

Attributive Features of the Reception of Chineseized Marxism in the Philosophy and Socio-Political Thought of the Soviet-Era

Nataliia Yarmolitska

Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Researcher,
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Kyiv, Ukraine)
E-mail: natashav63@ukr.net
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1922-3496>

Katherine Gan

Ph.D. student, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Kyiv, Ukraine)
E-mail: katherinegan.knu@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9357-7391>

Yarmolitska, Nataliia and Katherine Gan (2022) Attributive Features of the Reception of Chineseized Marxism in the Philosophy and Socio-Political Thought of the Soviet-Era. *Future Human Image*, Volume 17, 89-100. <https://doi.org/10.29202/fhi/17/11>

The article presents the results of the study of Chineseized Marxism in the philosophy and socio-political thought of the Soviet-era. The authors conducted historiographical studies of modern sources and analyzed the literature of the Soviet period. That made it possible to trace the formation of Ukrainian Chinese studies in the early 20-30s of the twentieth century, as well as to conduct a general review of attributive features of the reception of Chineseized Marxism conducted by Soviet scholars in the 60-80s of the twentieth was focused on the study of the socio-economic and ideological and political development of China. The research of Ukrainian-Chinese scholars is analyzed. Although they adapted to the general political and ideological tasks of Soviet society, they did not stop researching the history of ancient China, various aspects of economic development of this country, and studied different periods of Chinese philosophy, history, culture, and art. It is shown that under the ideological censorship of the totalitarian Soviet regime, in the publications of the Soviet period, scholars were forced to highlight the anti-Marxist and anti-socialist nature of Maoism, calling it petty-bourgeois and social-chauvinist teachings. Some Soviet sinologists considered it necessary to develop a special methodology for studying traditional Chinese philosophy, which would provide specific guidelines. It is concluded that this study provides an opportunity to expand knowledge about the method of reception of Chineseized Marxism, as well as help to enrich the philosophical and political science with comprehensive systemic knowledge.

© Yarmolitska, Nataliia, 2022
© Gan, Katherine, 2022

Keywords: Ukrainian Chinese studies, Chineseized Marxism, Soviet-era, history of Marxism, Maoism.

Received: 25 January 2022 / Accepted: 18 February 2022 / Published: 29 May 2022

Introduction

China is a country of history, culture, and philosophy that has always attracted researchers at different times. During the Soviet period, many works devoted to the study of the history of Chinese philosophy and the peculiarities of its development were published. Scientists of the former Soviet Union, the vast majority of whom were Ukrainian and Russian scholars, were actively involved in studying the history, culture, and literature of the East. It should be noted that in contrast to Russian, Ukrainian Chinese studies have been subjected to certain oppression and even bans. However, despite this, the Ukrainian Research Institute of Oriental Studies was founded in 1930, but this first center of academic oriental studies in Ukraine did not last long, and most oriental scientists were repressed. But despite Soviet repression, some gains still took place. Thus, in Kharkiv in 1927, the *Eastern World* journal was founded as a publication of the All-Ukrainian Association of Orientalists. However, in 1931 its publication ceased. And only after Ukraine gained independence, on October 22, 1991, the establishment of the A. Krymsky Institute of Oriental Studies was approved, and in 1993 the publication of this journal was resumed in Kyiv, which marked the beginning of the revival of Oriental Studies in Ukraine. The H. Skovoroda Institute of Philosophy of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine is also actively studying the intellectual traditions of the East. The institute has a sector of the history of Eastern philosophy. Scholars are actively working to determine the civilization paradigm of the region, study religious and philosophical texts of Eastern thinkers, and the reception of ideas of Eastern philosophies in the Western philosophical tradition.

Analyzing the research material of scientists of the Soviet period, it should be noted that most of it was presented in works in chronological order, and this applies mainly to ancient Thai philosophy. In this aspect, the works of Soviet-era philosophers on the history of the philosophy of Ancient China developed and used by Ukrainian historians are quite valuable. Still, unfortunately, there were not many of them. Here is how modern domestic scholars S. Rudenko and I. Lyashenko characterize the research of Ukrainian philosophers of the Soviet-era: they are critical of “Eurocentrism” and “West-centrism” as strategies for the understanding history of philosophy. The emergence and application of such an approach is a significant precedent for Ukrainian studies of the history of Soviet philosophy in the second half of the 20th century, as it indicates a critical rethinking of the dominance at that time of Hegel’s theory and methodology of History of Philosophy. The study of the philosophy of Ancient China also allows us to conclude how Ukrainian philosophers of the Soviet period understand philosophy itself and its history. For example, V. Dmytrychenko and V. Shynkaruk question the *European* origin of philosophy, arguing their point of view with the example of the philosophy of Ancient China: “The philosophy of Ancient China has a vivid history of origin and development. This history is so rich and multifaceted that there is no philosophical problem that the sages of Ancient China have not possessed or outlined” (Rudenko & Liashenko, 2020).

