

CAPITALISM OR SOCIALISM: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF SUN YAT-SEN AND LENIN

Jui-Ling Hsieh

National Taiwan University,
Taipei, Taiwan (R.O.C.)

<p>Article history:</p> <p><i>Received:</i> 17.05.2020</p> <p><i>Accepted:</i> 03.08.2020</p>	<p>Abstract: This study aims to provide a deep perspective on the debate between two camps in the beginning of the 20th century: the Chinese bourgeois revolutionary ideology represented by Sun Yat-sen (孫中山) and Marxism represented by Lenin. By studying Sun Yat-sen's speech "Principles of People's Livelihood and Social Revolution" and Lenin's article "Democracy and Narodism in China," which is in response to Sun Yat-sen's speech, this research attempts to reassess the nature of the Chinese bourgeois revolutionary road represented by the thoughts of Sun Yat-sen and remind researchers of the difficult choices between capitalist and socialist development in China as a latecomer country. This study first explains how Sun Yat-sen's speech expressed his views on capitalism, the definition of the Principle of People's Livelihood, and his claim of the equalization of land rights. Then, Lenin's evaluation of Sun Yat-sen's speech is discussed. The different views of Sun Yat-sen and Lenin on the stage of capitalism, the means and power of social revolution, and the solution of the land problem are thus presented. This study argues that the split between the Chinese Nationalist Party (KMT) and the Communist Party of China (CPC) in 1927 came less from the KMT's betrayal of the revolutionary road than from the fundamental difference between Sun Yat-sen's thoughts and Marxism. Although the ideology of Sun Yat-sen has an anti-capitalist component, he paid attention to the use of the state, rather than the society as a tool, and reconciliation, rather than revolution to ease the gap between the rich and the poor brought by capitalism. This thinking compels us to reconsider the particularity of the development path of China.</p>
<p>About the author: PhD Candidate, Department of Political Science, National Taiwan University e-mail: hsiehjuiling@gmail.com</p>	
<p>Key words: capitalism; Marxism; Sun Yat-sen; Lenin; development; social revolution; equalization of land rights</p>	

After Sun Yat-sen's (孫中山) dismissal as provisional president on April 1, 1912, he attended the member farewell meeting of the Nanjing Tongmenghui (中國同盟會) and gave a speech on the "Principles of People's Livelihood and Social Revolution (民生主義與社會革命)".¹ The first half of Sun Yat-sen's speech was first translated into French and was published on the Brussels socialist newspaper, *Le Peuple*, on July 11 of the same year, and then translated from French into Russian and was published on the Russian "Neva Star (Невская Звезда)" the 17th issue, entitled "Social Significance of the Chinese Revolution (Социальное значение китайской революции)".²

¹ Sun Yat-sen, "Min sheng zhu yi yu she hui ge ming (Principles of People's Livelihood and Social Revolution)," in Qin Xiaoyi eds., *Guo fu quan ji (Complete Works of Founding Father)*, vol. 3 (Taipei City: Modern China Publishing House, 1989), pp. 26-30.

² Sun Yat-sen, "Appendix: The Social Significance of the Chinese Revolution (Translation) (Fu lu: zhong guo ge ming de she hui yi yi (yi wen))," in

On July 15, Vladimir Lenin (Владимир Ильич Ленин) responded to Sun Yat-sen's speech with the article "Democracy and Narodism in China (Демократия и народничество в Китае)"³ and published it together with the newspaper on the same day,⁴ showing that the world's socialist camp was strongly focused on Sun Yat-sen and the modern bourgeois revolution in China.⁵

Qin, Xiao-yi eds., *Guo fu quan ji (Complete Works of Founding Father)*, vol. 3 (Taipei City: Modern China Publishing House, 1989), pp. 30-32.

³ Lenin, "Democracy and Narodism in China," in Stepan Apresyan trans., *Lenin Collected Works*, vol. 18 (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1978), pp. 163-169.

⁴ Li Yuzhen, *Guo min dang yu gong chan guo ji (1919-1927) (KMT and Comintern (1919-1927))* (Beijing: People's Publishing House, 2012), pp. 18-19.

⁵ In January 1912, The Sixth (Prague) All-Russia Conference of the R. S. D. L. P. had a resolution on "Chinese Revolution" stating: "... the conference recognises the worldwide importance of the revolutionary struggle of the Chinese people

Sun Yat-sen's speech showed his basic views on the Principle of People's Livelihood (民生主義) and represented the thinking of the Kuomintang (KMT, the Nationalist Party) on what kind of development path China should take after the bourgeois revolution when Western capitalism caused social problems; Lenin's evaluation of Sun Yat-sen then shaped the relationship between the KMT and the Chinese Communist Party (CPC) during the first period of cooperation between the KMT and the CPC and became the "ideological motive" of constant friction between the two sides. The evaluation also reflected the fierce debate about the revolutionary road in the world at that time.⁶ Concerning the KMT, when Chiang Kai-shek (蔣介石 Jiang Jieshi) combed the context of Chinese economics in the 1940s, he pointed out that Sun Yat-sen's Principle of People's Livelihood inherited the tradition of Chinese economics on the basis of human nature and focused on supporting the people.⁷ After the split of the KMT and the CPC, the China Research Institute, chaired by the Communist International (Comintern), systematically launched criticisms of the Three Principles of the People (三民主義) and successively published the "Discussion on Sun Yat-senism's

that is bringing emancipation to Asia and is undermining the rule of the European bourgeoisie. The conference hails Chinese revolutionary republicans, testifies to profound enthusiasm and completes sympathy with which the proletariat of Russia is following the successes of the revolutionary people of China, and condemns the behaviour of the Russian liberals who are supporting tsarism's policy of conquest." See "The Sixth (Prague) All-Russia Conference of the R. S. D. L. P." in Stepan Apresyan trans., *Lenin Collected Works*, vol. 17 (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1978), p. 485.

⁶ Li Yuzhen, "Lie ning wei he yao yan li pi ping sun zhong shan - e luo si dang an zhong de guo min dang yu gong chan guo ji (zhi yi) (Why Lenin Severely Criticizes Sun Yat-sen - KMT and Comintern in Russian Archives (Part 1)," *Century* 1 (2012), pp. 43-44.

⁷ Chiang Kai-shek, "Zhong guo jing ji xue shuo (Theory of Chinese Economics)," in Qin Xiaoyi eds., *Zong tong jiang gong si xiang yan lun zong ji* (President Chiang Kai-shek's Thought and Speech Collection), vol. 5 (Taipei City: Party History Society of the Central Committee of the Chinese Kuomintang, 1984), p. 24.

Class Essence (К вопросу о классовой сущности суньятсенизма)" by Soviet history scholar Kara-Murza and *Sun Yat-senism and Chinese Revolution (Суньятсенизм и китайская революция)* by Soviet scholar K.V. Antonov. On the basis of Lenin's "Democracy and Narodism in China," both scholars conducted a class analysis of Sun Yat-senism, pointed out that Sun Yat-senism represented the interests of petite bourgeoisie, and criticized Sun Yat-sen for disapproving class struggle and violent revolution and advocating a reformist path.⁸ Sun Yat-sen's proposition of the Principle of People's Livelihood provided the KMT's ideological resources on the blueprint for the development of Chinese characteristics. In addition, Lenin's evaluation of the Principle of People's Livelihood became the theoretical basis for the class analysis of the Soviet Union and criticism of the KMT.

