

The Evolution of Marxist Foreign Policy Interpretations and Contemporary Chinese Application

Name: Jake Preston Sweely

Category: Social Sciences

The People's Republic of China was founded in 1949 after decades of civil and world war between communist, nationalist, and Japanese forces. The Chinese Communist Party (CCP), under the singular leadership of Mao Zedong, emerged victorious out of the chaos and established a socialist state with fundamental ideology derived from the theories of Karl Marx. Mao had led and been involved with the communist movement in China for decades, and during that time had established his own thoughts and alterations on established theories of Marx and Vladimir Lenin.¹ Upon coming to power as autocrat of the new People's Republic of China (PRC), Mao, like Lenin and Josef Stalin before him, had the chance to apply Marxist theory to practice regarding all aspects of statehood, including foreign policy.

Since the creation of the new state, the PRC has grown into a major world power, and since the turn of the millennium, has become an economic superpower with trade relationships encompassing much of the world. After the normalization of relations between China and the United States in the 1970s, the PRC has increased economic ties with the West to attain manufacturing equipment and expertise, and since the 1990s the new industrial powerhouse has created trade relationships with many African nations to fuel its economic growth by finding markets and by attaining necessary natural resources.² When considering the basic tenets of thought along the Marxist-Leninist ideological strain, it is intuitive to ask: is contemporary Chinese foreign policy in line with Marxist interpretations of international relations? Global trade with capitalist economies, fueled by interactions with former colonies, seems to in fact fall under the Leninist description of Imperialism as the highest form of capitalism, in contradiction

¹ Elias Mandala, "The West 'Loses' China – and the World" (lecture, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY, September 16, 2015).

² David H. Shinn and Joshua Eisenman, *China and Africa: A Century of Engagement* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012), 111-121.

to the functions and goals of Marxist theory and practice.³ An analysis of various Marxist foreign policy interpretations and practices (including those of Marx, Lenin, Stalin, Mao himself, and others), in conjunction with a description of China's trade policies with African states, leads to the conclusion that modern Chinese foreign policy is the modern iteration of a practical usage of Marxist ideas to achieve state-oriented goals. In other words, contemporary leaders of the Chinese state bend Marxist ideas from various thinkers to practically advance the goals of the People's Republic. As time proceeds, the theories within Marxist ideology and the application of said theories have become increasingly practical, resulting in modern Chinese foreign policy.

Development of Marxist Foreign Policy Interpretations and Practices

Karl Marx and Frederick Engels originally published the pamphlet, *The Communist Manifesto*, in 1848. This short work, bolstered by subsequent writings by the two men, including *Das Kapital* by Marx, establishes the basic ideology now known as Marxism. In general, the theory is economic in substance and postulates a natural historical transgression of class struggle, which will evolve the current capitalist economic system into socialism, followed by communist utopia.⁴ The founders of the ideology were not very interested in international relations; after all, contemporary "Napoleonic Europe" was essentially peaceful. Neither man lived to see the imperialist outburst of the Great War, and so they theorized that the national capitalist systems were largely self-contained, and would collapse from simultaneous workers' revolutions.⁵

³ Vladimir Lenin, "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism," in *Essential Works of Lenin*, ed. Henry M. Christman (New York: Bantam Books, 1966).

⁴ Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *The Communist Manifesto*, (New York: International Publishers, 1975).

⁵ V. Kubalkova and A.A. Cruickshank, *Marxism and International Relations*, (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1985), 27-29.

According to fundamental Marxist theory, capitalism is a global economic system which develops evenly and homogeneously among developed powers, which will ultimately collapse *simultaneously* around the world from proletarian revolutions. There is no room for the coexistence of socialist and capitalist states, and thus they would not be able to interact with one another.⁶ Socialism is based on collective ownership, and, according to Marx and Engels, that logically means universal collective ownership at the global level. Even the existence of separate socialist states is logically fallacious under the basic theories created by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels.⁷ By the turn of the 20th Century, both founders would be dead, but their ideas lived on. Economic developments and interactions between nations after their deaths, culminating in the First World War, necessitated Marxism evolve to answer for these new conditions. Various thinkers, including Vladimir Lenin, sought to minimize the shortcomings of the original ideology in their contemporary circumstances.