Among several works by Soviet researchers were works on the history of philosophy, which was presented as a process of human development of nature, and its attempts to comprehend its

place and role in the universe. At the same time, the history of the formation and development of Chinese philosophy was presented in inseparable connection with the class struggle in society. The society of that time required Soviet scholars to teach the study of the history of Chinese philosophy and socio-political thought in the context of the social role and forms of a struggle between materialism and idealism. The very specificity of Chinese philosophy, Soviet researchers noted, was directly related to the role of the sharp socio-political struggle that has been traced back to Ancient China.

Also, in Soviet times, some works analyzed various aspects of the “special” course of the Beijing leadership. Much attention was paid to the socio-economic and ideological, and political development of China. Following the demands of the totalitarian regime of Soviet power, Soviet scholars conducted such research under the slogan that Maoism is far from Marxism, is a petty-bourgeois social-chauvinist doctrine, and the Beijing leadership’s course is anti-socialist and contrary to Chinese national interests. Such a view was aimed at showing the anti-Marxist nature and anti-socialist nature of Maoism and identifying the failure of this trend in Chinese public opinion. Thus, the period of the 60-the 80s of the twentieth century can be called a period of sharp ideological differences. On the one hand, it is a question of giving the *right* (Marxist) recommendations by the Soviet Union to the Chinese people in building socialism;

Let us talk about the state of the study of traditional Chinese philosophical thought by Soviet sinologists. It should be noted that it took place in the field of “self-awareness,” i.e., identifying the methodological foundations on which it was built. Soviet scholars believed that to study Chinese philosophy as part of the global historical and philosophical process, it is necessary to specify the principles of the general methodology of historical and philosophical heritage by the specifics of the subject. Soviet historians of Chinese philosophy emphasized that general methodological principles alone were not enough to study and a theoretical understanding of the methods applied. Therefore, some Soviet sinologists pointed to the need to develop a special methodology for the history of Chinese philosophy, which would be able to give specific guidelines (Spirin, 1976: 5-17).

These considerations identified the purpose of our study: to review the main results of research on the history of Ukrainian Chinese studies in the Soviet period, as well as to clarify the content and specifics of studies of Chinese Marxism conducted by Soviet sinologists in the 60-80s of the 20th century. This goal involves solving the main tasks: the reconstruction of the method of describing Chinese philosophical and socio-political thought by Ukrainian sinologists of the Soviet era; highlighting the attributive features of the reception of Chinese Marxism from the standpoint of Soviet historians of philosophy of the second half of the 20th century.

Ukrainian Chinese Studies in the 1920s and 1930s

Russia has long been considered a country with advanced Chinese studies, which has been developing for a long time and has many representatives. Therefore, there are a large number of scientific papers devoted to Russian Chinese studies. Unfortunately, little is known today in the world about the history of Ukrainian Chinese studies. Among the first modern scholars who tried to convey to the general public the history of the study of Ukrainian Chinese studies was the Ukrainian scientist V. Kiktenko. This was confirmed by his thorough works in which the main object of study was the activities of Ukrainians, describing the emergence, formation, and development of Ukrainian Chinese studies from the 18th century to the middle of the twentieth century. “During Ukraine’s membership in the Russian Empire (and later the USSR), the cultural

heritage of our people, its history, and achievements were marked as “Russian.” The same happened with Chinese researchers – Russian and Soviet scientists used the achievements of Ukrainian Chinese scholars as part of Russian science without a special study of this heritage and even more so to determine the phenomenon of Ukrainian Chinese studies” (Kiktenko, 2018).

The 1920s and 1930s were probably the most difficult period in the formation of Ukrainian Soviet Chinese studies. The reason for this was the fundamental difference between the new Soviet society, which completely changed the socio-political axiology of society. During this period, some works were published that had a general political and ideological character; they did not cover the level of development of Chinese studies, only spread the vision of the revolutionary movement in China. However, this period of development of Chinese studies in Ukraine was represented by the figure of the first Ukrainian sinologist Borys Kurtz, a researcher of the history of Russian-Chinese relations and head of a scientific seminar on Oriental and embodied the practical direction of Chinese studies. According to V. Kiktenko, during this period, the formation of the Kyiv School of Practical Chinese Studies was completed, which preserved the assets of the “old” science and became a real theoretical basis that enabled its further development (Kiktenko, 2018).