Past researchers either focused on the role of the CPC in the cooperation between the KMT and the CPC or emphasized the betrayal of the revolutionary line by KMT leaders after the death of Sun Yat-sen. Russian historian N. Mamaeva pointed out that when cooperation existed between the KMT and the CPC in the 1920s, the CPC was not only the main partner of the Comintern in China but also one of its members. Research on Chinese policy focuses on the interaction between the Comintern and the CPC, whereas the role of the KMT in the Comintern policy is mainly investigated through the interaction between the KMT and the CPC. Under the above research framework, studies on the interaction between the communist movement in China and abroad ignore the fact that the KMT is the main body of the National Revolution. Before 1927, the basic principles of Comintern's China policy were mainly from the KMT and the Comintern connection.⁹

Furthermore, Russian historian Mirovitskaya pointed out in the analysis of the role of the Soviet Union in the KMT policy in the

⁸ Кара-Мурза Г. К вопросу о классовой сущности суньятсенизма // Проблемы Китая 6, 7, 1931; Антонов К.В. Суньятсенизм и китайская революция. Москва: Изд-во Ком. Акад, 1931.

⁹ Мамаева Н.Л. Коминтерн и Гоминьдан. 1919-1929. Москва: Российская Академия Наук Институт Дальнего Востока, 1999. P. 4.

1920s and 1930s that after the death of Sun Yat-sen in 1925, the KMT leaders deviated from the revolutionary path and tended to the huge bourgeoisie and the landlord class interests in the 1930s.¹⁰ However, the above-mentioned revolutionary line during the period of the first KMT–Communist cooperation and the class nature of the party-state system in the 1930s can still be further investigated. First, for the KMT, the Soviet Union assisted the Chinese National Revolution led by Sun Yat-sen after Sun Yat-sen and Adolpf Joffe reached the Sun–Joffe Manifesto in 1923. According to the revolutionary procedure set by Sun Yat-sen, the national reunification would be completed during National Revolution.¹¹ For the Comintern, after the Second Congress of the Communist International, the proletariat in eastern and semi-colonial countries, such as China, could cooperate with bourgeois parties for a certain period from the perspective of the proletarian world revolution. The first step was to seek national independence and complete the bourgeois–democratic revolution. The second step was to wait for the proletariat to grow stronger before proceeding to a higher stage of the proletarian communist revolution. In the first stage, Sun Yat-sen and the KMT were available political forces.¹² Meanwhile, historian Shi Chunchun explained that the revolutionary goal of the cooperation between the KMT and the CPC in the first stage was only a class alliance of national revolutions in colonial countries under the guidance of the Comintern. Therefore, the difference between the KMT and the CPC is how to carry out the National Revolution, not whether China should realize

communism immediately: the KMT emphasizes the development of productive forces under the existing class structure through ideological changes and political and military actions, whereas the CPC highlights the comparison of class power during the revolution. The main revolutionary strategy is to promote class initiative.¹³ Therefore, when historian Li Yuzhen pursued the interactions between the KMT and the Comintern, she mentioned that the KMT and the Comintern were far away from each other. The Comintern compared the Chinese National Revolution to the Russian Revolution of 1905 which was only the first stage of the revolution. At this stage, the slogan of the Comintern was “from Sun Yat-senism to Leninism,” but Hu Hanmin (胡漢民) of the KMT advocated to change it to “Leninism to Sun Yat-senism.”¹⁴

Based on the above research, this study attempts to analyze that as the main social actor of the Chinese National Revolution, the KMT’s theory of judging revolutionary goals and roads mainly comes from Sun Yat-sen’s creation. The revolutionary goals and roads defined by Sun Yat-sen differed from those by Lenin from the beginning. The two speeches and responses of Sun Yat-sen and Lenin in 1912 are discussed in this study, that is, the view of Sun Yat-sen about the future development path of China is presented. Moreover, the reasons and patterns are foreseen from the response of Lenin to the future conflict between the KMT and the Comintern.

After the dismissal of Sun Yat-sen as provisional president, he tried his best to explain why China should carry out social revolution after the ethnic and political revolution in his speech. He also emphasized that because of the backwardness of capitalism in China, social revolution in the country may be different from the social revolution in Europe and North America. The equalization of land rights (平均地權) is a policy of social revolution that does

¹⁰ Мировицкая Р.А. Советский Союз в стратегии гоминьдана (20-30-е годы). Москва: Академия Наук СССР Институт Дальнего Востока, 1990. Р. 4.

¹¹ Chiang Kai-shek, “Su e zai zhong guo (Soviet Russia in China),” in Qin Xiaoyi eds., *Zong tong jiang gong si xiang yan lun zong ji* (President Chiang Kai-shek’s Thought and Speech Collection), vol. 9 (Taipei City: Party History Society of the Central Committee of the Chinese Kuomintang, 1984), pp. 15-16.

¹² Кун Б., Короткий Е., Пятницкий О. (ред.). Первый Конгресс Коммунистического Интернационала. Март 1919 г. Москва: Партийное издательство, 1933.

¹³ Shi Chunchun, *Ge ming yi fan ge ming? Jiang zhong zheng ge ming dao lu de qi yuan* (Revolution or counter-revolution? The Origin of Chiang Kai-shek’s Revolutionary Road) (Taipei City: Administration Office of National Chiang Kai-shek Memorial Hall, 2017) pp. 6, 13-14.

¹⁴ Li Yuzhen, *Guo min dang yu gong chan guo ji* (1919-1927).

not bleed. This study first explains how Sun Yat-sen's speech expressed his views on capitalism, the definition of the Principle of People's Livelihood, and the claim of the equalization of land rights. Then, Lenin's evaluation of Sun Yat-sen's speech is discussed. The different views of Sun Yat-sen and Lenin on the stage of capitalism, the means and power of social revolution, and on the solution of the land problem are thus presented.

Sun Yat-sen's speech and Lenin's response

When the Tongmenghui was established in 1905, it set three major doctrines: nationalist, republican, and socialist objectives; however, unlike nationalist and republican issues, socialist problems were ignored.¹⁵ Nationalist and republican objectives have been realized from the overthrow of the Qing Dynasty to the establishment of the Republic of China. At this time, Sun Yat-sen's resignation as provisional president was to commit to the Principle of People's Livelihood.¹⁶ For Sun Yat-sen, this principle can motivate history and this principle is to study people's livelihood issues.¹⁷

In Sun Yat-sen's speech "Principles of People's Livelihood and Social Revolution" after his dismissal as provisional president in 1912, he explained that in the global tide of social revolution, his blueprint for the development in China after the 1911 Revolution was not capitalism in Europe and North

America:¹⁸ "That is to say, many people today think of transforming China, but they want to make China an extremely powerful country and keep pace with European and American countries. Today, the United Kingdom and the United States are the richest and most powerful, and France is the most civilized. The United Kingdom is a constitutional monarchy, and the United States and France are democratic and republican. However, there are still many socialist parties in these countries who want to revolutionize. Without social revolution, people cannot enjoy all the happiness. Only a few capitalists enjoy happiness, and most workers still suffer."¹⁹

Compared with many people who are concerned about the prosperity and civilization of the United Kingdom, the United States, and France, Sun Yat-sen noticed that only a few capitalists lived happily in these European and American countries due to the absence of social revolution.

Can China carry out social revolution? Sun Yat-sen opposed that social revolution should be postponed until the Chinese people have a high degree of development in the future. European and American countries have many capitalists because of the development of industry and commerce, and breaking them through social revolution is difficult.²⁰ Social revolution requires the use of force in the United Kingdom and the United States, but not in China. Sun Yat-sen explained: "... When these national and republican revolutions succeed, if we do not think about prevention, then the capitalists will appear, and their means of suppression may be even more than that of authoritarian monarchs."²¹

That is, compared with European and American countries where capitalism is prosperous, China precisely benefits from the low degree of capitalism development, and

¹⁵ Sun Yat-sen, "San min zhu yi yu zhong guo min zu zhi qian tu (The Three Principles of the People and the Future of the Chinese Nation)," in Qin Xiaoyi eds., *Guo fu quan ji (Complete Works of Founding Father)*, vol. 3 (Taipei City: Modern China Publishing House, 1989), p. 10.

