

ture to industry. (pp. 224-225) As for industry, he thinks that the existing complicated network of controls can be dismantled by using the price mechanism as an allocative device, thus leading to higher efficiency in development. On the whole, he puts forth the idea of "indicative" as against the present "detailed" planning for India. Part V ends with a consideration of the current political situation. Rosen thinks that as far as this economic stagnation continues, there cannot be much hope for the continued political stability in India beyond 1970; and in order to help maintain this stability, he feels that there is a case for the U. S. to intervene.

Part VI, Conclusions: United States Policy, deals with the broad policy strategies by way of which the U. S. might be able to help India to get out of the present stagnant economic situation. The author suggests a number of rather bold policies and says that it would mean "that the United States become far more deeply involved in Indian planning than it has heretofore." (p. 268) One is struck at this straightforward proposal for intervention, for it is nothing more nor less; and also at the fact that U. S. recognition of the crisis in India has come to this height. At the same time, one feels that U.S. determination to maintain political democracy in India is based upon cool calculations in terms of the additional U. S. costs in case of India having alternative forms of government, whether right or left. The present reviewer cannot but be impressed by the fact that, with this book, the government and research workers in Asian affairs in the U.S. have come to entertain common aims and goals, and that the latter have started providing theoretical bases for the policy of the former, although the theorizing is still lagging somewhat behind. Under the present U. S. foreign policy, theorizing may be bound to be so.

Finally, Rosen suggests, in Part VII, Epilogue, the possibility of applying the framework outlined in this book to other developing countries. One would certainly be tempted to ask oneself if such applications might not lead to warranting global U. S. intervention in their home affairs.

(Hiroichi Yamaguchi)

DONALD M. LOWE, *The Function of "China" in Marx, Lenin, and Mao*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1966, xiv+200pp.

Studies on Maoism have been centred on the original formation of Mao's thought along with his deviation from the orthodoxy of Marxism and Leninism. Therefore, attention has been mainly focused on theoretical differences regarding the basic propositions and revolutionary strategies of each of these three thinkers. Lowe analyses the position and weight of China in the Marxist frameworks, from Marx himself to Lenin and Mao, and through this study he tries to make clear the mode of thinking characteristic in each of them, thereby to shed light on the weak points in past studies of Maoist thought.

The author, a member of the Department of History in the University of California, states in the preface that his present book aims at "a study in the historical significance of the Marxian, Leninist, and Maoist ideas of China." (p. xi) As he himself points out, the book neither deals with the problem of the application of Marxism to a non-Western society, nor goes into theoretical analysis of the controversy among Marxists over the question of Oriental society. The primary purpose of the book is to set down as accurately as possible, from a historian's standpoint and on the basis of historical documents and materials, what ideas of "China" were possessed by Marx, Lenin, and Mao in the course of their ideological developments. The author first notes that the changing idea of "China" in Marx, Lenin, and Mao stems in the first place from the historio-cultural backgrounds of Europe, Russia, and China, and in the second place from the change and development of their own ideological outlook. However, the author concludes that the concept of unifying theory and practice inherent in Marxism constituted the most important factor in bringing about the changes in their understanding of "China."

With the above as its main theme, the book consists of the following five chapters: (1) Marx; (2) The Russian Situation; (3) Lenin; (4) The Chinese Situation; and (5) Mao. The author takes full advantage of his extensive knowledge in discussing the theories of China or Asia that had been held by European thinkers before Marx, Russian thinkers before Lenin, and Chinese thinkers before Mao Tse-tung, and further in setting up these theories against the European situation. All of these studies constitute very interesting reading, but I will here limit my critique to the ideas of China held by Marx, Lenin, and Mao.

