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The purpose of this thesis is to use qualitative methods of inquiry to investigate the role that political ideology plays in a successful revolution. Within the thesis, I use Marxism and Maoism as primary independent variables and the successful revolutionary movement as a dependent variable; whereas the Bolshevik movement within the Russian Revolution and Peruvian Shining Path are used as case studies. Why did the Bolsheviks in Russia succeed while the Shining Path in Peru failed? I argue that the Bolsheviks' Marxist-Leninism led them to have strong ties with masses, whereas Shining Path's Maoism made it too elitist. Opposed to purely structural or institutional theories, it is my intention to explore the theoretical claims of ideology and human agency within revolution. I suggest that doing so will help to better understand the development of revolution and revolutionary theory.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

While there has been a resurgence of the study of revolution during the past few decades, the question of revolution, and the revolutionary vanguard\(^1\) - and for that matter, closely related areas of social movements and collective action - is ultimately a disorderly one. It is a question that spans not just political science, but several other disciplines within the social sciences. Many of those that study revolution and collective action look to understand the cause and development of revolutions. A common viewpoint is to see revolution as a response to oppression and tyranny or that the state cannot answer an unmanageable number of problems, (i.e. famine, poverty, and war); however, in the end this does not answer the fundamental questions within the field of revolutionary theory. The overarching problem is that scholars cannot agree upon a common denominator among the origins or causes of revolution. Moreover, they do not understand the trajectory or development of a respective revolution.

It is my opinion, that the way in which ideology interacts with state and revolutionary party institutions and agencies (i.e., rural and urban populations, and the bureaucratic and military elites), is an equally important to understanding the cause of revolutions. While ideology itself cannot be the sole factor in the destabilization and collapse of a state, as it must be used consistently with other political and social actions; it is my opinion that ideology is the critical and dominant variable within the revolution. With this in mind, I view political ideology as the defining factor in what drives and unites dissident groups within the revolution. The critical question I ask is how Marxism and Maoism as a political ideologies impact a revolutionary movement. Why did the Bolsheviks in Russia succeed while Shining Path in Peru failed? I argue that the Bolsheviks' Marxist-Leninism led them to have strong

\(^1\) The idea of the vanguard party, meaning the revolutionary party elite, was an idea first put forth by Vladimir Lenin in his 1902 text “What is to be Done?” It was further defined and used throughout the Russian revolution of 1917. It is a concept that is considerably important to the study of ideology within the revolution, and will be discussed in proceeding chapters of the thesis.
ties with the Russian population, whereas Shining Path’s Maoism made its organization too elitist, and therefore were rejected by the Peruvian peasantry.

The Shining Path’s vanguard was primarily made up of intellectual elites from urban areas; for the most part it did not consist of the peasantry. Furthermore, the Shining Path while initially had support from the peasants in the Andean mountains of Peru, could not create a stable ideological connection with the peasants, and eventually lost support within the Andean region. In the end, peasants in the Andean region of Peru saw the ideology of the Peruvian state as more beneficial than that of the Shining Path. This contrasts with the Bolshevik movement, which was both socially diverse and ideologically connected to the Russian proletariat.

**VARIABLES, CASES, AND HYPOTHESES**

I use two key variables in my argument. The independent variable is political ideology, specifically Marxism in the Russian revolution and Maoism within the Shining Path. Both Marxism and Maoism are measured in response to the state ideology in this case, the mass population either rejecting or accepting the respective ideological doctrine. Through acceptance of the political ideology used by the revolutionary movement, the respective population in politically mobilized against the state. Mobilization ultimately creates legitimacy for the movement. Finally the dependent variable is the respective successful or unsuccessful revolutionary movement.²

The case studies I use are the Russian revolution of 1917, and the Peruvian Shining Path. I use the Russian Revolution because it is known as the quintessential Marxist revolution. It is the benchmark when compared to all other Socialist revolutions. I use the Shining Path and the failed Peruvian revolutionary movement from 1980 to approximately 1992 as a second case study, first because it is culturally, temporally, and geographically dissimilar to the Russian Revolution. Secondly, because the Shining Path was not deemed a

---

²To be clear on this, I define a successful revolution as the revolutionary party assuming control over the state; and having the monopoly on the use of force.
successful revolution; I use it to better examine variance within the role of the independent variables.  

There are some that would say that while the Shining Path was a revolutionary movement, a true revolution did not exist, due to a lack of institutional cleavages (McClintock 1994). While this is true, it is important to note that I frame my argument within a context of revolutionary theory, in a narrow fashion as a study of revolutionary movements and not one of broad, specific revolutions. I place a greater emphasis on ideologies, factions and agencies within revolutionary parties, and less on the institutional outcomes. It is my intention to examine the revolutionary process, but not the consolidation of power.

Using the previously given variables and cases, I hypothesize, that Marxism and Maoism as ideologies, through an effective vanguard, are used to successfully mobilize and politicize a population’s discontent with a state. To express this more clearly, that the preference of the revolutionary ideology and related revolutionary movement over state ideology by the mass populace, subsequently mobilizes the population against the state. Simply put, the reason the Bolsheviks succeeded was because they were able to mobilize the Russian population through Marxist ideology, whereas, the Shining Path failed because they were incapable of mobilizing the Peruvian population using Maoism. For a visual guide to the hypothesis and variables used within my argument, and how they relate to one another, see the path dependency map in Figure 1.

At least superficially, one would assume that support of the revolutionary movement and related ideology by the international community would result in a positive outcome; while a lack of support would result in a negative outcome, although as I will show, this is certainly not an absolute. No less than eleven nation-states committed military action against the Bolsheviks during the Russian Civil War, yet the Bolsheviks succeeded in consolidating

---

3 It should be noted, that when using case studies, selection bias is a possibility (Geddes 1990; George and Bennett 2005). To refrain from this, I did not select case studies based upon my dependent variable. I selected them based upon my independent variables –their application of Marxist versus Maoist ideology, the role of the peasant or proletariat class, and the international community.
power nonetheless. Whereas in Peru, there was minimal or indirect support (most noticeable by the United States) for the Peruvian government against the Shining Path, yet the Shining Path still failed.

Rapid violent political change does not generally happen outside of the international community; and therefore, each revolutionary movement has supporters and antagonists within the world political system. The Bolshevik and Shining Path movements were certainly not excluded from this. Likewise, there is considerable research on the role of international pressure on a revolutionary movement (Blasier 1986; Halliday 1999; Skocpol 1979; Snyder 1999). While I examine the role of international pressures on the Bolshevik and Shining Path movements; however the international community as a variable is not the primary emphasis within this thesis. It is, at the very most, a narrow parallel avenue of research.

**Theoretical Perspectives**

Within the field of collective violence, Ted Gurr gives a clear hypothesis on the formation of violent dissent: “The primary causal sequence in political violence is first the development of discontent; second the politicization of that discontent, and finally its actualization in violent action against political objects and actors” (Gurr 1970, 12 – 13; Skocpol 1979, 15). I extend this statement to say that the respective discontent and both its direction and politicization towards the state is organized by revolutionary leaders through the application of ideology. Both the leadership and the related ideology play an important role in its dissemination and absorption by the population. Moreover, that the related ideology must be relevant to the needs of the mass population, or the group leadership risks
losing or alienating its support (Gupta 2008). Accordingly, there are two main concepts I
wish to address continually throughout my thesis: (1) that political ideology is inexorably
linked to the revolution, before, during, and after it. (2) Revolutionary ideology itself is
continually developing within the movement.4

The definition of revolution will be discussed in the proceeding chapter. However, on
the topic of ideology, and for the purposes of this thesis, I combine several current definitions
of political ideology to form one very narrow definition. In my thesis, political ideology is
defined as - a systematic, elaborated, and delimited system of thought taken from an
individual or group of individuals - and used as a rationale for collective action (Johnson and
Noakes 2005; Schmid 1981). Marxism is used as an ideology because of its impact upon
successful and unsuccessful types of collective action within several nation-states in the 20th
century. Marxism in this thesis is seen as a political ideology oriented towards socio-
economic and political inequality. It can be defined as a restructuring of private property, and
likewise both the means of production and distribution (Marx and Engels 1848; Perry 2002;
Webb 2006; Weinbaum 1977). By extension, I view Maoism, used by the Shining Path in
Peru as a variation of Marxism. However, there are key differences between them, and I later
compare and contrast the two ideologies.

Within an ideological context, Marxist-Leninism was used differently in the Russian
Revolution than Maoism was during the active period of the Shining Path. Ultimately the
critical difference between the two is this: the Bolsheviks emphasized the urban proletariat
over the rural peasantry, whereas the Shining Path emphasized the rural indigenous
population over the urban masses. However, even given these distinctions, the fundamental
approach to social and political change is the same – in the end the goal is revolution against
the capitalist system.

It is my opinion that the role of Marxism and by association Maoism, both in light of
legitimate and successful revolutions and within a framework of revolutionary theory have

4 Jack Goldstone (1991) initially presented this last idea in his highly influential and respected text “Revolution
and Rebellion in the Early Modern World”. Wherein revolutionary leadership consolidates power after the old
regime collapses. Revolutionary ideology is then institutionalized and becomes state policy. However,
Goldstone also supposes that while ideology is important in determining a new social order, it is less important
in the discernment of a cause for revolution.
not been adequately been studied in an impartial and neutral manner. To state this more clearly, a common problem when studying Marxism and its variations, are the existing pro-Marxist and anti-Communist orthodoxies. “Those who consider themselves Marxists, and also their opponents, are concerned with the question whether modern Communism, in its ideology and institutions, is the modern heir to Marxism” (Kolakowski 2005, 5).

Thus it is important to note, that when writing on the topic of any Socialist or Communist ideology, a social researcher could fail to recognize the differences or separation of classical Marxism, and Stalinist or other distinctions, consequently letting their respective bias or mistake influence the resulting analysis. A related problem, equal in its error, is the mistake of seeing both Marxism and Maoism as a history of parties, politics or movements, instead of an evolving doctrine. Such a mistake results in a poor foundation for political analysis.

In an attempt address this problem, I objectively differentiate between Marxism and Maoism as political ideologies and Communism as a political platform or method of governance. I essentially view Marxism (or Maoism) as the revolutionary theory, and Communism as the implementation of that theory. More clearly put, Marxism and Maoism are the political ideologies and Communism is the political system. It is my intent to view both ideologies simply within the framework of revolution, in opposition to a state ideology. Therefore, I ignore the formation of political parties and related concepts during the post-revolutionary period. That is to say, I ignore the role of Stalinism and its policies from the 1920s onward; and while I evaluate the role of the Soviet Union in relation to Peruvian politics, I see a considerable break in the programs of both the Soviet Union and the Peruvian Communist Party from their revolutionary counterparts.

In my thesis, I will first give an overview of the current literature on the topic. This includes the advancement in the definition of revolution, in addition to a summary of the four waves of scholarship leading up to the contemporary study of revolutionary theory, in addition to an in-depth review of the study of both how and why political ideology is used within the revolution. In the third chapter, I will focus specifically on Marxism and Maoism,

---

5By this I mean the state ideology and policies formed in the 1920s when Bolshevism shifted into the formation of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.
their similarities and differences, and how they relate to the concept of revolution in practical terms. In the fourth chapter I will use both Mill’s comparative method to examine the differences in the application of political ideology to the Russian and Peruvian Shining Path, and how international pressure impacted each movement. While the use of Mill is certainly contentious, nevertheless his methods serve an important role within Political Science. Finally, in the fifth chapter I will briefly look at narratives of Russia and Peru to analyze the effects of Marxism and Maoism as political ideologies on the mass population within both respective revolutionary movements.

