the socialist revolutionary paths.

It has already been pointed out that, as Communists, Maoists accept Marxism-Leninism, and even though along with Khrushchev they too had denounced Stalin for his personality cult, they include the study of Stalin's works as well. But as before 1949 Marxist Literature was not easily available in China and only a few of these works had been translated there into Chinese (Chinese was the only language which Mao knew) and also because Mao was busy with active political and military affairs most of the time before the Head Quarters were established in Yen-an in 1935, he did not get enough time to have grasp of the Marxist Literature and his understanding of it has never been adequate. He has admitted this fact. For instance, in the earlier period he thought the whole population of China is divided between bourgeoisie and proletariat, the rich including the feudal Lords being capitalist and the rest Labour. Similarly, before he studied the agrarian situation in Hunan in 1926 he did not realise the significance of the role of the peasantry in a Bourgeois Democratic or proletarian revolution; and, thereafter, he underestimated the role of the proletariat.

Mao borrowed most of his ideas about Marxism from the Soviet Sources but his understanding of these ideas is rather different. As a Marxist he believed in Dialectical Materialism and associated Dialectics with materialism and metaphysics with idealism while idealism and materialism can both be dialectical as well as metaphysical. He thought that the roots of idealism lie in the division of Labour between manual and intellectual; but this division existed in all class societies and may stay even under socialism. This is responsible for the development of productive forces which enabled the growth of culture. The origins of idealism lie not in the division of labour but in the splitting of the primitive society into class societies and emergence of the exploiting classes which needed idealist theory to defend their privileged position. At another place Mao says that the ancient times were dominated by the materialist, the medieval times by the idealist and once again modern age

is dominated by the materialist thought. This is a very simplistic sort of statement. Similarly Mao confuses mind and matter with subjective and objective, but not all objective reality is necessarily material and not all those who accept objective reality are necessarily materialist. Even some idealists accept objective reality. Only those who accept the existence of material reality can be considered as materialists.

“Being determines consciousness” is the basic law of dialectical materialism. From this it follows that the base, the economic structure in society determines the superstructure such as morality, politics, religion, law, etc. Further, it is the forces of production rather than the relations of production (which are dependent upon the former) which play the major role in production. Similarly, it is the objective laws rather than the subjective activity of man which determine the nature and pace of change.

On all these questions Mao came to have wide differences with other Marxists.

It is true that under socialism subjective activity begins to play a greater role because under it the leadership becomes conscious of the scientific and objective laws of social development and it consciously plans development which is not possible under bourgeois system of individual and private ownership in which profit motive is the spur of production. But it is the consciousness of the objective laws of production which heightens the role of subjective activity and not the subordination of objective laws to subjective activity or the ignorance of or indifference to those laws. There is no contradiction between the objective laws and subjective activity but the latter cannot change the objective laws; it has to conform to them.

Mao thinks that it is man and not the inert matter which plays the decisive role in production. From this he concludes that atom bomb is a paper tiger. Instruments, weapons of war or tools, machines and techniques and skills of production are not as important as man. Hence his

emphasis on the dominant role of ideas, superstructure, politics and leadership rather than that of the economic base or technology, specialist or expert. For him it is relations of production rather than the forces of production which matter in Socialist production.

Marxism does not deny the role of man, it only points to the limits of his power. Man himself is a part of the forces of production and has to work within the limits of the development of the instruments and technique of production available at a certain stage of social development. Man could not make the atom bomb or go to the moon in ancient times because at that time technology was not so developed.

Because of the emphasis on subjective activity and on the role of man Mao lays greater emphasis on super-structure, role of politics and moral values than on relations of production. He thinks that material reality can be transformed into spiritual and the latter into the former. Thus he gives undue emphasis on the role of man and of the leader which leads to personality cult. He lays very great stress on the power of education and propaganda. Over-emphasis on the subjective factor and role of the leadership to the neglect of objective laws is responsible for the adventurist policy of the Great Leap and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution at home and of Armed Guerilla Revolutions abroad. Thus, he ignores the role of objective factors even in bringing about revolutions.

In the encouragement of personality cult Mao has surpassed Stalin. Mao is being called as the greatest general, the greatest teacher, the greatest helmsman, the greatest genius the like of which appear only once in centuries in the world and only once in several millenia in China. Even certain magical and supernatural powers such as healing diseases or achieving success are attributed to chanting of Mao's quotations.