The outbreak of global war between the major imperial world powers in 1914 dramatically affected the worldview of many contemporary Marxists. The ghastly conflict amongst European empires quite obviously introduced a new facet into the international capitalist system, and this ultimately had to be answered theoretically for Marxism to remain relevant. Vladimir Lenin, a Russian Marxist, wrote “Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism,” while in exile in Switzerland in 1916, after two years of being surrounded by brutal conflict between European states. In this work, Lenin synthesizes and develops arguments made by fellow Marxist scholars, including the ideas by Nikolai Bukharin, regarding the modern form of imperialism as the final, parasitic stage of capitalism, before global socialist revolution.⁸ In the

⁶ Ibid., 36.

⁷ Ibid., 39-40.

⁸ Ibid., 46; Lenin, “Imperialism,” in *Essential Works of Lenin*, 248.

essay, Lenin expands upon ideas first set forth by Marx, and actually contradicts him at times. One of these alterations regarded national economies. Bukharin argues that as individuals are members of national economies, as Marx describes, national economies themselves are part of a world economy, and are thus interdependent and interactive with one another.⁹ Additionally, he and Lenin combine the state and its capitalists, as ‘state monopoly capitalism,’ expressing a necessary competition between states and their bourgeois elites after competition is ended within countries from the formation of monopolies.¹⁰ Both of these assertions are inconsistent with Marx’s original analysis of capitalism, as he maintained that capitalism was sustained within independent territories, even as a global economic system.

In “Imperialism,” Lenin reasons that imperialism develops as the last stage of capitalism, with five essential features and prerequisites to its emergence: the concentration of production and capital into monopolies; the merging of banks and industrial capital, creating “financial capital” and financial oligarchy; the export of capital, as opposed to the export of commodities or products; the formation of international capitalist monopolies which share the world for themselves; and finally the territorial division of the world among the greatest capitalist powers.¹¹ Competition between imperial powers for markets dominates global political activity, and “colonial possession alone gives complete guarantee of success to the (national) monopolies against all the risks of the struggle with competitors.”¹² To Lenin and Bukharin, war between capitalist powers becomes inevitable, as an extension of economic competition. Amending Carl von Clausewitz’s 18th Century analysis, these theorists claim that war is not simply an extension

⁹ Ibid., 48.

¹⁰ Lenin, “Imperialism,” in *Essential Works of Lenin*, 237.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid., 232.

of politics, but is an extension of economic production itself.¹³ This idea answered for the outbreak of war in Europe in 1914. On the other hand, upon the creation of socialist states, their coexistence with capitalist powers would be short, according to Lenin, as the existing belief that simultaneous revolution was only revised. Aggression on the part of socialist states and the initiation of war was advocated for, as this would exasperate global revolution.¹⁴ Again, this assessment was contradictory to Karl Marx's original ideology, but it also set the foundation for foreign policy of the Soviet Union in the next decades. The ideological realm of Marxism expanded to encompass theories of how nations interact, but upon the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917 and the creation of the first socialist state, practical necessity would lead to further theoretical development and debate.

The founding of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) greatly affected Marxist ideology surrounding international relations, as it was the first state to emerge with Marxism as official doctrine. Vladimir Lenin led the Bolshevik Party during the revolutionary period and served as the country's first head of state, making him the most powerful and influential Marxist in the world. According to Louis Fisher, "most of the basic principles of Soviet foreign policy between 1917 and 1923 originated with Lenin, but, in the final analysis, with the Bolshevik's conception of capitalism and imperialism."¹⁵ Incidentally, these Bolshevik "conceptions" themselves were decisively influenced by the theoretical works of Lenin as well. Upon the collapse of the Russian Provisional Government in 1917, the nation devolved into civil war. Foreign powers intervened on behalf of forces hostile to the Bolsheviks. The fledgling socialist

¹³ Kubalkova, V., and A.A. Cruickshank, *Marxism and International Relations*, 51-52.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ Louis Fisher, *The Soviets in World Affairs: A History of Relations Between the Soviet Union and the Rest of the World* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1930), 461.

state was at risk of collapsing before it was even truly founded, and these circumstances led Lenin to take certain actions out of the practical necessity to buy time.