¹⁶ Sun Yat-sen, "Min sheng zhu yi yu she hui ge ming (Principles of People's Livelihood and Social Revolution)," in Qin Xiaoyi eds., *Guo fu quan ji (Complete Works of Founding Father)*, vol. 3 (Taipei City: Modern China Publishing House, 1989), pp. 26.

¹⁷ Sun Yat-sen, "San min zhu yi: Min sheng zhu yi di yi jiang (The Three Principles of the People: Principle of People's Livelihood First Lecture)," in Qin Xiaoyi eds., *Guo fu quan ji (Complete Works of Founding Father)*, vol. 1 (Taipei City: Modern China Publishing House, 1989), pp. 129, 131, 136.

¹⁸ Sun Yat-sen, "Min sheng zhu yi yu she hui ge ming (Principles of People's Livelihood and Social Revolution)," in Qin Xiaoyi eds., *Guo fu quan ji (Complete Works of Founding Father)*, vol. 3 (Taipei City: Modern China Publishing House, 1989), p. 26.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid. P. 27.

²¹ Ibid. P. 27.

China can plan for precautions before the differentiation of the rich and the poor.

Regarding the ability of China to adopt social revolution, Sun Yat-sen put forward the idea of the equalization of land rights. In the past, taxes were collected according to the area of land owned by the people. Now, tax collection should be based on land price, and such basis is reasonable. With the development of industry and commerce, the price of land has risen. Today, land price is at least 10,000 times more expensive than it was a hundred years ago. "Dozens of Shanghai will appear 50 years later."²² However, land price appreciation is probably due to the opening of railways and the development of other industries, not made by the labor of landlords.²³ Accordingly, given that the gains from land price appreciation come from people's efforts, these gains should belong to the people, not to individual landlords.

After the first half of Sun Yat-sen's speech was translated into Russian, Lenin responded to Sun Yat-sen in July 1912 with the article "Democracy and Narodism in China," analyzing the Chinese revolutionary democratic ideas represented by Sun Yat-sen and their relationship with Russian Narodism.

Lenin first explained that Sun Yat-sen is a progressive Chinese bourgeois democrat, which is different from the bourgeoisie rotten to the core in Europe and North America. Lenin pointed out that Sun Yat-sen thoroughly understood the inadequacy of a "racial" revolution. Sun Yat-sen did not ignore "social reform" in China and posed the question of the condition of the masses, of the mass struggle. He expressed warm sympathy for the toiling and exploited people and faith in their strength and in the justice of their cause.²⁴ By contrast, the presidents of various republics in Europe and North America are all businessmen, agents, or puppets of the bourgeoisie, which long ago renounced all the ideals of its youth, rotten to the core. That is, Lenin distinguished between two kinds of bourgeoisie: one is rising and fighting for the future selflessly, such as Sun Yat-sen;

the other is declining, maintaining and restoring the past to safeguard its privileges, such as the Western bourgeoisie. However, this difference does not indicate that the West hopelessly decays and that light shines only from the East; it means that the East has definitely taken the Western path.²⁵

However, Lenin immediately claimed that the ideology of Sun Yat-sen on militant democracy is distinct from democracy and is a supplement to democracy, constituting the element which forms Narodism: first, this ideology has socialist dreams and hopes of China avoiding the capitalist path; second, this ideology advocates radical agrarian reform.²⁶

Lenin explained that the origin of these trends are: first, the Chinese democracy was able to overthrow the old order because of the immense spiritual and revolutionary upsurge of the masses. Such an increase presupposes and evokes the most sincere sympathy for the condition of the working masses. Democracy in China borrowed liberal ideas from Europe and North America, but these ideas were emancipation from the bourgeoisie, that is, socialism is the immediate task. Sympathy for socialism is bound to rise among Chinese democrats and is the source of their subjective socialism. They are subjectively socialists because they are opposed to the oppression and exploitation of the masses. However, the objective condition of China is an agricultural and semi-feudal country.²⁷ Therefore, the program proposed by Chinese democrats for "changing all the juridical foundations" of "immovable property" abolishes feudal exploitation alone for the development of capitalism; that is, the essence of the Narodism, bourgeois democracy, and quasi-socialist theory of Sun Yat-sen.²⁸ From the point of view of doctrine, this theory is that of a petty-bourgeois "socialist" reactionary. For the idea that capitalism can be "prevented" in China and that "social revolution" can be made easy by the country's backwardness is reactionary, but Sun Yat-sen admitted that "China is on the eve of a gigantic industrial [i.e., capitalist]

²² Ibid. P. 28.

²³ Ibid. P. 28.

²⁴ Lenin, "Democracy and Narodism in China," in Stepan Apresyan trans., *Lenin Collected Works*, vol. 18 (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1978), p. 164.

²⁵ Ibid. Pp. 164-165.

²⁶ Ibid. Pp. 165-166.

²⁷ Ibid. P. 166.

²⁸ Ibid. P. 166.

development;” “trade [i.e., capitalism] in China can develop to an enormous extent;” and “in 50 years, many Shanghais (i.e., huge centers of capitalist wealth and proletarian need and poverty) will appear.”²⁹ Lenin believed that Sun Yat-sen wanted to prevent capitalism with social revolution but predicted that China will develop capitalism in the future, exposing the contradiction between Narodism and bourgeois democracy in his thoughts.

Second, Lenin explained that although Chinese democrats sympathized with socialism in Europe, they championed a capitalist agrarian program in an attempt to “prevent” capitalism.³⁰ The economic revolution proposed by Sun Yat-sen was to transfer rent to the state through single tax along Henry George lines. This transfer is a manner of capitalism because land nationalization means “a maximum elimination of medieval monopolies and relations in agriculture, maximum freedom in buying and selling land, and maximum facilities for agriculture to adapt itself to the market.”³¹ Lenin regarded it as “the irony of history” because “Narodism, under the guise of ‘combating capitalism’ in agriculture champions and agrarian programs, indicates the most rapid development of capitalism in agriculture.”³² That is, Lenin believed that Sun Yat-sen wanted to prevent capitalism through land nationalization whose realization cannot prevent capitalism. On the contrary, the realization of land nationalization precisely leads to that of capitalism.

Good results of capitalism

Lenin’s evaluation of Narodism in Sun Yat-sen’s thoughts reflected the background of the Russian debate on Narodism and socialism. The so-called Narodism began in Russia in the 1860s; the Narodnik believe that Russian social economy is backward, and the bourgeoisie is weak; this view is conducive to the realization of socialism: Russia can play the nature of peasant collectivization on the basis of Obshchina and directly transition into a socialist society, thereby avoiding the

development stage of capitalism.³³ However, Lenin argued that according to Marxism, Russian society is based on commodity production and has commercial intercourse with civilized capitalist nations. Thus, Russia must inevitably take the road of capitalism. Marxism has irrevocably broken with the Narodnik and anarchist gibberish that Russia can bypass capitalist development or escape from capitalism.³⁴ Even in accordance with the wishes of Socialists-Revolutionaries, the redistribution of the whole of the land in favor of the peasants and in accordance with their desires and the establishment of consistent and full democracy are the eradication of all the oppressive features of Asiatic bondage in rural life; this eradication lays the foundation for a thorough improvement of living conditions and for a rise in living standards, giving an impetus to the development and hastening the class disintegration of the peasantry itself; as a result, the Socialists-Revolutionaries become unconscious ideologists of petite bourgeoisie.³⁵ That is, Lenin believed that Russia inevitably embarks on the path of developing capitalism. The claim that Russia can avoid capitalism and directly develop socialism and other Narodism is almost fantasy.

