

HISTORICAL SCIENCES

THE SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE REVOLUTIONARY LINES OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL AND HO CHI MINH

Nguyen The Phuc

University of Sciences, Hue University, Vietnam

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-9842-6518>

Nguyen Thi Kieu Suong

University of Sciences, Hue University, Vietnam

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17226045>

Abstract

In the course of seeking a path to national salvation for Vietnam, Hồ Chí Minh engaged with and assimilated various revolutionary ideologies from around the world, most notably Marxism–Leninism and the revolutionary line of the Communist International (Comintern). However, Hồ Chí Minh did not adopt these doctrines mechanically. Instead, he creatively applied their core revolutionary principles to the specific historical and social conditions of Vietnam. A comparative study of the revolutionary strategies of the Communist International and Hồ Chí Minh not only elucidates their shared objectives and methods of struggle but also highlights Hồ Chí Minh's strategic intellect and independent revolutionary thought, which played a decisive role in guiding Vietnam to success. This article delves into the similarities and differences between the two revolutionary paths, thereby underscoring Hồ Chí Minh's revolutionary leadership and strategic wisdom.

Keywords: the Communist International (Comintern), Ho Chi Minh, Revolutionary lines, Marxism–Leninism

1. Introduction

The Vietnamese revolution has undergone a long and arduous struggle for national independence and freedom, in which the influence of international revolutionary movements—especially the Communist International—played a significant role. Nevertheless, each revolutionary movement had its own unique characteristics, shaped by the specific contexts and goals of individual nations. A prominent example of the connection between the international communist movement and the Vietnamese revolution is Hồ Chí Minh—an eminent leader who inherited and further developed revolutionary ideals from abroad into a path tailored to Vietnam's unique circumstances.

The similarities and differences between the revolutionary lines of the Communist International and Hồ Chí Minh are most clearly observed in their guiding principles, strategic orientations, and specific objectives. While the Communist International emphasized the unification of global revolutionary movements into an international proletarian front, Hồ Chí Minh focused on creatively adapting revolutionary theory to Vietnam's national context, constructing a revolutionary path grounded in local realities. This article aims to analyze the key similarities and distinctions between the revolutionary strategies of the Communist International and Hồ Chí Minh, thereby shedding light on both the influence of international communism on Vietnam's revolution and Hồ Chí Minh's innovations in applying revolutionary theory to Vietnamese conditions.

2. The Emergence of the Communist International and Hồ Chí Minh's Journey to National Salvation

2.1. The Birth and Formation of the Communist International's Revolutionary Line

The Communist International (Comintern) was an international organization of Communist Parties, established with the aim of promoting global proletarian revolution and fostering solidarity among revolutionary movements worldwide. Its creation was closely linked to several pivotal events in early twentieth-century history, particularly the October Revolution of 1917, the success of the Bolshevik Party under Vladimir Lenin's leadership, and the subsequent expansion of the international workers' movement.

Historical origins and context: Following the triumph of the October Revolution in 1917, Soviet Russia became the first nation to establish a proletarian government. This victory served as a powerful source of inspiration for revolutionary movements and Communist parties around the world, especially those fighting for national liberation in colonial territories. By the early twentieth century, communists in many countries had come to realize the need for an international organization to support and coordinate revolutionary efforts in the colonies. Although earlier international organizations—such as the First and Second Internationals founded by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels—had played important roles in shaping workers' movements, none had successfully organized a coherent global revolutionary front. The Comintern was founded to fill this void.

Founding declaration: On March 2, 1919, in Moscow, the Communist International was formally established during a congress of Communist delegates from various countries. The Bolshevik leadership—particularly Lenin and the Communist Party of Russia—played a central role in this process. The primary objective of the Communist International was to unite communist parties across the world, organize revolutionary movements, and secure proletarian leadership in colonial nations in the struggle against imperialism and

capitalist forces. The organization did not limit itself to revolutionary efforts in Europe but sought to extend its influence to colonies and oppressed regions in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Program and objectives: The Comintern proposed a program of action aimed at fostering a global revolutionary movement, advancing class struggle, and establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat. Its key objectives included: disseminating Marxist–Leninist theory—particularly its emphasis on proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship; intensifying revolutionary movements in various countries—particularly those with a strong and active working-class movement—in order to fight against imperialism, capitalism, and counter-revolutionary forces; and organizing international workers’ associations, conferences, and coordinated uprisings across different countries.

Role and influence: The Comintern exerted a profound influence on communist movements worldwide throughout the interwar period, between the First and Second World Wars. Nevertheless, it was often criticized for excessive interference in the internal affairs of national Communist Parties, which led to fragmentation within revolutionary movements and reduced their autonomy. The Comintern also faced challenges in maintaining strategic unity due to differing conditions and revolutionary approaches among member countries.

Dissolution and long-term legacy: Although the Comintern was dissolved in 1943 amidst the global upheaval of World War II, its establishment and activities left a profound legacy on the history of international communist and workers’ movements. Communist Parties around the world continued to draw on the theoretical foundations and revolutionary strategies promoted by the Comintern well into the twentieth century. More than a political organization, the Comintern symbolized international solidarity among the working class and global revolutionary forces, encompassing national liberation and people’s democratic revolutions. Its emergence marked a significant turning point in the history of the world revolutionary movement, representing what Nguyễn Thế Lực described as “a tremendous victory of Marxism–Leninism over opportunism and revisionism” (Nguyễn Thế Lực 2006, p. 28). Despite its relatively short existence, the legacy of the Comintern continued to shape communist and revolutionary movements in numerous countries for decades to come.

2.2. The Formation of Hồ Chí Minh’s Revolutionary Line

In 1858, French colonial forces invaded Vietnam, sparking a series of patriotic movements aimed at reclaiming national independence. Figures such as Trương Định, Nguyễn Trung Trực, Trần Tấn, Đặng Như Mai, Nguyễn Xuân Ôn, Phan Đình Phùng, Nguyễn Thiện Thuật, and Nguyễn Quang Bích emerged as prominent leaders in anti-colonial resistance. However, these movements largely failed due to the absence of a correct revolutionary line. Rooted in feudal ideology, they were often characterized by loyalty to the monarchy, intense nationalism, and a spirit of vengeance, rather than clear strategic direction.

