

66

# **LENIN AND REVOLUTION IN THE EAST**





# **LENIN AND REVOLUTION IN THE EAST**

**Novosti Press Agency Publishing House**  
*Moscow, 1969*

## PUBLISHER'S NOTE

*Lenin and Revolution in the East* presents a collection of newspaper and magazine articles by Soviet foreign policy experts and journalists.

В. И. Ленин и революционная борьба народов Востока  
на английском языке

Цена 16 коп.

## CONTENTS

<b>B. Gafurov.</b> V. I. Lenin, the October Revolution and the National-Liberation Movement	5
<b>N. Simoniya.</b> Lenin's Concept of Revolutionary-Democratic Dictatorship and Non-Capitalist Development	34
<b>A. Reznikov.</b> How Lenin Fought Sectarianism in the National-Colonial Movement	57
<b>I. Shatalov.</b> Leninist Foreign Policy and the National-Liberation Movement	81
<b>A. Lavrishchev.</b> The Soviet Union and the Developing Countries	102

*B. Gafurov*

## **V. I. Lenin, the October Revolution and the National-Liberation Movement**

The Great October Socialist Revolution ushered in a new epoch in the history of mankind, the epoch of socialism. It inaugurated the era of the liberation of all peoples of the East from colonial oppression, and blazed the way to victorious national-liberation revolutions.

The October Revolution was an inspiration for the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America as they entered the struggle for emancipation from tribalism and feudalism, from colonialism and imperialism. It also pointed to the historical necessity and vital importance of merging the working-class and national-liberation movements into one revolutionary current for the attainment of national and social freedom.

To consolidate the victory of the October Revolution and promote the national-liberation movement of the peoples in the East, Lenin and the Communist Party and the Soviet Government led by him paid great attention to Marxist theory and practice regarding the national question

in their own country and closely studied this problem in the light of the new historical experience. Lenin stressed that the Soviet Republic must rally around itself all the peoples of the East who had risen under the influence of the October Revolution and were struggling for their liberation. In so doing Soviet Russia would become not only the spokesman for the workers of all countries but also the spokesman for all oppressed people. He held that following the victory of the October Revolution the relations between states would be determined by the struggle of a small group of imperialist powers against the revolutionary movement led by Soviet Russia and that the national question could not be solved without due regard for this fact. Lenin also pointed out that the common interests of the working class and the oppressed nations called for the closest alliance between all national-liberation movements, the Soviet republic and the international working-class movement.

Capitalism and imperialism—a powerful and insidious enemy—can be rebuffed and defeated only by merging all revolutionary forces into a single revolutionary front. This explains why Marx, Engels and Lenin, as well as their disciples and followers, were so much concerned with the elaboration and implementation of the principles of proletarian internationalism.

The idea of proletarian internationalism contained in the stirring call of Marx and Engels—“Workers of All Countries, Unite!”—is today a mighty material force in the joint struggle of the working class and of all oppressed peoples for their vital interests and against imperialism. “Soviet experience has shown,” the CPSU Pro-

gramme points out, "that fidelity to the principles of Marxism-Leninism, of proletarian internationalism, their firm and unswerving implementation and defence against all enemies and opportunists, are imperative conditions for the victory of socialism."

There was a time when proletarian internationalism meant chiefly working-class solidarity in separate countries in their struggle against the bourgeoisie and for their economic interests. This concerned mainly the European working class. Now the idea of proletarian internationalism is becoming more and more important internationally.

After the victory of the October Revolution, Marxist-Leninist proletarian internationalism became a mighty weapon in the hands of the international working class, vanguard class in the capitalist states, and of the colonial countries in their defense of the world's first socialist state of workers and peasants against the attacks by imperialist reaction. As for the Soviet people—workers, peasants and intellectuals—their proletarian internationalism is manifested in socialist construction and in the entire foreign policy of the Soviet state.

When the working class and all the peoples of the Soviet Republic, under the leadership of the Communist Party, upheld the gains of the October Revolution, routed the interventionists and defeated the counter-revolution waged by the landlords and bourgeoisie in a long and hard struggle, when they laid the foundations of the world's first socialist system, safeguarded and strengthened the bulwark of the international working-class and national-liberation movement,

they were putting into practice the Marxist-Leninist teaching on proletarian internationalism.

When the Soviet people made a decisive contribution to the defeat in 1941-45 of the crack forces of world imperialism, liberated dozens of nations from the fascist-militarist yoke and saved civilization from a deadly peril, they were putting into practice the Marxist-Leninist teaching on proletarian internationalism.

When the Soviet peoples helped to create an international situation that led to socialist revolutions in 13 countries of Europe, Asia and America, and to national independence of 70 countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America, they were putting into practice the Marxist-Leninist teaching on proletarian internationalism.

With the emergence of the world socialist system, proletarian internationalism became the basis for interstate relations between the socialist countries. In addition, socialist proletarian internationalism also means support and assistance by the socialist countries and the international working-class movement to the struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America for national and social emancipation, for sovereignty, economic independence, and all-round development. It also means the defence of young developing nations against imperialism.

Meanwhile, the dialectical unity of the social and the national, the national and the international has become even more pronounced both on the national and international level. The experience of the international working-class and national-liberation movements, and especially the experience of the socialist countries in the new historical conditions, have confirmed the



correctness of Engels' proposition that truly national ideas, i.e. ideas that grow out of the economic situation existing in the industry and agriculture of a given country, are at the same time truly international ideas since they serve the common and basic interests of the working-class and national-liberation movements. The historical experience of the countries of the world socialist system and of countries following a non-capitalist path of development, the experience of the socialist and national-liberation revolutions, the experience of the working-class movement convincingly show that genuine concern for the people's welfare and for national interests should be inseparably linked with a concern for the interests of the world socialist system, the international working-class and national-liberation movements.

The Marxist-Leninist teaching on the national question, the dialectical unity of the social and the national, the national and the international are manifested in the close alliance of the working class and peasantry at all stages of revolutionary struggle and peaceful construction, in the correct solution of social and national questions, in the close cooperation between the socialist states, the countries following a non-capitalist path of development, the international working-class and national-liberation movements.

The experience of the working people of all nationalities in the USSR, led by the Communist Party, proves that in these questions, too, the Soviet experience can serve as a model for all countries, for the international working-class and national-liberation movements.

By being creative builders of a socialist and communist society, the Soviet people exert a great influence on the working-class and national-liberation movements.

The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution delivered from colonial bondage many millions of people living in the vast outlying regions of the Russian empire and initiated the implementation of the Leninist ideas about international cohesion and the alliance of the working people of different races and nationalities.

The successful solution of the age-old national question, the formation of a fraternal union comprising 131 nations and nationalities and the creation of the world's most powerful multi-national state—these are major achievements of the October Revolution.

The Soviet Union, comprising 15 constituent republics, 20 autonomous republics, eight autonomous regions, ten national districts inhabited by 234 million people, is a great national and international community built on a voluntary and equal basis.

In the last 50 years significant changes have taken place in the country's economy, cultural development and class composition. But the most sweeping changes are found in former backward outlying regions of the Russian state, notably in Uzbekistan, Tadjikistan, Turkmenia, Kirghizia and Kazakhstan. Within a short period of time they had gone from the state of pre-capitalist relations and entered full-scale construction of the material and technical basis of communism; they have gone from backwardness to progress.

from disfranchisement to freedom, from hopelessness to a bright future.

Before the October Revolution Turkestan, as these regions were called then, occupied a vast territory of 3,700 thousand square kilometres, with a population of 13,000 thousand, four-fifths of them being Uzbeks, Turkmen, Tadjiks, Kirghizes and Kazakhs.

The majority of the population—cotton-growers and cattle-breeders—lived in misery and ignorance. They were brutally exploited by local feudal lords, usurers, mullahs, foreign merchants, industrialists and tsarist officials. The tsarist government pursued a policy of national enslavement. Before the Revolution, capitalism was virtually non-existent in Turkestan and, consequently, there was no industrial proletariat. Prevailing in those times was the tribal, subsistence and semi-feudal mode of life. The policy of the tsarist government, the landlords and the bourgeoisie was designed to thwart any attempt by the people to achieve statehood and to develop their national language and culture.

The establishment of Soviet power in these regions encountered tremendous difficulties. Local feudal lords and White Guard generals, inspired and supported by British and other imperialists, resisted the power of workers and peasants. In an attempt to confuse the masses they asserted that the Soviet Government would pursue a policy similar to the colonialist policy of tsarist Russia, the landlords and capitalists.

Lenin, the Communist Party, the Russian working class and local revolutionaries made great efforts in explaining to the population that the Soviet government's national and social policy

was basically different from that of the exploiters.

In 1917 Soviet power was established throughout Central Asia, with the exception of Bukhara and Khorezm. The Russian working class played a major role in this by helping the local workers and peasants to overthrow tsarist autocracy and defeat the local exploiters and foreign interventionists.