As I said, it is my intent to focus on related political organizations within revolutions, and how they distribute Marxist or Maoist ideology to the mass populace. Reiterating its importance, the acceptance of ideology by both social and political activists, and the mass populace is critical to the success of the revolution. Taking into account the breadth of revolution as a topic, one must ask, why is this focus significant? The nuances of ideology and its relationship to political leaders and populations is complex in any situation. The complexities are increased in cases where instability arises and sovereignty is called into question. Furthermore, as I will show in the following chapter, while there has been a large amount of research done on the role of social classes within revolutions, in comparison the role of ideology within revolutions has yet to be fully explained, either as causes or outcomes, its development and evolution, or in terms of success or failure.
CHAPTER 2

AN ASSESSMENT OF CURRENT LITERATURE

The definition of revolution itself has been a rather debatable topic, and consequently has changed with both the accumulation of knowledge and the currents of political action. So, before we can move onto the different schools of thought on the issue, we must first clearly understand what it is we are studying. Initially, from 1789 till about 1979, revolution was defined as, “A rapid change in values, institutions, mass action and violence” (Huntington 1968; Skocpol 1979). This definition initially included social and political revolutions from the French revolution through the Russian revolution. However, this all changed with the overthrow of Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi during the 1979 Iranian revolution.

The previously given definition is inadequate in its application to 20th century revolutions, for example, Iran and the Philippines. The definition is dependent upon successful violent acts of the revolutionary minority. To further explain the failed application, in Iran there were mass protests, but there was no organized violent revolution. There was little vanguard party, and the majority of violence was due to both the shah’s reaction to the protests; as well as, the new regime consolidating power. Thus, it quickly became clear that a new definition of revolution was needed. It cannot be understated how critical the Iranian revolution of 1979 was in advancing the study of revolution. It allowed for the development of the most current definition of revolution6:

An effort to transform the political institutions and the justifications for political authority in a society, accompanied by...mass mobilization and non-institutionalized actions that undermine existing authorities.” (Goldstone 2001, 142)

---

6This definition was found in several sources. Goldstone’s text was the most recent. There are also other definitions, i.e. Goodwin 2001.
This definition is slightly narrower than the previous one, in that it includes social and political revolutions, and excludes coup d’états, civil wars, and reform movements. It is dependent upon mass mobilization against the legitimacy of a political authority. So therefore, the level of violence and the success or failure of a revolution is not a given within the definition. The causes of which can be explained further by intervening variables. In addition to creating a new definition, it also gave way to political ideology being studied as a dependent variable (outcome) or the independent variable (cause) within a revolution case study e.g., Iran (Foran 1997; 2003) or the Philippines (Parsa 2000).

FOUR WAVES OF REVOLUTIONARY THEORY

The literature on revolution is rather broad and in-depth. There are four specific waves of study that can be seen in previous research, and which these four periods exemplify the development of revolutionary theory. Indeed, they are critical in understanding how and why revolution is studied. The first is looked at as the natural history school of thought (Brinton 1938; Edwards 1927; Pettee 1938). Revolution scholars compared various political and social revolutions, specifically, the French, English, American, and Russian revolutions, and found that there is a specific causal relationship. Civilian elites, (intellectuals, journalists, bureaucrats, teachers, lawyers, and poets) ceased to support the incumbent regime. This, coupled with some perceived economic or political crisis, led to the overthrow of the state. The new regime created a centralized state with a semi-absolute military leadership. However, this failed to explain why some revolutions developed and others did not, i.e. traditional regimes versus modern ones.

This lack of an explanation in revolutionary theory leads to the development of a second wave of research, and a new opposing theory, that of modernization. Modernization

---

7 It should be noted the differences between a political and a social revolution. A political revolution is one where regime change happens, but the political and economic systems are the same. A social revolution is on where there is a drastic change in regime as well as political and economic systems. (Skocpol 1979; Goldstone 1982; 1991; Selbin 1993) For further definitions see (McClintock 1998).

8 The four waves of revolution were initially presented in Jack Goldstone’s (2001) “Toward a Fourth Generation of Revolutionary Theory” in the Annual Review of Political Science. 2001 4 (1): 139 – 187. It was also presented as a chapter, titled “Comparative Historical Analysis and Knowledge Accumulation in the Study of Revolutions” in Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences edited by James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer. (See the bibliography for the full citation).
initially was seen as the cause of revolution (Almond 1973; Gurr 1970; Huntington 1968; Johnson 1966; Parsons 1966). There were several different theories using the same framework. Mass populations would become discontent with current material artifacts, and this eventually had an impact on either economic and/or political institutions. Some scholars focused more on political participation, others emphasized institutions.

Eventually, criticism of modernization theories progressed to a critical point (Moore, 1966; Tilly 1973; 1978; Wolf 1969). The primary contention of Barrington Moore and Charles Tilly was that not all revolutions were the same. Some had more or less violence, class conflict, or were urban versus rural; to be explicit, modernization did not have the same effect in each case. Charles Tilly and Barrington Moore further theorized that modernization could allow for revolutionary movements to develop. It gives them the opportunity to succeed, but it does not guarantee their success.

Subsequently developing out of Moore and Tilly’s critique, the third wave of revolutionary theory quickly became apparent. A wave in which, Theda Skocpol’s key text “States and Social Revolutions” was an extraordinarily important in the study of the field. To be more specific, the development and advancement of her Social Structure Theory, within “States and Social Revolutions” was a landmark concept in the field (Goodwin and Skocpol 1989; Meeks 2001; Skocpol 1979). Skocpol argues that the previous wave of revolutionary theory, specifically Moore’s work, is overly dependent upon economic institutions and state collapse. She uses Russia, France, and China as case studies, in which her premise is that social classes mixed with destabilization of institutions leads to political instability. This coupled with state relations (threats of war, dependency, inequalities) allows for popular movements to mobilize an already discontent population.

A few scholars who study revolutions have, in one way or another, written on outcomes of class-based social revolutions. A greater number of these have been on Marxist revolutions with a conservative incumbent regime. For example, both Daniel Castro and Timothy Wickham-Crawley apply it to guerrilla movement in Latin America. (Castro 1999;...
Wickham-Crawley 1991; 1992) Abdul Said and David Collier (1971) focuses heavily on Socialist and Communist revolutionaries in 1917 Russia and 1949 China. Both James Goodwin and Skocpol (1989) apply it to anti-colonial movements. Farideh Farhi (1990) uses social structural theory in comparative case studies on Iran and Nicaragua. Finally, Brian Meeks (2001) uses a similar methodology and variation of her theory in his study on Caribbean revolutions in the 20th century. So in the application of Skocpol’s theory, both states and impact on domestic institutions are critical to the advancement of revolution, and this is where a number of scholars had trouble accepting her theory, in that it lacks ideological and cultural theoretical explanations (Greene 1974; Said and Collier 1971; Selbin 1993). In the use of social structural theory, there is too great of an emphasis on political and economic institutions leading up to a revolution, and a lack of focus on human agency.

Scholars questioned her theory, in an ideological or cultural context, because there was a fundamental limitation to it. Social Structure Theory could not predict the overthrow of Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi. While the Iranian revolution was a social revolution, protest was almost exclusively confined to urban areas. It was not agrarian, nor class based. Furthermore, economic destabilization was not a primary factor. The basis for revolution was obviously ideological. The Iranian Revolution gave way to numerous revolutionary factions and ideologies (Axworthy 2008; Takeyh 2006). Paralleled by the quote below, structural theories, i.e. those based upon military or economic institutions, could not adequately explain the cause or outcome of the Iranian revolution.

The revolution gave rise to a variety of political movements, ranging from reactionary to liberal, fundamentalist to secular, Marxist to capitalist. Khomeini was the leader, but by no means the only actor in one of the momentous revolutions in modern Middle East history. (Takeyh 2006, 21)

Consequently, an increasingly large number of scholars found that structural theories could not account for regime collapse not only in Iran; but a number of other revolutions throughout the 1980s.11 Even more so, a number of initially successful revolutions, (particularly in Latin America) failed to consolidate power and institutionalize their ideology. Therefore, a fourth development begins to emerge.12

---

11 See the 1986 Philippine revolution for a further example.
12 For a more in-depth review of the four waves of revolution, see Jack Goldstone’s “Toward a Fourth
framework, this final development while still in its infancy; is the most current and consists of a variety of new research. Scholars look at the application of political ideology to revolutions and social movements within framing theory\textsuperscript{13} – how a movement, event or social phenomena is interpreted through a cognitive structure (Goffman 1974). Within this group are a number of scholars that study both political ideology and leadership as variables in the growth of revolutions.

Skocpol’s argument is certainly relevant to an extent, in that institutions and the development of a state socio-political crisis are critical to the development of an ideological response by a revolutionary movement. However, Skocpol completely ignores the role of ideology within the revolutionary movement, whereas ideology in this context is critical to the relationship of the movement to the population. I argue that ideology, as a response to structural cleavages within the state or state collapse, is therefore the other half of the revolutionary equation.

 Nonetheless, as I will discuss later in the review, the study of ideology is rather inconsistent. Even so, these studies, particularly the critical ones involving ideology, are for the most part, in response to Skocpol’s Social Structure Theory (Goldstone 1994; Katz 1997; Mahoney 1999; Selbin 1993; Snyder 1999). In addition to ideational theories, a large portion of the current literature involves the application of rational choice theory, albeit on a limited scale. Currently, these studies have not been fully explored (Goldstone 1994; Gould 1995; Kiser 1996; Kuran 1991; 1995; Lichbach 1995; Opp 1989). This wave also includes the study of regional and cross-regional nationalist and anti-colonial revolutions (Dix 1983; 1984; Goodwin 1994; 2001; Snyder 1999). Moreover, it includes the study of international pressures on the revolution as a variable (Blaiser 1986; Halliday 1999; Snyder 1999). However that said, scholars seemingly have trouble defining core ideas and institutions that comprise modern revolutions, particularly in relation to the study of revolution and political ideology (Goldstone 1982).

\textsuperscript{13} There is an immense amount of literature on the topic of framing theory, far too much to examine here. However, if one wanted a closer look, I would recommend Snow, David. A., & Benford, Robert. D. (1988). "Ideology, frame resonance, and participant mobilization". International Social Movement Research.
REVOLUTION AND POLITICAL IDEOLOGY

The study of ideology within revolution is likewise both a highly contentious and vaguely defined topic - “While culture and agency have begun to receive much more sustained attention from scholars over the past decade or so, no generally accepted theoretical synthesis has yet emerged in the field of revolutions” (Goodwin and Emirbayer 1996). Likewise, many scholars do not use an adequate definition of political ideology, specifically in that they confuse it with cultural norms within a society (Goodwin 2001). Clearly lacking an agreed upon theory and definition makes the study of ideology especially problematic in how it is applied to a revolution. Many scholars do not apply, nor study ideology in a consistent manner. As such, scholars cannot entirely understand its impact upon state and revolutionary institutions, i.e., the military or economic structures. Clearly, the question is not simply what political ideology is, but what it does.

While scholars understand its function within the revolution, they have trouble understanding how ideology changes the direction of the revolution. A number of authors study ideology from different perspectives, with it acting in a variety of different roles. Some authors look at the differences between peasant ideology and vanguard ideology (Rude 1980; Welch 1980; Wickham-Crawley 1992). Some scholars look at the opposite viewpoint and consider ideology unifying the revolution against the incumbent regime (Arjomand 1988; Skocpol 1979). A recently popular theory is that ideology in societies carries a historical memory of past revolutions, and revolutionary leaders tap into this during periods of political instability (Foran 1992; Wickham-Crawley 1992). Likewise, there are a number of authors who cannot agree on how ideology affects a revolutionary party, meaning it is either pragmatic or reactionary in contrast with the state (Calhoun 1994; Johnson 1966).

A secondary problem with revolutionary ideology is that being so complex and broadly used within the revolution makes it difficult to engage in a consistent and comprehensive study of the respective ideology or revolution. While it is not my intention to summarize every author within the field, I will however, give an overview of the three influential texts concerning political ideology within the field of revolution. These authors initially defined the study of ideology within the context of revolution. All three scholars, Goldstone, Parsa, and Wickham-Crawley to various degrees, look at the role of actors in developing and distributing ideology. They look at the differences in peasant and vanguard
ideology. Although both Goldstone and Wickham-Crawley look at how ideology impacts each actor, Parsa goes one step further, and views how ideology originated with individual non-state actors.

Jack Goldstone is the primary scholar within the fourth wave of revolutionary theory. Goldstone is defined by his text “Revolution and Rebellion in the Early Modern World” wherein he looks at ideology before, during, and after the revolution. His contention is that while one cannot predict the outcome of a revolution based on pre-revolutionary ideology, it is possible to distinguish the change in ideology through phases in the revolution. The problem many scholars have in identifying the effect of ideology within the revolution is because they look at the overall impact, and not its development. The three phases pre-revolution (period leading up to state breakdown), revolutionary struggle, and state reconstruction/consolidation of authority (Goldstone 1991, 417 - 418). The intervening factors involved with all three of these is both conflict and the state, either its collapse, or reconstruction.