Entering the early 20th century, patriotic movements in Vietnam began adopting bourgeois ideological elements. Exemplary efforts include the Đông Du Movement led by Phan Bội Châu, the Đông Kinh Nghĩa Thục (Tonkin Free School), the Duy Tân (Modernization) movement, and the Việt Nam Quang Phục Hội (Vietnam Restoration League), with key figures such as Phan Bội Châu, Trần Quý Cáp, Nguyễn Hưởng, Phan Châu Trinh, Huỳnh Thúc Kháng, Ngô Đức Kế, Đặng Nguyên Cánh and etc.... Compared to their feudal predecessors, these movements showed improvement in organization and scale, and “had a revitalizing effect on Vietnam’s patriotic spirit” (Trịnh Nhu, Vũ Dương Ninh 1996, p. 20). However, they also failed to achieve the ultimate goal of national independence. These successive failures reflected a profound crisis in Vietnamese society at the time—specifically, a deadlock regarding the path to national salvation and a lack of a coherent revolutionary strategy.

Hồ Chí Minh (1890–1969), born in Nghệ An Province—a region renowned for its revolutionary tradition and resistance against foreign invasion—emerged within this historical context. Inheriting the patriotic legacy of figures such as Phan Bội Châu, Phan Châu Trinh, and Nguyễn Thái Học, etc., Hồ Chí Minh chose a different path. Rather than following in their footsteps, he sought to understand the sources of successful bourgeois revolutions in the West—such as the English, French, and American Revolutions. As he declared: “I went abroad to see France and other countries. After observing how they did things, I would return to help my fellow countrymen” (Trần Dân Tiên 1986, p. 14).

In 1911, Hồ Chí Minh left Vietnam from the Nhà Rồng Wharf in Saigon and traveled to France. In 1912, he arrived in the United States and stayed until mid-1913 before moving to the United Kingdom, where he remained until 1917. Toward the end of 1917, he returned to France (Song Thành 2006a, p. 54). In France, the first major turning point in Nguyễn Tất Thành’s political career occurred in 1919, when he, along with Phan Văn Trường and Phan Chu Trinh, drafted and submitted a petition to the Versailles Conference under the pseudonym Nguyễn Ái Quốc. The petition, consisting of eight points, was titled *The Claims of the Annamite People*. Upon its submission, the petition was published in full by *L’Humanité* and *Le Populaire*, the official newspapers of the French Socialist Party. Although these demands were ignored by U.S. President Woodrow Wilson, they generated significant attention in France and internationally. French newspapers such as *L’Humanité* and *Le Populaire* published the full text, and the initiative profoundly influenced Vietnamese public consciousness. As noted by Song Thành, “a courageous Vietnamese, under the name Nguyễn Ái Quốc, for the first time dared to bring the political issue of Vietnam to the international stage, demanding fundamental, legitimate rights for the nation—a watershed moment in Vietnam’s journey toward independence” (Song Thành 2006a, p. 66).

The spirit of this *Petition* provided further impetus for Nguyễn Ái Quốc’s political activism in France during this period, culminating in his decision to join the

French Socialist Party. On August 2, 1919, he published his first article in *L'Humanité*, titled "The Question of the Indigenous People," which echoed the core themes of the Eight Demands and denounced France's brutal colonial policies in Indochina. Then, on June 16–17, Hồ Chí Minh encountered Lenin's Preliminary Theses on the National and Colonial Questions published in *L'Humanité*. Speaking about his emotions and realizations after reading V.I. Lenin's *Theses*, Ho Chi Minh wrote: "In those theses, there were many difficult political terms. But I read them again and again until I grasped the essentials. Lenin's theses moved me deeply, enlightened me, and filled me with confidence. I was so happy I cried. Sitting alone in my room, I exclaimed as if addressing a crowd: '*Dear oppressed compatriots! This is what we need; this is the path to our liberation!*' From then on, I had complete faith in Lenin, in the Third International" (Hồ Chí Minh 2011e, p. 562).

Alongside the event of reading V.I. Lenin's *Theses* (1920), Nguyễn Ái Quốc (Ho Chi Minh) voted in favor of the Third International (December 1920), participated in the 1st (1920) and 2nd (1922) Congresses of the French Communist Party, attended the First Congress of the Peasants' International (October 1923), the Fifth Congress of the Communist International (June 17 – July 8, 1924), authored *The Judgment of French Colonialism* (1925), *The Revolutionary Path* (*Đường Cách Mệnh*, 1927), and wrote the *Political Thesis* (1930). These key events laid the essential ideological, theoretical, and organizational foundations for the establishment of the Communist Party of Vietnam in 1930. Based on his revolutionary praxis and the ideas expressed in his works during this period, it can be affirmed that "Ho Chi Minh's thought on the revolutionary path of Vietnam had been fundamentally formed" (Võ Nguyên Giáp, 2003, p. 30). From that point onward, Ho Chi Minh came to be regarded as "a model communist and internationalist fighter" (Marx–Lenin Institute, 1990, p. 46).

3. The Similarities between the Revolutionary Lines of the Communist International and Hồ Chí Minh

Through our research, we have identified several key similarities between the revolutionary strategies of the Communist International (Comintern) and Hồ Chí Minh:

First, in terms of theoretical foundations, both the Communist International and Ho Chi Minh's thought were grounded in Marxist–Leninist theory, which posits that "*class struggle is the driving force of historical development*" (Marx & Engels, 1995, p. 199), and that the proletarian revolution is the means of emancipation for both the class and humanity as a whole—a revolution that Marx and Engels described as "*a universal social revolution*" (Marx & Engels, 1995, p. 338). The crucial point of convergence between the theoretical frameworks of the Communist International and Ho Chi Minh's ideology lies in their shared inheritance and further development of the fundamental principles of Marxism–Leninism—particularly the view that "*class struggle is the driving force behind the development of human social history*" (Marx & Engels,

1995, p. 199), and that the proletarian revolution is the only path to liberation from oppression and injustice. This solid theoretical foundation served as the basis for the entire political platform, strategic orientation, and methods of action of both the Communist International and Ho Chi Minh's revolutionary line.