Does the ideology of Sun Yat-sen have Narodism elements as Lenin claimed? The answer must be discriminated from Sun Yat-sen’s thoughts on capitalism and socialism. First, Sun Yat-sen’s concern for socialism has a long history. In 1905, Sun Yat-sen visited the International Socialist Party Executive Board of the Second International in Brussels, Belgium; he met with the president, Emile Vandervelde, and secretary, Camille Huysmans, to express his intention to cooperate with each other in the organization.³⁶ According to reports at the time,

²⁹ Ibid. Pp. 166-167.

³⁰ Ibid. P. 167.

³¹ Ibid. Pp. 167-168.

³² Ibid. P. 168.

³³ Meisner, Maurice. *Li Ta-Chao and the Origins of Chinese Marxism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1967. Pp. 75-76.

³⁴ Lenin, V. *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution* / in Abraham Fineburg and Julius Katzer trans., *Lenin Collected Works*, vol. 9. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1977. P. 49.

³⁵ Ibid. Pp. 48, 56-57.

³⁶ Li Yuzhen, “Lie ning wei he yao yan li pi ping sun zhong shan - e luo si dang an zhong de guo min dang yu gong chan guo ji (zhi yi) (Why Lenin Severely Criticizes Sun Yat-sen - KMT and Comintern in Russian Archives (Part 1))” *Century 1* (2012). P. 46.

Sun Yat-sen explained that the so-called Chinese socialist program does not involve any landlord, land is publicly owned and leased to farmers by the commune, and each person collects taxes according to the property. Chinese socialists must adopt European production methods and use machines, but they must avoid the various drawbacks of such machines and methods. Chinese socialists will build a new society without any transition in the future. They will absorb the essence of European civilization “and will never become its victim.” That is, in China, “the production methods of the middle ages will directly transition to the production stage of socialism, and the workers do not have to suffer the exploitation of capitalists.”³⁷ At this time, the blueprint proposed by Sun Yat-sen had the idea of China directly transitioning to the socialist stage.

After the establishment of the Tongmenghui, Sun Yat-sen declared in his *Minbao* (民報) speech that the Principle of People’s Livelihood is one of the three major revolutionary principles, and that people’s livelihood will become an important topic in the 20th century, which must be its era.³⁸ Sun Yat-sen realized that although European and American countries are strong, the people are living hard. Therefore, the social revolution of Europe and North America will not be far away.³⁹ Before the Revolution of 1911, Sun Yat-sen was aware of the shortcomings of Western capitalism and attempted to find the possibility of China embarking on a non-Western modernization path.

In a speech on the first anniversary of the *Minbao* in 1906, Sun Yat-sen explained that in view of the inequality between the rich and the poor brought about by the progress of civilization, the following social problems were formed: “The good fruits of the United Kingdom and the United States are enjoyed by the rich, and the poor fight against the evil. The minority of people always controls civilization and happiness, so this world is unequal. Our revolution this time will not only be a national country but also a socialist country, which is beyond the reach of the United Kingdom and the United States.”⁴⁰

That is, Sun Yat-sen did not advocate a retro approach to avoid the evils brought about by the progress of civilization but advocated an equal manner to distribute the good results of civilization to most people.

After Sun Yat-sen’s dismissal as provisional president in April 1912, he began to speak and promote the Principle of People’s Livelihood throughout China. In Shanghai, he pointed out that “China is a very poor country, and poverty can only be saved by rejuvenating its industry.” The method of rejuvenating industry is to implement the Principle of People’s Livelihood;⁴¹ Sun Yat-sen added that a bloodless social revolution would be launched in China.⁴² The Principle of People’s Livelihood is Sun Yat-sen’s belief and ideal. Even though the Revolution of 1911 succeeded, he still regarded the Principle of People’s Livelihood as a necessary strategy for China to become equally rich.

³⁷ “Fu: Fang wen guo ji she hui dang zhi hang ju de tan hua bao dao (Attachment: Report from a visit to the Executive Committee of the International Socialist Party)” in History Research Office of Guangdong Academy of Social Sciences, Institute of Modern History, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, Sun Yat-sen Research Office, Department of History, Sun Yat-sen University eds., *Sun zhong shan quan ji* (The Complete Works of Sun Yat-sen), vol. 1 (Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company, 1981), pp. 272-273.

³⁸ Sun Yat-sen, “Min bao fa kan ci (Published by the People’s Daily),” in Qin Xiaoyi eds., *Guo fu quan ji* (Complete Works of Founding Father), vol. 2 (Taipei City: Modern China Publishing House, 1989), p. 256.

³⁹ *Ibid.* P. 257.

⁴⁰ Sun Yat-sen, “San min zhu yi yu zhong guo min zu zhi qian tu (The Three Principles of the People and the Future of the Chinese Nation),” in Qin Xiaoyi eds., *Guo fu quan ji* (Complete Works of Founding Father), vol. 3 (Taipei City: Modern China Publishing House, 1989), p. 11.

⁴¹ Sun Yat-sen, “Ti chang shi ye zai shi hang min sheng zhu yi (Advocating Industry in the Practice of the Principle of People’s Livelihood),” in Qin Xiaoyi eds., *Guo fu quan ji* (Complete Works of Founding Father), vol. 3 (Taipei City: Modern China Publishing House, 1989), p. 40.

⁴² Sun Yat-sen, “Zhong guo zhi di er bu (China Second Step),” in Qin Xiaoyi eds., *Guo fu quan ji* (Complete Works of Founding Father), vol. 3 (Taipei City: Modern China Publishing House, 1989), pp. 273-275.

In his speech in 1912, Sun Yat-sen responded to the opposition to the Principle of People's Livelihood that China must promote capitalists, develop industries, and use the power of capital to establish itself in the world of economic competition. Sun Yat-sen "opposed that few people occupy the power of the economy and monopolize the wealth of society."⁴³ If the railway is controlled by a few capitalists, then it can monopolize the traffic and control passengers, cargo dealers, and railway workers; if the land is owned by a few rich people, then land price and ownership can hinder public construction.⁴⁴ Sun Yat-sen did not oppose capitalists but guarded against ills caused by capitalists; he also did not advocate equality between the rich and the poor but thought that "the rich cannot exploit private wealth by autocracy, but the poor can share their interests through competition."⁴⁵ That is, the capitalism that Sun Yat-sen pursued is the one where the monopoly of capitalists is eliminated, so that most people can have an equal foothold for competition, rather than capitalism in which capitalists monopolize capital.