Here are some moments in the Foundation of Ukrainian Chinese Studies history. It should be noted that in the first decade of Soviet rule, certain steps were taken to study the culture of the East. The All-Ukrainian Scientific Association of Orientalists (TASAO – Eng; VUNAS – Ukr) was established on January 10, 1926, and united the Kyiv and Kharkiv Societies of Orientalists, which included the Odesa branch on March 8, 1926. VUNAS’s activity was to study the countries and peoples of the East, publish scientific literature, and train scientists. During the short existence of VUNAS from January 1, 1930, the Ukrainian Research Institute of Oriental Studies was reorganized and opened on its basis. In September 1932, the institute became a part of the All-Ukrainian Association of Marxist-Leninist Institutions, which were subordinated to the Central Committee of the CP (B) U. This led to the overt politicization of research, which led to the termination of the institute, which was later merged with the newly established Agricultural and Economic Institute.

During its short activities, VUNAS held two annual congresses aimed at promoting oriental education in Ukraine. These congresses were of all-Union significance, and reports from various countries were heard. Thus, speaking at the congress, Ukrainian scientist Ol. Its task is to give a certain circle of special knowledge that can be used in practical work related to the study of the East. Such tasks should be performed by higher education institutions and research institutes, involving young orientalists in this process. Nor should the possibility of spreading knowledge of Oriental languages be abandoned. “Organized on a modest foundation Courses of Oriental Languages with a serious and definite case, create the preconditions and prepare the possibility of deploying them to the Institute of Oriental Studies” (Gladstern, 1928: 54-55).

Ukrainian scholars have emphasized that the study of Oriental languages, culture, and way of life in Ukraine is a vital necessity. The study of the East is not something far-fetched but has long come from the depths of the working masses. Scientific circles of Ukraine, especially historians and economists, feel the need for oriental education in Ukraine. Without the East, said the domestic researcher of Oriental studies P. Loziev, it is impossible to study the history of Ukraine and its people. Therefore, the existence of a center of oriental studies in Ukraine is a normal, natural, and vital thing. Above all, it concerns the need to establish a higher educational institution for oriental studies in Ukraine (Loziev, 1928: 57).

It is important to emphasize that in the works of the Soviet period, starting from the 1920s, there were stylistic clichés related to the social and state system and the life of the society of that time. These circumstances scientists had to consider and shed light on in their research. Thus, Ukrainian researchers of the Soviet-era noted that only after the October Revolution appeared works on real, living China, and until then had only traditional, outdated works of Sinologists without modern scientific analysis of socio-economic phenomena in this country. The absence of Marx's analysis of the state of China in the scientific literature was condemned, and criticism of bourgeois works "limited to mythology, history, and linguistics" was only encouraged.

In Ukrainian Soviet literature, much attention was paid to the history of the revolutionary movement in China. Ukrainian sinologists noted that from the beginning, the Chinese revolution was bourgeois because the Chinese proletariat was unable to take power into its own hands. The most active role in this struggle belonged to the revolutionary intelligentsia and the development and scope of the revolution – the peasantry. Another revolutionary force was the revolutionary army, which had been educated and organized since the time of Sun Yat-sen by the Cantonese government. The workers' unions and the Kuomintang were also huge organizing forces in the Chinese revolution. "In 1925, the Chinese trade union movement joined the strong global front of the Red Profintern. The Kuomintang party became paramount in China's national-revolutionary movement as its vanguard. In 1920, the program and statute of the Kuomintang party were finally adopted in Canton. The party's guiding idea is to implement three principles (San Min-zhu): nationalism, democracy, and socialism, and the main goal of the party is to implement the *constitution of the five powers* (legislative, executive, judicial, examination, and punitive powers)" (Ryappo, 1927: 7). According to Ukrainian Chinese scholar Ya. democracy is proposed to be carried out under the slogan "democracy to all people, not just minorities"; The Kuomintang socialism is the equality of land use and the delimitation of capital (Ryappo, 1927: 11).