Goldstone argues that during the prerevolutionary phase, there are variations of moderate and extreme ideologies. When the state is clearly collapsing, attempts are made at bridging these ideologies under one umbrella ideology against the incumbent regime. Once there is competition between groups for political authority, the group whose ideology most broadly appeals to the mass populace, and is best organized on a national scale is used by the revolutionary vanguard. Such ideology then manifests itself in anti-incumbent regime propaganda slogans, for example, “down with the shah” and “Somoza must go” after the old regime falls; power is consolidated among the revolutionary vanguard. It should be noted, success is dependent upon bringing key institutions, i.e. military, economic and civilian elites under the respective ideology. The best way to do this, is through the application of nationalism to ideological propaganda.¹⁴

In both “Exploring Revolutions” and “Guerrillas and Revolution in Latin America” Tim Wickham-Crawley looks at revolution and guerrilla movements in Latin America. His study analyzes peasant mobilization in Marxist revolutions within Latin American countries.

¹⁴ For a more in-depth review of nationalism within revolution, see Goldstone 1991; 1994. He notes that nationalism can also be used in a counter-revolutionary context, for example, England 1685.
His contention is that success of a revolution in an ideological context is dependent upon organizational networks linking urban revolutions and the revolutionary vanguard to the rural peasant-led movement. Wickham-Crawley notes, that any deficiency in the urban actors, peasant leadership, or the organizational network connecting the two, will cause the revolution to fail, as Wickham-Crawley gives examples, Venezuela in the 1960s and both El Salvador and Guatemala in the 1970s. This is considerably better defined, as there are two agreed-upon explanations to why political ideology is used in a revolution (Goldstone 1991; Greene 1974; Katz 1997; Parsa 2000; Wickham-Crawley 1991; 1992). The most clearly defined statement on the subject was written by Thomas Green in his text “Comparative Revolutionary Movements”. As Greene states:

The function of ideology is to facilitate the development of cross-cutting alliances between the active minorities of the society’s major classes. The more heterogeneous its actual or potential clientele, the greater the movements challenge to fashion an ideology that offers something for everyone – or almost everyone. (Greene 1974, 51)

Ideology creates a link between elites and peasants, and as I have stated earlier in the thesis, political ideology and related leadership within the revolution are inseparable. Taking this into consideration, ideology is used for two reasons. (1) It is used by the revolution leadership to mobilize the mass populace. (2) It is used to both legitimize their claims as a response to whatever destabilizing factors there may be; as well as to delegitimize the policies and institutions of the incumbent regime – the old regime (Dunne 1972; Goldstone 1991; Greene 1974; Katz 1997; Parsa 2000; Said and Collier 1971; Selbin 1993; Wickham-Crawley 1991).15 I will be more specific, in that ideology is used to bind a number of individuals together, creating a group identity. This identity is in response to an institutional instability or in some cases an authoritarian regime e.g., the Nicaraguan revolution in the 1970s and 1980s (Wickham-Crawley 1991).

Clearly there have been noticeable improvements in terms of scholarship; however there are still several unexplained problems with the current study of revolutionary theory. First, both the reasons behind revolutions and state breakdown are presently unexplained. Secondly, that the current study of revolution and political ideology is incomplete, as

15 While the exact wording is different, all of these authors give the same reasoning for the use of ideology.
scholars do not completely understand its application. Essentially, why ideology is used within a revolution is understood, what is unclear is the how. In addition, while structural or state-centric theories of revolution are important, existing institutional theories of revolution cannot sufficiently explain the development of social revolutions. While I cannot bridge the knowledge gap completely; I can add to the accumulation of knowledge concerning revolution and the impact of political ideology.

I propose that instead of looking at the purely structural causes of revolution or that of state crisis and breakdown, it would be better to examine the commonalities in ideology that define particular revolutionary movements. Doing so could potentially help explain two substantial issues within the field of revolutionary theory. (1) The fluidity of revolutionary ideology, and how revolutions develop and change over time. (2) The interaction between possible conflicting ideologies of different groups – some radical, some traditional – within the revolution. Given that we have established a compelling theoretical argument and as we have discussed general political ideology in terms of a revolutionary movement, we must now specifically discuss Marxism and Maoism as political ideologies in a similar framework.
CHAPTER 3

MARXISM AND MAOISM AS REVOLUTIONARY IDEOLOGIES

There was a tremendous growth of populist political and social movements in the 20th century, and both Marxism and Maoism were relevant and valid as frameworks for these movements. As avenues of political thought and action their impact upon social relations is quite profound, as they are closely related to two of the 20th Century’s most important social revolutions, within Russia and China. Thus the study of Marxism and Maoism is certainly not a wasted effort. Consequently within this thesis, Marxism and Maoism are compared because of this social and political relevance; given that former and the latter are the respective political ideologies associated with the Bolshevik and Shining Path movements. Both ideologies stress grassroots revolution against the capitalist system, albeit using different methods and classes within society. This difference is not insignificant, and therefore requires closer examination. What were the compelling theoretical arguments and justifications made by Marxist-Leninists and Maoists for revolutionary action?

As Christopher Finlay asserts, “For much of the 20th century Marxism provided the most widely used conceptual framework for contemplating revolutionary violence” (Finlay 2006, 374). The Marxist concept of revolution is characterized by class struggle against the capitalist bourgeoisie. Given this classification, it can be said that Marxism is exemplified by revolution; and that, “revolutions occupy a special place in the Marxists account of history” (Perry 2002, 17). As such, it is imperative we further examine the Marxist perspective as an ideology within a revolution, and the reasoning behind its application. I specifically look at ideas of Karl Marx and Vladimir Lenin, and how these ideas were used by the revolutionary vanguard to mobilize both the military and general population within the revolution, ultimately influencing and changing the direction of the revolution.16

---

16 While the February and October revolutions of 1917 and the Chinese revolution of 1949 are the primary resources used in this chapter, it should not be confused with an analysis of the Russian or Chinese revolutions.
When looking at political ideologies, one must look at their theoretical origins, in addition to how they are applied to a political or social situation. This is no easy task, and the questions surrounding Marxism and Maoism as political ideologies used in social or political movements are equally difficult to answer. Specifically, in addressing these questions it is first important to look at the Marxist perspective toward revolution. Secondly, we must examine the evolution of classical Marxism through Marxist-Leninism. Finally, using China as an example, it is important to compare this perspective and development to those of Maoism, examining the practical and theoretical differences between Marxist-Leninism and Maoism.

Regarding this comparison, it should be noted that within the Chinese revolution Mao did not adhere exactly to Marxist-Leninist ideals (Deutscher 1974; Woods 2009; Wylie 1980). Moreover, while Maoism is considered a derivative of Marxist doctrine, there are several important distinctions between the two; this allows us to consider Maoism as an independent doctrine in its own right. The discussion at that point, which will be further examined in the chapter, revolves primarily around the application of ideology to the peasant class of the revolution – the emphasis on agrarian socialism versus the industrial proletariat found in the Russian revolution. Regardless of socialist agenda or practical application, what is important is how these ideologies are accepted by the population.

**Revolution and the Marxist Perspective**

The Marxist perspective, in terms of the Marxist political activist, view capitalist social forces acting each other within society as inherently corrupt. However, the social and economic inequalities these forces create are capable of being successfully altered through socialist revolution. Therefore, the idea of socialist revolution is a continual aspect of the Marxist perspective. This is a concept that is established early within the Marxist tradition with Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, and subsequently prevalent throughout the entire evolution of Marxist thought. Keeping in mind the distinction between Marxist theoreticians and political activists, revolution as a tool for social change is a concept that is more than just

---

in their entirety, as my emphasis is on ideology. I will give a more in-depth analysis of the Russian revolution in later chapters.
an option, or a last resort for Marxist political activists. In a response to social and economic inequality, socialist revolution is seen as important or even necessary within the Marxist agenda. Revolutions are thus, part and parcel to Marxist ideology. This is paralleled by Adam Webb, as he states:

The Marxist account of history sees revolutions as periodic transitions between one social order (one “mode of production,” such as feudalism or capitalism) and its successor. (Webb 2006, 78)

I view historical materialism as the central aspect to the idea of Marxist revolution. The inevitable clash of social forces results in the proletariat seizing control of the means of production through revolutionary action. To state this more clearly, a clash between the proletariat and those that control the means of production is both required and anticipated – thus for the proletariat to assume control of the means of production, and socialism to be realized, revolution is necessary.

In 1848 Marx and Engels initially clarified their views on revolution in “The Communist Manifest”. Written before the 1848 German revolution, “The Communist Manifesto” is the primary theoretical text advancing and justifying proletariat revolution against the bourgeoisie. Through the manifesto, Marx continues to say that history is deterministic. This is not to say that revolution will occur independently of human actions through some fatalistic manner, but that it occurs through the machinations and interactions of existing social classes (Sherman 1981). The revolution is an expectation within Marxism, within a given set of social conditions and choices made by the proletariat. Marx characterizes these choices and conditions in the statements below.

…And here it becomes evident, that the bourgeoisie is unfit any longer to be the ruling class in society, and to impose its conditions of existence upon society as an over-riding law. It is unfit to rule because it is incompetent to assure an existence to its slave within his slavery, because it cannot help letting him sink into such a state, that it has to feed him, instead of being fed by him. Society can no longer live under this bourgeoisie, in other words, its existence is no longer compatible with society.

The essential conditions for the existence and for the sway of the bourgeois class is the formation and augmentation of capital; the condition for capital is wage-labour. Wage-labour rests exclusively on competition between the labourers. The advance of industry, whose involuntary promoter is the bourgeoisie, replaces the isolation of the labourers, due to competition, by the revolutionary combination, due to association. The development of Modern Industry, therefore, cuts from under its feet the very foundation on which the bourgeoisie produces and
appropriates products. What the bourgeoisie therefore produces, above all, are its own grave-diggers. Its fall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable. (Marx and Engels 1848, Ch 1)

While living in Paris and London Marx was heavily influenced by social historians writing on the French Revolution. Having already established his key ideas in the “Communist Manifesto” in 1848, Karl Marx wrote “The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte” while living in London in 1852.\(^\text{17}\) The two major works together can be seen as establishing the foundation of Marx’s socio-economic ideas oriented toward the revolution.\(^\text{18}\) Marx used historical materialism in the Eighteenth Brumaire to analyze the role of the individual within history. Specifically Marx states, “Men make their own history, but they do not make it as they please; they do not make it under self-selected circumstances, but under circumstances existing already, given and transmitted from the past” (Marx 1869, 1). This outlook and use of historical materialism clearly defines the role of Marxist ideology at the micro level within a political and social framework for class struggle, for as Marx continues to state:

The social revolution of the nineteenth century cannot take its poetry from the past but only from the future. It cannot begin with itself before it has stripped away all superstition about the past. The former revolutions required recollections of past world history in order to smother their own content. The revolution of the nineteenth century must let the dead bury their dead in order to arrive at its own content. There the phrase went beyond the content – here the content goes beyond the phrase. (Marx 1869)

Marx further clarifies his statements on revolution and the proletariat in 1870 within “The Civil War in France”. Written after “The Communist Manifesto”, it was initially an address to the General Council of the First International, on the character of the members of the Paris Commune in their struggle during the French Civil war 1871. “The Civil War in France” can be seen as a much more developed work on proletariat revolution wherein the manner in which the proletariat rests power from the state is defined. Marx viewed the Paris

---

\(^\text{17}\) In addition to being published in Germany, it was published by Joseph Weydemeyer in New York City in the socialist weekly Die Revolution.