Over the vast expanses of Turkestan, Kirghizia and Kazakhstan two Russias were locked in a fierce class battle—the Russia of exploiters and oppressors, of the Romanovs, Purishkeviches, Ryabushinskys, Kerenskys and the Russia of workers, internationalist-Leninists, who inherited the progressive traditions of the great Russian revolutionary democrats, writers and intellectuals.

The Russia of workers emerged victorious. The revolutionary working class and its vanguard—the Communist Party led by Lenin—proved by deeds to the peoples of Central Asia and Kazakhstan, as to all the other nations, nationalities and ethnic groups of Russia, that the people were the real masters of the country and that all power belonged to them. This power brought them liberty and economic and cultural renaissance. It also ensured the right of all nations in Russia to self-determination, the abolition of all national and religious privileges and restrictions, and the free development of national minorities and ethnic groups.

The Soviet Government's Appeal of January 17(4) 1918 addressed to all working and exploited people reaffirmed the principles of the October Revolution regarding the national question

and the strengthening of friendship among the Soviet peoples.

In explaining the policy of the Communist Party and the Soviet Government on the national question, Lenin repeatedly emphasized that the policy was based on the principle of self-determination for the peoples of Turkestan and the abolition of all kinds of national privileges and the exploitation of one national group by another. That was the only way of overcoming the distrust of the Turkestan working masses towards Russian workers and peasants which had been gradually built up during the long tsarist rule. In November 1919 Lenin sent a letter to the Turkestan Communists pointing out that the establishment of correct relations between the Russian workers and peasants and the peoples of Turkestan was of historical significance. "The attitude of the Soviet Workers' and Peasants' Republic to the weak and hitherto oppressed nations is of practical significance for the whole of Asia, for all the colonies of the world, for thousands and millions of people," he wrote.

The abolition of national oppression, the establishment of national equality and the ensuring of rights to all nations helped dissolve national feuds, won for the working class and the Communist Party the trust of all nations and contributed to the working people's victory over their class enemies—White Guard generals and foreign interventionists.

In Central Asia, Kazakhstan and other economically backward areas the Communist Party and the Soviet Government began to carry out the Leninist policy of eliminating national inequality in the country. They tried to draw the

formerly backward peoples into the work of abolishing tribal-subsistence relations and into socialist construction. Taking into full account the national traditions of these people, the Soviet Government helped them to change from the nomadic mode of life to settled farming, from handicraft production to manufacturing. In directing the objective continuous process of the political, economic, defence, social, cultural, ideological and moral unification of all Soviet nations and nationalities on a socialist basis, the Communist Party and the Soviet Government were guided by the principle of the dialectical unity of the social and the national, the national and the international.

Marx's proposition that every nation can and must learn from other nations has been applied in the Soviet Union. Learning from each other and helping each other, the Soviet socialist nations have been advancing towards common socialist goals. They have strengthened their military and political unity by consolidating the alliance formed in the joint armed struggle against foreign interventionists, White Guard armies, nationalist governments and counterrevolutionary bands during the Civil War. The voluntary union of Soviet nations was given legal form in the first Constitution of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic adopted in July 1918. This union developed, and finally in December 1922, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was formed.

Now the Soviet state has entered a new period of its development—the period of the full-scale construction of a communist society. This, among other things, indicates a major gain of the Soviet

state—the solution of the national question.

Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the peoples of Central Asia and Kazakhstan, like the peoples of the other national regions in the country are actively developing their state, exercising their right to vote, and participating in state administrations.

The formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics played an important role in eliminating inequalities among the peoples. It helped organize cooperation and mutual assistance of all Soviet republics for their speedy economic and cultural advancement.

Industry in the national republics was developing at a fast pace during the years of socialist industrialization, in accordance with the decision of the 14th Congress of the CPSU held in December 1925. As compared with Central Russia, the republics of Central Asia and Kazakhstan had many more difficulties such as the absence of roads and the acute shortage of skilled personnel or even local inhabitants in some areas. However, the Soviet Government helped these republics build large industrial centres during the first Five-Year Plan periods. By 1937 they made a great progress in industry and agriculture such as might take a number of capitalist countries centuries to achieve.

After the minimum of necessary conditions for the country's socialist development were created, the Communist Party, the state and the working people of the Russian, Ukrainian, Byelorussian and other Soviet republics helped the peoples of the formerly backward outlying regions to bypass capitalism and begin building socialism. This happened, for instance, in Kirghizia, Tur-

kmenia and Tadjikistan. A number of other republics were able to advance from early stages of capitalist development to socialism. The experience of the republics of Central Asia and Kazakhstan has definitely proved the correctness and great vital force of the Marxist-Leninist theory on the possibility of advancing from tribalism and feudalism to socialism without going through capitalism.

The correct solution of the general strategic task, that of establishing socialism in every national region, led to an expected result: the entire multi-national country—all nations, nationalities, ethnic groups, all republics, regions, districts and areas—achieved the victory of socialism simultaneously after twenty years of Soviet power. It was the result of the implementation of the Leninist policy on the national question, of applying Lenin's propositions concerning the dialectical unity of the social and the national, the national and the international. It was socialist proletarian internationalism in action. The Russian working class, the working class of all economically advanced regions of the multi-national Soviet Union, fulfilled their internationalist duty by helping the peoples of formerly backward outlying areas, where peasants accounted for 90 per cent of the population, swiftly to accomplish the transition from backwardness to progress.

Before the October Revolution, Kirghizia had almost no industry, with the exception of a new small coal and salt mines, cotton-cleaning, tanning, brewing and flour-grinding enterprises employing several hundred workers, among them only 50 Kirghizes.

Nomadic cattle-breeding was the basic branch



of Kirghizia's economy. Under Soviet Government hundreds of large industries have been built in the republic. Its mining, electronics, farm machine-building and instrument-making industries have made substantial headway. During 1959-65 the republic doubled its industrial output. Today it exports its products to 57 countries.

In Kazakhstan, industrial output has increased 102 times during Soviet years. Dozens of large industrial towns and centres have appeared in the republic. Today it is a major producer of grain and meat in the country. One hundred and one nationalities live in Kazakhstan, all contributing to its progress.

Uzbekistan has also become an industrialized republic. It turns more farm machinery than all the countries of the Middle East taken together. It cooperates with 91 countries in the cultural, scientific and technological fields.

The history of the Soviet Central Asian republics vividly confirms the correctness of Lenin's idea that the main task of the dictatorship of proletariat following the victory of the revolution is to carry out economic-organizational and cultural-educational work. It also confirmed the correctness of Lenin's idea that during transition from a capitalist to a socialist society political tasks should be subordinated to economic tasks.

Owing to the Leninist national policy the Soviet Central Asian republics have outstripped all Asian countries and a number of West European capitalist countries in per capita industrial output. Their cultural achievements are the envy of most countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The Soviet Central Asian republics

are far ahead of Asian countries in the number of schools, specialized secondary schools, higher educational institutions, theatres, cinemas, clubs, scientific centres, newspapers, magazines, books and the number of intellectuals per thousand of the population.

In the field of culture as, perhaps in no other field, millions of formerly backward, downtrodden and oppressed people have come to realize through their own experience, the great significance of the Leninist theory on the national question, the Leninist national and international policy pursued by the Soviet Communist Party and the Soviet state.

The Soviet people are creating a new mode of life, basically different from that in countries where the system of exploitation of man by man prevails. This is clearly manifested in the radical changes that have occurred in the position of women in the Soviet East. Rightless, ignorant and brutally exploited before the revolution, they are now full-fledged participants in the creative process of building socialism and communism. Women account for 54 per cent of the population. They account for 49 per cent of the total number of factory and office employees, 55 per cent of collective farmers, 86 per cent of public health workers, 71 per cent of educational workers, 55 per cent of government employees and various service workers and 44 per cent of all research workers.

Profound changes have taken place in the social and state set up, in the economy and culture, in everyday life of the people in the formerly backward areas. Here it is worth recalling Lenin's idea that the principles of Soviet power

are applicable not only in industrially advanced countries having such a social class as the proletariat, but also in countries with a predominantly peasant population. This idea has been confirmed by the half-century of labour and struggle in all the union and autonomous republics, national regions and territories of the Soviet Union.

The achievements of socialism in the USSR open up tremendous possibilities for the country to score still greater successes. The working people of the Soviet Central Asian republics and Kazakhstan, together with the other Soviet people, are carrying out the tasks set by the 23d Congress of the CPSU. Making use of scientific and technological progress and higher labour efficiency they are striving for greater industrial and agricultural output, which will serve as a basis for the attainment of higher material and cultural standards. What powerful force has enabled the peoples of the Central Asian republics and Kazakhstan to achieve during the last 50 years such rapid progress unimaginable under the former regime? The answer is Leninism, Soviet power, the people that have won this power and are steadily putting into practice Lenin's teaching under the leadership of the Communist Party.

Leninism also constitutes a firm ideological basis for the construction of socialism in other countries, including Asian countries that have taken the path blazed by the Great October Revolution.

For over two hundred years the Mongolian people were under the yoke of foreign oppressors and local feudal lords. They had no industry, farming or monetary system, and they were

illiterate.