Marxism–Leninism posits that throughout human history, society has evolved through struggles between progressive productive forces and obsolete, reactionary ruling classes. In capitalist societies, the working class represents the advanced productive force, yet suffers systemic exploitation by the bourgeoisie. Hence, proletarian revolution is seen as a necessary means to abolish class oppression and establish a new social order in which laboring people hold power. Under Lenin's leadership, the Communist International spread this theory globally, with a particular emphasis on exporting revolution to colonized and semi-colonized nations—regions subjected to dual oppression: by foreign imperialism and by local feudal systems. Thus, the Communist International advocated for national liberation revolutions led by the proletariat as an integral component of the global proletarian revolution. This achievement affirms that "the great merit of V.I. Lenin and the Communist International lies in the fact that, for the first time in the history of the struggle against capitalism, they were able to unite national liberation movements into a single, cohesive force—recognizing them as an integral part of the structure of the world revolution" (Nguyễn Thành, 1987, p. 103).

Hồ Chí Minh systematically studied Marxism–Leninism and applied its principles—especially those of class struggle and proletarian revolution—in a flexible and creative manner suited to Vietnam's specific conditions. He identified the fundamental contradiction in early 20th-century Vietnamese society as that between the Vietnamese people and French colonialism. Yet he did not isolate national liberation from class struggle. Instead, he viewed them as dialectically linked. For Hồ Chí Minh, true national liberation must entail social liberation and human liberation—objectives achievable only through proletarian revolution. He clearly affirmed the central role of the working class and the Communist Party as the only force capable of leading the revolution to final victory, famously declaring: "To save the country and liberate the nation, there is no other way than the proletarian revolution" (Hồ Chí Minh, 2011, a, 1, p. 30), and: "Only a party that creatively applies Marxism–Leninism to its country's specific conditions can lead the national liberation revolution to victory and the socialist revolution to success" (Hồ Chí Minh, 2011, f, 15, p. 391). This perspective aligned closely with the revolutionary direction advocated by the Communist International.

Both also emphasized the pivotal role of revolutionary theory in guiding social transformation. Marx noted, "Theory also becomes a material force once it grips the masses" (Marx & Engels, 1995, a, 1, p. 580). Similarly, Hồ Chí Minh asserted, "Without revolutionary theory, there can be no revolutionary movement" (Hồ Chí Minh, 2011, d, 11, p. 93). For both, theory was not mere abstraction but a strategic tool for action—a compass for decision-making. Therefore, both Hồ Chí

Minh and the Comintern prioritized the building of a new type of party, cadre training, and political education for the masses as indispensable elements of revolution.

From this shared theoretical foundation, both Hồ Chí Minh and the Communist International understood class struggle as a fundamental driving force of social progress and proletarian revolution as the necessary path toward national liberation and the eradication of injustice. This ideological congruence provided a solid theoretical basis for linking the Vietnamese revolution to the broader international revolutionary movement, and also served as a bulwark “against distortions of Marxism–Leninism from both the left and the right” (Viện Quan hệ Quốc tế, 2005, , p. 139). Later, the dissolution of the Comintern would “cause fragmentation within the socialist bloc, weaken global revolutionary forces, and complicate international relations to the detriment of national liberation struggles—Vietnam’s included” (Trần Minh Trường, 2005, , p. 21).

Second, regarding objectives: Both Hồ Chí Minh and the Communist International shared a vision of overthrowing colonial and feudal regimes to establish a socialist society. They agreed that the ultimate goal of revolution was not merely regime change, but the complete emancipation of humanity from oppression and exploitation. Their shared vision sought to build a just, egalitarian, and humane society—ushering humanity from the “realm of necessity” into the “realm of freedom,” where “the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all” (Marx & Engels, 1995, c, 39, p. 258). Accordingly, both revolutionary paths prioritized the struggle against colonialism, imperialism, and other forces obstructing national and human development. Their central slogan—“struggle for peace”—united democratic forces willing to join the movement against imperialist war (Viện Quan hệ Quốc tế, 2005, , p. 137).

Founded in 1919 under Lenin’s leadership, the Communist International called for global proletarian revolution. This was reflected in Lenin’s appeal: “Proletarians of all countries and oppressed nations, unite!” (Lenin, 1981). A key priority was the liberation of colonized peoples from imperialist oppression and support for revolutionary uprisings in the East. Thus, “the colonial question became a focal point in the Comintern’s agenda” (Hùng Thắng & Nguyễn Thành, 2005, , p. 33). In its manifesto, the Comintern viewed national independence as a precondition for the establishment of proletarian rule and the eventual construction of a classless, communist society.

For Hồ Chí Minh, particularly after adopting Marxism–Leninism and engaging with the Comintern, national independence was a vital, non-negotiable prerequisite for any further revolutionary goals. He argued that without national independence, no ideology—not even communism—could be realized. Thus, Hồ Chí Minh emphasized that the foremost task of the revolution was national liberation, to be followed by social reform and the building of socialism. This position carried “a truly global revolutionary significance” (Phạm Xanh, 2009, , p. 29). In his Brief Political Strategy for the Communist Party of Vietnam, he wrote:

“While promoting the slogan of Annam’s independence, we must simultaneously propagate and carry out international solidarity with the oppressed nations and the global proletariat” (Đảng Cộng sản Việt Nam, 1999, , p. 5).

The similarity between these two revolutionary lines is further reflected in the shared perception that revolution is not merely a political event, but a long-term process requiring the integration of political, ideological, and economic struggles. Both the Communist International and Ho Chi Minh emphasized that revolution must be rooted in the active participation of the working masses—who constitute the principal force and fundamental driver in overthrowing exploitative and oppressive powers.

In addition, the shared revolutionary objective of both ideologies is evident in their vision of a universal society—a world of equality, freedom, and peace, without war, class divisions, or racial discrimination. Ho Chi Minh once asserted: “Nothing is more precious than independence and freedom!” (Ho Chi Minh, 2011c, Vol. 5, p. 1), and further emphasized: “Only communism can save humanity and bring to all people—regardless of race or origin—freedom, equality, fraternity, solidarity, prosperity on this earth, jobs for all and by all, joy, peace, and happiness; in short, a true world republic, eliminating capitalist boundaries that have until now stood as long walls separating workers from understanding and loving one another” (Ho Chi Minh, 2011a, Vol. 1, p. 496). These ideals were entirely consistent with the revolutionary platform of the Communist International.

Thus, the similarity between the Communist International and Ho Chi Minh regarding revolutionary goals was not merely a theoretical convergence, but a “practical unity forged through struggle” (Phan Ngọc Lien, 1995, p. 84). Both identified national liberation as the central mission in colonial contexts and saw it as the breakthrough point toward constructing a new society. These ideals inspired the revolutionary spirit of millions of Vietnamese patriots, creating a broad-based liberation movement throughout the 20th century and leaving a profound mark on human history. Ho Chi Minh, indeed, “placed the Vietnamese revolution within a global context” (Nguyen Phuc Luan, 1999, p. 52).