A multitude of capitalist countries sent troops to wage war against the Red forces in the Russian Civil War in the early 1920s, after the conclusion of the Great War. Lenin sought to create schisms between these powers and take advantage of their natural willingness to compete with one another, according to his own theory. “This strategy of defense was perhaps the most marked characteristic of Lenin’s foreign policy. It aimed to divide the forces of the enemy and weaken the united front against Bolshevism. It aimed, in like manner, to win time even at the expense of serious loss of territory or apparent loss of honor.”¹⁶ The Soviet leader repeatedly reached out to his enemies asking for peace, and offered larger land concessions than requested to buy time.¹⁷ According to Lenin, any policy which either promoted revolution or led to communism was rightful to conduct.¹⁸ Lenin’s New Economic Policy, which introduced some small scale capitalist elements into the post-civil war Soviet economy, and the signing of the international Treaty of Rapallo increased Soviet ties to the established international system and watered down the application of original Marxism.¹⁹ These are all examples of policies pursued by Lenin which practically ensured the survival of his newborn state at the expense of stringent ideological adherence.

Kubalkova and Cruickshank argue that, prior to Stalin’s reign in the USSR, Soviet foreign policy was developed with hierarchical priorities, with constant, basic Marxist-Leninist ideology at the pinnacle, above strategy, which in turn superseded specific policies and tactics.²⁰

¹⁶ Ibid., 462.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Kubalkova, V., and A.A. Cruickshank, *Marxism and International Relations*, 74.

¹⁹ Ibid., 79.

²⁰ Ibid., 72-75.

Vladimir Lenin acted at least nominally in accordance to his own theories, to strategically ensure the survival of the first socialist state, through specific methods which are seemingly contradictory to Marxist-Leninist ideology itself. Out of practical necessity, Lenin as head of state was willing to take actions which ensured the survival of at least his own single socialist state, even if that meant acting contrarily to his own theories, and those of Karl Marx. As long as he was protecting the first bastion of the global proletarian revolution, his policies were justifiable. After Lenin's death in 1924, a struggle of Marxist ideology and power would occur in the Soviet Union, largely between Leon Trotsky and Josef Stalin. The result of this would evolve socialist foreign policy further in the direction of the practical achievement of state-oriented goals.

The succession struggle between Stalin and Trotsky was both a fight for power between ambitious men and a battle of different ideas. Although their differences were largely regarding domestic issues, perhaps the most ideologically relevant point of contention regarded international relations: Trotsky's advocacy for permanent global revolution, and Stalin's for "socialism in one country."²¹ Trotsky's position, which advocated pursuing global proletarian revolution, had strong ideological support from Marx himself and Lenin's theoretical writings. The theorist saw capitalism's fundamental weakness as being global economically and yet split politically. It would be absurd for socialism to be reduced to the same detrimental system.²² Stalin, on the other hand, asserted that Trotsky's position was realistically untenable. After all, after the rise of the Soviet Union, world revolution did not break out, and where revolution did emerge, it was largely disastrous. Kubalkova and Cruickshank summarize Stalin's perspective, and sociopathic practicality, with the following assertion:

²¹ Ibid., 79-80.

²² Ibid., 80.

Stalin was too much of a state leader and a politician to gamble on such imponderables and instead proceeded with all speed, and ruthlessly, to subordinate other goals (including Marxism in its entirety) to a socialism in one country strategy; which in the domestic context became the doctrine “revolution from above.”²³

Instead of viewing policy goals through the framework of Marxist ideology, Stalin viewed Marxism itself through the framework of promoting the state he built, and sought to bolster the USSR’s strength in any possible way. To him, that was to secure socialism within the confines of the state before spreading it elsewhere.