\(^\text{18}\) This coincides with minor works by Marx “England’s 17th century Revolution” (1850) and “Revolution & Counter Revolution in Germany” (1852).
Commune as a success in that it dictated, for a brief period, lessons on revolution in practical terms. As Marx states:

But the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery, and wield it for its own purposes… In a rough sketch of national organization, which the Commune had no time to develop, it states clearly that the Commune was to be the political form of even the smallest country hamlet, and that in the rural districts the standing army was to be replaced by a national militia, with an extremely short term of service. The rural communities of every district were to administer their common affairs by an assembly of delegates in the central town, and these district assemblies were again to send deputies to the National Delegation in Paris, each delegate to be at any time revocable and bound by the mandat imperatif (formal instructions) of his constituents. The few but important functions which would still remain for a central government were not to be suppressed, as has been intentionally misstated, but were to be discharged by Communal and thereafter responsible agents. (Marx 1870 Ch 5)

Canadian political scientist Robert Cox said on the application of historical materialism, “theory is always for someone and for some purpose” (Cox 1981, 128). This is reiterated through Gyorg Lukács views in “History and Class Consciousness” – that there cannot be a proletariat revolution without a unity between theory and practice (Lukács 1923, Section 4; Marcus and Tarr 1989) However, while it cannot be a cause of a revolution, nor the sole factor in state collapse, Marxism as an ideology used by the revolutionary vanguard, influences the organization, development, and direction of the revolution (Goldstone 1982). I would further say that unlike other ideologies, i.e., purely nationalist ideologies or pan-Arabism, Marxism has had a considerable following throughout modern political thought, both as political theory and practice. Moreover, it is used similarly to other ideologies, i.e. fascism, Islamism, or anarchism as an organizing force within the population. This is paralleled by a statement made by Jack Goldstone:

Thus the main role of ideologies in revolutions is to bring together diverse grievances and interests under a simple and appealing set of symbols of opposition…Puritanism, Liberalism, Communism, and most recently, Islam….Though none of these ideologies of themselves brought down governments, they were crucial in providing a basis for uniting diverse existing grievances under one banner and encouraging their active resolution. (Goldstone 1982, 203)

To otherwise state that revolution is not an integral part of Marxist doctrine would be naive at best. While it is not my intent to slander or stereotype the Marxist perspective as simply a violent reaction to the principles of capitalism, the concept of revolution certainly
plays a significant role within the Marxist program. The quintessential example would be Lenin and viewpoints and position within the vanguard of the Russian Revolution. Given his views toward the proletariat, bourgeoisie, and capitalism, socialist revolution is not only necessary but an expected part of social and historical development.

Keeping in mind the relationship of Marxism to the concept of revolution, Marx and Engels established that the proletariat has a responsibility to act within a revolutionary framework towards the bourgeois, “that they alone are the revolutionary class – in its special and essential product” (Marx and Engels 1848, Ch 1). In order for the mass populace to accept a Marxist doctrine, and consequently participate in the revolution regardless of its policies, it has to be perceived as politically and economically viable. Similarly, it has to be seen as a practical solution or alternative to the existing state ideology. The preceding essential texts confirm the Marxist perspective towards both society and history. Broadly speaking, the foundations of class struggle do not change, but the theoretical perspectives within Marxist thought do. It is my opinion, that this evolution is crucial to the analysis of the impact of Marxism as a political ideology used for social change.

**THE EVOLUTION OF MARXIST THOUGHT**

This brings us to the second part of the evolution of Marxism, and the role of Vladimir Lenin. To this effect, there are two primary questions to ask. First, there is the question of whether Lenin was faithful to classical Marxism, or did his ideas diverge from Marx’s in a noteworthy manner. This question is both significant within the scope of the development of Marxism, and the role of Marxism within the revolution. The answer is difficult to discern simply by comparing the works of Marx and Lenin. An interrelated question to take into consideration is, whether or not there is sufficient evidence to suggest that Lenin’s ideas constitute a significant shift from classical Marxism.

One must look at how Lenin uses classic Marxism, and how it may differ from his own ideas. Ultimately, Lenin used Marx as an outline for revolution; however, he formulated

---

19 As they are not interchangeable, it is necessary to clarify my use of the phrase population, in comparison to the peasant and urban population. I use the phrase mass populace or general population in regards to the population in its entirety – both urban and rural. Whereas the peasantry is in reference to the rural peasant or indigenous population; while the urban population or urban proletariat is in reference to those within the industrial sectors of the economy in major cities.
his own ideas toward how to implement that outline. While this brought him into conflict with other more orthodox Marxists, (specifically Rosa Luxemburg) his ideas were critical to the success of the Russian Revolution (Kolakowski 2005). Our second question to ask is how do Lenin’s theoretical arguments on revolution translate to practical application? To be clearer, how do they apply specifically to the Bolshevik movement within the Russian Revolution?

Lenin’s “What is to be Done” is the defining text on the Bolshevik movement. It made extremely clear, how revolution is to be practiced against the tsarist government, within early 20th century Russia. While Karl Marx and Vladimir Lenin fundamentally agreed on the outcome of the revolution, there were two important discernable differences between the Marx’s and Lenin’s ideologies. First, unlike Marx, it was Lenin’s (1917a) opinion that the proletariat could not lead the revolution alone – that it was necessary for a vanguard, through the Communist party to control the movement. Secondly, given that the end goal is Communism, Lenin believed that the vanguard party must take political control of social relations, and the proletariat would eventually recognize its role within a socialist and subsequent communist society.

Given that Lenin used classical Marxist ideas as a practical method for the Russian Revolution, and that Lenin’s entire viewpoint was in terms of the Russian Revolution, the theoretical argument in his mind could be summed up in the question of how Marxist theory is applied to the revolution. As stated earlier, “What is to be Done” defined the role of the vanguard party or socialist intellectual elite within the revolutionary movement; the vanguard party is used to lead the proletariat through the revolution. Within the revolutionary movement it is their responsibility to further disseminate Marxist thought within the population. Within both “What is to Be Done” and “The Tasks of the Proletariat in Our Revolution.” Lenin states:

What must be done in order to bring political knowledge to the workers…Social Democrats must go among all classes of the population. (Lenin 1902, p. 112 - 113)

What is required of us is the ability to explain to the masses that the social and political character of the war is determined not by the “good will” of individuals or groups, or even of nations, but by the position of the class which conducts the war, by the class policy of which the war is a continuation, by the ties of capital, which is the dominant economic force in modern society, by the imperialist character of international capital, by Russia’s dependence in finance, banking and
diplomacy upon Britain, France, and so on. To explain this skillfully in a way the people would understand is not easy; none of us would be able to do it at once without committing errors. (Lenin 1917c, Ch 5)

The second text is Lenin’s “The State and Revolution” in which he uses Marx and Engels to clarify the role of the state as a tool for oppression, and the necessity for proletariat revolution; in addition to further clarifying the role of the state during the post-revolution reconstruction period. From an ideological standpoint, Lenin surmises that the state cannot be neutral in class conflict, and likewise is only used to oppress the working class. Furthermore, a state utilizing a premise or notion of liberal democracy does not support the proletariat, and thus cannot be compatible with a Marxist program. That any such form of government must be dismantled (Christman 1987; Kolakowski 2005). As Lenin states:

To smash this machine, to break it up – this is what is truly in the interests of the people, of the majority, the workers, and most of the peasants, this is what is essential for the free alliance between the poor peasants and the proletarians; without such an alliance democracy is unstable and the socialist reformation is impossible. (Lenin 1917b, p. 299)

How does this relate to the Bolshevik movement? Lenin’s “The State and Revolution” continues to assert that the state is necessary, even after the revolution that the abolishment of the bourgeoisie state in an anarchistic fashion, will only result in its eventual re-establishment. Therefore, it must be abolished slowly, through a structured process. In the event of a successful proletariat revolution, there would be the development of a “dictatorship of the proletariat” through a communal state (similar to the 1871 Paris Commune) led by the revolutionary vanguard, wherein the bourgeoisie state would eventually wither away (Lenin 1917c).

The concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat further relates to the other major theoretician of the Bolshevik movement - Leon Trotsky and his concept of Permanent Revolution. The concept was initially formed by Marx; however it is most closely attributed to Trotsky. It was Trotsky’s opinion that the Bourgeois Democratic Revolution was not adequate in completing the revolution that it must be carried out by the proletariat and

---

20 He relies heavily upon Marx’s “A Critique of the Gotha Programme” (Christmas 1987).

21 The “Dictatorship of the Proletariat” was published in 1852 by Joseph Weydemeyer. It was eventually used by Marx in the “Critique of the Gotha Program” (1875). The term dictatorship refers to absolute political control by an entire class, opposed to an individual.
likewise, the proletariat could not solidify power, without socialist revolutions developing in other countries. Furthermore, Trotsky argues that within the dictatorship of the proletariat, the bourgeois will not only be required to comply with the proletariat, but the peasantry as well. As Trotsky states:

> The Russian revolution does not, and for a long time will not, permit the establishment of any kind of bourgeois-constitutional order that might solve the most elementary problems of democracy. All the ‘enlightened’ efforts of reformer-bureaucrats like Witte and Stolypin are nullified by their own struggle for existence. Consequently, the fate of the most elementary revolutionary interests of the peasantry – even the peasantry as a whole, as an estate, is bound up with the fate of entire revolution, i.e., with the fate of the proletariat. (Trotsky 1906, Ch 5)

Both Lenin and Trotsky viewed the vanguard as critical aspects of the revolutionary movement. Moreover, both agree on a particular role for both the proletariat and the peasantry within the revolution. While their theoretical arguments (particularly those of Lenin) are divergent from those of Marx and Engels, the ultimate goal is the same – the establishment of a socialist and eventual communist political system. Furthermore, Marxist-Leninism was the primary political ideology applied throughout the Bolshevik movement, in that it was the blueprint for the successes of the Russian Revolution.

I argue Vladimir Lenin used classical Marxism as the foundation for the Russian Revolution formulating a limited set of his own ideas on the subject, divergent from those established by Marx and Engels. Furthermore, given Lenin’s work and his role within the revolution is a significant example of how Marxism is used to influence and unite the mass populace. For the purposes of this thesis, the concept of Leninism or Marxist-Leninism represents a unique branch within the evolution of Marxism. However, in terms of the revolution, I view Marxist-Leninism as the essential aspect of Marxist revolutionary theory, and while theoretical debates beyond Marxist-Leninism are important; they are not within the scope of this argument.

In both an ideological and methodological context, one can see a division in certain Marxist party ranks. Clearly Marxist activists oppose the state ideology; however, there are those who advocate revolution, and those that support more reformist policies. To state this more clearly, from an ideological standpoint, there are both moderate and extremist ideologies. As an example, during the late 19th and early 20th centuries this division was seen in Socialist-Democratic parties in Europe (Forgacs 2000).
Ultimately there are two possibilities one of which will be discussed in later chapters; the divide between the different groups is bridged, for example within the Chilean revolution and the Movement of the Revolutionary Left. Or the different groups split into competing parties, with different sets of agendas, for example the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks during the Russian revolution. Even more important, are the distinctions between Marxist-Leninism and the various ideologies that developed from both it and classical Marxism. Relevant in this case are the ideological and methodological separations of Maoism - how has Maoism existed as a current of Marxist though - and subsequently developed beyond the borders of China?

**MAOISM AND MARXISM COMPARED**

A basic distinction of Maoism when compared to Marxist-Leninism is that Maoism by the 1950s was established as a state ideology, with Marxist-Leninism existing solely as a revolutionary ideology. As the official political ideology of the Chinese Communist Party, it was granted further credibility among political activists throughout the globe. Moreover, with Communist parties in Nepal, New Zealand, Brazil, and India, throughout the Cold War, the CPC and Maoism competed with the USSR in efforts to have an ideological impact on the World Communist Movement. As such, China and the Soviet Union did not have a positive political relationship, and while foreign policy is not the emphasis of this thesis; it is important to briefly examine this relationship with regards to the development of political ideology and revolution.