It may be noted that even though Mao and Maoists talked of the atom bomb as 'paper tiger', in reality they

have been producing it in ever larger numbers. They are opposed to the banning of the production of this 'paper tiger'. Similarly, while they attacked the specialists and educationists in the name of "politics in Command" and subordination of 'expertness' to 'redness', they did not touch the scientists and technologists, specially those who were engaged in the production of atom bomb and military equipment.

I have said above that these ideas were developed by Mao after he was reduced to a minority at the Eighth Party Congress in 1956. These along with his views on "Contradictions" form the theoretical background of his struggle against the Party Leadership which was entrenched in the Government. This struggle assumed the form of "The Great Leap Forward" in 1958-59, and The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution from 1966 to 1969.

The Law of Contradiction is an important law of dialectics in Marxist thought. There are two aspects of a contradiction which co-exist and are, therefore, in unity; but they are, at the same time, in conflict and in a process of constant change. These two are the positive and a negative aspects of the contradiction and through their constant struggle and through gradual quantitative changes a new stage is reached when there is a qualitative change. A synthesis emerges which in its turn becomes thesis and comes to have two aspects. Thus, the process continues. Contradictions are the source of all development. In class society they assume the form of class struggle through which changes take place, finally leading to classless society and communism.

While accepting this law of contradictions Mao and the Maoists accept almost any concept with an antonym as two aspects of contradiction such as good and evil, war and peace, landlord and tenant, or bourgeoisie and proletariat, *etc.* On this basis, they consider war as inevitable concomitant of peace and as such inevitable. But these are two different types of inter-state relationships. World war is not necessarily followed by peace but may continue in the

form of minor or limited wars. This happened after the First World War and again after the Second. To Mao and the Maoists war is the most important form of class struggle whereas in fact it is one of the outcomes of contradictions in capitalist society.

Similarly, Mao thinks that in accordance with the Law of interpretation and interchangeability of aspects peace gives place to war, landlords become tenants while the latter become landowners, the oppressors become the oppressed and the latter the oppressor. Here he misses the evolutionary aspect of things and treats them as interchangeable. To him movements amount to change of places of things and not the emergence of a new quality through quantitative changes. This is the concept of circular motion or of cycle Theory of Change. Under Socialism exploiters do not become exploited nor oppressors become oppressed but the system of exploitation and oppression is put an end to. Similarly, dictatorship of the proletariat is not something permanent but it too, evolves and when exploitation and the exploiting classes are eliminated the State becomes a State of the whole people. It is also possible to have bourgeoisie without proletariat such as the existence of the commercial or compradore bourgeoisie in backward countries without industrial working class; or, the existence of the proletariat in socialist countries without the existence of bourgeoisie.

The Law of 'Contradictions' is a complex one. It is possible for the two 'contradictory' and opposed aspects not only to co-exist but also at times to co-operate on a short term programme basis for a limited purpose. That will not change the nature of contradictions. Thus though bourgeoisie and proletariat are two antagonistic hostile classes yet in the struggle for national liberation against foreign imperial power they may co-operate until the objective is won. During the Second World War Western imperialism and the Soviets joined hands against Fascism. This was possible because of inter-imperial contradictions.

One of the classifications of contradictions is as antagonistic and non-antagonistic. Maoists say that contradiction with the enemy is antagonistic, but one among the people is non-antagonistic. With the State power in the hands of the people, non-antagonistic contradictions among people can be resolved peacefully by means of education, persuasion and propaganda while resolution of contradiction with the enemy requires force. Maoists consider contradiction between the national bourgeoisie and the proletariat in the People's Republic of China as non-antagonistic which can turn antagonistic in case bourgeoisie refuses to be amenable to reason. According to the Marxist view contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie can never be non-antagonistic because their interests are basically opposed to each other. Whereas bourgeoisie will be interested in retaining the Capitalist system the opposite of it is true of the proletariat.

The term "people" is also vague and does not signify the Marxist class approach. According to Mao all those elements who support Socialism in the Peoples' Republic of China are in the Camp of the people and those who are opposed to it are the enemies. According to this definition the national bourgeoisie, as long as it supports the People's Republic of China is to be treated as friend and is to be included in the peoples' fold, but all those who differ with Mao are regarded as enemies even though they may be old and tried communists. This is a sheer arbitrary approach.

Mao has come out with a new theory of contradictions according to which even under socialism there are contradictions between the Government and the masses, the Communist party and the people, the Leadership of the Party and the Cadre, etc. This view was propounded by him in 1957. This theory was his excuse for starting the Great Leap and later the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution with a view to reasserting his leadership in the Party and the Government. These contradictions can become antagonistic in case they are not handled properly. On this basis during the course of the cultural Revolution

he asked the Red Guards and the People's Liberation Army to intervene and to bombard the Party Headquarters.