When Stalin defeated his ideological opponent (largely through political manipulation, rather than by convincing others), the Soviet Union’s rhetoric turned to a siege mentality. Interstate competition between the capitalist world and the socialist one became in and of itself class struggle.²⁴ He sought integration into the existing world order to achieve the benefits that accompany that, such as having a say in the League of Nations, vastly industrialized the largely-agrarian country, and modernized the military to prepare for potential conflict with Western capitalist democracies and the newly-established Third Reich.²⁵ Unlike his predecessors, “Stalin’s theory of international relations is a conglomeration of *ex-post facto* justifications for courses of action already taken.”²⁶ The new autocrat of the first socialist state was above all pragmatic, and sought the preservation and advancement of his state at any cost, with any policy. While Lenin expanded upon Marxist theory to fit the changing world, and while some of his policies actually contradicted Marxist ideas to buy time for the Soviet Union, Stalin applied policies which simply advanced the goals of the state and then after the fact formulated theoretical justifications for such actions. The manipulation of Marxism itself by Stalin to the

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Ibid., 85.

²⁵ Ibid., 82-83; John Erickson, *The Soviet High Command: A Military-Political History, 1918-1941* (Portland, OR: Frank Cass Publishers, 2001), 352-358.

²⁶ Ibid., 84.

circumstances he faced as head of state was adopted by Mao Zedong in his theories and actions during the mid-20th Century as well.

Mao spent much of the 1920s and the entire 1930s heavily involved with the guerrilla communist movement in China, fighting at first the nationalist Kuomintang and then Japanese invaders. Throughout this period, the leader studied Marxist ideology, and rose to prominence as a theorist and leader within the Chinese Communist Party (CCP). Recognizing some of the inherent problems with original Marxism, and some in Lenin's writings as well, Mao altered these theories to fit the specific Chinese historical, cultural, and economic circumstances.²⁷ Years before gaining sovereignty, the founder of the People's Republic of China displayed a willingness to manipulate foundational ideology of Marxism so it could be a more effective, and more relevant, ideological force in the East. After all, Marx and Engels were both Europeans who had not traveled widely, and original Marxist theory is thus very Eurocentric in general. During the long civil war period in China, Mao published many works regarding military philosophy, but only a handful regarding diplomatic ideas.²⁸ Therefore, his specific theoretical conclusions before actually coming to power are difficult to identify.

However, after the defeat of the Japanese in 1945, and the exile of the nationalists to Taiwan in 1949, the CCP under the leadership of Mao gained control over China, and as Lenin and the Bolsheviks did before them, established a new state and implemented actual policies. Mao was the undisputed "strongman" in China, and the direction of Chinese foreign relations was derived directly from Mao's personal experiences.²⁹ During his tenure as leader, the PRC's

²⁷ Mandala, "The West Loses China," Lecture.

²⁸ Andrew Bingham Kennedy, *The International Ambitions of Mao and Nehru* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 55.

²⁹ Robert G. Sutter, *Foreign Relations of the PRC* (New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2013), 34.

relationships with other countries and foreign priorities changed dramatically.³⁰ However, even after coming to power, Mao was never personally interested in diplomacy, as he only traveled abroad twice his entire life, and both times to the neighboring Soviet Union.³¹ His first test came soon though, as in 1950 United Nations forces, led by the United States, intervened into the Korean Peninsula conflict between the communist North and Western-aligned South.³² The leader felt threatened by the American military presence so close to his border, especially that of the US Navy in the Taiwan Strait.³³ This led the nation to intervene militarily in the Korean War, sending hundreds of thousands of Chinese soldiers to oppose the Americans and bolster the North Korean state. Clearly, during this early period of Mao's reign the United States was the PRC's major antagonist in the region.