The October Revolution saved the Mongolian people as a nation. It provided them with opportunity of establishing a Mongolian people's democratic state and carrying out the people's revolution in 1921 that led to the formation of the Mongolian People's Republic.

Lenin's thesis that backward countries can, with the aid of the proletariat of advanced countries, start building socialism and, after passing through certain stages of development, come to build communism, by-passing the capitalist stage of development, became a powerful ideological weapon in the hands of the Mongolian people and their militant vanguard—the People's Revolutionary Party. It clearly showed the possibility of transition from pre-capitalist relations to socialism. Armed with the Marxist-Leninist theory the Mongolian people have successfully overcome their backwardness inherited from the age of feudal rule and colonialism and have built a flourishing economy and a new culture. They abolished the exploiting classes and established public ownership of the means of production. They have created a healthy socialist state in which all power belongs to the working class, cooperative herdsmen and working intellectuals.

The revolution in Vietnam was also influenced by Marxist-Leninist theory and the experience of the Great October Socialist Revolution. In the national-colonial question, Ho Chi Minh once pointed out, the principles of Marxism-Leninism were triumphantly confirmed by the liberation struggle of the peoples of the East. The October Revolution had a decisive impact on this struggle, and the existence of the Soviet Union was

a major historical factor in its rapid development.

The October Revolution and Lenin's theory on the national question proved invaluable to the Vietnamese people in that it pointed out the path to national and social emancipation. Rallying under the banner of Leninism, the Vietnamese working people and peasantry, the entire nation, led by their militant Marxist-Leninist vanguard, successfully carried out the August Revolution of 1945 and established the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. They expelled the French, Japanese and Chiang Kai-shek colonialists after nine years of the War of Resistance. They have since achieved signal successes in the political, economic, social and cultural fields.

The Vietnamese people could have scored even greater successes in building a new life, if not for the war imposed on them by US imperialists. The Vietnamese people are valiantly defending their right to create unified, independent, democratic and prosperous Vietnam. Vietnam is now the scene of a fierce clash between the forces of socialism and the national-liberation movement, on the one hand, and the forces of imperialism and neo-colonialism, on the other. Using that tired slogan of anti-communism, world reaction headed by the USA is trying to set up in Vietnam a government to its liking and to crush the national-liberation movement on the entire continent of Asia. The Soviet people, guided by the principles of proletarian internationalism, are rendering and will continue to render the Vietnamese people every necessary assistance in their heroic struggle. The fighting people of Vietnam have the sympathy and support of the

peoples of the socialist community and of all progressive forces in the world. The Vietnamese people are confident that the forces of socialism and national-liberation movement will win, for their cause is a just one—the cause of freedom and progress for which the October Revolution was fought.

The Marxist-Leninist theory also helped the Korean people solve their national and social problems. “The October Revolution pointed out the road to freedom to the Korean people who had been languishing in dire misery, and spurred their progress along the path of struggle, towards victory,” wrote Kim Il Sung. Liberated by the Soviet Army from the bondage of the Japanese imperialists, the people of North Korea, with the fraternal assistance of the Soviet Union, speedily rehabilitated their national economy. They carried out democratic transformations in all spheres of life, created a people’s democratic state, completed the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal people’s democratic revolution and began socialist construction.

From June 1950 to July 1953 the Korean People’s Democratic Republic was forced to take up arms and repel the attempt by the US aggressors to crush the new regime in North Korea. With the fraternal assistance of the socialist countries the Korean people successfully defended their revolutionary gains and rehabilitated the war-ravaged economy. In accomplishing this they displayed high political consciousness and valour and overcame tremendous difficulties. After the Patriotic Liberation War of 1950-53 the working people of the Republic, led by the Labour Party of Korea, restored and further

developed their industry, transport, communications and agriculture.

True to the ideas of proletarian internationalism the Leninist Party has always been working energetically for the creation of a militant, anti-imperialist alliance of the Russian and Chinese working class, for friendship between the Russian and Chinese peoples. The working class and all toiling masses of the multi-national Soviet Union warmly wished the Chinese people every success in their national-liberation struggle. They also rendered them moral, political and material support in their just heroic struggle for liberation from the feudal-militarist and colonial-imperialist oppressors.

The ideas of proletarian internationalism, Lenin's idea of joint struggle by the Chinese and Soviet peoples for their common vital interests were widespread in China. Li Ta-chao, one of the founders and leaders of the Communist Party of China, pointed out the international significance of the October Revolution, regarding it as the dawn of a new civilization. "The current Russian revolution is a major turning point in history," he wrote on July 1, 1918. Later, on November 7, 1922, reflecting the opinion widely held among the workers and toiling masses of China, he wrote: "A workers and peasants' state was born in the flame of the October Revolution. That state is the motherland, vanguard and indomitable bulwark of workers and peasants throughout the world." There was a time when similar sentiments were expressed by Mao Tse-tung, who said that the salvoes of the October Revolution brought Marxism-Leninism to the Chinese.

The Soviet people, loyal to the Leninist princ-

iples of socialist proletarian internationalism, have rendered the Chinese people extensive material, scientific and technical assistance, especially during the first years following the establishment of the Chinese People's Republic. The Soviet Government has invariably upheld the interests of the CPR in international organizations. The economic and defense might of the Soviet state helped safeguard the Chinese People's Republic from the threat of attack by US imperialism. The good effect of Soviet assistance could be felt, directly or indirectly, in every field of the Chinese people's activity—economic, social, international and others. The Chinese people were able to concentrate their strength and means—their own and that received from the socialist countries—on raising the country's economic and cultural levels. Great progress was made in 1950-57. This was acknowledged by Mao Tse-tung who, speaking on October 15, 1953 on behalf of the Chinese Government and people, thanked the Soviet Government and people "for their great, all-round, long-term and unselfish assistance." Owing to the efforts of the Chinese people and the fraternal assistance of the socialist countries the foundations of modern industry have been laid in the Chinese People's Republic.

However, during the last several years, Mao Tse-tung and his group, crudely violating the principles of proletarian internationalism, entered the path of great-power chauvinism and began to pursue an anti-Soviet policy. They ignored the objective economic laws and the experience of the socialist countries. They initiated the reckless course of the "big leap" and "pe-



ople's communes," which resulted in serious economic setbacks. In that period it became evident that Mao Tse-tung and his group were departing from the path of the world communist, workers' and national-liberation movement, from the theory, strategy, tactics and organizational principles of Marxism-Leninism. Mao's adventurist domestic and foreign policy reflects the pressure of bourgeois elements; it is associated with the so-called "great proletarian cultural revolution," great-power chauvinism and anti-Sovietism, the diminishing of the role of the working class, the Communist Party and the popular masses, the promotion of the personality cult of Mao Tse-tung, and the distortion of Marxism-Leninism, the ideals of socialism and communism.

The great-power nationalistic and chauvinistic attitude of the Mao group towards the national-liberation movement is being rejected by a growing number of progressive, truly patriotic forces in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, which are for proletarian internationalism and the strengthening of the unity of all revolutionary forces in struggle for the interests of the masses.

The experience of building socialism in Uzbekistan, Tadzhikistan, Turkmenia, Kirghizia, Kazakhstan, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the Korean People's Democratic Republic and other countries has fully borne out the correctness of Marxist-Leninist theory on the national and colonial questions. It also shows that those who, like the Mao Tse-tung group, seek to oppose the common interests of the liberation movement by insisting

on pursuing their own course, only play into the hands of imperialists, to the detriment of the interests of their own and other peoples.

Current international relations also show that the revolutionary liberation process initiated by the October Revolution continues to exert a healthy influence on the peoples and countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, strengthening the role of the newly-independent countries in international developments.

\* \* \*

Following the October Revolution, the struggle of the working class and other revolutionary forces for socialism and the struggle of the oppressed peoples against national-colonial bondage merged into one revolutionary current. The October Revolution revealed the necessity and the viable force of the alliance of the working-class movement and the national-liberation struggle in the fight against imperialism. The character of the national-liberation movement of the Asian and African peoples has changed under the impact of the October Revolution, the successes of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and the weakening of the forces of world imperialism. It has become broader in scope, more experienced in defining aims and tasks and, what is more important it has become more effective and successful. The creative example of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries in solving the national question and social issues continues to exert a great revolutionizing impact on the national-liberation movement and the young developing nations.

The victory of the October Revolution and subsequent world development have radically changed the political map of the world. More than 70 countries have won national independence. The once powerful, vast colonial empires are a thing of the past. Dozens of new states have appeared and are playing an increasing role in international development. Although 1.2 per cent of the world's population and six million square kilometres of its territory are still under colonial rule, the age of colonialism is drawing to an end, as the peoples of the developing countries step up their struggle against imperialism and strive to solve national, economic and social problems.

The emergence of young nations in Asia and Africa is taking place in the conditions of sharp political struggle. Difficult indeed is the process of emancipation from the economic chains of colonialism and neo-colonialism. These chains are being used by imperialism to retain its control over many countries that have become independent. Fierce struggle among domestic and external forces often takes place as to how the young Asian and American states should develop. Thus during the last several years 37 military coups have been engineered in Asian and African countries, most of them by imperialist intelligence. Some of the coups led to the change of government and to basic changes in home and foreign policies as, for instance, in Ghana.