It should be noted that unlike J. Ryappo, who did not condemn the ideas of Sun-Yat-sen and the work of the Kuomintang, the Soviet orientalist L. Zuckerman held a different opinion. Examining the socio-political situation in China in the late 1920s, he wrote that during this period, the country began a period of deep national crisis, which was as follows. First, there was an outbreak of civil war between the militarists backed by the imperialist states. These contradictions are only exacerbated; second, the formation of a counterweight to the Nanjing Kuomintang, the Kuomintang Reorganization Party, led by Wang Jingwei, Chen Hongbo. It was this party that was supported by the militarists in the political arena. Third, the situation was further complicated by the anti-Soviet adventure, which also caused some controversy; fourth, the bankruptcy of attempts to attract significant foreign capital contributions and the revision of unequal treaties with the imperialists; fifth, the apparent bankruptcy of the Kuomintang's domestic policies, which failed to completely suppress the revolutionary movement of the masses through terror. Also, the national crisis was caused by depression in various industries, as well as the prolonged agrarian crisis, which is hopeless in the current bourgeois-landlord system, the general deterioration of the working class and peasantry, the rise of a new wave of labor movement and revival of the peasant movement. According to L. Zuckerman, such were the results of three years of management of the counter-revolutionary Kuomintang. According to him, the Kuomintang, which raised its flag in Nanjing, left behind a long path of betrayal, counter-revolutionary rebirth, and white terror, the brightly revolutionary Kuomintang, became a simple addition to Chinese imperialism. L. Zuckerman described this new stage of Chinese revolutionary events as an imperialist intervention against the workers and peasants movement (Zuckerman, 1930: 3-16).

It should be noted that such views of scholars were not unfounded because from the very beginning of its existence, the Soviet government used certain slogans, and calls for a revolutionary struggle against the bourgeoisie, bourgeois ideology, imperialism, and capitalism, and all this was covered by the ideas of Marxism-Leninism as a single movement. from enslavement and slavery.

However, there were also works where the ideological component was not so clearly traced. Evidence of this is the work of a Ukrainian researcher of Chinese studies of the Soviet-era M. Lebedev. He explores the history of China's secret alliances. M. Lebedev begins with the oldest secret unions, which emerged in 22 AD; they organized an uprising in northern China, which was called the *Red Eyebrow Uprising*. Much later, the proof of the existence of secret unions, from which many modern ones originate, is The White Lotus (Báiliánjiào). Emerging as a religious sect of Buddhism, at the end of the 11th century, society began to acquire the features of the political organization during the Mongol rule in China. The religious doctrine was combined with physical training and did not reject violence and armed rebellion to achieve religious goals. As a religious organization and a Buddhist sect, the White Lotus had several prohibitions. The union members were not to eat meat, milk, wine, or wool; they had to take part in the revolutionary struggle, which was always suppressed. In 1724 the union was banned; it hid but did not cease to exist. Part of the union, which consisted of merchants, changed its name to Uweitsyan; it was already a Taoist name. The peasant part of the White Lotus followed the path of soldiers, great wizards. Much younger in historical sources was the union – the Triad (sānhéhuì), the union of the three coordinates, which means Heaven, Earth, and Man. Its other names are The Tiandihui, the Heavenly Emperor's Union, or Hongmen, the Red Sect. It was Taoist, but it can also be considered a descendant of the White Lotus. The second half of the nineteenth century was the heyday of the Triad. However, all Hongmen branches sided with the Relief Society in the early twentieth century. Lebedev believes that such a reorientation was achieved with the help of such a Europeanized man as Sun-Yatsen, who became a leader of the Triad (Lebedev, 1931: 156).

The existence of such secret sects would be impossible without the assistance of economic and political circumstances, as well as contributing to the class and social soil on which they grew. According to M. Lebedev, unions can be divided into three groups. The first group is bourgeois. In it, all unions in the mass consisted of the peasant poor and the pre-class element, but they were divided according to who ran the sect. The second group is large-owned. It was aimed at using the peasantry in the interests of another class. Often large landowners used such secret alliances against the revolution. In some places, such a union is reorganized into a regular army. The third group is small-scale ownership. Such unions adhered to their class character, in essence, they were deeply reactionary; their task was to provide their members with the opportunity to cultivate their piece of land peacefully. In the conditions of class struggle, secret unions acquired a positive character; they accustomed the peasants to the organization. Often, revolutionary peasant movements grew out of such secret unions. Such unions were the Great Sword and Red Science (Lebedev, 1931: 157). The organization in the unions was different. She was the most conservative in Swords, where every word had its teacher. Anyone who cultivates their land and has a home can be a member of most unions. Without this, a person cannot be a member of a secret union. Lebedev believed that this emphasizes the small-scale nature of unions (Lebedev, 1931: 158).

The most famous was the Red Science Union, which in the 1930s was the largest in China. Its origin is not known for sure; it is believed that it came from the White Lotus Society; another way is possible – from the Triad. Red Science organized a mass movement of peasants called the

Red Spears, but this movement quickly split. Different researchers give different classifications of this split. For example, Semenov gave a classification, which, according to M. Lebedev, was quite vague: 1. *Pure-peasant organization of self-defense*. 2. *Bandit organization of the Red Spear Society*. 3. *Society of Red Spears, used by local hooligans* (Lebedev, 1931: 160). Lebedev considered such a classification a non-Marxist, primitive and practical mistake, to call Xiaohung *bandits*.