As the United States and the West expressed hostility to the Asian power, the Soviet Union during the early 1950s expressed solidarity with the new socialist state. Mao and Stalin were personally friendly, and their nations signed a cooperative agreement in 1950. In fact, before the PRC had achieved statehood, Mao was reliant on the Soviet Comintern to analyze global affairs.³⁴ This was not a permanently positive relationship though, and in fact Mao's reign in the PRC involves immense shifts in foreign policy. From 1950 to 1969, China and the Soviet Union went from being close allies with similar geostrategic goals to potential hostiles to one another.³⁵ The Cultural Revolution within China during the 1960s changed foreign policy in China for a time, reemphasizing ideological purity over traditional diplomacy.³⁶ Additionally,

³⁰ Ibid., 29.

³¹ Kennedy, *The International Ambitions*, 58.

³² Ibid., 68.

³³ Ibid., 71.

³⁴ Sutter, *Foreign Relations*, 35.

³⁵ Ibid., 29.

³⁶ Ibid., 30.

this upheaval expressed Mao's distaste for Soviet-style bureaucratic socialism, and this in-part led to the schism between the socialist countries.

Leadership in the USSR, after Stalin's death in 1953, came to increasingly blame China for the United States' hardline response in Asia, as the Eastern socialist state had directly intervened militarily in several circumstances outside of its borders. In response to these allegations and developments, "Beijing not only opposed the Soviet Union on ideological grounds but strongly attacked Moscow's willingness to cooperate with the United States in international affairs."³⁷ This schism between the two largest socialist states is immensely important regarding the development of Marxist foreign policy. Marx and Lenin's hopes of global revolution were essentially null at this point, and the two main countries following their general belief system became major geopolitical rivals in the ideological and strategic spheres. In the 1970s, Mao even turned to his greatest enemy, the United States, to offset the potential Soviet threat and import industrial equipment and expertise to the PRC.³⁸ In less than fifteen years, the PRC went from closely allying with the USSR to the brink of war with her ideological cousins, while at the same time proceeding from proxy conflict with the US to economic and diplomatic cooperation. This shift is highly indicative of Mao's practicality in foreign affairs, and his desire to advance the goals of the People's Republic of China. The longer Marxist foreign policy has developed, the more it has been subordinated to the goals of the states in which it is applied.

Contemporary Chinese Foreign Policy with Africa

³⁷ Ibid., 41,48.

³⁸ Shinn and Eisenman, *China and Africa*, 111-121.

Since Mao Zedong's death in 1976, China has rapidly become a global economic superpower, surpassing Japan as the world's second largest economy in 2011.³⁹ This growth has been studied by various scholars over the last few decades, as its immense and consistent rate has amazed economists and historians alike. Ultimately, China's industrialization in the 1970s and 1980s and its low cost labor made it a very attractive location for Western manufacturing. Mao Zedong and his successor, Deng Xiaoping, sought to industrialize the nation after setbacks from the Cultural Revolution, and so the PRC imported large amounts of Western-built machinery during this period.⁴⁰ In general, between 1978 and 2005, China's share in global trade increased from 0.8% to 7.7%.⁴¹ To fuel its rapid manufacturing growth, China in the 1990s and 2000s has sought to secure immense amounts of natural resources and markets for its products.⁴² In doing so, they have turned to Africa. From 1999 to 2010, the value of total Chinese trade (imports and exports) with nations on the African continent grew from US \$6.3 billion to \$128.5 billion.⁴³ While China attains natural resources from this relationship, these countries in return benefit from massive Chinese aid programs that result in the training of many African workers in industrial and agricultural fields and the building of vital infrastructure.⁴⁴ The situation is mutually beneficial, and lacks the coercive aspect that Western interactions with both Africa and China itself have included.

Naturally, when reviewing the facts surrounding the modern Chinese economy and its interactions with other nations independently, one may assume that today's People's Republic of

³⁹ "China overtakes Japan as world's second-biggest economy," Last modified February 14, 2011, <http://www.bbc.com/news/business-12427321>

⁴⁰ Shinn and Eisenman, *China and Africa*, 100.

⁴¹ Padraig Carmody, *The New Scramble for Africa* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2011), 65.

⁴² Shinn and Eisenman, *China and Africa*, 116.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 114.