Marxist-Leninists are studying the complex processes of the class and political struggle in the newly emergent countries from the point of view of revolutionary dialectics. The decline of the political influence of the feudal-landlord class,

the vigorous growth of the proletariat, the stratification of the peasantry, the evolution of the so-called bureaucratic bourgeoisie, the increasing role of intermediate sections—all these processes reflect the sharpening of class struggle in the developing countries around the question of the choice of paths of further development. The question of the economic development of young nations is an urgent one. Economic backwardness prevents many of these nations from solving outstanding social problems. And the imperialist states are using this weakness to hinder these nations' normal development.

The achievement of economic independence by a given country depends largely on the correlation of class forces in that country. Progressive forces fight for social improvement while reactionaries lean towards foreign monopolies. A struggle is going on to complete democratic transformations—agrarian and other reforms promoting the development of productive forces. In such complex conditions, of great importance to young nations are the support and assistance they receive from the socialist countries. Experience points to the need not only for a political and diplomatic but also for an economic and social alliance of the young nations and the socialist countries. Both sides are objectively interested in such an alliance, since it helps them fight their common class enemy—the monopolist bourgeoisie and imperialism, and solve basic problems of social development.

The reactionary policies of monopoly capitalism and domestic reaction are opposed by the alliance of progressive forces in the young Asian and African states, by world socialism and the

international working-class movement. The socialist countries follow Lenin's teaching about rendering the backward and oppressed peoples of the East economic and cultural assistance and helping them achieve industrialization, democracy and socialism. By putting into practice, for the first time in history, the Marxist-Leninist thesis on the non-capitalist way of development in the Soviet Central Asian republics and other regions of the Soviet Union, the USSR offers an example to the developing nations of how they may overcome their backwardness and enter the road of progress.

A new factor in the national-liberation movement is the development of a national, democratic revolution into a socialist one in the conditions of non-capitalist development and with the absence of a working class or only a small working class. The non-capitalist path of development is an objective revolutionary process in the epoch of the replacement of capitalism by socialism.

In foreign policy and international relations the majority of young nations adhere to the policy of peaceful coexistence of states with differing social and economic systems and of nonalignment in the military and political spheres. Such a policy is consistently carried out particularly by those young states that have taken a non-capitalist path of development, where revolutionary democrats play a leading role. World socialism is a natural ally of the countries pursuing a policy of peaceful coexistence and nonalignment, both being against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism and for progress. The world-wide revolutionary process is leading to the strengthening and broadening of the all-

round cooperation between the socialist and developing countries, to their alliance. Coexistence and nonalignment act as a barrier against imperialist aggression and, at the same time, as a bridge linking the young nations of Asia and Africa with the socialist countries in their common struggle for social progress. In this sense such policy represents a continuation and further development of the progressive course in international relations initiated by the October Revolution.

It would be a grave mistake, as borne out by the experience of the October Revolution, to lose sight of the threat to the future of young nations and all participants in the world liberation process stemming from the aggressive, subversive activities of world imperialism, which is capable of hitting hard and causing severe damage to the world liberation process. This is evidenced by current developments in Ghana, Indonesia, Nigeria, South Rhodesia, Brazil and other countries.

Further evidence of this is the criminal aggression of Israel, under the covert support of western imperialist circles, against the peoples of the Arab East. World reaction, in unleashing war against the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan through Israeli extremists, had far-reaching aims: it sought to weaken the national-liberation movement of the Arab peoples, to obstruct the social progress of the young states and to strengthen the positions of oil monopolies in that rich and strategic area. However, the aggressors plainly underestimated the strength of the world anti-imperialist front; they were up against a formidable force comprising the Soviet Union, the other socialist states and all

progressive and peace-loving forces of the world. Addressing the special session of the UN General Assembly on June 19, 1967 the Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers A. N. Kosygin said: "Loyal to the ideals of peace, freedom and independence of peoples, the Soviet Union will do all it can in the United Nations and outside it to liquidate the outcome of the aggression and help establish a stable peace in that region."

Seeking to nullify the growing influence of the ideas of the October Revolution, of the idea of socialism on all peoples of the world, and to belittle the importance of the all-round assistance given by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries to the young nations in rebuilding their economy on a modern basis, imperialists spare neither means nor efforts in conducting psychological warfare and indoctrinating Asian and African peoples with anti-communism, reactionary nationalism, chauvinism and racism. But at the ideological front too, the imperialists and their class allies and henchmen in the young nations are being rebuffed on an increasing scale by the forces of progress, armed with the Marxist-Leninist theory, their own experience and the experience of the Soviet Union.

Truer than ever before are these words of Lenin: "...this revolutionary movement of the peoples of the East can now develop effectively, can reach a successful issue, only in direct association with the revolutionary struggle of our Socialist Republic against international imperialism."

The experience of the last 50 years is convincing proof of the truth of these words. It also

shows the significance of the warning made by Marx some 120 years ago that uncoordinated actions by revolutionary contingents are self-defeating.

As foreseen by Lenin, the revolutionary movement of the peoples of the East has been developing in close association with the Soviet Union and the entire socialist community. This is manifested in the large material assistance given by the Soviet Union and all socialist countries to the young nations of Asia and Africa. The USSR, for instance, helped in the construction of 600 industrial projects in newly independent countries. Tens of thousands of technicians and skilled workers, many thousands of engineers from Asian and African countries have undergone training in this country. Soviet instructors, doctors and scientists work in 28 countries. The USSR granted developing countries loans amounting to nearly four thousand million roubles on easy terms, and maintains trade relations with them on a basis of equality. Also important is the Soviet Union's extensive assistance to young nations in strengthening their defences and safeguarding the gains of the national-liberation revolutions from the threat of imperialist aggression.

The October Revolution initiated an irreversible process. The vast expanses of Asia, Africa, America and Europe are now the scene of a gigantic battle between the forces of progress, national liberation and socialism, on the one hand, and the forces of reaction, oppression and imperialism, on the other.

The 1917 Revolution revealed the objective necessity and feasibility of the alliance of the



working-class and national-liberation movement, the alliance of the socialist countries and the developing nations. Despite resistance by imperialists, reactionaries and renegates, despite the splitting, disrupting actions of ultra-leftist extremists, this militant revolutionary alliance is growing stronger. It is playing an increasing role in the onward march of history. The ideas of the Great October Revolution will inevitably triumph throughout the world.

*N. Simoniya*

## **Lenin's Concept of Revolutionary-Democratic Dictatorship and Non-Capitalist Development**

The world-wide historic significance of the 1917 October Revolution is a generally accepted fact. The crucial moments and stages of this revolution and its impact on subsequent world revolutionary development have been the object of extensive study and research.

The study of certain aspects and trends attending the 1917 bourgeois democratic revolution that preceded the October Revolution are of considerable significance in understanding contemporary revolutionary processes in the eastern countries, although these aspects and trends stopped short in 1917 and were "overtaken" by other trends.

In any revolution there is bound to be a clash of different trends, and the trend which stems from the more favourable combination of internal and external conditions will prevail and develop. Dogmatism is liable to absolutize a given combination of conditions and the consequent basic tendency of social development. Living dialectical Marxism bases its conclusions on the diversity of concrete historical conditions and tendencies and the ensuing development. What appears superfluous or secondary in one revolution

ion may turn out to fundamental in other revolution in that same or another country. That is why a study of the world-wide historic significance of the October Revolution also includes the study of trends that did not materialize in the concrete conditions of Russia in 1917, but have acquired (or will acquire) practical import in the present-day, hence new, historic conditions. A potent but unrealized possibility of the 1917 Russian revolution was one that Lenin discussed in his theory of petty-bourgeois revolutionary-democratic dictatorship as a means of enabling the bourgeois-democratic revolution to develop into a socialist revolution.

It goes without saying that the external and internal conditions of the 1917 Russian Revolution cannot be likened to the conditions of contemporary national-liberation revolutions. The general level of Russia's capitalist development was incomparably higher, social differentiation had been much more pronounced and the growth of political awareness of the main classes of Russian society was far ahead of its socio-economic development (the bourgeoisie and the proletariat had been much more mature while the bulk of petty-bourgeois democrats had already lost their revolutionary potentialities and determination). Finally, the Russian revolution took place at a time when imperialism still held undivided sway and the revolutionary proletariat in Europe could only be a passive supporter. However we believe that certain aspects and ideas of Lenin's theory can be of much value in a study of the problems of non-capitalist development of the emergent countries of Asia and Africa.

Until recently researchers were mostly con-

cerned with one aspect of Lenin's theory: the form of revolutionary development (peaceful ways or armed struggle). But the form of struggle is the result of a definite socio-political situation. Lenin maintained that the peaceful way was directly associated with the possibility of establishing full power of revolutionary-democratic dictatorship by the proletariat and the peasantry. That was the first practical thesis of a bourgeois-democratic revolution developing into a socialist revolution by means of petty-bourgeois revolutionary-democratic dictatorship in a backward peasant country or in other words, a revolutionary-democratic dictatorship which would halt the process of spontaneous capitalist development. That kind of dictatorship would be able to make use of the latest achievements of the capitalist era (modern productive forces and respective forms of organization of production) to promote the development of the socio-economic requisites of socialism.