There are moments in the history of every nation when religious disputes turn into armed clashes of a revolutionary nature. China was no exception. The last escalation of the struggle of unions, Lebedev stressed, took place in the 19th century in connection with China's entry into the world market. Until the twentieth century, the Chinese peasantry did not win and could not win, because "the struggle was fought either by the kulaks or the petty nobility – classes that are essentially exploiters of the peasantry" (Lebedev, 1931: 161). Although the Red Spears were the real bearers of the peasant revolution, he was unable to win, and in 1928 the movement was liquidated. Without political support, the peasantry was always defeated. "However, of course, it is not only the reaction that is to blame for the death of secret unions. Life itself, which forced secret unions to become mass, led them to liquidation as secret unions. Changing social conditions put forward new forms of peasant struggle. Lack of leadership only made this transition more painful" (Lebedev, 1931: 162-163).

In conclusion, I would like to note that even though Ukrainian Chinese studies did not have state support at the beginning of their existence, and the main synological centers were located in Moscow and Leningrad, it cannot be said that Chinese studies were completely absent in Ukraine. Although Marxist-Leninist methodology has long been the basis of Chinese studies in Soviet Ukraine, Ukrainian researchers have focused on determining China's place in world history, studying the general nature and driving forces of the Chinese revolution, and determining the role of the working class and peasants in the communist movement of China.

A study of Chinese Marxism in the 60s and 80s of the 20th century

For three decades, Soviet researchers have focused on the theory of building socialism with Chinese characteristics based on Chinese Marxism. Marxism took different forms in different countries, reflecting the country's specifics in which it prevailed. In China, it has acquired its specific form.

Turning to the analysis of the problems of research of Soviet scholars on the study of the development of Chinese philosophy before and after the formation of the People's Republic of China (PRC), it should be noted the following. Since the early 1950s, scientific publications have considered the plans of Chinese philosophers, the nature and essence of discussions on various philosophical issues, and raised issues of ideological struggle among the Chinese philosophical community. In addition, some works on Maoist philosophy appeared in the Soviet Union in the late 1960s. Mostly it is a critical analysis of Mao Zedong's approach to such philosophical problems as the essence of dialectical contradiction, the nature and role of contradictions in nature and society, the content of the concept of practice, the relationship between empirical and theoretical knowledge, the formation of scientific theories, personality, and society, etc.

Soviet researchers of the development of philosophical and socio-political thought in China viewed them against the background of processes that took place in the ideological and political life of China. Soviet Sinologists explain their interest in the study of Chinese philosophy and the development of philosophical science in China by the fact that such studies reveal the role

of philosophy in the ideological and political struggle in modern Chinese society and the place of philosophers in it; allowing to determine the level and main trends in the development of philosophical science in China; analyze the various currents of modern Chinese philosophy – Marxist, Maoist, and bourgeois; identify the ideological and theoretical origins of Maoism, its main parameters, mechanism and degree of influence on Chinese philosophy, ideological and political life of society (Burov, 1980: 6).

It should be noted that Soviet Russian Sinologists paid much attention to studying the policy of the Chinese Communist Party (SSR) in the field of science and culture. They noted that the socio-political situation in China was uneven; on the one hand, there was a confrontation between Marxist-Leninist and Maoist forces in the party, and on the other – the evolution of the theory and practice of Maoism. During this period, ideological campaigns aimed at criticizing *wrong* trends in social science, literature, and art became widespread. The struggle of two lines in the SSR, the confrontation of socialist and anti-socialist tendencies and forces, had the primary influence on the nature of each ideological campaign. This is how the Soviet Russian researcher L. Kyuzadjian describes these events: “All the ideological campaigns that formally took place under the slogans of spreading the socialist worldview and Marxism-Leninism took place in a completely different way. The Maoists used them to instill their views, to politically harass opponents or simply people they did not trust. At the same time, the workers of the ideological front, who focused on scientific socialism, tried within these campaigns to promote the establishment of Marxism-Leninism, to fight against the manifestations of bourgeois ideology” (Kyuzadjian, 1970: 10).