⁴⁴ Deborah Brautigam, *The Dragon's Gift: The Real Story of China in Africa* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 157-161, 236.

China is socialist in name only. Chinese companies are often state owned, and thus monopolize their certain industries. Chinese companies' activities in Africa are often funded by Chinese banks, which have a degree of control over the terms and duration of said involvement on the continent.⁴⁵ Capital is at times exported by the PRC to Africa in the form of aid or by business relationship established after aid programs are concluded.⁴⁶ These trends can be interpreted as three of the five "essential" features of Lenin's imperialism.⁴⁷ This potential verdict inspires the original question at hand: is contemporary Chinese foreign policy in line with Marxist interpretations of international relations?

Original Marxist theory from the mid-18th Century surrounding international relations is, at best, lacking. As the ideology was further developed to answer for events and trends of the late 19th and early 20th Centuries, its contemporary proponents inevitably altered, expanded upon, and even contradicted certain points made by its founding thinkers. Once the Soviet Union was established as the first socialist state in existence, this evolution was exasperated. Vladimir Lenin, as first Soviet head of state, promoted several policies which were seemingly contradictory to the theories he himself had developed simply to ensure the survival of the new government. Josef Stalin, Lenin's successor, not only was practical in his actions as head of the socialist country, he subordinated "Marxism in its entirety" to the strategy he considered most effective in increasing the power of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.⁴⁸ As revolutionary leader, Mao Zedong manipulated Marxist theory to fit with Eastern tradition, and as autocrat of the PRC, his actions quite obviously reflect a desire to advance the strategic position of his

⁴⁵ Ibid., 140.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 143-145.

⁴⁷ Lenin, "Imperialism," 237.

⁴⁸ Kubalkova, V., and A.A. Cruickshank, *Marxism and International Relations*, 80.

country rather than the advancement of Marxist global revolution. Ultimately, precedent exists within the Marxist sphere which promotes the practical advancement of state-oriented goals.

Today's foreign policy actions of the PRC are largely practical in advancing economic and diplomatic strength, along the line of historical progression in Marxist international relations. However, that does not mean the Chinese do not have legitimate ideological justifications or guidelines to their international goals and maneuvers. First and foremost, the Chinese seek the creation of a multipolar world. According to a variety of academic and political sources, after the collapse of the USSR, , the United States has attempted to create global hegemony, which undermines China's own influence, and that of her Third World sister countries.⁴⁹ A multipolar world would not only increase China's influence compared to the current international model, it would, in the perspective of the PRC's leadership, be a moral improvement by empowering many nations. Current Chinese ideology also hinges on a Leninist correction of Marx, which states that uneven economic development inherently creates inequality.⁵⁰ Marx, on the other hand, saw capitalistic development as homogenous throughout the various industrialized nations of the world. Also, according to certain correspondences of his, he actually viewed European colonialism as a positive historical force, as it brought capitalist development, a necessary prerequisite for the creation of communism, to "backwards" parts of the world.⁵¹ The Chinese thus advocate for the advancement of the developing world, contrarily to original Marxist ideals, and work actively towards achieving that goal.

Perhaps the most important ideological constraints to current Chinese foreign policy are the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence. First established in agreement between China and

⁴⁹ Jenny Clegg, *China's Global Strategy* (London: Pluto Press, 2009), 1-10.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 94.

⁵¹ Kubalkova, V., and A.A. Cruickshank, *Marxism and International Relations*, 24-25.

India in the 1950s, the principles are as follows: mutual respect for territorial integrity; mutual non-aggression; mutual non-interference in internal affairs; equality and mutual benefit; and peaceful coexistence.⁵² Sovereignty is the most important systemic feature to protect, as the “foremost collective human right.”⁵³ Although these ideas were developed under Mao, the period of his rule was too tumultuous for China to follow them at the time. However, today’s Chinese foreign policy is largely constrained by these ideas, though not determined by them. The betterment and survival of the state are the ultimate goals of today’s leaders in China, while the Principles of Peaceful Coexistence serve as a framework to justly achieve those goals.