Third, regarding methods: relying on the masses, especially the worker–peasant alliance, to carry out armed struggle

A crucial and prominent similarity between the revolutionary methods of the Communist International and Hồ Chí Minh lies in their shared emphasis on mass mobilization—particularly of the worker–peasant alliance—as the foundational force in conducting armed struggle. Rooted in the Marxist–Leninist principle that “revolution is the work of the awakened and organized masses, and armed uprising is the highest form of mass movement” (Phạm Quốc Thành, 2007, , p. 128), both lines of thought advanced a strategy wherein the revolutionary process is carried out by the people themselves. This viewpoint is not merely a strategic directive but also a fundamental and immutable principle in the course of carrying out the proletarian revolution.

According to Marxism–Leninism, human history is a history of class struggle. In capitalist societies, the working class is the truly revolutionary class, and the one capable of initiating the most thorough transformation (Phạm Ngọc Dũng, 2007, , p. 17). The Communist International inherited and expanded upon this concept, asserting that successful proletarian revolution must be led by the Communist Party and executed by the masses—mainly workers and peasants. For this reason, every revolutionary movement guided or supported by the Comintern focused on organizing, educating, and mobilizing the masses as the subjects—not just the objects—of revolution. As Phan Ngọc Liên and Trịnh Vương Hồng (2001, p. 166) observed: “The global revolutionary movement advanced thanks to the guidance of the Communist International.”

The Communist International not only encouraged peaceful political struggles but also regarded armed struggle as a necessary and inevitable means under specific circumstances. The October Revolution of 1917 became the archetype of a successful proletarian revolution—organized, led, and carried out by the working class through resolute, armed resistance against the old ruling order.

Hồ Chí Minh absorbed this perspective early in his revolutionary journey. He understood that Vietnam’s independence could not be granted by imperial powers or restored by feudal elites. Instead, liberation would require the mobilization of “the strength of the people” (Phạm Hồng Chương, 2003, , p. 191)—those who had the most direct and profound stake in the success of national liberation. This ideology was clearly articulated by Ho Chi Minh in his official documents, writings, speeches, and most notably through his efforts in building revolutionary forces in Vietnam. Hồ Chí Minh consistently emphasized the decisive role of the working class as the vanguard of the revolution, while also recognizing the vital contributions of the peasantry, which made up the majority of Vietnam’s population.

As early as 1925, when organizing the Vietnam Revolutionary Youth Association, Hồ Chí Minh prioritized the recruitment and training of cadres from the working class and peasantry. He sought to disseminate revolutionary theory among the masses, awaken patriotic consciousness, and inspire a readiness to resist colonial domination.

In Hồ Chí Minh’s view, political and armed struggle were not mutually exclusive; they were complementary. Depending on the historical stage and material conditions, one could take precedence over the other. However, when the revolutionary moment arrived, the people had to be prepared to seize power through armed insurrection. As he asserted, “Political power does not come by itself; it must be seized through struggle and the sacrifice of the people.” This was most clearly demonstrated during the August Revolution of 1945, when the unified strength of the entire nation, organized and led by the Communist Party of Vietnam, rose up in unison to seize power from the colonialists and feudalists.

Both Hồ Chí Minh and the Communist International understood that revolution could not rely on a

small elite or intellectual class alone. Instead, revolution must be the collective uprising of the working masses. Revolutionary methodology is not merely theoretical; it must be transformed into practical action—where every citizen becomes a revolutionary fighter.. The masses were not simply recipients of propaganda but were, in fact, the principal agents of change. This methodological similarity ensured that the Vietnamese revolution was not merely a national movement but one deeply intertwined with the global revolutionary wave. The fusion of national and class struggle, of theory and mass mobilization, of political and armed action, became a hallmark of both Hồ Chí Minh’s and the Comintern’s revolutionary strategy.

Ultimately, both revolutionary lines affirmed that the key to success lay in the decisive role of the masses—especially the worker–peasant alliance—in initiating and sustaining armed struggle to overthrow oppressive regimes and establish a government of the people. This approach represented the synthesis of revolutionary theory and practical action, of internationalist ideals and national identity, giving rise to a powerful and enduring force for national liberation and socialist construction.

Fourth, in terms of revolutionary organization: both emphasized the leading role of the Communist Party.

A fundamental similarity between the revolutionary strategies of the Communist International and Hồ Chí Minh lies in their unequivocal affirmation of the essential and irreplaceable leadership role of the Communist Party in the revolutionary process. Both frameworks are grounded in the Marxist–Leninist conviction that only a political party representing the working class, possessing a tightly organized structure, a scientifically grounded ideology, and deep roots among the masses, can successfully guide the revolution to its final triumph.

The Communist International was established with the mission of uniting Communist Parties around the world into a single, unified international revolutionary movement. Within its ideological framework, the Comintern consistently emphasized the central role of the Communist Party as the primary instrument for organizing, directing, and sustaining revolutionary activity. Its resolutions clearly articulated that only a Communist Party, grounded in Marxist–Leninist principles, could initiate revolution, guide it toward victory, and safeguard its achievements. The Party was not only the core of leadership but also a symbol of unity in politics, ideology, and action.

Hồ Chí Minh, upon adopting these principles, did not replicate them mechanically. Rather, he adapted them to Vietnam’s unique historical and social conditions. From the founding of the Vietnam Revolutionary Youth Association in 1925, he prioritized the political education and ethical training of a cadre force characterized by revolutionary integrity, ideological commitment, and deep knowledge of Marxism–Leninism. This preparation was intended to lay the foundation for establishing a new-type revolutionary party: the Communist Party of Vietnam. In his seminal work *Revolutionary*

tionary Path (1927), Hồ Chí Minh stressed the indispensable role of a revolutionary party, stating: “To carry out revolution, there must be a revolutionary party,” and that “the Party must firmly uphold the working-class stance, taking Marxism–Leninism as the compass for all its actions.” This viewpoint reflects a profound alignment with the Comintern’s position on the Communist Party as the sole force capable of organizing, leading, and defending the revolution.