I noted earlier that Mao did not completely follow Marxist-Leninist tradition during the revolution. Mao developed his ideology as a response to Stalinism, and while he viewed Stalin as an exceptional Marxist-Leninist, he disagreed with Stalin’s policies that took place in the 1920s and 1930s Soviet Union; primarily those policies that were directed toward (1) the mass populace, (2) other revolutionary groups or Communist parties throughout the developing world, and (3) The bureaucratic aspects of the Communist party in the Soviet Union (Chiou 1974; Jacobs 1963). Furthermore, Mao viewed the Soviet Union as an imperialist state, not critically dissimilar from the United States. Conversely, Stalin also viewed China and Maoism as outside of his political periphery (Deutscher 1984).
It is plainly evident that Stalin and Mao would continue to strongly disagree on the practice of revolution\(^{22}\) (Garver 1992; Sheng 1992). However, I do not view their relationship as merely an ideological divide, or even limited to frigid diplomatic relations; but a tangible political separation. Both Mao and Stalin viewed themselves and their respective ideologies as leaders at the forefront of a global workers’ revolution, neither one willing to concede infallibility (Kerry 1969). Likewise by extension, this separation is primarily due to Stalin’s attempt to control the CCP in the context of both the impending revolution and the KMT. For further explanation see the quote by John Chan below and while these historical developments are important, the central aspect of Maoism in regards to Marxist-Leninism is: Even though the critical dissimilarity is the perspective or method toward revolution, both the justifications for revolution and the desired outcome are the same.

On March 21, 1927, the CCP organised an armed insurrection, backed by a general strike of 800,000 Shanghai workers. The working class crushed the warlord forces and took control of the city, except the foreign concessions. However, the CCP was prevented by Stalin's policy from establishing a workers' government, and instead formed a "provisional" government that included leading bourgeois representatives. Its main task was not to advance the interests of workers, but to welcome Chiang Kai-shek and his troops. (Chan 2009, part 2 sec 3)

The primary distinctions between Marxist-Leninism and Maoism can be explained in regards to culture, guerrilla warfare, and social class. However, the greatest difference between the two points of view involves the proletariat. Lenin viewed the urban proletariat as critical to the success of the revolution, whereas Mao saw beginnings of socialist revolution coming from the rural working class, with the urban working class behind it. Furthermore, Lenin saw industrialization as a key aspect of the revolution; while Mao thought that it only further oppressed the urban proletariat (Chiou 1974; Jacobs 1963). This distinction can be seen more clearly with the failed Chinese revolution from 1925 to 1927, wherein thousands

\(^{22}\) It is reasonable to say that Mao and Stalin had a complicated relationship. As of the writing of this thesis, there is a debate between John Garver and Michael Sheng on the strength and complexity of the Stalin – Mao and related CCP-Moscow relationship. It is likely that my brief explanation is far less nuanced than either of their own.
of Communists in Shanghai were murdered by the KMT. The KMT failed to establish an adequate urban populist base, nor a dominant party hierarchy within Shanghai. This caused two actions to happen: (1) it caused a rift between socialist factions of the KMT, pushing the Soviets to support the CPC, and (2) it led Mao to establish a peasant-led revolution.

Mao was the first revolutionary leader to fully realize the potential of the Chinese peasant class (Chiou 1974). While the Soviet Union didn’t see a peasant-led revolution in China succeeding, that the Chinese peasant class didn’t have the capability to lead a successful revolution; however, in the early 20th century, before 1949, much of China’s population was agrarian based (Chiou 1974). This, along with the Shanghai massacre of 1927 is why Mao did not view the urban proletariat as the central aspect of the revolution. To support and clarify this, as Mao stated in 1927, “The present upsurge of the peasant movement is a colossal event. In a very short time, in China’s central, southern and northern provinces, several hundred million peasants will rise like a mighty storm…” (Mao 1927).

The 1949 Chinese socialist revolution was quite unique in regards to its social classes, development and success. China was much more susceptible to political and economic collapse than equivalent states. This is despite the fact that the collapse of the Chinese monarchy after 1911, did not immediately result in revolution. It only entrenched the local and regional elites, further defining the roles of peasant-landlord and peasant-guerrilla relations. These landed-elites existed as both local landowners, as well as regional merchants. Likewise, there was an even greater divide between the rural peasants and wealthy urban elites – with an overwhelmingly majority of the government bureaucrats were literate, university-educated people from wealthy urban families. For further explanation or summarization of the role of social classes, particularly the peasant class, in comparison to other states see Tables 1 and 2 and 3 taken from Skocpol’s “States and Social Revolutions” on the following pages.

It is obvious the distinctions and separate historical developments of both Marxist-Leninism and Maoism. It is also obvious that while the methods and pathways of revolution are different, Marxist-Leninism and Maoism share common views toward capitalism and the goals of revolution. However, from a practical standpoint, their greater impact upon a revolution is not presently clear. In what ways did Maoism expand beyond its defined
Table 1. Conditions for Political Crisis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>DOMINANT CLASS</th>
<th>AGRARIAN ECONOMY</th>
<th>INTERNATIONAL PRESSURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHINA</td>
<td>Landed – dominant class has leverage within semi-bureaucratic state</td>
<td>No developmental breakthrough; near limits of growth, given resources</td>
<td>Strong – Defeats in war and imperialist intrusions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLAND</td>
<td>No bureaucratic state. Landed class is dominant</td>
<td>Transition to capitalist agriculture</td>
<td>Mild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>Highly bureaucratic state. Landed nobility is dominant</td>
<td>Transition to capitalist agriculture</td>
<td>1806 – Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAPAN</td>
<td>Bureaucratic with no centralized state. Nor landed upper class</td>
<td>Increasing productivity</td>
<td>Strong-Imperialist intrusions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Skocpol, Theda. 1979. States and Social Revolutions. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Table 2. Conditions for Peasant Revolution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>AGRARIAN CLASS STRUCTURES</th>
<th>LOCAL POLITICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHINA</td>
<td>Peasants own 50% and work all land in small plots. Pay rent to elites. No peasant community</td>
<td>Landlord elites. Literate and dominant organizational life. Cooperation with officials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLAND</td>
<td>Landed class owns 70%+ Peasants polarized between farmers and laborers. No strong peasant community</td>
<td>Landlords are agents of monarchy; dominate administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>Large estates owned by elites. With peasants owning small plots. No strong peasant community.</td>
<td>Landlords are local agents of bureaucratic state; dominate local administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAPAN</td>
<td>Communities dominated by rich peasants.</td>
<td>Strong bureaucratic controls over local communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Skocpol, Theda. 1979. States and Social Revolutions. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Table 3. Social and Political Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>RESULTS OF TABLE 3.1 + 3.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHINA</td>
<td>1911 – Breakdown of Imperial State. 1949 – Successful Communist social revolution against incumbent nationalist regime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLAND</td>
<td>Political revolution establishes parliament with non-bureaucratic monarchy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>1848 – Failed social revolution. Bureaucratic monarchy stays in power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAPAN</td>
<td>Political revolution centralizes power; followed by bureaucratic reform.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Skocpol, Theda. 1979. States and Social Revolutions. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

national borders of China, and cement itself into revolutionary politics in the developing world? In answering this question it is currently necessary to look at specific cases of Marxist-Leninist and Maoist revolutionary movement in Russia and Peru, and how ideology is used both similarly and differently within each.
CHAPTER 4

MILL’S METHODS AND CASES OF RUSSIA AND PERU

Ideology was not used in the exact same manner in the Russian revolution and the Shining Path movement. It is therefore critical to look at this effect and what it means for both the revolutionary process and the outcome. What I argue as important is the revolutionary elite, and its connection to the population through the vanguard. I use John Stuart Mill’s joint method of agreement and difference found in “A System of Logic” (2001) to compare the similarities and differences in the application of ideology within each case study. Mill’s logic and methods form the basis for the Comparative Method. However, as many authors have noted, including Mill himself, there are a number of strengths and weaknesses in its use within the social sciences (Roberts 2008).

In order for Mill’s methods to be considered valid, they must meet three rigorous assumptions (George and Bennett 2005, 155):

1. The causal relationship must be deterministic.
2. All relevant variables must be identified prior to the analysis. (there can be only one cause of the outcome)
3. All of the possible causes must be identified.

As Mill states, (see below) the application of his methods to the social sciences is at best ill advised. Within the social sciences, it is difficult to determine if the all of either the cases or the independent variables have been identified. Likewise, a decision has to be made whether or not the causal relationship can be seen as deterministic versus probabilistic. A failure to adequately satisfy the previous conditions results in either a false positive or a false negative. So why then is the Comparative Method still relevant to political science?

Nothing can be more ludicrous than the sort of parodies on experimental reasoning which one is accustomed to meet with, not in popular discussion only, but in grave treaties, when the affairs of nations are the theme. “How,” it is asked, “can an institution be bad, when the country has prospered under it?” “How can such or such causes have contributed to the prosperity of one country, when another has prospered without them?” Whoever makes use of an argument of this
kind, not intending to deceive, should be sent back to learn the elements of some one of the more easy physical sciences. (Mill 2001, 298)

Despite this, there have been a number of comparative political analyses using Mill’s methodological foundations (Collier 1993; Lijphart 1971; 1975; Przeworski and Teune 1970). Clearly a fundamental principle of comparative political analysis is the juxtaposition of political events. Moreover, the field of Comparative Politics would more than likely not have progressed to its current point without the use of the Comparative Method. What then does Mill add to the contemporary study of political science, and why am I compelled to apply his logic?

Even given its limitations, Mill’s Comparative Method is still relevant to the study of Comparative Politics. I argue, as do others (Hall 2004; Lijphart 1971; 1975) that the Comparative Method allows the opportunity for a deeper analysis of one or two case studies, consequently allowing for the development of a clearer understanding of a few key variables within a causal relationship. Moreover, that the Comparative Method presents the opportunity to reveal new processes, typologies, and concepts within political phenomena (Hall 2004).

Within the current study of political science, no methodological tool is completely accurate or universally applicable. The complete number of relevant variables within a given causal relationship in the social sciences is difficult (or impossible) to determine even using statistical methods – as there are often times existing moderating and intervening variables. Furthermore, whatever methodology the researcher chooses to use, there is always the risk of human error. While there are shortcomings to Mill’s methods, those researchers both for and against the Comparative Method agree that they do adequately define the necessary and sufficient conditions within a causal relationship. Secondly, any methodology, including Mill works best when combined with others. Within this thesis I combine the Comparative Method with a brief historical narrative to further explain the use of ideology.

In an effort to completely explain the causal relationship between ideology and the population within revolutions, within my thesis I define both the necessary and sufficient conditions as the vanguard revolutionary movement and the popular ideology. First, a vanguard revolutionary movement is necessary but not a sufficient condition for a successful revolution. In order for there to be a revolution, there must be a revolutionary movement. Secondly, a popular ideology greater than the state ideology is sufficient, but not a necessary
condition for a successful revolutionary movement, as there could be a weak state, and the movement could centralize power despite the objections of the mass populace. In the end, there are two interrelated and significant factors – the movement and the populace. Of course one must keep in mind, that both of these are interrelated, and likewise that necessary and sufficient conditions in one case may not be relevant in others.

**THE BOLSHEVIK MOVEMENT**

The creation of the revolutionary movement, specifically, the formation of the vanguard party within the revolutionary movement is the first key factor in the analysis. As such, social discontent is not enough to create a revolutionary movement; there must be a group that compels the populace to act. The vanguard party is the mechanism that causes change in response to the state within a revolutionary movement. The vanguard party is ultimately responsible for both the advancement of the movement, as well as the distribution and propagation of the related ideology. Typical of vanguard parties within other revolutionary movements, it is made up of a bloc of intellectual and social elites. According to Richard Pipes, (Pipes 1990, 122) there exist two criterions for the development of an intelligentsia:

1. An ideology based on the conviction that man is not a unique creature, endowed with an immortal soul, but a material compound shaped entirely by his environment: from which premise it follows that by reordering man’s social, economic, and political environment in accord with “rational precepts, it is possible to turn out a new race of perfectly rational human beings. This belief elevates intellectuals, as bearers of rationality, to that status of social engineers and justifies their ambition to displace the ruling elite.

2. Opportunities for intellectuals to gain social and occupation status to advance their group interests – that is, the dissolution of estates and castes and the emergence of free professions which make them independent of the Establishment.