In its interactions with Africa, today’s government in China is highly flexible.⁵⁴ In fact, “absolute flexibility” is a key feature in the history of Chinese strategic culture.⁵⁵ The ability to respond effectively to different circumstances is central to China’s strategy, and is reflected especially in the socialist state’s interactions with Africa. Its policies vary greatly from country to country, reflecting the PRC’s ability to react to different circumstances in different places. This aspect of Chinese cultural history is important in understanding contemporary Marxist application in the Asian state. Additionally, today, theory is only part of the decision-making process regarding China’s foreign policy.⁵⁶ However, this fact is totally consistent with the development of Marxist foreign policy itself. Whilst many specific policies are not in line with the original theories developed by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, there is a long and detailed history of amending and outright contradicting these founders through the evolutionary development and application of Marxist foreign policy.

⁵² Carmody, *The New Scramble for Africa*, 84-85.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Samuel S. Kim, “Chinese Foreign Policy in Theory and Practice,” in *China and the World: Chinese Foreign Policy Faces the New Millennium*, ed. Samuel S. Kim (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1998), 13.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 11.

Though Marx and Engels intended to provide theoretical direction to their adherents regarding total societal revolution, including the sphere of foreign policy, certain factors have necessitated an evolution of their thought. Firstly, their statements and views surrounding international relations relied upon the analysis of their own historical circumstances, which were decisively affected by the longstanding peace of Napoleonic Europe. The only thing that is inevitable in the progression of history is change. As circumstances changed, Marxist thinkers were forced to reevaluate specific aspects of their ideology, or abandon it as contemporarily irrelevant. A spectrum of different Marxist interpretations has emerged in the last 150 years regarding every statement put forth in *The Communist Manifesto* and *Das Kapital*, not just those involving international relations. Secondly, the ideology itself that Marx and Engels promoted, communism, directly advocated for the destruction of national boundaries. It is unnecessary to develop theories as to how nations should interact with one another if one believes that they will soon be destroyed by revolution. As Marxist ideology is further developed and applied, it has become increasingly practical as a matter of policy, and state oriented. Therefore, it can be concluded that the People's Republic of China's current foreign policy is not out of line with Marxist foreign policy, as it is the most recent expression a practical pursuit of the socialist state's goals.

Bibliography

- Brautigam, Deborah. *The Dragon's Gift: The Real Story of China in Africa*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011.
- British Broadcasting Corporation. "China overtaks Japan as world's second-biggest economy." Last modified February 14, 2011.
<http://www.bbc.com/news/business-12427321>
- Carmody, Padraig. *The New Scramble for Africa*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2011.
- Clegg, Jenny. *China's Global Strategy*. London: Pluto Press, 2009.
- Erickson, John. *The Soviet High Command: A Military-Political History, 1918-1941*. Portland, OR: Frank Cass Publishers, 2001.
- Fisher, Louis. *The Soviets in World Affairs: A History of Relations Between the Soviet Union and the Rest of the World*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1930.
- Kennedy, Andrew Bingham. *The International Ambitions of Mao and Nehru*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2012.
- Kim, Samuel S. "Chinese Foreign Policy in Theory and Practice." In *China and the World: Chinese Foreign Policy Faces the New Millennium*, edited by Samuel S. Kim, 3-33. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1998.
- Kubalkova, V., and A.A. Cruickshank. *Marxism and International Relations*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1985.
- Lenin, Vladimir. "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism." In *Essential Works of Lenin*, edited by Henry M. Christman, 177-270. New York: Bantam Books, 1966.
- Mandala, Elias. "The West 'Loses' China – and the World." Lecture at the University of Rochester, Rochester, NY, September 16, 2015.
- Marx, Karl, and Frederick Engels. *The Communist Manifesto*. New York: International Publishers, 1975.

Shinn, David H., and Joshua Eisenman. *China and Africa: A Century of Engagement*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012.

Sutter, Robert. *Foreign Relations of the PRC*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2013.