Both Hồ Chí Minh and the Communist International viewed the Party’s leadership as not merely political, but also ideological and organizational. The Party was to serve as the guiding force of the working class, with strict discipline, clear revolutionary ideals, and a close relationship with the people. It could not function as a bureaucratic entity removed from reality; rather, it had to embody the will, aspirations, and interests of the working class and the broader laboring population.

Therefore, when the Communist Party of Vietnam was founded in 1930 under the leadership and guidance of Nguyễn Ái Quốc, one of its fundamental organizational principles was loyalty to Marxist–Leninist theory, the implementation of unified and centralized leadership, and the assurance of internal democratic principles. The Party’s leadership was comprehensive, encompassing political strategy, the organization of popular struggles, the building of mass fronts, and the launching of armed uprisings.

The Comintern likewise mandated that Communist Parties operate as vanguard forces, overcoming reformism, opportunism, and narrow nationalism. It envisioned these Parties as nuclei for mobilizing all authentic revolutionary forces. This perspective profoundly influenced Hồ Chí Minh’s thinking on party organization and development. He consistently regarded Party building as a central task throughout every stage of the revolutionary process, emphasizing that only a strong Party—grounded in sound theoretical foundations and closely connected to the people—could successfully lead the revolutionary cause.

Thus, both the Comintern and Hồ Chí Minh were united in their conception of the Communist Party as the highest form of revolutionary organization—the vanguard of the proletariat, the force that shapes and guides the revolutionary process. This convergence provided a durable theoretical and practical foundation for both the Vietnamese and international revolutionary movements.

4. The Differences between the Revolutionary Lines of the Communist International and Hồ Chí Minh

First, a fundamental difference lies in the interpretation and determination of the nature of revolution in the colonial context of Vietnam.

The Communist International, particularly in the early 20th century, primarily focused on fostering proletarian revolutions in advanced capitalist nations. It adopted the October Revolution in Russia as the paradigmatic model of socialist revolution and promoted a model centered on the class struggle between the proletariat and bourgeoisie within industrialized societies.

From this perspective, the Comintern emphasized that the proletarian revolution—led by the working class and aimed at overthrowing the capitalist regime—was the universal and inevitable path for all oppressed nations. Although the Comintern had issued resolutions on national liberation movements in colonial countries (such as at its Second Congress in 1920), the practical application of these ideas remained underdeveloped. In particular, the relationship between national liberation struggles and the socialist revolution was not fully clarified in theory or practice—especially in contexts as specific and complex as Vietnam’s.

In contrast, Hồ Chí Minh, drawing upon Vietnam’s unique realities as a colonized, semi-feudal nation—with a nascent proletariat and a predominantly peasant population—argued that the foremost and most urgent revolutionary task was national liberation. For him, social revolution was only possible after the nation achieved political independence. He asserted that, in the Vietnamese context, the national liberation struggle and the class struggle were closely connected; however, the class struggle could not be placed above the national struggle. National liberation was the immediate and decisive contradiction, and addressing it was a necessary precondition for any subsequent class-based transformation.

Thus, the revolution led by Hồ Chí Minh was defined as a national democratic people’s revolution—a transitional phase required to pave the way for the socialist revolution. He clearly stated that the first step was to gain national independence; only then could Vietnam proceed with comprehensive social reform along the path of socialism. This perspective demonstrated Hồ Chí Minh’s dialectical and creative application of Marxist–Leninist theory to Vietnam’s historical context.

For Hồ Chí Minh, the nature of revolution in Vietnam was not solely class-based; it was, above all, a national revolution aimed at liberating the people from colonial domination. It bore the characteristics of mass participation, national solidarity, and international alignment. This emphasis on national liberation, adapted to the colonial condition, represents a distinctive feature of Hồ Chí Minh’s revolutionary thought as compared to the general line of the Comintern.

From this foundational difference, Hồ Chí Minh advocated for a broad-based national alliance—uniting all patriotic forces regardless of class origin—so long as they shared the objective of resisting imperialism and achieving independence. This inclusive approach helped expand the national united front and mobilize the collective strength of the entire population in the liberation struggle.

Whereas the Comintern approached revolution primarily through a class-based lens, Hồ Chí Minh supplemented this with a national lens—placing the struggle for independence at the core, and only subsequently pursuing the socialist transformation. This strategic shift represented an original and contextually appropriate innovation that ultimately contributed to the success of the Vietnamese revolution.

Second, a notable difference lies in the approach to revolutionary alliances

A significant distinction between the Communist International and Hồ Chí Minh pertains to their respective views and strategies regarding the composition of revolutionary alliances. The Comintern, grounded in the Marxist–Leninist theoretical framework, held that the working class (proletariat) was the sole force capable of leading a successful revolution. Accordingly, it emphasized the formation of a proletarian-led alliance—primarily between workers and peasants—as the foundation for advancing the global proletarian revolution.

In its official documents and directives, the Comintern tended to discount or underestimate the role of social strata outside of the working class and peasantry, especially the petty bourgeoisie, intellectuals, small landlords, and even national bourgeois elements. These groups were often viewed with skepticism, as potential conduits for opportunism or deviation from proletarian principles. As such, the Comintern's directives generally discouraged broad-based alliances that included non-proletarian forces, for fear of diluting the class character of the revolution.

In contrast, Hồ Chí Minh, responding to the complex sociopolitical conditions in colonial Vietnam, adopted a much more pragmatic and inclusive approach. He understood that the Vietnamese revolution, first and foremost a national liberation movement, demanded the broadest possible unity of all patriotic forces, regardless of class background. This required overcoming rigid class distinctions to forge a unified front against the common enemy: colonial imperialism and feudalism.

Thus, Hồ Chí Minh advocated for a revolutionary alliance that extended beyond the working class and peasantry to include intellectuals, small landlords, national bourgeois elements, and other patriotic groups. His strategy was to unite all those who were willing to fight for independence, regardless of their class origins or ideological leanings. This approach was clearly articulated in the 1930 Political Thesis of the Communist Party of Vietnam, which stated: “We must establish contact with all oppressed peoples and exploited classes in order to jointly overthrow imperialism and feudalism.” This principle became foundational to Hồ Chí Minh's doctrine of building a National United Front—a broad political coalition that transcended class boundaries in pursuit of national independence. The Việt Minh Front, established in 1941, was the most prominent manifestation of this approach. It mobilized not only workers and peasants, but also students, intellectuals, merchants, and even progressive landlords—all united in the anti-colonial struggle. This mass-based, inclusive alliance proved decisive in the success of the August Revolution in 1945.