Although Sun Yat-sen said that "the Principle of People's Livelihood is socialism, also known as communism," he had other ideas.⁴⁶ For Sun Yat-sen, compared with socialism or communism, the Principle of People's Livelihood can effectively explain the Principle of Social Evolution. Sun Yat-sen cited the work of Russian-American socialist Maurice William, *The Social Interpretation of History*, and criticized the historical materialism of Karl Marx,⁴⁷ stating that "people's livelihood is social evolution, social evolution is the center of history, and the center of history comes down to people's livelihood." Sun Yat-sen opposed Marx who claimed that material is the center of history, and changes in material

determine human behavior and the operation of the world.⁴⁸ Furthermore, the driving force for social evolution comes from humans seeking to solve their own survival problems, rather than the class struggle advocated by Marx.⁴⁹ Class struggle that occurs when humans cannot survive during social evolution. Therefore, the research of Marx on social issues "only sees the problems of social evolution and does not see the Principle of Social Evolution." Therefore, Sun Yat-sen believed that Marx is a "social pathologist," not a "social physiologist."⁵⁰

Improvement or revolution

Sun Yat-sen once divided European socialist ideas into two groups, one is the Marxist approach and advocates the realization of the dictatorship of peasants and workers by means of social revolution; the other is represented by the German social democrat Eduard Bernstein. The Socialist Party advocates the use of social reforms, such as political movements, and compromises to seek the current interests of the working class.⁵¹ The argument between the two parties is different in terms of the strategy that favors proportion; but if the means selected by the two parties are to carry out their purpose and the doctrine on which the purpose is based, then the differences between both parties not only lies in strategy but also in the doctrine itself.⁵²

Marx and Friedrich Engels argued that in modern bourgeois society, society is divided into two hostile classes: the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The interests between the two classes are mutually contradictory, and

⁴⁸ Ibid. P. 136.

⁴⁹ Ibid. Pp. 129-145.

⁵⁰ Ibid. P. 139.

⁵¹ Sun Yat-sen, "San min zhu yi: Min sheng zhu yi di er jiang (The Three Principles of the People: Principle of People's Livelihood Second Lecture)," in Qin Xiaoyi eds., *Guo fu quan ji* (Complete Works of Founding Father), vol. 1 (Taipei City: Modern China Publishing House, 1989), p. 145.

⁵² Socialist research society trans., *Ma ke si zhu yi yu she hui shi guan* (Marxism and Social Historical View) (Shanghai: Minzhi Bookstore, 1927), pp. 1-2.

⁴³ Sun Yat-sen, "Ti chang min sheng zhu yi zhi zhen yi (The True Meaning of Advocating the Principle of People's Livelihood)," in Qin Xiaoyi eds., *Guo fu quan ji* (Complete Works of Founding Father), vol. 3 (Taipei City: Modern China Publishing House, 1989), pp. 32-33.

⁴⁴ Ibid. P. 33.

⁴⁵ Ibid. P. 40.

⁴⁶ Ibid. P. 129.

⁴⁷ Ibid. P. 136.

coordination is impossible; only a fundamental change can eliminate the huge gap between the two classes.⁵³

Marx and Engels once pointed out: “Owing to the extensive use of machinery and to the division of labour, the work of the proletariat has lost all individual characters and consequently, all charms for the workman. He becomes an appendage of the machine, and it is only the most simple, most monotonous, and most easily acquired knack that is required of him. Hence, the cost of production of a workman is restricted, almost entirely, to the means of subsistence that he requires for maintenance and for the propagation of his race.”⁵⁴

Nevertheless, at the beginning of the 20th century, Western countries, including the state socialism initiated by Otto von Bismarck, successively implemented a set of social programs. Do these social welfare policies appear because of the fear of the capitalists against the working class resistance, or are these social policies in the interests of the capitalist society? Socialists should regard the implementation of social programs as the loss of the capitalist class and the victory of the working class, as a way to “the road to socialism,” or whether the capitalists are still the advocates and practitioners of this trend. Socialists still have different opinions about the above issues.⁵⁵

According to Maurice Williams, social programs are still made by capitalists for the benefit of the capitalist society, not by the fear of the working class.⁵⁶ For example, although the capitalist class once opposed the burden of socializing the cost and responsibility of educating children, the loss of the capitalist

class caused by the lack of knowledge of the mass is greater than the cost of the compulsory education budget. When children without knowledge become adults, they can only do the most superficial work. The crimes and illnesses caused by the lack of knowledge of the people must be borne by the capitalist society.⁵⁷ The loss caused by the lack of knowledge contributed to education becoming “socialized by adapting to the needs of the capitalist system.”⁵⁸ Modern countries have also launched public health undertakings. The relationship between public health and society is profound; given that the occurrence of the plague has no boundaries, the capitalist class must protect the entire society, and only a healthy working class can cope with the work required by modern industry. Therefore, the capitalist society “should take the socialized public healthcare to meet the needs of the capitalist class.”⁵⁹

Williams explained that if social programs shake the nature of deprivation in production, then such an occurrence can be regarded as a concession of the capitalist class. However, historically, social programs did not reduce the surplus value that capitalists can obtain; instead, it gradually increased and advocated all kinds of improved power. German all-encompassing social programs brought the benefits obtained by German capitalists and the enhanced effectiveness of German workers beyond the reach of all countries. The monopolistic market of German capitalism precisely comes from the effect of social improvement on the increase of production and surplus value rates. To compete with Germany, capitalists in other countries, such as the United Kingdom and the United States, have also adopted social programs to increase their production and surplus value rates. Therefore, if the purpose of Marxism is to abolish the deprivation of capitalists and the pursuit of the happiness of producers, then the Socialist Party, which uses social programs as a means, can increase the deprivation of capitalists. This party advocates social programs which have departed from Marx.

Compared with the time when *Manifesto of the Communist Party* was published, the

⁵³ Ibid. Pp , 11, 70.

⁵⁴ Samuel Moore in cooperation with Frederick Engels trans., *Manifesto of the Communist Party in Marx/Engels Selected Works*, vol. 1 (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1969), pp. 98–137. (as cited in Marx/Engels Internet Archive (marxists.org) 1987, 2000. Updated May 16, 2020. Mode of access: <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Manifesto.pdf>, p. 18).

⁵⁵ Socialist research society trans., *Ma ke si zhu yi yu she hui shi guan* (Marxism and Social Historical View) (Shanghai: Minzhi Bookstore, 1927), pp. 14–22.

⁵⁶ Ibid. P. 29.

⁵⁷ Ibid. Pp. 26–27.

⁵⁸ Ibid. P. 28.

⁵⁹ Ibid. P. 28.

development of social productive forces was insufficient. Therefore, the bourgeoisie mainly relied on prolonging the working hours to squeeze the surplus value of workers, resulting in huge oppression of the proletariat and sharp conflicts between the two classes. With the further development of social productive forces and changes in social production conditions, the bourgeoisie changed its policy of treating workers and borrowed from the achievements of socialism.⁶⁰ The rise of social programs suggests that the speed and extent of bourgeois reform and progress may be so great that the interests of deprived persons are even promoted,⁶¹ leading to theoretical differences within the proletariat.⁶²

Protecting society from the pain of economic class oppression

Sun Yat-sen pointed out that in recent years, the United Kingdom and the United States have adopted four ways to promote social evolution through improvement, rather than revolution: the first is the improvement of society and industry, the second is that transportation undertakings are publicly owned, the third is direct taxation, and the fourth is the socialization of distribution. The first is to use the power of the government to improve the education and health of workers, including the machinery and equipment of factories to increase the effectiveness of workers' production; the second is to hand over the postal and transportation services to the government to facilitate transportation and increase various economic undertakings throughout the country. The third is where the

income tax and inheritance tax of capitalists are levied at progressive tax rates. Doing so increases the financial resources of countries as the incomes of capitalists increase. Countries can also have additional financial resources to improve social undertakings. The fourth is where social groups or governments, not merchants, distribute goods to save the commission earned by merchants. The above measures eliminate the monopoly of businessmen and increase the wealth of countries with capitalist taxes; states use this wealth to nationalize transportation and improve the education and health of workers and the equipment of factories to increase social productivity. As social productivity increases, capitalists' wealth increases, and workers can receive increased wages. This social progress suggests that the interests of capitalists and workers are reconciled, not conflicted.⁶³

Sun Yat-sen illustrated that Bismarck used state power to relieve workers' pain.⁶⁴ Although Sun Yat-sen mentioned socialism many times, his blueprint for development reveals that his so-called socialism is close to the state socialism advocated by Bismarck. Sun Yat-sen explained that only socialism can make China prosperous and strong and prevent capitalists from monopolizing the country; he added that the Principle of People's Livelihood "is also state socialism,"⁶⁵ that is, "few capitalists are excluded, and people share freedom in production."⁶⁶ State socialism is used by Germany to nationalize all its major industries, such as railways and electrics, for allowing private individuals to enjoy their own benefits. This policy could not be adopted by the United Kingdom and the United States at the beginning of their establishment. At present, the railway

⁶⁰ Zhang Hongfeng, "Gong chan dang xuan yan de shi dai xing fen xi ji qi dang dai jia zhi (Analysis of the Times of Manifesto of the Communist Party and Its Contemporary Value)," *Journal of Changchun University* 24: 1 (2014), pp. 89-90.