Contrary to the Soviet view Mao contended that the stage of Socialism was a prolonged stage of transition in which the capitalist elements could usurp power unless people showed wisdom and vigilance. This, according to him, has happened in the Soviet Union where during the period of transition from Capitalism to Communism the Bourgeois element has become dominant. According to him the same thing has happened in all the other countries of the Socialist block which follow the Soviet Lead. The Soviets are considered as imperialist. Thus while Mao treated the national bourgeoisie as a part of the people with which the contradiction was non-antagonistic, he treated the whole of the Socialist Camp including the Soviet Union, with the exception of Albania as revisionist, Capitalist roader and enemies.

The main arguments of the Maoists for taking up this stand are: The Soviet Union and the Countries of the Socialist Camp following the Soviet lead believe in material incentives and profit motive for encouraging production. This has caused wide disparities of income. This they consider as the capitalist way. Further, they charge the Soviets with expansionist and hegemonistic motives. They think the Soviets exploit other Socialist and developing countries through trade and investments. Thus they are imperialistic.

To avoid a situation which would turn a Socialist Country into capitalist Mao advocates continuous watch, continuous right to revolution and rebellion to fight out revisionism and capitalist roaders, and a prolonged period of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat until Communism is achieved. This forms the basis of his Cultural Revolution.

According to classical definition of Capitalism what determines its nature is the private ownership in the means of production which causes recurrent economic crises, unemployment and social unrest. During the last two or three

years, Capitalism on the World Scale was passing through such recession when the growth rate in a number of countries had come down to zero or even minus. During this period, or earlier during the Great Depression of 1929, the Soviets had no such crisis. The Socialist World is not afflicted with it. In the Socialist countries there is no private ownership in the means of production such as land, mines, mills, factories and banks or even shops. Payment in accordance with the amount of work done leading to differences in incomes under socialism does not make the socialist countries capitalist. That is the principle of payment under socialism.

In the classical Leninist sense which the Maoist accept there can be no imperialism in the Soviet Union because it has been defined as the highest, the moribund, the monopolist or the finance capital stage of capitalism. Since there is no capitalism in the Soviet Union there is no need for it to seek markets for its surplus production to keep the economy going or to earn profits. No country can do without trade and commerce because none is completely self-sufficient; but the Soviet terms of trade are not disadvantageous to other countries and are usually mutually beneficial. In fact the possibility of this alternative of trade with the Soviets has enabled the developing countries to resist the pressures of the imperialist countries, a fact which is made clear by the resistance which has been put up by the OPEC countries. The Soviets have also enabled the developing countries to develop such basic and heavy industries as lead to a country's economic independence. Such is the case with India's own development of industries like steel, machine tool and heavy electrical. There are only a few countries in the recent past which have become independent and which had not been helped by the Soviet Union. She has helped China, at first in its struggle against imperialism and later against Chiang's corrupt Koumintang dictatorship supported by U.S. She has helped her reconstruction as well.

One might ask the question: when did the Soviets become capitalist or imperialist? The basic principles of her home and foreign policy have not changed almost ever since the October Revolution. Mao did not brand her as capitalist or imperialist even until 1962. How did they turn capitalist and imperialist overnight during and after Mao's Great proletarian cultural revolution? If the Soviets have emerged as a stronger imperial power and she and the countries of the socialist camp have become capitalist how is this the period of declining imperialism and socialist revolutions as Mao suggested elsewhere? It should rather be the period of rising social imperialism and capitalist counter-revolution.

Lenin had propounded the view that in the period of imperialism the imperialist chain will break where the link is the weakest. Thus it was not necessary that the Socialist revolution should take place only in the industrially advanced countries. Further he said that in industrially backward and predominantly feudal countries the two revolutions — the Bourgeois democratic and proletarian (socialist) — can be more or less simultaneous. In the age of imperialism when the feudal and capitalist orders are in a process of decay and the working class socialist ideology and movements have come to stay the bourgeoisie will not be the leader even of the Bourgeois Democratic Revolution which too will be under the leadership of the proletariat. Lenin also said that revolutions in the backward countries may precede those in some of the advanced countries. In opposition to Lenin's theory Mao developed his own theory of Bourgeois Democratic Revolution.