Considerable attention of Soviet Russian researchers was focused on the period of the «cultural revolution» and the SSR’s policy in the field of culture, which, they noted, was based solely on Maoist principles, and a nihilistic attitude towards the intelligentsia. This was the cause of a deep crisis that engulfed all aspects of the spiritual culture of Chinese society, while in the field of philosophy, the ideological struggle was mainly around the full national liberation of China and the elimination of its socio-economic backwardness, practice, theoretically substantiated the programs of social restructuring of China, which put forward political organizations of different classes and walks of life (Burov, 1980: 38-40).

Analyzing China’s philosophy and socio-political thought on the eve of the formation of China, Russian Soviet researchers adhered to the ideological orientation. They characterized the worldview of Chinese philosophers as bourgeois and feudal, divided into three main groups. The first included followers of new trends in foreign bourgeois philosophy, especially pragmatism and positivism. The second included those who promoted the synthesis of Western bourgeois philosophy and traditional Chinese ideology (mostly Confucianism). The third included those who advocated the preservation of values. Chinese culture denied the idea of *updating* Chinese philosophy with the help of the latest foreign scholars. According to Soviet researchers, the most important figures in these groups were: In the first group – Hu Shih (1891-1962); in the second – Feng Youlan (1895-1990) and He Lin (1902-1992); in the third – Liang Shuming (1893-1988).

This is how Soviet researchers characterized these three figures. Hu Shih was under the influence of the bourgeois intelligentsia; he gained popularity due to criticism of various aspects of traditional spiritual culture, Confucian norms and ideas, and political institutions of the old society. Hu Shih was a propagandist of the ideas of American pragmatism, approved of the Western way of life, and called to borrow the cultural, scientific, and technical achievements of the West. In Soviet times, such views were condemned, and considered an indicator of the most reactionary side of Chinese life (Burov, 1980: 42-43).

Somewhat different were the views of Feng Youlan, a twentieth-century Chinese philosopher who, unlike Hu Shih, created an original doctrine, the new Confucianism (Xin Lisieu), in which he attempted to synthesize the ideas of Chinese and Western philosophy, mainly Sung Confucianism and positivism. Feng Youlan noted that true metaphysical philosophy chooses the object of study as abstract, supreme principles that are not related to the daily lives of people in society. Thus, the entire history of Chinese philosophy Feng Youlan presented as the history of agnosticism and Western philosophy – as the history of rationalism. Such an interpretation of the development of world philosophy was not recognized by Soviet ideologues because it suffered from overt anti-historicism. After all, the line of agnosticism can be traced in both Chinese and Western philosophy (Burov, 1980: 47-50).

In the 1930s and 1940s, He Lin's theory of the synthesis of Chinese and Western cultures became popular. It was based on a combination of Confucianism with the achievements of the West in the field of philosophy, religion, science, and art. Considering Confucianism as a philosophy and ethical-political doctrine, he, like religion and art, considered it a universal doctrine. Lin's views were class-based, and his object of worship was bourgeois democracy and capitalist society, which was unacceptable in Soviet science.

In the 1940s, another prominent twentieth-century Chinese philosopher, Liang Shuming, appeared, whom Soviet researchers called reactionary and sociopolitical. His worldview was influenced by Buddhism, Lu Xiangshan's subjective idealist school, Wang Yangming, and Bergsonianism. Liang Shuming, as well as Feng Youlan and He Lin, are characterized by an apology for feudal Chinese culture. His nationalist prejudices and class positions led to a negative attitude towards all Western cultural values. Liang Shumin's critique of capitalism was combined with denying the need for an anti-imperialist struggle. This indicates that he saw the main enemy in communism. La Shumin argued that socialism and capitalism are characterized by a regime of authoritarian rule (Burov, 1980: 61). In general, Soviet researchers described Liang Shumin's philosophy as expressing the worldview of the reactionary-conservative part of the Chinese bourgeoisie, which was associated with the feudal-landlord class and, through these connections, sought to preserve Chinese feudal culture, feudal morality, and the developed capitalist relations, he tried to direct the so-called *Chinese way* (Batalov, 1964).

Although Hu Shih, Feng Youlan, He Lin, and Liang Shuming enjoyed the support of the Kuomintang authorities, their sphere of influence was limited to the intelligentsia, students, and the trade and industry. Whereas in the struggle against the CCP and Marxism-Leninism, the Kuomintang needed a "mass" ideology that would justify its regime and accessibility to the general population and, above all, the peasantry. To achieve this goal, in early 1934, the Kuomintang authorities launched a movement "for a new life." Chiang Kai-shek declared that the movement was designed to establish a "just social order" in China. The basis of the social program of the movement was declared «rural construction». It should be noted that Soviet researchers of this period of Chinese history condemned the way they wrote in quotation marks "concern" for the interests of the peasants, explaining that the intentions of the Kuomintang leadership aimed at transforming the village into one of the mainstays of its socio-political system. 1980, pp. 63). And under the movement "for a new life," an attempt was made to create an official *national* ideology. The top Kuomintang leaders, Chen Lifu and Chiang Kai-shek sought to modernize Confucianism's ethical and political doctrine and bring it into line with the spirit of the times. Requiring each member of society to adhere to the principles of Confucian morality, Chen Lifu called his teaching a "philosophy of life." However, according to Soviet researchers, neither Chen Lifu nor Chiang Kai-shek succeeded in spreading their