Within the context of the Russian Revolution, the Russian intelligentsia eventually formed the Bolshevik and Menshevik parties. However, given the existing Marxist precedent, the intelligentsia within the Russian Revolution has its beginnings in Western Europe, before the collapse of tsarist Russia. Starting in the 1860s, levels of dissent towards the Russian

---

23 An example of revolutions with intelligentsia defined vanguard parties are the French Revolution, Chinese Revolution, and to a lesser extent the color revolutions of the early 21st century.
monarchy increased among university students and faculty, although, it wasn’t until the late 1890s when critical socio-political parties develop in Russia, taking up violent action against the tsarist government, specifically the Social-Radicals and later the Social-Democrats. As P.P. Maslov states:

Essentially the activity of local SR groups differed little from that of the SDs. The organizations of both parties usually consisted of small groups of intelligentsy, formed into committees, who had little connection with the masses and viewed them mainly as material for political agitation. (Pipes 1990, 149)

Eventually the Social-Radicals and the Social-Democrats gave way to the October Manifesto. However, the conception of political violence did not dissipate, and would again come to the forefront of Russian social activity.

Vladimir Lenin would become the embodiment of the Russian Revolution. However, Lenin rejected the existing political parties in Russia, viewing specific types of democracy as incompatible with socialism. Eventually the Social-Democratic Party split into two opposing factions – Lenin’s Bolshevik party and Julius Martov’s Menshevik party. While 1917 Russia was certainly a culture of competing ideas and political groups the Bolsheviks were the more radical of the two. The Bolsheviks consequently made up of a majority of the existing intelligentsia, whereas the Mensheviks were considered relatively moderate and tended to side with the more liberal Constitutional-Democratic party. The split between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks is a critical juncture in the development of the Russian Revolution.

The split between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks had two important consequences, particularly in 1917 at the dawn of the revolution. First, it allowed the Bolsheviks to become the dominant revolutionary party within Russia, absorbing smaller parties such as Leon Trotsky’s organization the Mezhraiontsy (Fitzpatrick 2008; Pipes 1990). This consolidated both resources and the Marxist ideological perspective, allowing the Bolsheviks to broadly distribute its ideological message, as well as homogenously oppose the tsarist regime. Secondly, I argue that while the Mensheviks played a smaller role within the revolution, ultimately, the Bolsheviks assumed power due to their ability to appeal to population across socio-economic schisms. Ultimately, their ability to unite both urban and rural proletariat, against the state is allowed them to succeed as well as centralize power during the post-revolutionary period.
The second key factor within revolution is the acceptance of Marxist-Leninism by the mass populace, in comparison to the tsarist state ideology. At the beginning of 1917 Party membership was 23,600. After the February revolution, the April conference of the Party reported 79,000 members. By the Sixth Congress in late July, 240,000 persons belonged to the Bolshevik Party…the Petrograd membership had been 2,000 dues-paying members during World War I; by April, 1917, it was 16,000, and by the Sixth Congress it was 41,000 (Loren 1973). Within the Russian population, there were three primary groups of actors that made up the membership of the Bolshevik party, defined the February and October revolutions of 1917, and influenced the outcome of the Russian Revolution - the urban industrial workers, the military personnel, and the rural peasants.

The urban industrial workers were the primary focus of the Bolshevik party, this is despite the fact that they only made up approximately 10 percent of the population (Wade 2001). The urban working class had a significant political interest in the revolution, to further this, see Table 4. The Bolshevik party appealed to the urban industrial workers, in part because they addressed labor rights – the workers stood to gain not only a wage increase, but stable and healthy working conditions. Nevertheless, it was not merely an issue of wages or working conditions, but social and political status, as the working class understood the importance of the revolution and eventual civil war, demanding political representation. The urban proletariat stood to gain sizeable political control by participating in the events surrounding the 1917 revolution, and by aligning themselves with this demand, the Bolshevik party obtained loyalty from a very powerful social organization.

The military personnel were the second emphasis for the Bolsheviks. There was considerable social tension between officer and enlisted members of the military, and the ruling social and political elites. The Bolshevik party focused specifically, on the garrison of soldiers stationed in Petrograd. With 180,000 soldiers, they were a key figure in the February revolution (Wade 2005). Similar to the urban industrial class, the military played an influential role in local politics. Likewise with the urban working class, the military demanded both fundamental change within the military structure, and political representation. They sided with the Bolsheviks due to the expectation that they would gain similar labor rights within the military structure, as well as economic and social gains (Wade 2001).
Table 4. Number of Participants in Political Strikes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. Of People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>87,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>25,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>1,843,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>651,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>540,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>93,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>502,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914 (first half)</td>
<td>1,059,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>156,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>310,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917 (Jan - Feb)</td>
<td>575,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The rural peasants were the third group within the majority party. While Marxist-Leninist ideology and the revolution in general were slow to reach the peasantry, nonetheless, they were an integral part of its success (Figes 1998). While the vanguard members of the Bolshevik party did not think much of the Russian peasantry, the peasants were drawn to the Bolshevik party due to the prospect of land redistribution (Pipes 1990; Trotsky 1937). The Russian peasantry had a moral belief that those that worked the land had a right to it. Consequently, they instigated their own peasant insurrection in the villages, first, by encroaching upon private land and using resources, finally by open rebellion against the landed elites, as well as the church-owned property. The provisional government had difficulty controlling the peasantry, and eventually lost all control of rural Russia (Pipes 1990; Wade 2001) When the Bolshevik party instituted a land redistribution decree, they gained a key ally during the October revolution, and subsequent civil war. As Trotsky claims in the following statement:

> If the agrarian problem, as a heritage from the barbarism of the old Russian history, had been solved by the bourgeoisie, if it could have been solved by them, the Russian proletariat could not possibly have come to power in 1917. (Trotsky 1937, 51)
THE BOLSHEVIK MOVEMENT WITHIN THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY

As I stated previously, neither revolutionary movement existed outside the international community. From 1917 to 1920, there were a number of nations that opposed the Bolshevik centralization of power. To be specific, the United States, Britain, France, Germany, and the Japanese led a multi-nation effort to aid Kerensky’s provisional government. While specifically the Japanese saw Bolshevikism as an adjacent national security problem, as a whole, the multi-national effort had three goals (1) Prevent the German or Bolshevik capture of Allied material stockpiles in Arkhangelsk. (2) Mount an attack rescuing the Czechoslovak Legion stranded on the Trans-Siberian Railroad. (3) Resurrect the Eastern Front by defeating the Bolshevik army with help from the Czechoslovak Legion and an expanded anti-Bolshevik force of local citizens – and, in the process, stop the spread of Communism and the Bolshevik cause in Russia (Moore, Mead, and Jahns 2003, 47 – 50) The number of foreign soldiers who occupied Russia includes (Riasanovsky 1993, 483; Willett 2003, xix – xxviii):

1. 50,000 Czechoslovaks (along the Trans-Siberian railway)
2. 28,000 Japanese, later increased to 70,000 (in the Vladivostok region and northern Russia/Japan border)
3. 24,000 Greeks (in the Crimea)
4. 40,000 British (in the Arkhangelsk and Vladivostok regions)
5. 13,000 Americans (in the Arkhangelsk and Vladivostok regions)
6. 12,000 French and French colonial (mostly in the Arkhangelsk and Odessa regions)
7. 12,000 Poles (mostly in Crimea and Ukraine)
8. 4,000 Canadians (in the Arkhangelsk and Vladivostok regions)
9. 4,000 Serbs (in the Arkhangelsk region)
10. 4,000 Romanians (in the Arkhangelsk region)
11. 2,500 Italians (in the Arkhangelsk region and Siberia)
12. 2,000 Chinese (in the Vladivostok region)
13. 150 Australians (the Arkhangelsk regions)

The Russian Revolution ended in 1917, although the Russian Civil War continued from 1918 to 1920. This is despite the fact that the Russian Civil War was enormously unpopular with both the general population, as well as the common rank-and-file military
personnel. Consequently, the provisional government saw a high degree of desertion among white army troops, leading to an increased support for the red army. This, coupled with the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, allowed for the Bolsheviks to refocus its efforts on a single front against the allied armies (Riasanovsky 1993). Ultimately, the role of the general population alongside the military is what allowed the Bolsheviks to retain power within Russia.

THE SHINING PATH MOVEMENT

If the revolutionary party was successful during the Russian revolution and subsequent civil war, how does this compare to our other case study, the Shining Path? As David Scott Palmer states below, the Shining Path fits within the theoretical debate on revolution. Likewise, while there were several Peruvian Marxist and Maoist political parties before the Shining Path\(^\text{24}\), the Shining Path however, were the first ones to use guerrilla warfare similar to the Chinese Revolution (Alexander 1999). As a revolutionary movement, they had military, social, and political resources. They could have allied themselves with any number of similar revolutionary organizations in Latin America at the time. Moreover, they could have found support in Cuba, China, or the Soviet Union. Why then did the Shining Path fail? The answers to this question fit broadly not only within the present argument, but the broader contentions in revolutionary theory.

In terms of theories of revolution, Sendero Luminoso evolved in a context with several recognizable elements. These include a center in a region which was both isolated geographically and marginalized socially, an area which experienced a decline in central government resources for a number of years followed by a number of initiatives inappropriate for the region, a historically exploited Indian population, an increasingly politicized provincial university. (Palmer 1986, 127)

Unlike the Bolshevik movement, the Shining Path is a top-down movement, forming initially due to ideological splits with the more moderate Communist Party of Peru. Similar to the Russian Revolution, there were competing parties and factions against the Peruvian government, specifically the Peruvian left and the MRTA; although the historical development of interactions between factions in the Russian Revolution Peru during the 1980s is considerably different. Simply put, the level of violence against the Peruvian left by

\(^{24}\) The Communist Party of Peru - Unidad formed in the late 1920s. From the 1950s into the mid 1970s there was one major splitter group, the Communist Party of Peru – Bandera Roja. From this organization came the Communist Party of Peru – Shining Path.
the Shining Path was not equal to that of the Bolsheviks during the Russian Revolution. In using Mill’s comparative methods the questions to ask are how the vanguard within the Shining Path is different than the Bolsheviks during the Russian Revolution? Secondly, why did the population largely accept the Bolsheviks Marxist-Leninist doctrine, and the Peruvian population rejected SPs version of Maoism?

The Shining Path was formed by philosophy Professor Abimael Guzman in the late 1970s. Guzman became attracted to Maoism in approximately 1965, after experiencing the Cultural Revolution in China. By those within the organization, from a theoretical perspective, he is called “the fourth sword” of world revolution – equal to that of Marx, Lenin, and Mao. Clearly, Abimael Guzman has what can be described as a cult following among Shining Path’s core supports, and similar to Lenin, he was the embodiment of the revolutionary movement. This historical development is unique, in that many revolutionary leaders, i.e., Lenin, Stalin, Mao, developed a cult of personality during the post-revolutionary period; whereas Guzman’s developed somewhat before, the revolutionary movement became relevant, and certainly during its politically violent period (Ron 2001). It is certainly more unique considering that his revolutionary movement was ultimately not successful.

A direct relation to Guzman, the ideological perspective of the Shining Path was likewise unique. It was not a straightforward application of Maoism or even a combination of Marxist-Leninism and Maoism, as Guzman was vehemently anti-reformist, even against those reforms within socialist theory and practice (McClintock 1984). This is in addition to a racial or anti-colonial element to Guzman’s ideology, despite Guzman seemingly having little interest in indigenous Peruvian history or culture (Degregori 1994; Strong 1992). Furthermore, there was a violent nature to the ideological viewpoint of the Shining Path. They viewed violence, not merely as a means to an end, but as morally and socially purifying. Violence was an absolute value, proportional to the movement itself (Degregori 1994). Guzman continually fed this to the senior and middle-level leadership within the Shining Path.

Moreover, unlike neighboring El Salvador’s FMLN, there is clear evidence of a divisive ideological and organizational perspective; with his organization on one side, and both the Peruvian left and Peruvian state on the other (Grenier 1999; Ron 2001; Strong 1992). However, it was not simply that they rejected other forms of Marxism and Maoism,
and as a result, rejected other Peruvian revolutionary parties and organizations; its lack of political socialization created a much more hierarchical, unified, and centralized decision-making process (Gorritti 1994; Ron 2001). Given the role of Guzman within the organization, his autocratic leadership style, and ideological perspective, one must question the role of the vanguard membership.