Lenin, the great strategist and tactician of the revolution, had the gift of being able to endow old revolutionary slogans with new meaning that accorded with a changed historical situation. He was resolutely opposed to the attempt to "force the complex, urgent, rapidly developing practical tasks of the revolution into the Procrustean bed of narrowly conceived 'theory' instead of regarding theory primarily and predominantly as a guide to action." In the situation that developed during March and April, 1917 the old slogan of revolutionary-democratic dictatorship also acquired a new meaning. The difference between the 1905-07 level of general development and the scope of organized revolutionary movement in

Russia on the one hand, and the political and economic situation in Europe, on the other, enabled Lenin to realize that revolutionary-democratic dictatorship was not merely a way of radical and consistent solution of the problems of bourgeois-democratic revolution and, therefore, of creating favourable conditions for the subsequent socialist revolution (as was believed before), but that it was also a step from which bourgeois-democratic revolution could begin to develop into socialist revolution. That was a completely new and extremely bold interpretation of the historical role of petty-bourgeois dictatorship. It is a fact that the Marxian theory of permanent revolution, having evolved in different historic conditions, did not allow for that kind of evolution of petty-bourgeois dictatorship (nor could it have done so objectively).

In 1905 revolutionary-democratic dictatorship was perceived as doing away with autocracy and all pre-capitalist social relationships. The idea was that such a dictatorship would be established in alliance with the radical sections of the bourgeoisie. Meanwhile the liberal bourgeoisie were to remain in a state of passive expectancy. As for post-February Russia of 1917, the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship would have had to establish its full power in the struggle against what was predominantly a counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie which had already won power (or was sharing it with petty-bourgeois Soviets).

The difference in the two instances mentioned above could have been decisive for it would have immediately orientated the new petty-bourgeois government against capitalism and, given the support of a socialist Europe, this government

would have probably been able to accomplish the democratic tasks of the revolution and even attain a gradual transition to socialism at the same time.

Why did Lenin accept in principle the possibility of such a shift in the course of the Russian revolution?

In order to overcome the grave economic crisis in which Russia found itself at that time, she had to quit the war and carry out socio-economic transformations that would greatly infringe on the interests of the bourgeoisie and place capitalist activities under strict state control, although private capitalist relationships would still continue. Lenin specified as urgent such measures as nationalization of the land, banks, insurance companies and capitalist syndicates, or the establishment of state control over them, as well as the transition to a more just system of taxation on profits and properties, and the regulation of consumption. Actually this amounted to the establishment of some kind of state control over production and distribution and would not go beyond the system of state or state-monopoly capitalism.

Nevertheless Lenin believed that in the specific conditions of Russia in 1917 those measures would mark a "transition to socialism." By the "transition to socialism" Lenin did not mean the narrow concept of a passive objective process engendering the material requisites of socialism but something much broader, an active and consciously directed transformation of bourgeois into socialist revolution, a process tied in and based on the said democratic transformations. Lenin felt that the implementation of these democratic measures would immediately acquire an anti-

imperialist colouring and orientation. He assumed that once in power the Russian bourgeoisie would not be able to implement them by itself, that this would require the absolute rule of the Soviets, i. e. the complete barring from power of the bourgeoisie and landowners. Even the first step on the way to realizing democratic transformations in post-February Russia, that is, the establishment of revolutionary democratic dictatorship, would objectively become anti-bourgeois in character. In 1917 only a democratic dictatorship which had already broken away from the bourgeoisie, thereby having begun to overcome its petty-bourgeois illusions, could have become consistently revolutionary.

In this way the different political meaning of the general democratic transformations stemmed from the special social character of the government, which was not an exploiter government in nature, although still petty-bourgeois. It was precisely because there exist the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies (i. e. the petty-bourgeois revolutionary-democratic dictatorship) the implementation of such transition measures as control over production "...will bring about a situation in which Russia will have one foot in socialism—we say one foot because the peasant majority controls the other part of the country's economy."

"Universal labour conscription introduced, regulated and directed by the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies, will *still not* be socialism, but it will *no longer* be capitalism. It will be a tremendous *step towards* socialism, a step from which, if complete democracy is preserved, there can no longer be any retreat

back to capitalism, without unparalleled violence being committed against the masses."

Consistent realization of democratic transformations that infringe on certain (but not basic) interests of the bourgeoisie would definitely arouse the latter's resistance and sabotage. Lenin wrote that "the bourgeoisie's resistance to the transfer of the land to the peasants without compensation, to similar reforms in other realms of life, to a just peace and a break with imperialism, is, of course, inevitable." While fighting this resistance the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship would become involved in the mounting struggle against capitalism. In the course of this struggle "the main shortcoming of the petty-bourgeois groups, their chief sin, that of trusting the capitalists, really would have been overcome, would have been criticized by the experience of their own measures." Thus the logic of consistent inter-Party struggle would take the democratic masses along the way of anti-bourgeois development towards the next, socialist stage.

There was no question in Lenin's mind that this way of the development of Russian revolution would not have firm, direct contact with the general development of international events. Lenin considered that Russia's advance to socialism under the absolute power of revolutionary-democratic dictatorship in the form of the Soviets was an "international" task and that the very possibility of such development was in direct dependence on the victory of the socialist revolution in one or several European countries. And he did not mean military and political support alone. The "force of example" of a socialist Europe would be of tremendous importance for



democracy, vacillating between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

The present-day historical experience of a number of emergent countries that have embarked on a path of non-capitalist development displays some of the features of Lenin's logical concept of revolutionary development. We say "some" because the correlation between the proletarian and petty-bourgeois political forces in Afro-Asian countries substantially differs from those in Russia of 1917, in that the petty-bourgeois elements are still more prevalent in the Afro-Asian countries. Where petty-bourgeois democracy has taken hold and has turned out sufficiently revolutionary, consistent and sincere in its socialist aspirations (even if these aspirations have not been fully realized as yet), the practice of social transformations inevitably leads to conscious realization of the basic difference between the vital interests of the working people and the exploiter classes, to a gradual overcoming (through much wavering) of petty-bourgeois illusions concerning the class uniformity of society and the possibility of cooperating with the bourgeoisie in governing the state.

It is noteworthy that at first many revolutionary leaders representing the democratic sections of the population in the newly-independent countries pinned their hopes on bourgeois parties or groups. That was the case in Egypt after the 1952 revolution, in Burma after the first military coup in 1958. Certain illusions and wavering of this kind were also apparent in Guinea, Tanzania and other countries. However, it is a fact that subsequent revolutionary development shat-

tered the illusions, and many leaders of these countries later expressed dissatisfaction with bourgeois ideals.



One of the key points in Lenin's concept of peaceful development of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia and the change in its social orientation is the question of inner evolution of the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship itself and its gradual transformation into a political superstructure, based on the principles of scientific socialism. The main content of this process is what Lenin noted as the overcoming of petty-bourgeois prejudices. Actually it is only when this process is under way can we really speak of the purposeful development towards socialism and regard the above democratic transformations as such that "in their sum total and their development" signify "transition to socialism." When no such process is under way the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship can only become a step to the further consolidation of bourgeois political domination and the measures it takes can only build up the bourgeois system.

Either—or. The way leads either to socialism, or to capitalism. For there is no "third" petty-bourgeois development. Petty-bourgeois democracy can display a relative independence and take power. It can also display relative independence in the choice of the way of development. But proof that its independence is only relative is borne out by the fact that its choice is limited to only two ways: socialist or capitalist. World-historical experience has long since proved the

correctness of the Marxist-Leninist stipulation regarding the impossibility of a "third way." All petty-bourgeois dictatorships that have ever existed have undergone the evolution either towards socialism or capitalism. And attempts to follow some "third" line invariably ended in the collapse of those dictatorships.

How could the evolution of the petty-bourgeois revolutionary-democratic dictatorship proceed towards socialism in Russia? The peaceful development of the revolution meant there was to be no political struggle as such. Lenin based his argument of the possibility of a bloodless, peaceful struggle on the non-exploiter social nature of revolutionary dictatorship. ("In their class composition, the Soviets were organs of the movement of the workers and peasants, a ready-made form of their dictatorship".)

But on the other hand, the class interests of the proletariat and the various sections of petty-bourgeoisie were not at all identical, and that made political struggle inevitable between them within the Soviets that is, within the framework of the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship itself. In this way the evolution of dictatorship would "proceed peacefully and party strife in the Soviets would be peacefully overcome..." "The change of classes and parties in power could have proceeded peacefully within the Soviets, provided the latter wielded exclusive and undivided power. The contact between all the Soviet parties and the people could have remained stable and unimpaired. One must not forget for a single moment that only such a close contact between the Soviet parties and the people, freely growing in extent and depth, could have

helped peacefully to get rid of the illusion of petty-bourgeois compromise with the bourgeoisie. The transfer of power to the Soviets would not, and could not, in itself have changed the correlation of classes; it would in no way have changed the petty-bourgeois nature of the peasants. But it would have taken a big and timely step towards separating the peasants from the bourgeoisie, towards bringing them close to, and then uniting them with, the workers.