doctrines. This was facilitated, not least by the theoretical activities of Chinese Marxists (Burov, 1980: 64).

The assessment of Sun Yat-sen's teachings by Soviet scholars was also rather ambiguous. Some noted his commitment to the idealistic doctrine of neovitalism, its peculiar Chinese form. However, it cannot be said that during the existence of ideological censorship, scholars only criticized philosophers and politicians who were *displeasing* to the Soviet government. Most researchers of the history of China's socio-political thought have pointed to the significant contribution of Sun Yat-sen's ideas to Chinese public opinion, which launched a new Chinese policy, sought to restore the sovereign rights of the Chinese people, and advocated democratization in China. Being quite an educated man, having a European education, he stayed with China and tried to combine "Europeanism" with "Chineseism." He was a practitioner and theorist of the revolution (Vilensky-Sibiryakov, 1924: 13-14), a leader of the Chinese revolution, a fighter for independent democratic China, and a friend of the Soviet Union. All the political activities of Sun Yat-sen are an important way of forming new ideological views and developing the future economic construction in China (Efimov, 1981: 5).

However, the Russian researcher S. Tikhvinsky spoke somewhat differently. He noted that Sun Yat-sen's *socialism* had nothing to do with scientific socialism. It was most likely the ideal state capitalism that Sun Yat-sen was trying to establish in China. But he did not succeed; he did not find the right path and put forward utopian plans to *prevent* capitalism by transferring land rents to the state so that the increase in real estate remains in the possession of the people who created them, not private capitalists (Tikhvinsky, 1976). Sun Yat-sen's deep faith in the continuous development and improvement of human knowledge in the cognition of the world coexisted in it with a metaphysical approach to explaining the phenomena of life. There are many idealistic points in Sun Yat-sen's teachings, such as the position on the leading active role of the lone thinker and the passivity of the *crowd*, the explanation of historical development "spiritual needs of people's lives," the idealization of Chinese antiquity, and categories, *Humanity, Justice*, which were set out in a purely traditional, feudal-Confucian interpretation. He misunderstood the relationship between the material and spiritual culture of the people, and the concepts of classes and class struggle in Sun Yat-sen were absent (Sun Yat-sen, 1985: 21-22).

Although Soviet researchers pointed to some positive aspects of Sun Yat-sen's teachings, they still believed that ignorance of Marxism-Leninism alone did not allow him to rise independently to the materialist understanding that human knowledge arises and develops based on practice. Subsequently, they direct the practice; at the same time, in the course of the practice, they are tested, corrected, and supplemented; in turn, the practice is the basis for new knowledge.

It is worth mentioning another period in the socio-political thought of China, which was studied quite carefully by Soviet scholars. This period was marked by the victory of the people's revolution, which led to fundamental changes in Chinese philosophical science. That is a period when bourgeois and feudal ideas are beginning to give way to the Marxist worldview, and the propaganda trend is the propaganda of Marxist philosophy. However, during this period, wrote Soviet researchers, there was an ideological dualism, and a significant place in the activities of Chinese philosophers was the popularization of the theoretical positions of Mao Zedong. According to Soviet scholars, Mao Zedong came to the Chinese communist movement with non-Marxist ideas of socialism. Although he tried to master Marxist theory, he did not have some theoretical training and revolutionary-practical experience of participation in the labor movement. He, therefore, could not get rid of non-Marxist ideas (Altaisky & Georgiev, 1969: 47-51). In his ideas, Mao Zedong did not proceed with objective laws of development but

with pragmatic aspirations. In this way, he detached the subjective factor from the material conditions of life. The possibility that socialism consciously used the objective laws of social development gave Mao Zedong the illusion of omnipotence of the subjective factor, by which he meant not conscious, purposeful activity of the masses based on knowledge of the laws of social development and action on implementation of any subjectivist attitudes of leaders. This was evidence, said the Russian researcher V. Burov, that the whole socio-historical concept of Mao Zedong stood on the position of idealism in the explanation of social phenomena (Burov, 1980: 140).

