

9/21/1966  
 Dr. Eisenstadt  
 in a  
 new book  
 labeled as in  
 sub

CHINA'S HERITAGE AND THE COMMUNIST POLITICAL SYSTEM (book two)  
 Edited by Ping-ti Ho and Tang Tsou

I shall go directly to the last chapter entitled: "Tradition, Change and Modernity: Reflections on the Chinese Experience" by S.N. Eisenstadt

"Here we find in China, among the great historic imperial civilizations, the closest interweaving, almost identity, of cultural with political centers. Although in principle many universalistic ethical elements in the dominant Confucian ideology was very closely tied to the specific political framework of the Chinese empire. The empire is legitimized by the Confucian symbols, but the Confucian symbols and Confucian ethical orientation found their "natural" place and framework, their major "referent", within the empire. This, of course, was also related to the fact that no church or cultural organization in China existed independently of the state." (p. 763)

Professor Eisenstadt further shows that the linkage between the "reformists" and "rebellious tradition", between the literati and the gentry, on the one side, and, on the other side, between the secret societies and the peasant rebellions, were so unusual in Chinese history that it helped the Chinese Communists to forge a relatively cohesive movement:

"Another factor which helped to forge the Chinese Communist movement (and in which already some of the important differences from the Russian Communist movement stand out) was that it was molded in a war of national liberation, so that from the very beginning there did not develop within it great incompatibilities between the transformation of the symbols of the national order and of the social order, and the two could (even if in fact this did not always take place) reinforce one another continuously." (p. 772)

- Derk Brodde, professor of Chinese at University of Pennsylvania
- Jerome Alan Cohen, professor of law at Harvard University
- Herrlee G. Creel, Professor of Chinese History at University of Chicago
- Robert Dernberger, assistant professor of economics and chairman of committee on Far Eastern Studies at University of Chicago
- Alexander Eckstein, Professor of Economics etc. at University of Michigan
- S.N. Eisenstadt, Rose Isaacs Professor of Sociology at Eliezer Kaplan School of Economics and Social Sciences, Hebrew University
- Albert Feuerwerker, Professor of history; director of Center for Chinese Studies at University of Michigan
- C. P. Fitzgerald, Professor of Far Eastern History at Australian Natl.U.

of  
 08/25/66  
 P3  
 for  
 proc.  
 11  
 attrib. Fe  
 12/2/66  
 a.m.  
 the  
 the  
 8/25/66

- Herbert Franke, Professor of Far Eastern studies at University of Munich
- Ping-ti Ho, Professor of History at University of Chicago
- Hsu Dau-lin, Professor of linguistics and Oriental and African languages at Michigan State University
- Francis L.K. Hsu, Professor of Department of Anthropology at Northwestern University
- Chalmers Johnson, Associate Professor of Political Science and Chairman of Center for Chinese Studies at University of Calif., Berkley
- Philip Kuhn, Assistant professor of history at University of Chicago
- John W. Lewis, associate professor of government and director of Cornell Committee etc. at Cornell University
- James T.C. Liu, Professor of Oriental studies and history at Princeton University
- Kwang-Ching Liu, Professor of History at University of California, Davis
- Ta-Chung Liu, Professor of Economics, director of program on Comparative Economic Development at Cornell University
- Donald J. Munro, assistant professor of philosophy and associate of Center for Chinese studies at University of Michigan
- Michael Oksenberg, assistant professor of political science at Stanford U.
- Dwight H. Perkins, associate professor of modern China studies and economics and associate of East Asian Research Center at Harvard U.
- Stuart R. Schram, formerly director of Chinese and Soviet section of Centre etc., now reader in politics in School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London
- Peter Schram, associate professor of economics in Asian studies at University of Illinois
- Franz Schurmann, professor of sociology and history at University of California, Berkeley
- Benjamin I. Schwartz, professor of history and government etc. of East Asian Research Center at Harvard University
- Richard H. Solomon, assistant professor of political science etc. at University of Michigan.
- Anthony M. Tang, professor of economics at Vanderbilt University
- S.Y. Teng, University professor at Indiana University
- Tang Tsou, professor of political science at University of Michigan

Ezra F. Vogel, professor in Social Relations Dept. and associate director of East Asian Research Center at Harvard University

Wang Gungwu, professor of history at University of Malaya etc.

C. Martin Wilbur, George Sanson Professor of History etc., department of Chinese and Japanese etc. at Columbia University

Arthur Frederick Wright, Charles Seymour Professor of History at Yale University

C.K. Yang, professor of sociology at University of Pittsburgh

The first chapter of Book Two, actually Chapter 7, "Leader, Commissar, and Bureaucrat" by John W. Lewis, though it has its interesting points is too pre-determined, and, therefore, the most interesting part are actually the comments on it by Micel Oksenberg that reveal that we are too prone to attribute to irrational compulsions to that with which we disagree and warns further against exaggerating the differences between Mao and Liu in the pre-1966 period. For example, the rift is not due to different guerrilla experiences but to the two strands of thought -- the human will and man's material environment that has been present in CCP from the start regarding Chen Tu-Hsiu and the "scientist" on the one hand and Li Ta-Chao and voluntarism on the other, "with its priority upon the destruction of the old institutions and the instilling of new attitudes."

But, that doesn't mean that these taking up the voluntary position are opposed to production but, on the contrary, because they believe "that the Cultural Revolution would provide a more powerful motive force for increasing production". (p. 489) He points to item 14 of the 16-point precision of the CC statement, "any idea of counterposing the great cultural revolution against the development of production is incorrect." (Peking Review, 8-12-66) Oksenberg also claims (and quotes Robert Scalapino and George Yu, the Chinese Anarchist Movement) that the anarchist tradition, rather than a "primitive" political system "is in the mainstream of one influential modern intellectual current". The fault with the commentary is that the author also thinks that Mao is allegedly fighting the entrenched political elite.

\*\*\*\*  
Chapter 8, "Cultural Revolution and Revisionism" by C.K. Yang is written as if there was a continuous logical line between Mao and the opposition, which has culminated in a cultural revolution.

\*\*\*\*  
Chapter 9., "The Attack of the Cultural Revolution" by Kranz Schurmann is the usual apologist's white-wash, this time using such expression as "flying squads of excited students who head out ~~for~~ some base-point to force big and little party cadres to Chien-t'ao ("confess") before the masses; once ~~again~~ the party committee has crumbled before their attacks, they dissolve back (sic! R.D.) into their schools" (p. 525) Schurman even dares to show how right the Chinese always were that Stalin's Russia is likewise excused at all the wrong points, the apology being: "Germany finally did attack Russia." (p. 539)

Not so much  
Why elite  
is necessary  
in  
Special

(K)

(K)

10/12/68

About the only point that is of value is the revelation that "the classic text of Communism are rarely cited in China today. The thought of Mao Tse-tung is far more important today than the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin." (p. 55) The rightful apologia for this Maoist fellow traveller is climaxed by his last two sentences

"now Mao has decided that it (centralism) must be balanced with ~~being~~ extensive democracy'.

whether this man of grand visions and schematic thinking is right or wrong remains to be seen."

Professor Ezra F. Vogel states, in his commentary, that the 9th plenum (1-1961) opened up new criticisms of Mao and his closest allies and it was this which the 10th plenum (in the fall of 1962) was meant to purge with the "Socialist Education Campaign" of 1962

\*\*\*\*

The two chapters on Economic Development -- Chapter 11 by Ta-Chung Liu and Chapter 12 by Alexander Eckstein -- are quite important but I am not summarizing them at the moment since they are not immediately relevant to the Cultural Revolution.