Hồ Chí Minh's initiative to broaden the great national unity bloc was not merely a tactical maneuver but a deeply strategic vision. He recognized that under the brutal repression of colonial rule, a successful revolution could not rely solely on one or two social classes. Instead, it was essential to mobilize all patriotic forces—including those not yet fully committed to socialism but willing to join the struggle for national in-

dependence. This inclusive approach reflected a pragmatic yet principled understanding of revolutionary dynamics in colonized societies.

This inclusive and flexible view of revolutionary alliances represents a clear departure from the more rigid class-centric orientation of the Comintern. Hồ Chí Minh's model emphasized unity over uniformity, and patriotism over class exclusivity, without abandoning the long-term socialist goal. His strategic innovation lay in recognizing that national liberation was the common denominator that could bind diverse social forces into a single revolutionary movement.

In this way, Hồ Chí Minh transformed the Marxist–Leninist concept of class alliances into a broader framework of national solidarity. His success in doing so illustrates not only his political pragmatism but also his capacity to adapt universal theories to specific historical and cultural contexts. This difference in approach proved to be a key factor in the widespread support and eventual triumph of the Vietnamese revolution.

Third, the difference in cultural and national approaches: the Comintern's class-oriented model versus Hồ Chí Minh's integration of national traditions and patriotism

A profound and strategically significant difference between the revolutionary lines of the Communist International and Hồ Chí Minh lies in their respective approaches to culture, national identity, and indigenous traditions. The Comintern, shaped by the context of industrialized Europe and a developed proletarian class, primarily emphasized a universal, class-based model of revolution grounded in Marxist–Leninist theory. This orientation led to a tendency to overlook or downplay the role of local cultures, historical specificities, and traditional values—particularly in colonized or semi-colonial societies. Consequently, the Comintern promoted a model of international revolution that prioritized ideological uniformity and attempted to replicate the experience of the October Revolution across vastly different national contexts. In doing so, it often failed to account for the distinct cultural and historical characteristics of societies like Vietnam, where social structures, values, and political consciousness differed significantly from those in Western Europe.

In contrast, Hồ Chí Minh early recognized that a successful revolution in Vietnam could not be achieved solely through abstract theoretical frameworks or externally imposed models. He understood that national culture—particularly the spirit of patriotism, traditions of solidarity, and moral principles such as gratitude and filial piety—constituted powerful sources for mobilizing popular support and sustaining revolutionary spirit. Rather than viewing culture as secondary or neutral, Hồ Chí Minh placed it at the center of revolutionary strategy. Therefore, while firmly adhering to Marxist–Leninist principles, Hồ Chí Minh applied them in a flexible and creative manner, adapting them to the specific historical and cultural conditions of the Vietnamese nation.

Hồ Chí Minh did not separate class struggle from the broader context of national liberation, which was

the most urgent demand of the Vietnamese people under colonial domination. Therefore, his revolutionary slogan was not merely to overthrow the domestic ruling class, but to "Expel the French colonizers – achieve national independence." This marked a fundamental shift in revolutionary thought—from a purely class-based theoretical framework to a synthesis of class and national struggle. This perspective is clearly articulated in seminal works such as *The Colonial Question* and *The Revolutionary Path*, where Hồ Chí Minh asserted: "To save the nation and liberate the people, there is no other path than the proletarian revolution" (Hồ Chí Minh 2011e, 30).

Thus, he did not isolate class struggle from national liberation, nor did he see Marxism–Leninism as incompatible with indigenous values. Instead, he developed a synthesis in which revolutionary theory was adapted to resonate with the lived experience and moral values of the Vietnamese people. Core cultural principles such as patriotism, solidarity, "drinking water, remember the source" (a Vietnamese idiom for gratitude), and respect for tradition became integral to the revolutionary message.

Hồ Chí Minh's slogans and propaganda reflected this cultural sensitivity. Rather than using abstract class terminology, he invoked familiar moral and historical narratives that appealed to peasants, intellectuals, and workers alike. His calls to "resist the French to save the country" or "nothing is more precious than independence and freedom" reflected both revolutionary purpose and cultural continuity. This was a decisive break from the Comintern's abstract and often Eurocentric rhetoric.

Such cultural integration was also evident in Hồ Chí Minh's emphasis on preserving and promoting Vietnamese identity within the revolution. He argued that "Culture lights the path for the nation" (Hồ Chí Minh, 2011), insisting that cultural development was inseparable from revolutionary struggle. As a result, revolutionary efforts were accompanied by campaigns to preserve the Vietnamese language, uphold traditional customs, and promote patriotic education. Even in his personal conduct, Hồ Chí Minh exemplified cultural modesty, simplicity, and closeness to the people—values deeply ingrained in Vietnamese social norms. In organizing the revolutionary movement, Hồ Chí Minh also encouraged cadres to maintain a simple lifestyle and remain close to the people, reflecting the spirit of "nationalizing" the revolution.

This culturally grounded approach enabled Hồ Chí Minh to translate Marxist–Leninist ideology into a language accessible to the masses, thereby fostering broad-based support for the revolutionary cause. The result was not a diluted form of Marxism, but a culturally enriched and politically effective application of it. By "nationalizing" revolutionary theory, Hồ Chí Minh succeeded in building a movement that was both ideologically coherent and socially resonant. Hồ Chí Minh's principle of "taking the people as the root" was, in essence, a vivid manifestation of his assimilation of Marxism–Leninism through the cultural and national lens of Vietnam.

In contrast, the Comintern's relative neglect of cultural factors limited its ability to adapt revolutionary theory to diverse colonial contexts. Its rigid class-centered framework often failed to inspire or mobilize populations with strong national and cultural identities. Hồ Chí Minh's success in Vietnam underscores the necessity of blending universal theory with national particularity—demonstrating that cultural insight is not a supplement to revolution, but one of its essential pillars.

Thus, while the Comintern focused primarily on class ideology and internationalism, Hồ Chí Minh offered a revolutionary model that synthesized socialism with patriotism, international solidarity with cultural heritage, and class struggle with national pride. This synthesis not only distinguished his revolutionary line but also helped ensure its legitimacy, popularity, and ultimate success in the Vietnamese context.