Marx and Engels "began with the idea of a static, unchanging China; they ended with the idea that China was static before the nineteenth century, but was changing under Western economic pressures in the nineteenth century." (p. 26) Their static view of China was in part a result of the influence of Hegel, but the author goes on to say that it resulted far more because such a view was convenient for their preconception that the shrinkage of the world market would give rise to European revolution. He further states that their later view that in the nineteenth century China was changing also resulted because it tallied well with their theoretical prediction that China would become an unstable nation owing to the pressures of capitalism and because they thought that the Taiping Rebellion, which was a major factor in promoting this change of view, indicated the instability of China and "might be the spark to light a European conflagration." (p. 22) He concludes that Marx's change of view about China was thus strongly influenced by the factor of "practice" and that in this sense "the Marxian idea of China illustrated the shifting emphasis of Marx and Engels away from universal theory to specific practice." (p. 29)

One more thing that merits particular attention in Chapter (1) is the author's criticism of "the Asiatic mode of production" which Marx made

the basis for his theory about the static character of China and of Asia in general. The author points out that it is the only exception in the development in Marx's historical materialism, and that it contradicts the theory of development by inherent economic factors which constitutes the basis of historical materialism; he states categorically: "Because of the Asiatic mode of production, historical materialism never became universal history." (p. 27)

The author's unique analysis can thus be seen in his seeking the cause of the changing Marxian idea of China in the demand of "practice." However, his view about the Asiatic mode of production is not acceptable. The present reviewer asserts, albeit admitting that it forms the basis of the Asian mode of production and is closely related to Asian history, that the Asiatic mode of production is, theoretically speaking, the mode in the first stage of the agricultural commune and that therefore it is not a mode peculiar to Asia alone.

Author Lowe believes that Lenin's ideas of China were entirely subordinate to the problem of how to unify Marxist theory with Russian revolutionary practice; in other words, that his ideas were determined by the shift in his understanding of Russia and by the changing revolutionary situation there. The author divides the whole sequence of changes in Lenin's ideas into four periods. First, Lenin identified Russia with Western Europe and therefore considered China to be a static, backward nation. But from about 1908 he regarded Russia as a "semi-Western" nation in accordance with his revolutionary strategy and changed his idea of China into that of a revolutionary, democratic China. According to Lowe, this change "was not motivated by any consideration for the universalist implication of Marxist theory." (p. 81) It was, on the contrary, entirely dictated by the needs of revolutionary practice.

As the author himself points out, Lenin's treatises on China concentrate overwhelmingly on the 1911 Revolution which was one of the greatest events in the history of Asia. Even if Lenin did not take much interest in Asia, might it not be that he evaluated the progressiveness of the 1911 Revolution itself? And would it not have been the new reality in Asia, rather than the practical demands in Russia, that would have brought about the change in Lenin's idea of Asia, and more specifically, China? Of course, Lenin's experience of the 1905 Revolution of Russia enabled him to attain a quick understanding of a new trend in Asia.

The last part of the book discusses the idea of China held by Mao Tse-tung. The author divides Mao's ideological development into five periods, and pays major attention to the Formation period (1927-1935) and the Maturity period (1935-1940). He asserts that prior to the Formation period, Mao had no understanding of Marxist theory and only followed the policy of the Comintern. With Mao's analyses of various social classes as clue, the author states that Mao at this time applied Western yardsticks to the interpretation of China; in other words, that he considered China qualitatively the same as Western Europe. But in the second period, or the Formation

period, Mao begins to stress the special characteristics of Chinese society. He began to do so in order to justify his strategies—or on the demands of practice. At this time, Mao had no consciousness of the question of what relation there was between Marxist theory and Chinese society. But in the Maturity period, he begins to unify his practice with Marxist theory, an attempt which has its most direct manifestation in his application of historical materialism to the history of China. However, in the final analysis, this attempt amounted to nothing more than a grafting: “premodern China was seen more in terms of the demand of Marxist theory, modern China in terms of the demands of practice.” (pp. 132~133) In other words, Mao’s greatest concern was in making his approach to “contemporary China with even greater commitment to voluntarist practice than to Marxist theory.” (p. 133)

The author’s argument that the Maoist idea of China was formed on the basis of practice is a justifiable one, and the present reviewer wishes to stress that point even more strongly than the author of the book.

The author concludes in fine that each of the three—Marx, Lenin, and Mao—was found to have changed their ideas of China on the demands of practice. Viewed from only this angle, Mao Tse-tung may be said to have been faithful to the behaviour pattern of traditional Marxists. If, as a clue to finding the degree of Mao’s or Lenin’s deviation from Marx, such European socialists’ ideas of China as Bernstein and Kautsky were also considered, the book might have made an even more interesting study. (*Katsuhiko Ōta*)