Interestingly enough, Guzman continually stressed the role of the vanguard party (Starn 1995). Its membership within the Shining Path was initially comprised of upper-middle class college students and faculty members. This is not completely dissimilar from the Bolsheviks and the Russian intelligentsia; however, there are two important distinctions. First, Shining Path membership was much more restricted than the Bolsheviks, having, “never more than a few thousand even in the late 1980s” (Starn 1995, 441), whereas Smith puts it at approximately 6,000 (Smith 1994, 34). Secondly even given the intellectual elite leadership of the Bolshevik party, it was nonetheless comprised of a number of urban and rural proletariat, whereas the Shining Path inner circle never evolved beyond a homogenous elitist institution. While the lower ranks were relatively diverse, made up of guerrillas coming from lower and middle class backgrounds, ultimately the upper echelon leadership were intellectual elites (McClintock 1998). The Shining Path, unlike the Bolsheviks was completely dominated by the urban intellectual elites – enforcing upon the population their ideological views. As Lew Taylor states:

Hardly any of the Shining Path militants (not to mention its leadership), were peasants, and not one of its senior or middle-level leadership was even of peasant origin. In terms of its social complexion, Shining Path was still very much an organization of predominantly urban-based students and educators, and a few middle-class professionals. It was this sector that would continue to be its principal source of recruits in decades to come…the majority of them were young, single, and childless, often members of the Andean, provincial urban ‘elite’… (Taylor 2006, 205)

While the organization still exists, the Peruvian Shining Path operated primarily from 1980 to 1992 in the Ayacucho region of Peru. From 1980 to 1983 the majority of peasants and the rural indigenous population supported Guzman and the Shining Path. For a visual guide to where in Peru the Shining Path operated, see Appendix A. The overwhelming majority of this support came from youths with either a primary-school or secondary-school education. Through socialization, they were indoctrinated by the Shining Path with a message of an independent Ayacucho. The Ayacucho youth were attracted to both the social
mobility the Shining Path offered, as well its social organization (Degregori 1998). This coupled with a weak infrastructure and economy, and SLs vow of land redistribution, created a high degree of support within the population. However, in 1983 the failures of the Shining Path among the peasant population clearly made themselves known. Consequently, throughout much of this twelve year period, Guzman and the Shining Path vanguard created a perpetual disconnect between their ideological structure, and the Peruvian indigenous peasant society. As such, the support for the Shining Path by the peasants was on a very limited basis. As Degregori states:

They can win sectors of the peasantry, but only by imposition and that is quite another thing. Sendero is not a peasant movement but a movement of intellectuals and young people without hope. (Bourque and Warren 1989, 19)

In 1983 there are several reasons why the peasants in the Ayacucho region of Peru started to reject the Shining Path. The Shining Path demanded that agricultural products planted by the indigenous farmers be used directly by the party and self-subsistence. Likewise, they closed off village markets, and trade routes between rural and urban areas (Degregori 1998). In an effort to purify the Peruvian capitalist society, the Shining Path likewise uprooted political and social leadership at the community level. Guzman wanted to completely erase, on a widespread scale, any signs of previous authority. The Shining Path completely misunderstood the needs of the peasant population. The peasants were dependent upon trade both between villages and urban areas; the Shining Path did not adequately replace this. In addition, structural changes in village social and political organizations were not correspondent with social and kinship norms. The effects of these mistakes were immediate, causing enormous opposition to the Shining Path at the community level.

However, the most telling fissure between the Shining Path and the peasant population was the intense level of violence perpetrated against them. As the demands of the Shining Path on the peasantry increased, the level of peasant tolerance dropped. The Shining Path responded to this by increasing the degree of violence against the rural peasant population. The Shining Path conscripted peasants and eventually murdered peasant leaders for what was viewed by the peasants as minor offenses (Isbell 1994). While in response to

25 I view the violence perpetrated by the Shining Path as part and parcel to their ideology, not as a separate variable.
the Shining Path, the Peruvian military committed violent acts against the indigenous population however ultimately, the Shining Path was seen by the peasants as the worse of the two evils; with Abimael Guzman’s organization killed approximately 11,000 civilians, whereas an estimated 70,000 were killed overall (Gregory 2009). This is paralleled in Table 5, describing the level of political violence in Peru from 1982 to 1991.

Table 5. Political Violence in Peru 1982 - 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Deaths</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>3588</td>
<td>1437</td>
<td>1376</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>2877</td>
<td>3745</td>
<td>3044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaths Attributed to Military/Paramilitary</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>1226</td>
<td>1721</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>1175</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>1375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assassinations</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Unlike the Bolsheviks within the Russian Revolution, the Shining Path ideology and vanguard structure not only made them unpopular with the peasant population, but isolated them from other revolutionary organizations and movements. It removed them from valuable resources, provided by both the peasant and urban class within Peru, as well as logistical, military, and ideological support from similar organizations within Central and South America. This failure to cooperate is also indicative of their standing as a non-state actor within the international community. In the end, made clear by the chart below; a homogenous and ineffective vanguard party, lack of peasant support, and subsequent violence is what resulted in the Shining Path’s failure. A visual comparison of why the Bolsheviks succeeded and the Shining Path failed can be seen in Table 6.

THE SHINING PATH WITHIN THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY

The Shining Path was somewhat isolated within the international community. They had no direct supporters, neither Communist or otherwise; nor did they have any direct adversaries other than the Peruvian government. While the USSR had strong economic and
Table 6. Comparison of Revolutionary Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revolutionary Movement</th>
<th>Effective Vanguard Party</th>
<th>Popular Ideology</th>
<th>Excessive Violence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bolsheviks</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shining Path</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

diplomatic ties with the Peruvian government, (Berrios and Blaiser 1991) and likewise strong ties with the Peruvian Communist Party (PCP – Unidad); they had no connection to the Shining Path. As I stated previously, the Shining Path rejected all other forms of socialist thought, and thus all other Communist government – including Cuba, China, and the USSR.  

26 In comparison to the Russian Revolution and the Bolsheviks, kinetic military action against the Shining Path on the part of the United States or other world powers did not happen. According to McClintock, there were a number of reasons why the United States did not become directly involved with the Shining Path, the most paramount of which are summarized in the statement below. Although it is a mistake to say that the international community is not important - as dissent is not synonymous with detachment.

First, and most important in my view and accordingly mentioned previously, the Sendero challenge was not a conventional Cold War challenge. Even prior to the collapse of the East bloc, as a Maoist group that vilified the Soviet Union and China, Sendero’s advance had minimal implications for the Cold War…Secondly, the fact that Sendero was not a conventional Cold War challenge also meant that “tried and true” U.S. responses were inappropriate. (McClintock 1998, 236)

Indirectly, there was a degree of support for the Peruvian state, and thus a degree of rejection of the Shining Path. For instance, the United States and Great Britain both consider the Shining Path a terrorist organization. This alone would constitute ideological support of the Peruvian state, further strengthening the incumbent state ideology versus the Shining Path ideology. Likewise, as seen in Table 7, from the early 1990s to the present, the United States and the Peruvian government have cooperated on narcotics interdiction programs, in addition

26 What is interesting is, similar to FARC in Colombia, the Shining Path eventually turned to cocaine production in the Andean mountains for financial support.
Table 7. US Aid to Peru, 1981 – 1990 (Millions of Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcotics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total % of all US Aid to Latin America | 12 | 6 | 7 | 11 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 |


...to financial support both military and economic, as well as through loan programs between Peru and the United States. In the end, the fact that there was not a military intervention supporting the incumbent regime similar to the Russian Civil War is of little consequence, the indirect support for the Peruvian state is valid in relation to the Shining Path.

The Shining Path likewise had no ties to other revolutionary movements within Latin America. This is quite dissimilar to organizations such as the Sandinista National Liberation Front which received assistance from Cuba as well as Eastern Bloc countries like the Soviet Union. Of course, one must keep in mind the ideological separation from other organizations, movements, and states; that would certainly preclude the Shining Path from forms of cooperation. As I have stated previously, the Shining Path perpetrated a number of violent attacks against political parties that comprised the Peruvian left, as well as the revolutionary group the MRTA. This uncompromising view of Socialist thought and action isolated them within a broader revolutionary community – eventually causing organizational collapse.
CHAPTER 5

NARRATIVES OF RUSSIA AND PERU
JUXTAPOSED

In order to support Mill, I explore closely the respective historical narratives to further examine the independent variables, in relationship to the dependent variable. I likewise use it to further look at the variance between the Russian Revolution and the Shining Path. Ultimately the Shining Path self-destructed due to their uncompromising and violent ideology, lack of peasant support, and isolated position in relation to other leftist revolutionary movements. This was in stark contrast with the Bolshevik movement within the Russian Revolution, whereas the Bolsheviks were a heterogeneous and effective revolutionary movement with a popular ideology, and thus both urban and rural support from the proletariat.

THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

The beginnings of the Russian Revolution, a bottom-up social crisis, can be traced three significant incidents between 1905 and 1917. The first was on January 9th, 1905, when tsarist troops massacred several hundred peasants. The second was the start of the February revolution in Petrograd, with massive industrial strikes, and a subsequent tsarist oppressive response. The third was the beginning of the October Revolution, ending in the centralization of power by the Bolshevik movement. These cleavages built upon one another, eventually leading to the development of the necessary and sufficient conditions existing within a revolutionary conflict. They allowed for the Bolshevik movement to distribute a popular political ideology, in this case Marxist-Leninism that was accepted by the mass populace as more effective than the tsarist ideology. For a comparison of timelines between the Bolshevik movement and the Shining Path, see Appendix B and C.

January 1905, saw the beginning of popular dissent against the tsarist government. Leading up to the events of “Bloody Sunday” there were several workers’ strikes within Petrograd. Workers marching to the winter palace, lead by father Apollonovich Gapon,
intended to deliver a petition to Tsar Nicholas II. However, the tsar had no intention of acquiescing to the demands of the workers, and the imperial guard fired into the crowd – killing and wounding approximately 1,000 (Kurth 1998). What does this mean in an ideological context, and thus in the context of a historical narrative? It required the Russian urban working class to make a choice between accepting the political ideology of the Russian state and rejecting it. On January 9th 1905, the seeds of rejection were planted.

The events of Bloody Sunday both marked the beginning of the 1905 revolution, and further strengthened the ideological premise of the Bolsheviks. Secondly, in terms of competing ideologies, the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of the Bolshevik party was perceived as more beneficial than the feudalist ideology of the Russian state. This is the critical aspect within the population in relation to the revolutionary movement. The Bolshevik ideology was more successful in appealing to the demands of the urban proletariat, and consequently, the proletariat identified with it over the state ideology. This identification grew exponentially between 1905 and 1917, and therefore carried over into the second event within the narrative – the February Revolution.

With massive demonstrations and industrial strikes, the February Revolution both characterized the population’s discontent with the state, and it’s identification with the Bolshevik party ideology. Simply put, the working class surrounding Petrograd believed that the Bolsheviks could provide them with greater economic, political, and social opportunity than the incumbent tsarist government; that the Bolsheviks could resolve the looming economic stagnation, famine, and social injustice. The February Revolution magnified the role of the popular ideology as well as the effective organizational ability of the vanguard movement.

Similar to the February Revolution, the October Revolution defined the role of the vanguard and popular ideology in terms of competing ideologies between the Bolsheviks and the Russian Provisional Government. Led by socialist Alexander Kerensky, the ideological and subsequent political divide between the provisional government and the Bolsheviks is important to discuss. Again, the population had to make an ideological choice between the

---

27 As I stated in the previous chapter, the military played an important role in the Bolsheviks assuming power. As soldiers were ordered to violently quell the February revolution, there was a massive mutiny within the military ranks. Similar to the proletariat, the military rejected the tsarist ideological perspective.
Bolsheviks and the Provisional Government. The Bolshevik party had the more effective and appealing vanguard party. Likewise, the Bolsheviks held the dominant ideology within a political context, offering greater political opportunity, social and economic stability.\(^{28}\) The population therefore maximized their position and supported the Bolsheviks.

In the end, the Bolshevik party had greater success organizing and distributing its ideology within both the February and October Revolutions. Likewise, the Russian population had a stronger identification with the Bolshevik party, due to its more appealing economic, political, and social agenda. Whereas, the Russian state could not create a strong connection with the Russian population, they had no political support, and subsequently the population had no political enfranchisement. This eventually led to their collapse. The Shining Path in Peru had a similar or equal effect.