He accepted the theory of proletarian leadership of the nationalist (people's) revolution and the contemporaneousness of the proletarian revolution; but in practice, he laid more emphasis on the role of the peasantry. Secondly, he seemed to absolutise the theory of revolutions in the developing countries preceding those in the developed countries, when for example he said that the world village will surround the world city. This has also meant the adoption of a

different method of achieving revolution, — viz., the prolonged armed guerilla struggle and creation of bases in the remote hilly and forest areas. In Russia, it was the method of insurrection in the cities followed by rebellion in the country-side. That failure to resolve the economic crisis, leads to war for the sake of markets is, according to Lenin, the main feature of Imperialism. Mao therefore insists that war is inevitable and that this is the most important form of class struggle which would lead to revolutions and end of capitalism and imperialism, and victory of socialism.

Other Marxists do not think that the Armed Guerilla-method is of universal application which can be practised in all situations or that it is the only or the most important method. They also think that in this period of the Crisis of world imperialism, strengthening of the socialist block, strong progressive and proletarian movements, war-weariness and the dangerous nature of the nuclear war, war is not inevitable. And while emphasising the need for class struggle they do not think that use of violent revolutionary methods is the only way to bring about revolutionary change, especially under present circumstances when people's movements have grown strong. The object can be achieved through persistent class struggle. This along with Mao's criticism of material incentives form the main basis of differences between the Soviet Union and her communist supporters on the one hand and the Maoists on the other.

It may be noted that while China has been talking about war she has not fired a shot after the Korean war and has not gone to war even to liberate Macao and Hong Kong not to speak of Taiwan. It is imperialism which needs war to overcome its crisis; this is not in the interest of the people. Hence, the Soviets, ever since their inception have stood for a policy of peace, of peaceful co-existence and for disarmament.

The ideological differences between the Soviets and the People's Republic of China have led to split in the Communist movement and its mass organisations such as the World Trade Union, World Teachers and World Students

movements. Whereas the Soviets still treat China as a member of the Socialist Camp and want to keep differences at the ideological level, the Maoists denounce her as capitalist and imperialist and have found a theoretical justification for the split which they consider as inevitable and healthy.

They take advantage of the Law of Unity and Conflict of opposite, and splitting of a single whole or the law of split of an entity. Lenin confined its operation to the period of class society in which there is exploitation and class struggle. In Socialist Society, here is no exploitation, no classes, and hence, no class struggle. Maoist view on the other hand is that even under socialism classes and class struggles continue for a prolonged period under the dictatorship of the proletariat until the stage of communism is reached, and hence, this law is applicable to the period of socialism. Therefore splits are natural and inevitable and are to be welcomed. Thus, they not only do not mind split in the socialist camp, they consider it as healthy. On the other hand, the Soviets consider these differences as non-antagonistic to be resolved by mutual discussions and understanding. They think that within the socialist society or among socialist communities (States) there is no basic conflict of interests and hence differences can be resolved peacefully and the Unity of the Socialist Society, Socialist States and progressive movements can be maintained. In fact, the Maoists go to the length of saying that even the scientific and revolutionary Marxist thought engenders its opposite, *viz.* the unscientific and counter-revolutionary doctrine and that the Socialist Society also splits. Marxists rule out such a possibility. There may be splits in the socialist movements only when the enemy ideology penetrates a section of it or when counter-revolutionaries capture the leadership of these movements; but there is nothing dialectical or progressive about it; nor it is inevitable because of the absence of any basic contradictions.

Marxists attribute these deviations of Mao from the path of Marxism-Leninism to lack of understanding of the philosophy and to influences foreign to Marxism such as

anarchism, idealism and nationalism which have worked on him. His ideology according to them is basically petty-bourgeois, Jingoistic, hegemonistic and sinocentric.

Mao's understanding of Marxist philosophy too appears rather weak. For example at one place he says that the understanding of Marxist philosophy requires hard work whereas no such effort is needed to learn idealist philosophy. On the other hand, at another place he expresses a contrary opinion saying, it is easy for workers to understand Dialectical Materialism because they work on matter with machines, and they observe change. Contrary to Mao's view it is possible to say that workers are interested only in the economic improvement of their living conditions and acquire revolutionary consciousness through education in revolutionary philosophy. Again Mao thinks that practice (without subjecting it to scientific analysis) leads to theory. Yet at another place he says that Marxist literature—books of Marx, Engels and Lenin—are difficult to understand and are remote from Chinese life.

There is no doubt that Mao's achievements are great and that he would be remembered along with Marx and Lenin. Similarly the technique of Guerilla war which he and his Comrades developed is indeed unique. However, it is difficult to consider Mao as a consistent Marxist. The use of Charisma and Spread of his personality cult and the counter-revolutionary practice in the international field are a clear proof of his non-Marxist attitudes.

Indian Institute of
Advanced Study
Simla 5.

Asha Ram