⁶¹ Socialist research society trans., *Ma ke si zhu yi yu she hui shi guan (Marxism and Social Historical View)* (Shanghai: Minzhi Bookstore, 1927), pp. 29-30, 35, 44, 53.

⁶² Zhang Hongfeng, "Gong chan dang xuan yan de shi dai xing fen xi ji qi dang dai jia zhi (Analysis of the Times of Manifesto of the Communist Party and Its Contemporary Value)," *Journal of Changchun University* 24: 1 (2014), p. 90.

⁶³ Sun Yat-sen, "San min zhu yi: Min sheng zhu yi di yi jiang (The Three Principles of the People: Principle of People's Livelihood First Lecture)," in Qin Xiaoyi eds., *Guo fu quan ji (Complete Works of Founding Father)*, vol. 1 (Taipei City: Modern China Publishing House, 1989), pp. 136-138.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.* P. 141.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.* Pp. 29-30.

⁶⁶ Sun Yat-sen, "Ti chang min sheng zhu yi zhi zhen yi (The True Meaning of Advocating the Principle of People's Livelihood)" in Qin Xiaoyi eds., *Guo fu quan ji (Complete Works of Founding Father)*, vol. 3 (Taipei City: Modern China Publishing House, 1989), p. 33.

may now be state-owned, but both countries have no financial resources to do so. Germany is a latecomer country; it can take precautions first and nationalize all national railways later. China should follow the example of Germany. In addition to railway income, the state can also collect land taxes and mine rents, assuming compulsory education, pension, and social welfare expenses, “so that society will not suffer from the oppression of the economic class.” The achievements of Chinese civilization in the future will not only keep pace with the United Kingdom and the United States but also reach the realm of national interests and people’s welfare.⁶⁷ That is, the national development capital and the national interests are still the welfare of the people; private development capital “only improves the private economy and increases the hardships of the poor.”⁶⁸ The political platform for state socialism includes state-owned enterprises, such as railways, mines, and hydropower.⁶⁹ Considering that Bismarck invented state socialism, in addition to conflicts between labor and capitalist, a buffer method is used. The state is neither capitalist nor labor, but it surpasses the two. On the one hand, the state limits the excessive development of capital; on the one hand, it protects the interests of workers.⁷⁰

Sun Yat-sen clarified the difference between socialism and state socialism. He once explained that the Principle of People’s

⁶⁷ Sun Yat-sen, “Min sheng zhu yi yu she hui ge ming (Principles of People’s Livelihood and Social Revolution),” in Qin Xiaoyi eds., *Guo fu quan ji (Complete Works of Founding Father)*, vol. 3 (Taipei City: Modern China Publishing House, 1989), pp. 29-30.

⁶⁸ Sun Yat-sen, “Ti chang min sheng zhu yi zhi zhen yi (The True Meaning of Advocating the Principle of People’s Livelihood),” in Qin Xiaoyi eds., *Guo fu quan ji (Complete Works of Founding Father)*, vol. 3 (Taipei City: Modern China Publishing House, 1989), p. 33.

⁶⁹ Socialist research society trans., *Ma ke si zhu yi yu she hui shi guan (Marxism and Social Historical View)* (Shanghai: Minzhi Bookstore, 1927), p. 26.

⁷⁰ Chang Yansheng, “San min zhu yi pi pan (Criticism of the Three Principles of the People),” in Chang Yansheng, *Forgotten Scholars: Essays on Educational Politics by Chang Yansheng* (Taipei City: Independent Writer, 2016), p. 290.

Livelihood is not “the doctrine of equalizing the rich and the poor,” but “the power of the state, the development of natural benefits, and the prevention of capitalist dictatorship.” Bismarck of Germany “opposed socialism and advocated state socialism,” which has swept the world. Ten years later, huge capitalists exist in China. To spare China from the tyranny of capitalists, similar to the case in the United Kingdom and the United States, state socialism must be advocated as the foundation of the prosperity of the Republic.⁷¹

Sun Yat-sen believed that communism and the Principle of People’s Livelihood are interrelated. “Communism is the ideal of the Principle of People’s Livelihood, and this principle is the practice of communism.” The main difference between the two is the method.⁷² According to the above analysis, Sun Yat-sen’s Principle of People’s Livelihood is close to state socialism. The difference between people’s livelihood and communism can be understood as the difference between statism and socialism: statism is the socialist labor organized by the state and the government, whereas socialism is the combination of social labor and public. The former can be realized without any major changes among classes; the latter must eliminate the boundary between the two classes of labor and capital, and revolution is the only way to do so.⁷³

If Sun Yat-sen’s Principle of People’s Livelihood is embodied as a method, it can be divided into two points: the control of capital and the equalization of land rights. Controlled capital refers to the control of private capital

⁷¹ Sun Yat-sen, “Ti chang guo jia she hui zhu yi (Advocating State Socialism),” in Qin Xiaoyi eds., *Guo fu quan ji (Complete Works of Founding Father)*, vol. 3 (Taipei City: Modern China Publishing House, 1989), p. 74.

⁷² Sun Yat-sen, “San min zhu yi: Min sheng zhu yi di er jiang (The Three Principles of the People: Principle of People’s Livelihood Second Lecture),” in Qin Xiaoyi eds., *Guo fu quan ji (Complete Works of Founding Father)*, vol. 1 (Taipei City: Modern China Publishing House, 1989), p. 145.

⁷³ Socialist research society trans., *Ma ke si zhu yi yu she hui shi guan (Marxism and Social Historical View)* (Shanghai: Minzhi Bookstore, 1927), pp. 92-93.

mainly on the basis of income tax selection; however, compared with the overproduction in foreign countries, productivity in China is insufficient. Therefore, China needs the capital of developed countries, such as that for transportation and minerals, in addition to the control of private capital. If such industries are allowed to operate privately, then private capital can be developed, and a huge gap between the rich and the poor may be promoted. Therefore, operation with state power is necessary. The state manages capital and developed capital, and the benefits are owned by the people. Conducive to capital, without being damaged by capital, can resolve the class war. Sun Yat-sen revealed that after the 1917 Revolution in Russia, the country switched to a new economic policy because its socio-economic level was less developed than that in the United Kingdom and the United States and could not realize communism according to Marxist theory; By contrast, the socio-economic level in China is far behind that in the United Kingdom and the United States. Moreover, realizing Marxist theory is impossible.⁷⁴ Sun Yat-sen believed: "... China is suffering from poverty, not unevenness. In an uneven society, of course, Marxist method can be used to promote class wars, but as long as the Chinese industry is not yet developed, Marxist class war proletarian dictatorship is unnecessary. Therefore, we can learn Marxist intention today, but not practice it. We advocate a solution to the problem of people's livelihood, instead of first proposing an untimely and violent method, and then waiting for the development of the industry to apply it. The solution we advocate is to prevent large private capital and future social poverty."⁷⁵

⁷⁴ Sun Yat-sen, "San min zhu yi: Min sheng zhu yi di er jiang (The Three Principles of the People: Principle of People's Livelihood Second Lecture)," in Qin Xiaoyi eds., *Guo fu quan ji (Complete Works of Founding Father)*, vol. 1 (Taipei City: Modern China Publishing House, 1989), pp. 145-157.