Fourth, differences in methods of struggle: the Comintern's emphasis on class-based violent revolution versus Hồ Chí Minh's flexible combination of political, military, diplomatic, and cultural means

A prominent difference between the revolutionary lines of the Communist International and Hồ Chí Minh lies in their respective approaches to the methods of struggle. While the Comintern prioritized radical and often violent class struggle as the principal vehicle for revolution, Hồ Chí Minh adopted a more pragmatic, flexible approach—emphasizing the strategic combination of political mobilization, armed resistance, diplomacy, and ideological persuasion, with a consistent emphasis on national unity and patriotism.

The Comintern, grounded in the revolutionary experience of Soviet Russia and the Marxist–Leninist emphasis on the "dictatorship of the proletariat," often regarded violent class confrontation as both necessary and inevitable. The October Revolution had demonstrated the viability of seizing state power through armed uprising, and the Comintern sought to universalize this method as the essential model for global revolution. Within this framework, violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of proletarian dictatorship were considered indispensable steps toward socialism.

This rigid adherence to armed class struggle often resulted in a one-size-fits-all approach, with insufficient adaptation to the specific socio-political realities of colonized nations like Vietnam. The Comintern's methods prioritized the internal class contradiction over other strategic considerations, including national identity, historical conditions, and geopolitical balance.

In contrast, Although Hồ Chí Minh adopted the spirit and theoretical foundation of Marxism–Leninism and affirmed the necessity of class struggle, he did not absolutize this form of struggle. Instead, he advocated for the combination of multiple methods—political, diplomatic, armed, and ideological-cultural struggles—executed with a high degree of flexibility and pragmatism. In his thought, class struggle was always subordinated to the overarching goal of national independence. Therefore, in specific historical contexts, expanding the national united front and mobilizing all patriotic

forces—including landlords and national bourgeois elements—was not only necessary but a strategic imperative.

He stated unequivocally: “National liberation takes precedence above all else” (Hồ Chí Minh, 2011, b, 3, p. 230). This principle guided his decision to prioritize the unification of all patriotic forces, including elements not traditionally aligned with the proletariat. During the August Revolution of 1945, he spearheaded the Việt Minh Front, which welcomed all social classes and political tendencies into the anti-colonial struggle. His strategy was not rooted in ideological rigidity, but in an acute understanding of national urgency and political timing.

Moreover, Hồ Chí Minh consistently advocated for the coordination of armed struggle with political activism and diplomatic engagement. In the resistance wars against both France and the United States, he combined guerrilla warfare with international diplomacy and ideological education. He sought international solidarity, lobbied for recognition at global forums, and emphasized public diplomacy to expose the crimes of imperialism and win support from progressive forces abroad.

This flexibility was not opportunistic; it was a strategic application of Marxist–Leninist principles in light of Vietnam’s colonial and semi-feudal reality. While the Comintern often advanced a monolithic model of revolution, Hồ Chí Minh adjusted the tactical balance according to the objective and subjective conditions of struggle.

He also placed strong emphasis on the role of ideas and morality in revolutionary practice. For Hồ Chí Minh, a successful revolution required not only arms and organization but also ethical conviction, national spirit, and intellectual clarity. Revolutionary struggle had to embody the people’s deepest aspirations and reflect their cultural values.

In essence, whereas the Communist International emphasized direct and violent confrontation with the ruling class as the principal method of revolution, Hồ Chí Minh embraced a strategy of integration—blending armed resistance with diplomacy, ideology with culture, and political struggle with popular mobilization. He elevated national unity above class exclusivity and subordinated theoretical orthodoxy to practical effectiveness.

This difference in method underscores the broader distinction in revolutionary vision: the Comintern’s approach was marked by ideological absolutism and doctrinal uniformity, while Hồ Chí Minh’s strategy was rooted in dialectical reasoning, political flexibility, and a profound understanding of Vietnam’s national reality. It was this adaptive and people-centered method that enabled the Vietnamese revolution to secure decisive victories in the mid-twentieth century.

Conclusion

Hồ Chí Minh adopted Marxism–Leninism as introduced through the Communist International, but applied it with flexibility and creativity, in accordance with the concrete conditions of Vietnam. While profoundly influenced by international revolutionary theory, he did not mechanically follow the models of other

countries. Instead, Hồ Chí Minh adapted core revolutionary principles to suit the particular historical, cultural, and social context of Vietnam. His revolutionary thinking and praxis reflected independent judgment, a sharp sense of realism, and a firm prioritization of national interests.

Hồ Chí Minh’s approach placed national liberation at the forefront, considering it the prerequisite for subsequent social transformation. For him, freedom from colonial domination was the indispensable first step, without which any aspiration toward socialism would be unattainable. Therefore, he strategically emphasized the mobilization of all patriotic forces, the unification of the national front, and the deployment of a multi-pronged revolutionary strategy—including armed struggle, political advocacy, diplomacy, and ideological education.

In doing so, Hồ Chí Minh demonstrated a capacity not only to absorb Marxist–Leninist theory but to master and transform it—shaping a revolutionary path that was distinctly Vietnamese and broadly effective. His methods revealed an astute ability to reconcile the universal with the particular: applying global theory in local practice, without sacrificing the foundational goals of socialism and human emancipation.

His flexibility in combining different forms of struggle, especially his integration of military, political, and diplomatic efforts with cultural and moral elements, proved crucial in ensuring the success of the Vietnamese revolution. Rather than isolating the working class as the sole revolutionary subject, he united all oppressed and patriotic forces, fostering a broad coalition that made possible victories such as the August Revolution and the subsequent wars for national independence.

This success is not only a testament to Hồ Chí Minh’s strategic wisdom and ideological clarity but also serves as a powerful example of how revolutionary theory must be rooted in national conditions and adapted to the lived realities of a people. It affirms that revolutionary leadership requires not just ideological commitment, but the courage to think independently, to innovate in practice, and to serve the people with deep empathy and unwavering dedication.

In sum, Hồ Chí Minh brought forth a new current of revolutionary thought—independent, reality-driven, and deeply humanist. His legacy demonstrates the ability to master revolutionary theory not by imitating models, but by applying its principles in ways that are responsive to time, place, and people. Under his leadership, the Vietnamese revolution achieved monumental victories, laying the groundwork for national independence, freedom, and development. His path remains a compelling model of how revolutionary movements in the Global South can blend universal ideals with national identity, and theory with practice, to shape their own destinies.