"This is what might have happened had power passed to the Soviets at the proper time. That would have been the easiest and the most advantageous course for the people. This course would have been the least painful, and it was therefore necessary to fight for it most energetically."

It is true that there are no Soviets as a form of the dictatorship of the working people in any country that has taken the non-capitalist way. Nevertheless regardless of the diversity of political forms, Lenin's idea of peaceful political struggle within the framework of one revolutionary-democratic dictatorship is finding its way to a greater or lesser degree in the concrete practical work being done in a number of newly-independent countries, and is embodied in it. As experience shows, the political struggle of this kind will not necessarily develop in the form of inter-Party competition. It can also assume the form of struggle among various political trends, groups or individuals on the scale of a single democratic front.

If the above is taken into account it becomes clear that the question of cooperation between the proletarian party and petty-bourgeois democracy is of great interest from the point of view

of modern experience of non-capitalist development. Actually it is a matter of tactics of the united front of all or the major sections of the toiling population (the proletariat plus the petty-bourgeois sections of town and village) in a revolutionary situation, applicable also to a peasant, petty-bourgeois country. It is important to bear in mind that Lenin did not mean a tactical manoeuvre, not a temporary, short-lived compromise of the two political forces, but a political line envisaging a comparatively lengthy, voluntary cooperation between the proletariat and the petty-bourgeois revolutionary forces under the absolute rule of the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship. Therefore it is essential to have a correct idea of the concrete situation pertaining to this contemplated cooperation.

It is known that after the February revolution peasant Russia allowed for an overwhelming predominance of petty-bourgeois parties in the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies. At that time (April, 1917) there could even be no talk of the hegemony of the truly proletarian party (Bolsheviks) which numbered about 70 thousand then and which, according to Lenin, was "a weak minority" in most Soviets. In other words, the slogan "All power to the Soviets!" for which the Bolshevik Party was fighting during the period between April and the beginning of July 1917 meant the establishment of a petty-bourgeois revolutionary-democratic dictatorship. "I said," Lenin wrote in his *Letters on Tactics*, "that there *can be no* government (barring a bourgeois government) in Russia *other than* that of the Soviets of Workers', Agricultural Labourers', Soldiers' and Peasants'

Deputies. I said that power in Russia now can pass from Guchkov and Lvov *only* to these Soviets. And in these Soviets, as it happens, it is the peasants, the soldiers, i. e. petty bourgeoisie, who preponderate, to use a scientific Marxist term, a class characterization, and not a common, man-in-the-Soviet, professional characterization."

Why did Lenin believe it possible in principle that there could be constructive and durable cooperation between the two different and sometimes even bitterly rivalling political forces? To answer this question it is necessary first to understand the meaning and nature of the hostility between the proletarian and bourgeois democracy. Lenin based his argument on the non-exploiter nature of the petty-bourgeoisie class and the fact that the working class, on the one hand, and petty bourgeoisie of town and village, on the other, were not antagonistic class forces. Therefore objectively there could be no antagonistic class contradictions between the sincere and consistent representatives of these classes. For example in his article *On Compromises* Lenin explained that the Bolsheviks suggested "...a voluntary compromise—not to our direct and main class enemy, the bourgeoisie, but to our nearest adversaries, the 'ruling' petty-bourgeois-democratic parties, the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks." This explanation shows the vast difference that Marxist-Leninists make between political hostility having a class, that is, objective basis (proletariat—bourgeoisie) and political hostility on a subjective basis (proletariat—revolutionary petty-bourgeois democracy).

This does not mean that bitter contradictions and differences, sometimes tragic in consequence

do not or can not exist between the non-exploiter classes, or even between some sections and political groups within these classes. History knows quite a number of incidents of fierce political struggle (even armed) between non-antagonistic class forces, incidents that only weakened the general working people's positions in relation to the antagonistic exploiter classes. One need only recall the Robespierre dictatorship in France, the civil war in Russia, the defeat of the Stambulov petty-bourgeois dictatorship in Bulgaria. We could list many more examples. The experience of contemporary national-liberation revolutions in Asian and African countries supplies us with similar examples even today. Take the United Arab Republic before the early 60s or Burma. But probably it is important to remember that this is not a case of hostility having a class objective basis and therefore the possibility of subsequent conciliation and even firm alliance must be kept in mind. This is why Lenin wrote in his draft statement of the CC RSDLP (B) and the Bureau of the Faction of Bolsheviks to the All-Russia Congress of Soviets concerning the ban on the peaceful demonstration that the Party had scheduled for June 23, 1917 (June 10, old calendar):

"We hold that the inique institution known as the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies is the nearest approach to a popular body expressing the will of the majority of the people, to a revolutionary parliament.

"On principle we have been and are in favour of all power passing into the hands of such a body despite the fact that at present it is in the hands of the defencist Mensheviks and Socialist

Revolutionaries, who are hostile to the party of the proletariat."

In this way it was the profound understanding of the class essence of the Soviets that made it possible to hope that with certain favourable internal and external conditions the political representatives of petty-bourgeois masses would be forced to completely break away from the bourgeoisie and agree to cooperate with the proletarian party. Lenin never identified rank-and-file bourgeois democrats with some of their political representatives or party leadership, all the more so since both the political representatives of a class or a social strata can differ. Some political leaders sounded quite "revolutionary" while actually serving the bourgeoisie. Others really wanted to represent the working people's interests, although they still cherished petty-bourgeois illusions and misconceptions. Lenin stressed, for instance, that "the medley of voices in the 'bloc' (Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries—N. S.) is great and inevitable, for a host of shades is represented among the petty-bourgeois democrats—from the complete bourgeois, perfectly eligible for a post in the government down to the semi-pauper who is not yet capable of taking up the proletarian position."

Lenin hoped, however, that under the absolute rule of the Soviets the course of events would itself demonstrate what parties and leaders correctly understood and better represented the working people's basic and vital interests. In the course of practical struggle for concrete revolutionary transformations the true face of a part of petty-bourgeois democrats-gone-bourgeois would be revealed and they would be removed



from the political scene. The other democratic leaders, truly loyal to the cause of revolutionary struggle would be "enlightened" by the very course of events and learn the lesson of their own mistakes, while gradually drawing closer to working people's representatives taking the positions of scientific socialism.

We do not know, and Lenin did not even attempt to predict, the exact course this process of disintegration of petty-bourgeois democracy and dissociation of consistent and earnest revolutionary-democratic elements would take; how much vacillation and hostility, how many ups and downs those revolutionary democrats would go through as they proceeded along their tortuous path of overcoming petty-bourgeois illusions and drawing nearer to the revolutionary proletariat. But the possibility of that vacillation and volte-face did not prevent Lenin from realizing the probability of the revolutionary-democratic and proletarian elements finding common ground. Fresh proof of this is Lenin's article in memory of Left-wing Socialist Revolutionary B. P. Proshyan who became a Socialist "in his own way, not through Marxism, not starting with the idea of the class struggle of the proletariat."

It was Proshyan's pseudo-patriotism (a characteristic feature of all petty-bourgeois democrats) that had alienated him from the Soviet Government after the conclusion of the Brest Peace Treaty and led him to the armed struggle against it in the summer of 1918. Lenin, commenting on Proshyan's wavering, concluded that the logical sequence of events which took Proshyan to the camp of counter-revolution due to his stand on the Brest Treaty, would have

brought him as a consistent revolutionary closer to communism but for his untimely death. It is also well known that subsequently a certain part of the Mensheviks Internationalists and left-wing Socialist Revolutionaries recognized Soviet Rule and some even joined the Bolshevik Party.

The experience of some newly-free countries provides examples of how the more consistent revolutionary democrats approach socialism "not through Marxism", but gradually, and with much vacillation they begin to accept scientific socialism.

\* \* \*

When Lenin put forward his idea of peaceful development of revolution under the power of revolutionary-democratic dictatorship he also raised the question of hegemony in the revolution, the question of who would lead and how. Basing his reasoning on objective reality Lenin mentioned the possibility of willing cooperation between the Bolsheviks and petty-bourgeois democrats even if the latter predominated in the revolutionary government bodies. This point is of special importance at present when the Chinese dogmatists, who are displaying their "revolutionary irreconcilability" in this question, create unnecessary obstacles in the way of unity of the revolutionary-democratic and communist forces in the Eastern countries, thus sometimes aggravating relations between these revolutionary forces. The dogmatists absolutize the experience of the Russian petty-bourgeois democrats, inability to take revolutionary action and implement essential democratic transformations. They apply this conclusion to all revolutions in the East

without taking into account the concrete situations in concrete countries, or the historic changes in the balance of forces in the world.