**THE PERUVIAN QUAGMIRE**

The Shining Path movement, a top-down movement can likewise be traced to three key events. The first event related to the historical narrative of the Shining Path, is on May 17th, 1980; in which the Shining Path rejected the Peruvian state’s resolve to hold democratic elections. The second is on April 3\(^{rd}\), 1983 when the Shining Path murdered a number of peasants in the Andean village of Lucanamarca. The third event is on September 12\(^{th}\), 1992, when Guzman and several of the senior-leadership of Shining Path was captured by the Peruvian military.

On May 17\(^{th}\) 1980 the Peruvian government returned to democratic form, and held open and free elections for the first time in decades. The majority of revolutionary groups within Peru supported these reforms, and created legitimate political parties.\(^{29}\) However, the Shining Path rejected them, and took its first violent action against the Peruvian political system. During the 1980 elections the Shining Path attacked several polling stations in the

\(^{28}\) Kerensky and the Russian Provisional Government supported Russian allies in World War I; this was immensely unpopular with both the military and the general population, signifying the role of the international community indirectly influencing the Bolshevik movement.

\(^{29}\) Specifically, the Peruvian Communist Party – Unidad, Along with the Peruvian Communist Party – Bandera Roja, the Socialist Workers Party, and the Revolutionary Marxists Workers Party participated in the 1980 elections under the umbrella party The Worker Peasant Student and Popular Front (FOCEP).
Andean mountains. This caused the peasant population to initially support the Shining Path for a couple of interrelated reasons.

First, the attacks on the polling stations were not overtly violent. The Shining Path did not kill indiscriminately, but simply disrupted the democratic political processes within the region, as the peasant population in the Andean mountains were largely disenfranchised, and did not completely trust the Peruvian state. Secondly, their actions within urban areas, specifically Lima, were also only disruptive and largely symbolic. Within Lima, the Shining Path destroyed power lines and other aspects of infrastructure, as well as hanging dogs from lampposts – as a representation of capitalism. It was not until the Shining Path became violent against the rural population did they reject their ideological premise.

On April 3rd 1983, the Shining Path and their relationship with peasants in the Andean mountains fell apart, wherein the Shining Path murdered a total of 69 people, including 22 children. The village leadership would not agree to the demands of the Shining Path, and the Shining Path consequently responded with violence. As stated in the previous chapter, as the level of violence against the peasants increased, their degree of tolerance for the Shining Path dropped. They lost its support from the population due to their violent actions against the peasants in the Andean region. Similar to tsarist Russia in 1917, the peasants further supported the Peruvian state, given greater political enfranchisement, social and economic stability. This in my opinion led to the third development in our Peruvian narrative, the dismantling of Shining Path’s key leadership.

On September 12th 1992, the Peruvian military captured Abimael Guzman and several other senior leaders of the Shining Path. This would not have been likely, if the peasants within the Andean region were more supportive of the organization, in addition to helping the vanguard membership to actively recruit proletariat members from urban areas. Furthermore, at the same time of Guzman’s capture, the Shining Path faced several military defeats to peasant-led defense organizations. These organizations were the by-product of the ideological disconnect and subsequent lack of support between Shining Path and Peruvian peasants. Moreover, because of this the peasants had more of an inclination to work with the Peruvian military acting against the Guzman and the Shining Path.

In a comparison of the historical narratives, the Shining Path was ultimately seen as being less politically, socially, and economically viable, in addition to being more violent and
unstable. Opposite of the Bolsheviks and parallel to the Russian state, the proletariat in Peru rejected the ideological premise of the Shining Path because it lacked political and socio-economic credibility among the rural population. The Peruvian government, despite its problems was ideologically more attractive than the Shining Path, which translated into political support.
CHAPTER 6

LIMITATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

It was my intention to analyze the role of political ideology within revolutionary theory, part and parcel to a revolutionary movement. I ask why Bolsheviks in Russia succeeded while Shining Path in Peru failed. I argue that the Bolsheviks' Marxist-Leninism led them to have strong ties with populace, whereas Shining Path's Maoist vanguard was considered too elitist. At what point was the Bolsheviks as a revolutionary movement successful, and was that success due to their ideological connection with the population; compared to the failure of the Shining Path given the same variable. Simply put, why did the population accept the Bolshevik movement and not the Shining Path? In its clearest form, the question asked is one of a revolutionary movement versus an insurgency, with legitimacy agreed upon in the actions of the respective population.

In further answering the given question, I compared Marxist-Leninism within the Bolshevik movement during the Russian Revolution and Maoism within the Shining Path movement from 1980 to 1992, and how they influenced the population, given the international community as a moderating variable. I hypothesize that, political ideology is used by a revolutionary movement to successfully mobilize and politicize a population’s discontent against the state. In an examination of the hypotheses, the analysis provided a moderate degree of success. Through an effective revolutionary vanguard, political ideology clearly mobilizes the rural and urban population against the state. Bolsheviks succeeded using Marxist-Leninism, while the Shining Path failed using Maoism.

While, the ideology of the revolutionary movement and the ideology of the state are in competition over support of the population; however, in order to be successful, the vanguard party must be representative of the population both socio-economically and politically. Only through accurate representation, can the vanguard party ideology win the support of the population, in regards to the existing state ideology. The political ideology is ultimately a tool for the vanguard to relate to the population, in response to the state, on a broad political and economic basis. One might say that the ideology used by the Shining Path
is not a strict interpretation of Mao Zedong’s premise. Although, I would say that they followed his basic outline and their violent nature is their own mistake.

In using qualitative methods to examine the effect of the international community on the Bolshevik and Shining Path movements, there seems to be a neutral or at the very most a limited effect on the outcome. The international community was clearly opposed to the Bolshevik movement and Marxist-Leninist ideology. Nonetheless, the Bolsheviks successfully centralized power after the revolution. Furthermore, while it was significant that the Shining Path isolated themselves from other similarly-themed organizations and that the U.S. and Europe ideologically supported Peru; the international community did not directly influence the collapse of the Shining Path. It is more likely this is due to the political and social cleavages they had with the Peruvian peasantry.

In the end, it seems questionable that international pressure truly influences the outcome of a revolutionary movement, although this would more than likely benefit from a different, possibly more specific method of analysis. For example, if one were to use social network analysis, the researcher could more accurately examine how the international community interacts with the respective revolutionary movement. Specifically, the various relationships Bolshevik vanguard leadership had throughout Europe. In addition, if one were to take a different theoretical approach, for example, rational choice theory; it might be possible to establish the factors in which international state actors make decisions to support or not support an organization.

In summary, political ideology acts as the link between the revolutionary vanguard and the population, with the vanguard party and the popular ideology are the two necessary aspects of a revolutionary movement. With this in mind, the Bolshevik movement within the Russian Revolution was successful because of a demographically comprehensive and effective vanguard party, as well as an ideology popular with the rural and urban proletariat. The Bolsheviks used ideology to appeal and unite groups of people, whereas the Shining Path used an unpopular and dichotomous ideology to isolate themselves from the population. This is in addition to a failure because of a socio-economically homogenous and ineffective vanguard party, and subsequently a disproportionate level of violence against both the Peruvian state, Peruvian political left and rural indigenous populations.
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APPENDIX A

MAPS
Figure 3. Siberia. Source: Serge, Victor. 1930. “The Map of Russia.”
http://www.marxists.org/archive/serge/1930/year-one/ch08.htm (March 31, 2010).
APPENDIX B

TIMELINE OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION
1904 – 1905
Russo-Japanese War

1905
The Revolution of 1905 in Russia.

January 9 – “Bloody Sunday” – 200 workers led by Father Gapon carrying a petition to the tsar, were shot by the tsar’s troops.

October 18 – October Manifest promises legislature, civil rights

1915
April – Russian revolutionary internationalist paper *Nashe Slovo* appears in Paris.
September – The International Socialist Congress takes place in Zimmerwald, Switzerland.

1916
Growing discontent among both educated elites and the masses

1917
February - After several days of demonstrations in Petrograd (formally St Petersburg) the government orders troops to open fire. An agreement is reached between the Petrograd Soviet and the Provisional Government headed by Lvov.

April 20th to 21st - Opposition to the Foreign Minister Milyukov boils over due to his refusal to renounce annexations.

May - Milyukov resigns. Members of the Mensheviks and the Socialist Revolutionaries join the government.

June 3 - First All-Russia Congress of Workers and Soldiers opens.

June 18 - Offensive launched by Russia against Austria Hungary.

July 3rd to 4th - Workers and soldiers in Petrograd demand the Soviet takes power. Sporadic fighting results and the Soviet restores order with troops brought back from the front. Trotsky arrested. Lenin goes into hiding. A new provisional government is set up with Kerensky at its head (8th).

August - An attempt by General Kornilov to establish a right wing dictatorship is a disastrous flop. Chernov the leader of the Socialist Revolutionaries resigs from the government denouncing Kerensky for complicity in the plot.

September - The Bolsheviks win control of Petrograd.
In the countryside peasant seizure of land from the gentry continues and reaches the level of near insurrection in Tambov.
October - The Bolsheviks overthrow the Provisional government on the eve of the meeting of 2nd All-Russia Congress of Soviets.

October 30th - Kerensky forced away outside Petrograd

Nov 2nd - Bolsheviks gain Moscow

Nov 12th to 14th - Elections are held. Socialist Revolutionaries is the largest party.

December - Congress of Socialist Revolutionaries results in victory for the left under Chernov. Likewise Menshevik Congress gives victory to Martov's Menshevik internationalists.

1918

January 5th - The Constituent Assembly in which the Bolsheviks are a minority meets for one day before being suppressed. Earlier that day a demonstration is fired on by Bolshevik units and several demonstrators are killed

January 28th - Trotsky denounces the German Peace Terms as unacceptable and walks out of the peace negotiations at Brest- Litovsk.

February 1/14 - Russia adopts Western (Gregorian) calendar.

March - The Bolsheviks accept the dictated peace of Brest-Litovsk. The Left SRs denounce the peace and leave the government.
APPENDIX C

TIMELINE OF THE SHINING PATH MOVEMENT
May 17, 1980 - Peru returns to civilian rule with re-election of Fernando Belaunde as president; Shining Path, or Sendero Luminoso, guerrillas begin armed struggle. *Shining Path* launched its first attack, on several polling stations in Andean villages. It later made its debut in Lima by hanging dogs from lampposts, a reference to capitalist "running dogs."

1981 - Peru fights border war with Ecuador over Cordillera del Condor, which a 1942 protocol had given to Peru.

1982 - Deaths and "disappearances" begin to escalate following army crackdown on guerrillas and drug traffickers.

Apr 3, 1983 - Quishua was just 14 when a column of the Maoist rebel group *Shining Path* marched into her southern highland village of Lucanamarca. They were there to exact vengeance for rebel leaders who had been killed in clashes in the village, which had refused to bow to the guerrillas' leadership. They killed 69, including at least 22 children.

Aug 29, 1985 - *Shining Path* killed 47 peasants, including 14 children aged between four and fifteen in the Andean region. Additional massacres by *Shining Path* occurred, such as the one in the village of Marcas

1985 - APRA candidate Alan Garcia Perez wins presidential election and begins campaign to remove military and police "old guard".

1987 - New Libertad movement led by writer Mario Vargas Llosa blocks plans to nationalise banks as Peru faces bankruptcy.

1988 - Peru seeks help from International Monetary Fund; Shining Path guerrilla campaign intensifies.

1990 - More than 3,000 political murders reported; independent centre-right Alberto Fujimori elected president on anti-corruption platform; severe austerity and privatisation programmes launched as inflation reaches 400%.

Sep 12, 1992 - Guzmán and several *Shining Path* leaders were captured by Peruvian military; shortly thereafter the rest of *Shining Path's* leadership fell as well. At the same time, the *Shining Path* suffered embarrassing military defeats to campesino self-defense organizations — supposedly its social base — and the organization fractured into splinter groups. Guerrilla activity diminished sharply thereafter

1993 - New constitution adopted, enabling Fujimori to seek re-election.

1994 - Some 6,000 *Shining Path* guerrillas surrender to the authorities.