References:

1. C. Marx, F. Engels. (1995a). *Collected Works*, Vol. 1. Hanoi: National Political Publishing House.
2. C. Marx, F. Engels. (1995b). *Collected Works*, Vol. 2. Hanoi: National Political Publishing House.

3. C. Marx, F. Engels. (1995c). *Collected Works*, Vol. 39. Hanoi: National Political Publishing House.
4. Dương Trung Quốc, Đào Hùng. (2005). “Hồ Chí Minh – An Embodiment of Peace Culture.” Hanoi: Saigon Culture Publishing House.
5. Communist Party of Vietnam. (1998). *Complete Party Documents*, Vol. 2. Hanoi: National Political Publishing House.
6. E. Copelev. (1985). *Comrade Hồ Chí Minh*. Hanoi: Youth Publishing House.
7. Hồ Chí Minh National Academy of Politics. (2005). *Textbook on the History of the Communist and International Workers’ Movement*. Hanoi: Theoretical Politics Publishing House.
8. Hồ Chí Minh. (2011a). *Collected Works*, Vol. 1. Hanoi: National Political Publishing House.
9. Hồ Chí Minh. (2011b). *Collected Works*, Vol. 3. Hanoi: National Political Publishing House.
10. Hồ Chí Minh. (2011c). *Collected Works*, Vol. 5. Hanoi: National Political Publishing House.
11. Hồ Chí Minh. (2011d). *Collected Works*, Vol. 11. Hanoi: National Political Publishing House.
12. Hồ Chí Minh. (2011e). *Collected Works*, Vol. 12. Hanoi: National Political Publishing House.
13. Hồ Chí Minh. (2011f). *Collected Works*, Vol. 15. Hanoi: National Political Publishing House.
14. Hùng Thắng, Nguyễn Thành. (2006). “President Hồ Chí Minh – Pioneer Fighter on the Front of National Liberation.” Hanoi: People’s Public Security Publishing House.
15. Hữu Ngọc. (2006). “A Sketch of French Cultural Portrait.” Hanoi: Literature Publishing House.
16. M. V. Iordan. (1985). “Proletarian Internationalism against Nationalism.” Hanoi: Theoretical Information Publishing House.
17. Nguyễn Khánh Bật. (2010). “Similarities and Differences in Revolutionary Views between Hồ Chí Minh and the Indochinese Communist International (1930–1941).” Hanoi: National Political Publishing House.
18. Nguyễn Phúc Luân. (1999). “President Hồ Chí Minh – A Great Thinker in Modern Vietnamese Diplomacy.” Hanoi: National Political Publishing House.
19. Nguyễn Thành. (1987). “The Communist International and the Colonial Question.” Hanoi: Marx–Lenin Schoolbook Publishing House.
20. Nguyễn Thế Lực. (2006). “Understanding the Subject of Communist, International Workers’ Movements and Global Geopolitics.” Hanoi: Theoretical Politics Publishing House.
21. Phạm Hồng Chương. (2003). “Hồ Chí Minh’s Thought on Basic Issues of the Vietnamese Revolution.” Hanoi: National Political Publishing House.
22. Phạm Ngọc Dũng. (2007). “Hồ Chí Minh’s Creative Application and Development of Marxism–Leninism on the Communist Party.” Hanoi: National Political Publishing House.
23. Phạm Quốc Thành. (2007). “Hồ Chí Minh’s Thought on National Liberation in the 1920s.” Hanoi: National Political Publishing House.
24. Phạm Xanh. (2001). “Nguyễn Ái Quốc and the Dissemination of Marxism–Leninism in Vietnam (1921–1930).” Hanoi: National Political Publishing House.
25. Phan Ngọc Liên, Trịnh Vương Hồng. (1994). “Hồ Chí Minh – International Revolutionary Fighter.” Hanoi: People’s Army Publishing House.
26. Phan Ngọc Liên. (1994). “Exploring Hồ Chí Minh’s Thought on International Issues.” Hanoi: National Political Publishing House.
27. Philippe Devillers. (2003). *Paris–Saigon–Hanoi*. Hanoi: Hồ Chí Minh City: General Publishing House.
28. Song Thành. (2006a). *Biography of Hồ Chí Minh*. Hanoi: Theoretical Politics Publishing House.
29. Song Thành. (2005b). *Hồ Chí Minh – A Brilliant Thinker*. Hanoi: Theoretical Politics Publishing House.
30. T. Lan. (2007). *Tales Along the Journey*. Hanoi: Hồ Chí Minh City: Youth Publishing House.
31. Trần Dân Tiên. (1986). *Stories of President Hồ’s Revolutionary Life*. Hanoi: Sự Thật (Truth) Publishing House.
32. Trần Minh Trường. (2005). “President Hồ Chí Minh’s Diplomatic Activities (1954–1969).” Hanoi: People’s Public Security Publishing House.
33. Trịnh Nhu, Vũ Dương Ninh. (1996). “On Hồ Chí Minh’s Path to National Liberation.” Hanoi: National Political Publishing House.
34. Trường Chinh. (1975). *The Vietnamese National Democratic People’s Revolution*, Vols. 1–2. Hanoi: Sự Thật (Truth) Publishing House.
35. V. I. Lenin. (1995). *Collected Works*, Vol. 29. Hanoi: National Political Publishing House.
36. Institute of Marxism–Leninism. (1990). *President Hồ Chí Minh – A Steadfast Fighter of the National Liberation and Communist Movements*. Hanoi: Theoretical Information Publishing House.
37. Institute for International Relations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. (1990). *President Hồ Chí Minh and Diplomatic Work*. Hanoi: Sự Thật (Truth) Publishing House.
38. Võ Nguyên Giáp. (2003). “Hồ Chí Minh’s Thought and the Vietnamese Revolutionary Path.” Hanoi: National Political Publishing House.
39. Võ Văn Sung. (2010). “Reflections on the Hồ Chí Minh School of Diplomacy.” Hanoi: National Political Publishing House.
40. Vũ Dương Huân. (2005). “Hồ Chí Minh’s Thought on Diplomacy.” Hanoi: Youth Publishing House.
41. Vietnam National Commission for UNESCO. (1995). *Proceedings of the International Conference: President Hồ Chí Minh – National Liberation Hero, Great Man of Culture*. Hanoi: Social Sciences Publishing House.
42. William J. Duiker. (1995). *Hồ Chí Minh – A Life*. Hanoi: Hồ Chí Minh Institute and Leaders of the Party, Hồ Chí Minh National Academy of Politics.