In this way the deterioration of relations and rivalry occurring at the bourgeois-democratic stage of the struggle stem from petty-bourgeois prejudices of revolutionary democracy and the elements of leftism, sectarianism and dogmatism in the communist movement. In some instances this rivalry can alienate petty-bourgeois democracy and bring it to the camp of reaction for a more or less lengthy period, and force it into direct contact with the imperialist forces. But even when petty-bourgeois democracy manages to firmly maintain its anti-imperialist positions, the rivalry among the revolutionary forces greatly damages the unity of the working people and distracts attention and strength from persistent anti-imperialist struggle.

The question of the difference in principle between objective and subjective hostility directly refers to the anti-communist struggle being waged in the eastern countries. Marxist-Leninists distinguish between the truly anti-communist, antagonistic class forces, representing the interests of the bourgeoisie and landowners, and transient anti-communism stemming from petty-bourgeois prejudices of politically backward sections of the population. Some of the emergent countries now taking the way of non-capitalist development have to some extent undergone the stage of anti-communist struggle. Very often that stage was justified by the peculiar thesis that the revolutionary rule was fighting both "rights" and "lefts" or that the revolutionary rule was only fighting against "domestic", "national"

communism but that it did not oppose communism in theory and was for contact with "external" communism, i. e. the countries of the socialist system. The factor of subjectivism in this reasoning which reflects the artificial and harmful competition between the two revolutionary forces, is obvious. In the past the attempts of petty-bourgeois democracy to fight "on two fronts" invariably ended in its isolation and subsequent defeat. But the outstanding feature of the present-day international situation is the existence of the world socialist system, the contacts and cooperation which accelerate the process of overcoming petty-bourgeois prejudices, elements of leftism and dogmatism thus promoting the unity of the revolutionary forces.

True, this does not mean that the existence of the world socialist system can automatically prevent all outbreaks of anti-communism in future. The instability of petty-bourgeois democracy, its nationalistic patriotism and other such features present a real danger of its becoming completely bourgeois, bureaucratic and degenerate which could result in the prevalence of reactionary-bureaucratic tendencies or collapse of the regime.

While speaking of the elements of inconsistency, subjectivism, voluntarism and adventurism of petty-bourgeois democracy one must bear in mind that all these negative aspects have deep-lying objective causes inherent in the socio-economic struggle of the newly-liberated countries. As Lenin wrote, "the more backward the country, the stronger is the hold of small-scale agricultural production, patriarchalism and isolation, which inevitably lend particular strength and

tenacity to the deepest of petty-bourgeois prejudices, i. e. to national egoism and national narrowmindedness. These prejudices are bound to die out very slowly, for they can disappear in the advanced countries only after imperialism and capitalism have disappeared and after the entire foundation of the backward countries' economic life has radically changed."

Lenin taught that true Marxists could not be guided by their subjective moods and likings in conducting their policy. Periods of deteriorated relations and persecution on the part of the ruling petty-bourgeois democracy must not become an insurmountable obstacle to further cooperation when appropriate conditions arose. "It would be a profound error," Lenin wrote in July 1917, "to think that the revolutionary proletariat is capable of 'refusing' to support the Socialist Revolutionaries and Mensheviks against the counter-revolution by way of 'revenge,' so to speak, for the support they gave in smashing the Bolsheviks, in shooting down soldiers at the front and in disarming the workers. First, this would be applying philistine conceptions of morality to the proletariat (since *for the good of the cause*, the proletariat will always support not only the vacillating petty bourgeoisie but even the big bourgeoisie), secondly—and that is the important thing—it would be a philistine attempt to obscure the political substance of the situation by 'moralizing.'"

The outliving of bourgeois illusions and transition of bourgeois revolutionary democracy to the positions of scientific socialism is not merely a lengthy but also a contradictory process. It comprises two basic factors: alienation of petty-

bourgeois democracy from the bourgeoisie and rapprochement and alliance with the proletariat. In his works Lenin proved—and this has been borne out by historical experience—that the alienation of the bourgeoisie is the first decisive stage in the evolution of petty-bourgeois revolutionary-democratic dictatorships. Democracy's break with the bourgeoisie and the gradual heightening of the anti-imperialist struggle will ultimately lead to its alliance with the proletariat. However it must not be supposed that the alienation from the bourgeoisie will immediately and automatically be accompanied by union with the proletariat advocating scientific socialism. History shows that between the two extreme points there could emerge a certain stage lasting for an undetermined period of time.

When revolutionary petty-bourgeois democracy has not yet reached the stage of rapprochement or alliance with the revolutionary proletarian forces or is even temporarily opposed to them, the main criterion indicating that we should deal with the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship which could become an instrument of a gradual transition to socialism, and not to a petty-bourgeois dictatorship which only serves as a screen for capitalist development, is petty-bourgeois democracy's actual break with the bourgeoisie and barring the latter from power. Neither the good intentions of revolutionary democracy nor the radical transformations it proclaims can by itself be such a criterion. As long as democracy remains with the bourgeoisie, neither revolutionary striving nor good intentions in this regard will be realized.

In this connection it is interesting to note that

in 1917 the petty-bourgeois ministers also voiced plans for democratic transformations that differed little from the respective programme of the Bolsheviks. Lenin described the programme of petty-bourgeois democracy outlined in the resolution of the economic department of the Executive of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies as "marvellous" and stressed that it was no different from "horrible" Bolshevism. Commenting on the somewhat "left" programme speech of former Menshevik Minister, V. I. Skobelev, Lenin wrote: "We do not demand anything else." And he added immediately that it was not a matter of the personal intentions of Menshevik or Socialist-Revolutionary ministers. "I have known these parties for several decades... I am the last person, therefore, to question their good intentions. But that is not the point. It is not a question of good intentions. Good intentions pave the road to hell." The crux of the matter lies in the fact that the petty-bourgeois ministers entrusted the implementation of their radical programmes to the capitalists "with purely philistine credulity," and that "the Narodniks and Mensheviks trust the capitalists and encourage the people to share this fatal trust. That is the sum and substance of the political situation."

The United Arab Republic and Indonesia are vivid examples of the importance and the decisive significance of the moment of democracy breaking away from the bourgeoisie. In the early 60s the programmes for revolutionary transformations advanced by the petty-bourgeoisie in these countries had much in common. However, whereas the programme in the United Arab Republic was being implemented as a consequence of ali-

enation from the bourgeoisie and to the latter's detriment, enabling the country to take a non-capitalist way of development, in Indonesia the transformations were carried out in alliance with the bourgeoisie. And there, even though some sections of old national bourgeoisie suffered somewhat, that was only for the good of the rapidly developing bureaucratic bourgeoisie and led to the heightening of reactionary bourgeois tendencies in Indonesia's public affairs.

\* \* \*

Lenin's concept of the peaceful development of the bourgeois-democratic revolution and the subsequent change in its social orientation was not destined to be realized in Russia. When Lenin put forward this concept he himself noted there was very little hope of expecting it would work out due to the lack of basic internal and external requisites. There was no socialist revolution in Europe at that time and the petty bourgeoisie in Russia, doubting the possibility of developing the revolution and even fearing it, could not break with the bourgeoisie. Lenin said that "...the entire petty bourgeoisie has, not by chance but of necessity, turned towards chauvinism (=defencism), towards 'support' of the bourgeoisie, towards dependence on it, towards the fear of having to do without it, etc. etc." Indeed, considering the world dominance of imperialism, it was difficult to expect a different position from the vacillating petty bourgeoisie. Now that the world system of socialism exists, ever-broader sections of petty-bourgeois democracy are turning to socialism.



A. Reznikov

## How Lenin Fought Sectarianism in the National-Colonial Movement

Following the Revolution, in the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, Lenin advanced and scientifically substantiated fundamental, programmatic and tactical theses on the national-colonial question. In solving problems of the national-liberation struggles these have proved invaluable.

At the 2nd Congress of the Communist International held in 1920 Lenin subjected to merciless criticism petty-bourgeois views on the national-liberation movement that were alien to Marxism. Of particular worth is a little-known speech by Lenin at the July 25 sitting of the commission on national and colonial questions. Points he stressed were: unity of the anti-imperialist forces, the role of the liberation movement in the world revolutionary process and the tasks of the communist movement in the East. These theses, advanced in addition to the "*Preliminary Draft Theses on the National and the Colonial Questions*," permit a better understanding and estimation of his principled position on this matter.

The following is an extract from the account of this discussion and Lenin's speech.

## **Materials of the Commission**

“The commission on national and the colonial questions which discussed Lenin’s theses on these matters also heard reports by all commission members, delegates from Korea, China, India, Persia, Bulgaria, Hungary, America and Britain. These interesting reports would have filled a whole book. . .

### **India**

#### **Report by Comrade Roy**

The Indian nationalist movement began to assume more or less definite forms in the 1880s and found expression in the National Congress.

The movement embraced broad sections of the students and the middle classes, but the nationalists’ call to fight for India’s independence did not find a response among the popular masses.

The Indian people are not imbued with the nationalist spirit. They are interested exclusively in socio-economic questions. Their living conditions are extremely hard.