⁷⁵ Sun Yat-sen, "San min zhu yi: Min sheng zhu yi di er jiang (The Three Principles of the People: Principle of People's Livelihood Second Lecture)," in Qin Xiaoyi eds., *Guo fu quan ji (Complete Works of Founding Father)*, vol. 1 (Taipei City: Modern China Publishing House, 1989), p. 156.

In sum, Sun Yat-sen advocated to use the state as a tool for controlling the class disparity caused by capitalism; Marxism suggests to eliminate capitalism by class struggle after capitalism deepens class opposition.

The idea of the equalization of land rights was raised as early as when Sun Yat-sen led the revolution. In 1903, he mentioned in a letter that his claim to the equalization of land rights is a policy that China can implement today. Although countries such as the United Kingdom and the United States have experimented such an equalization, their landlord power is almost equal to that of China, and reform is difficult. However, China still mainly relies on human production and has not produced industrial owners with machinery. Therefore, if China adopts the policy regarding the equalization of land rights, then the implementation is easier than that in countries such as the United Kingdom and the United States.⁷⁶

Although Sun Yat-sen believed that the Principle of People's Livelihood is close to socialism, is this principle considered socialism? The definition of socialism differs from person to person, but two basic principles are considered: first, private capital is unrecognized; second, the right to produce is distributed to the whole people, not to the organs of the state. The measures adopted by the Principle of People's Livelihood are "control capital" and "equalization of land rights." The existence of the private capital system and private land rights is still recognized because of "control capital" and the "equalization of land rights," respectively. Therefore, Sun Yat-sen advocated a social policy which aims to reconcile the phenomenon of class inequality with the power of the state. This policy is completely different the proletarian standpoint of socialists.⁷⁷ Compared with Lenin, Sun Yat-

⁷⁶ Sun Yat-Sen, "Fu mou you ren han (Reply to a Letter from a Friend)," in History Research Office of Guangdong Academy of Social Sciences, Institute of Modern History, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, Sun Yat-sen Research Office, Department of History, Sun Yat-sen University eds., *Sun zhong shan quan ji (The Complete Works of Sun Yat-sen)*, vol. 1 (Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company, 1981), p. 228.

⁷⁷ Chang Yansheng, "San min zhu yi pi pan (Criticism of the Three Principles of the People),"

sen paid more attention to productivity that can solve people's survival problems.⁷⁸

Conclusion

The purpose of this paper is to attempt to address Sun Yat-sen through his speech "Principles of People's Livelihood and Social Revolution" after his dismissal as provisional president on April 1, 1912. The paper also discussed Lenin's "Democracy and Narodism in China" published in July that is in response to Sun Yat-sen's speech. A preliminary exploration of the differences between the views of Sun Yat-sen and Lenin on the socialist movement at the historical, revolutionary, and national levels is conducted.

Since the establishment of the Tongmenghui in 1905, Sun Yat-sen has regarded the Principle of People's Livelihood as an important issue. After his dismissal as provisional president in 1912, he explained in his speech that although people in European and American countries lived wealthy lives without social revolution, only a few capitalists enjoyed happiness due to its absence. However, European and American countries already have capitalists, and breaking them down through social revolution is quite difficult. China lacks powerful capitalists and vested interests. Therefore, social revolution can be easily carried out in the country. That is, compared with European and American countries where capitalism is prosperous, China benefits from low-level advantages of capitalism development and can take measures to prevent the class division of the rich and the poor in advance. Sun Yat-sen put forward the idea of the equalization of land rights, which can benefit from land price appreciation and benefit the people. After the first half of Sun Yat-sen's speech was translated into Russian, Lenin responded in July with the article "Democracy and Narodism in China." Lenin explained that Sun Yat-sen is an advanced Chinese bourgeois democrat, but his ideas

have a Narodnik factor because of his socialist fantasy characteristics and he hopes that China can avoid the road to capitalism. However, a close look at Sun Yat-sen's account reveals that he opposed capitalism that monopolizes capital and supported capitalism that enables many people to have equal foothold competition. As for the means of socialism, Marxism insists that coordinating the interests of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat is impossible. However, Western countries, including Germany (state socialism), carried out social reforms one after another at the beginning of the 20th century. Sun Yat-sen stated that his proposed Principle of People's Livelihood is close to the state socialism of Bismarck in Germany. The aim is to use the state as the arbiter, on the one hand, to restrict the excessive development of capital, and on the other hand, to protect the interests of laborers.

Sun Yat-sen's speech and Lenin's response reflected the differences in the views of the two sides in history, revolution, and state. First, as far as history is concerned, Lenin upheld Marxist historical materialism and advocated that history focuses on the changes in economic production. He believed that after the feudal society, people must first go through the bourgeois revolution, enter the capitalist society, and then enter the communism through the communist revolution. Therefore, China, which has only ended its feudal autocracy, should develop capitalism first. However, Sun Yat-sen put forward the concept of the history of people's livelihood, thinking that human beings seek to solve their survival problems before economic production, which is the focus of history. Sun Yat-sen also believed that after feudal autocracy, based on the experience of Western capitalism, China can pursue "good" capitalism in which capitalist monopoly is nonexistent, enabling the equal distribution of the development of capitalist productivity to most people, unlike the capitalism that is monopolized by capitalists in the West.

Regarding the means of socialist revolution, Lenin and other Marxists believed that the interests between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat in capitalist society run counter to each other, and the bourgeoisie gains benefits by squeezing the surplus value of the

in Chang Yansheng, *Forgotten Scholars: Essays on Educational Politics* by Chang Yansheng (Taipei City: Independent Writer, 2016), pp. 286-287.

⁷⁸ Socialist research society trans., *Ma ke si zhu yi yu she hui shi guan* (Marxism and Social Historical View) (Shanghai: Minzhi Bookstore, 1927), p. 2.

proletariat. However, at the beginning of the 20th century, German state socialism and even Western countries adopted social programs. Such an adoption not only increased capitalists' deprivation but also eased the contradictions among classes. Sun Yat-sen explained that his Principle of People's Livelihood is inspired by Germany (state socialism), aiming to restrict the excessive development of capital by the state and protect the interests of laborers, rather than to eliminate the boundary between labor and capital in a revolutionary way.

In sum, Lenin advocated a bourgeois revolution first and a communist revolution later, but Sun Yat-sen believed that Marxist revolutions are out of date. Based on the Western experience of developing capitalism, China can focus on the state, which is partially involved in wealth distribution to ease the contradiction between labor and capital, so that many people in China can enjoy the good results of capitalism, avoid its evil results, and the disparity between the rich and the poor brought about by capitalists. The differences between the views of Sun Yat-sen and Lenin herald differences in future cooperation between the KMT and the CCP.

References:

Chang Yansheng, "San min zhu yi pi pan (Criticism of the Three Principles of the People)," in *Chang Yansheng, Forgotten Scholars: Essays on Educational Politics by Chang Yansheng* (Taipei City: Independent Writer, 2016).

Chiang Kai-shek, "Su e zai zhong guo (Soviet Russia in China)," in Qin Xiaoyi eds., *Zong tong jiang gong si xiang yan lun zong ji* (President Chiang Kai-shek's Thought and Speech Collection), vol. 9 (Taipei City: Party History Society of the Central Committee of the Chinese Kuomintang, 1984).