Summing up, it should be noted that Soviet researchers of Chinese philosophy noted its weaknesses, pointed out mistakes, and included the activities of Chinese Marxist philosophers of the 1930s and 1940s, which helped to acquaint the scientific community with Marxist methodology and the spread of Marxist ideas. However, due to changes in the ideological and political situation in China, this process has not been further developed. Later, one of the main factors influencing the situation in Chinese philosophical science was Maoism, for which the ally was bourgeois philosophy, which by nature is idealistic. The 1950s and 1960s were no exception when Maoism's frontal offensive against Marxist internationalist ideology took place. As a result, in the first half of the 1970s, the Maoists managed to suspend the development of Marxist philosophy and significantly undermine its influence in the scientific community and society as a whole. Such conclusions were made by Soviet researchers of Chinese philosophy, belittling the achievements of Chinese philosophers and politicians and promoting Marxist-Leninist teachings.

Conclusions

As a result of the study, the works of Soviet scholars were analyzed, which highlighted the main trends and stages of development of philosophical and socio-political thought in China, and analyzed the views of the most influential Chinese philosophers. The vast majority were criticisms of the Maoist worldview, condemnation of anti-Marxism, and dialectical-materialist philosophy. The development of theoretical problems of socialist construction and the process of spreading the Marxist worldview among the Chinese community was positively received. The formation of Chinese studies in Ukraine, which has long been under the influence and dependent on Russia's political interests, was considered separately. Despite all the persecution, Ukrainian scholars continued to study the philosophy of Ancient China, study the Chinese revolutionary movement, and promote Oriental education in Ukraine. Thanks to the existence of Ukrainian Chinese studies, knowledge about Chinese history and culture is spreading. However, the final resumption of research in Ukrainian Chinese studies took place only after Ukraine gained independence when it became possible to show its history, heritage, and research tradition openly.

Acknowledgments

This research is done in the framework of the project "Chinese Marxism and its socio-cultural implications" (scientific supervisor – Prof. Dr. Sergii Rudenko, reference number 0122U001967).

References

- Altaisky, M.L., and Georgiev, V.G. (1969) *The anti-Marxist essence of Mao Zedong's philosophical views*. Moscow: Thought.
- Ancient Chinese philosophy* (1972) Collection of texts in two volumes. T. 1. Moscow: Thought.
- Batalov, E.Y. (1964) *Critique of the main directions of Chinese reactionary bourgeois philosophy of modern times (1919-1949)*. Moscow.
- Burov, V.G. (1980). *Modern Chinese philosophy*. Moscow: The main edition of the eastern literature of the Science.
- Efimov, G.V. (1981) *Sun Yat-sen. Finding the way. 1914-1922*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Gladstern, A.N. (1928) Organization of Oriental Studies Education in Ukraine. *Eastern World. All-Ukrainian Scientific Association of Oriental Studies*. 2, 54-55.
- Kiktenko, V.O. (2018) *History of Ukrainian Chinese Studies (18th – early 21st century)*. Available online: https://oriental-studies.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/Kiktenko_2018_web.pdf
- Kyuzadjian, L.S. (1970) *Ideological campaigns in China. 1949-1966*. Moscow: Thought.
- Lebedev, M. (1931) Secret peasant unions in China. *Red East. Body of the All-Ukrainian Association of Marxist Orientalists and the Ukrainian Research Institute of Oriental Studies*. 1-2 (16-17), 155-164.
- Ryappo, J. (1927) The Chinese Revolution and its driving forces. *Eastern World. All-Ukrainian Scientific Association of Oriental Studies*. 1, 5-25.
- Rudenko, S., and Liashenko, I. (2020) Chinese Studies in Ukrainian Philosophy of the Soviet Period. *STUDIA WARMŃSKIE*. 57, 85-101. Available online: <https://czasopisma.uwm.edu.pl/index.php/sw/article/view/6007/4687>
- Spirin, V.S. (1976) *Construction of Ancient Chinese texts*. Moscow: Thought.
- Sun Yat-sen (1985) *Selected works. The second edition is corrected and supplemented*. Moscow: Science.
- Tikhvinsky, S.L. (1976) *Chinese history and modernity*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Vilensky-Sibiryakov, V. (1924) *Sun Yat-sen is the father of the Chinese revolution*. 2nd ed. Moscow: State Publishing House.
- Zuckerman, L. (1930) General quarrel in China and the imperialist states. *Red East. Body of the All-Ukrainian Scientific Association of Oriental Studies and the Ukrainian Research Institute of Oriental Studies*. 6 (15), 3-16.