Chiang Kai-shek, "Zhong guo jing ji xue shuo (Theory of Chinese Economics)," in Qin Xiaoyi eds., *Zong tong jiang gong si xiang yan lun zong ji* (President Chiang Kai-shek's Thought and Speech Collection), vol. 5 (Taipei City: Party History Society of the Central Committee of the Chinese Kuomintang, 1984).

Lenin, V. "Democracy and Narodism in China," in *Stepan Apresyan trans., Lenin Collected Works*, vol. 18 (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1978).

Lenin, V. *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution* / in Abraham Fineburg and Julius Katzer trans., *Lenin Collected Works*, vol. 9. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1977.

Li Yuzhen, "Lie ning wei he yao yan li pi ping sun zhong shan - e luo si dang an zhong de guo min dang yu gong chan guo ji (zhi yi) (Why Lenin Severely Criticizes Sun Yat-sen - KMT and Comintern in Russian Archives (Part 1)," *Century 1* (2012).

Li Yuzhen, *Guo min dang yu gong chan guo ji* (1919-1927) (KMT and Comintern (1919-1927)) (Beijing: People's Publishing House, 2012).

Meisner, Maurice. *Li Ta-Chao and the Origins of Chinese Marxism.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1967.

Shi Chunchun, *Ge ming yi fan ge ming? Jiang zhong zheng ge ming dao lu de qi yuan* (Revolution or counter-revolution? The Origin of Chiang Kai-shek's Revolutionary Road) (Taipei City: Administration Office of National Chiang Kai-shek Memorial Hall, 2017).

Socialist research society trans., Ma ke si zhu yi yu she hui shi guan (Marxism and Social Historical View) (Shanghai: Minzhi Bookstore, 1927).

Sun Yat-sen, "Appendix: The Social Significance of the Chinese Revolution (Translation) (Fu lu: zhong guo ge ming de she hui yi yi (yi wen)," in Qin, Xiao-yi eds., *Guo fu quan ji* (Complete Works of Founding Father), vol. 3 (Taipei City: Modern China Publishing House, 1989).

Sun Yat-Sen, "Fu mou you ren han (Reply to a Letter from a Friend)," in *History Research Office of Guangdong Academy of Social Sciences, Institute of Modern History, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, Sun Yat-sen Research Office, Department of History, Sun Yat-sen University eds., Sun zhong shan quan ji* (The Complete Works of Sun Yat-sen), vol. 1 (Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company, 1981).

Sun Yat-sen, "Min bao fa kan ci (Published by the People's Daily)," in Qin Xiaoyi eds., *Guo fu quan ji* (Complete Works of Founding Father), vol. 2 (Taipei City: Modern China Publishing House, 1989).

Sun Yat-sen, "Min sheng zhu yi yu she hui ge ming (Principles of People's Livelihood and Social Revolution)," in Qin Xiaoyi eds., *Guo fu quan ji* (Complete Works of Founding Father), vol. 3 (Taipei City: Modern China Publishing House, 1989).

Sun Yat-sen, "San min zhu yi yu zhong guo min zu zhi qian tu (The Three Principles of the People and the Future of the Chinese Nation)," in Qin Xiaoyi eds., *Guo fu quan ji* (Complete Works of Founding Father), vol. 3 (Taipei City: Modern China Publishing House, 1989).

Sun Yat-sen, "San min zhu yi: Min sheng zhu yi di er jiang (The Three Principles of the People: Principle of People's Livelihood Second Lecture)," in Qin Xiaoyi eds., *Guo fu quan ji* (Complete Works of Founding Father), vol. 1 (Taipei City: Modern China Publishing House, 1989).

Sun Yat-sen, "Ti chang guo jia she hui zhu yi (Advocating State Socialism)," in Qin Xiaoyi eds., *Guo fu quan ji* (Complete Works of Founding Father), vol. 3 (Taipei City: Modern China Publishing House, 1989).

Sun Yat-sen, "Ti chang min sheng zhu yi zhi zhen yi (The True Meaning of Advocating the Principle of People's Livelihood)," in Qin Xiaoyi eds., *Guo fu quan ji* (Complete Works of Founding Father), vol. 3 (Taipei City: Modern China Publishing House, 1989).

Sun Yat-sen, "Zhong guo zhi di er bu (China Second Step)," in Qin Xiaoyi eds., *Guo fu quan ji* (Complete Works of Founding Father), vol. 3 (Taipei City: Modern China Publishing House, 1989).

Zhang Hongfeng, "Gong chan dang xuan yan de shi dai xing fen xi qi dang dai jia zhi (Analysis of the Times of Manifesto of the Communist Party and Its Contemporary Value)," *Journal of Changchun University* 24: 1 (2014).

КАПИТАЛИЗМ ИЛИ СОЦИАЛИЗМ: СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ ФИЛОСОФИИ СУНЬ ЯТСЕНА И ЛЕНИНА

Хуэй-Лин Шувэй

*Национальный Тайваньский университет,
Тайбэй, Тайвань (Китайская Республика)*

<p>Информация о статье: <i>Поступила в редакцию:</i> 17 мая 2020 <i>Принята к печати:</i> 3 августа 2020</p>	<p>Аннотация: Исследование направлено на то, чтобы представить глубокую перспективу дебатов между двумя лагерями в начале 20-го века: китайской буржуазной революционной идеологией, представленной Сунь Ятсеном (孫中山), и марксизмом, представленным Лениным. Исследуя речь Сунь Ят-сена «Принципы жизни народа и социальная революция» и статью Ленина «Демократия и народничество в Китае», которая является ответом на речь Сунь Ятсена, данное исследование пытается переосмыслить природу воззрений китайского буржуазного революционера. В исследовании сначала показано, как в речи Сунь Ятсена выражены его взгляды на капитализм, дано определение принципа жизнеобеспечения людей и обосновано появление его требования равенства прав на землю. Затем обсуждается оценка Лениным выступления Сунь Ятсена. Таким образом, представлены различные взгляды Сунь Ятсена и Ленина на стадии капитализма, средства и силы социальной революции и решение земельной проблемы. В исследовании показывается, что раскол между Китайской Национальной Партии (Гоминьдан) и Коммунистической партией Китая (КПК) в 1927 году был вызван не столько «предательством» Гоминьдана революционного пути, сколько фундаментальным различием между идеями Сунь Ятсена и марксизмом. Хотя идеология Сунь Ятсена имеет антикапиталистический компонент, он обращал внимание на использование механизма государства, а не общества в качестве инструмента, и примирение, а не революцию для уменьшения разрыва между богатыми и бедными. Такой подход позволяет пересмотреть особенности развития Китая в настоящее время.</p>
<p>Об авторе: аспирант, Факультет политологии, Национальный университет Тайваня e-mail: hsiehjuiling@gmail.com</p>	
<p>Ключевые слова: капитализм; Марксизм; Сунь Ятсен; Ленин; развитие; социальная революция; уравнивание земельных прав</p>	

Для цитирования: Hsieh, Jui-Ling. Capitalism or Socialism: A Comparative Analysis of Sun Yat-Sen and Lenin // *Сравнительная политика*. – 2020. – № 4. – С. 27-41.

DOI: 10.24411/2221-3279-2020-10046

For citation: Hsieh, Jui-Ling. Capitalism or Socialism: A Comparative Analysis of Sun Yat-Sen and Lenin // *Comparative Politics Russia*, 2020, No. 4, pp. 27-41.

DOI: 10.24411/2221-3279-2020-10046