Since British capitalism established itself in India 80 per cent of the country’s population who lived off the land have lost their possessions and become hired labourers. They now live like beggars. Although they till the soil, they are starving since everything their labour produces is taken out of the country. These scores of millions of people have no interest at all in bourgeois-nationalist slogans; the only slogan that could interest them is “Land—to the Ploughman. . .”

Compared with the agricultural proletariat the industrial proletariat is small in India. Workers total about five million. The trade union movement is spreading rapidly among these workers. The strike movement has been particularly strong in recent years. The first major strike, staged in 1905 by railway workers, reached the proportions of a real uprising.

There are elements in India from which a strong Communist Party could be built. Yet the revolutionary movement, as far as the broad masses are concerned, has nothing in common with the national-liberation movement.

On the basis of this analysis Comrade Roy concluded that the paragraph on the need for all Communist parties to help the bourgeois-democratic liberation movement in Eastern countries, from Item 11 of the theses on the national question, should be deleted. The Communist International should limit itself to starting and promoting the communist movement in India, while the Communist Party of India should concern itself exclusively with organizing broad popular masses to fight for their class interests.

Comrade Roy upheld the idea that the destiny of the revolutionary movement in Europe depended wholly on the course of revolution in the East. Unless revolution triumphed in the Oriental countries the communist movement in the West could be brought to nought. World capitalism drew its main resources and income from the colonies, mostly those in Asia. In the extreme case, the European capitalists may give all the surplus value to the workers and thus win them over by killing their revolutionary aspirations, while the capitalists themselves would go on

exploiting Asia with the help of the proletariat. Such an outcome would suit the capitalists very well. In view of this it was necessary to direct efforts towards developing and promoting the revolutionary movement in the East and to accept the basic thesis that the destiny of world communism depended on the triumph of communism in the East.

Comrade Quelch of the British Communist Party disagreed with Comrade Roy, arguing that we must assist any anti-imperialist movement. Although the national-liberation movement in India probably had not yet won support from the broad popular masses this did not mean that it would not win it in the very near future. . .

Comrade Lenin also argued against Comrade Roy's view. He said that in Russia we supported the liberal movement during the fight against tsarism. The Indian Communists were bound to support the bourgeois-democratic movement without merging with it.<sup>1</sup> Comrade Roy went too far in claiming that the destiny of the West depended exclusively on the degree and strength of the revolutionary movement in the Eastern countries. Despite the fact that India had five million proletarians and 37 million landless peasants the Indian Communists had not been able

---

<sup>1</sup> There is an obvious misprint in the text of the account published in the "Bulletin of the Second Congress," which says that the Indian Communists are obliged to support the *bourgeois-communist* (emphasis is mine—A. R.) movement without merging with it. If we remember that Lenin objected to Roy's demand for the exclusion from Thesis 11 of the paragraph on the need for all Communist parties to help "the bourgeois-democratic liberation movement" in the Eastern countries, then there is no doubt that the bourgeois-democratic movement was meant.

to form a Communist Party. This alone made Comrade Roy's views largely unjustified.

### **Problems of a United Front**

Lenin's speech was directed against Roy's attempt to revise the theoretical, programmatic and tactical principles formulated in the *Preliminary Draft Theses on the National and the Colonial Questions*. The initial text of Roy's "Supplementary Theses" contained the erroneous sectarian allegations that the bourgeois-democratic liberation movements did not reflect the strivings of the masses and that the masses did not support these movements; therefore, Roy maintained, the bourgeois-democratic stage of revolution was not obligatory in colonies and backward countries.

These sectarian views were vigorously opposed by Lenin, and the "Supplementary Theses" were submitted by the commission to the Congress in a revised form, incorporating Lenin's critical remarks on questions of principle. Nevertheless Roy continued to object in the commission to Lenin's conclusions.

The above materials of the commission on the national and colonial questions show that in his speech of July 25, 1920 Roy proceeded from the idea that the struggle for national independence and the social movement of the masses had nothing in common; accordingly he proposed to delete Item 1 of Thesis 11 of Lenin's "Preliminary Draft" on the need for Communists to support the bourgeois-democratic liberation movement in less developed countries. By doing so Roy objected to Item 5 of the same thesis which said

that the Communist International must enter into a temporary alliance with bourgeois democracy in the colonial and backward countries, but should not merge with it, and pointed to the need for a determined struggle against attempts to give a communist colouring to bourgeois-democratic liberation trends. In other words, Roy stubbornly rejected Lenin's thesis on the need to rally all anti-imperialist forces.

We may note that Roy was not alone at that time in opposing this fundamental thesis of Lenin. The remarks on the "Preliminary Draft" Lenin received from Ye. A. Preobrazhensky in June 1920 contained fundamental errors.

Preobrazhensky asserted that "it was wrong to overestimate the revolutionary significance of the national uprisings in the colonies," that the national-liberation movements of the oppressed peoples had no revolutionary prospects whatsoever. "The merchant bourgeoisie and the intelligent top of the people" in the economically backward countries, he wrote, "inevitably strive for the solution of the national question approximately in such forms as it was raised at the time of the formation of national-bourgeois states and thus become representatives of degenerate nationalism destined to perish without preparing gravediggers from among their own people."

The practical conclusions Preobrazhensky made from these premises were naturally harmful to the unity of the world anti-imperialist front. They were basically as follows: the proletariat of the Soviet republics would have to act as the "gravedigger of nationalism" in backward countries; "should it prove impossible to come to an economic agreement with the leading nat-

ional groups they would inevitably have to be suppressed by force and the economically important areas would have to be annexed to the union of European republics for the period in which the labouring masses of the people were moving forward groups capable of taking power on the basis of a federation with Europe." It was from these positions that Preobrazhensky proposed to alter Lenin's 11th thesis.

In the final count both Preobrazhensky and Roy directed their efforts mainly against Lenin's conclusion on the need for unity of all anti-imperialist forces, their arguments being based on erroneous leftist views.

The pronouncement of Roy and Preobrazhensky which were objectively opposed to the formation of one anti-imperialist front both on the national and international scale met with objections of principle put forward by Lenin who believed that only by creating such a front could imperialism be defeated.

Lenin sharply censured Preobrazhensky's proposal for the victorious proletariat of the "European republics" to use violence against the "leading national groups" in backward countries, pointing out that it could not be proved and was wrong to say that suppression by force was inevitable. He maintained that such a statement was basically erroneous. Criticizing Preobrazhensky's view that after the proletarian revolution "the solution of the national question should be subjugated to the task of building a single economic whole from the socialist republics" Lenin noted that simple subjugation was impossible and referred to his Thesis 12. In Thesis 12 of his "Preliminary Draft" Lenin pointed out that imperial-

ist oppression left among the toiling masses of the colonial and dependent countries "distrust in the imperialist powers in general, even in their proletariat... These prejudices (of national egoism and national narrowmindedness—Ed.) are bound to die very slowly... It is therefore the duty of the class-conscious communist proletariat of all countries to regard with particular caution and attention the survivals of national sentiments in countries and among nationalities which have been oppressed the longest; it is equally necessary to make certain concessions with a view to more rapidly overcoming this distrust and these prejudices."

Lenin believed that a correct, truly internationalist policy towards the formerly oppressed peoples of Russia was a powerful revolutionizing factor on the international plane. At the same time simple subjugation of the national question to economic tasks could result, as Lenin wrote, in that "all our international policy, all struggle 'for Asia' would go to the devil" and that in that case "we shall not be able to do anything against British imperialism (in Asia)."

A. Sultan-zade, a Congress delegate and one of the founders of the Communist Party of Iran, pointed in his written report, "The Prospects of Socialist Revolution in the East," to the ruthless colonial oppression of the Oriental peoples, the weakness of the working class in colonial and dependent countries, the lack of proper conditions for assimilating a class proletarian ideology, the acute contradictions between imperialism and the urban bourgeoisie of the oppressed countries, the harsh feudal rule ("the clinking of the fetters of feudal bondage can be heard every-



where in the East"). And yet Sultan-zade, like Roy, believed that socialist revolution was imminent in the East.

Having read Sultan-zade's report Lenin summed it up as follows: 1) Disintegration of the propertied exploiter classes (Sultan-zade wrote that some of them came out against imperialism—A. R.); 2) Most of the population are peasants living in conditions of medieval *exploitation*; 3) Petty craftsmen—in industry. Item of Lenin's notes read: "To adapt both Soviet institutions and the Communist Party (its composition, its special tasks) to the level of the peasant masses of the colonial East. This is essential. Should think it over and look for concrete answers." We should stress here that this conclusion belonged to Lenin, since Sultan-zade did not even raise the matters dealt with in Item 4 of Lenin's notes.

Of exceptional importance is the idea expressed by Lenin in June 1920 regarding a thesis advanced by G. V. Chicherin. "Union with their own bourgeoisie," Chicherin wrote to Lenin, "is appropriate for the oppressed peoples only where they have to remove local feudalism propped by the bayonets of the oppressor nation, as is the case in Persia. The Persians have on their agenda a joint movement of the working people and the bourgeoisie to get rid of the unbearable yoke of the feudals who have sold out to Britain." Lenin's comment to this was: "Persia is not alone."

Lastly, in his speech in the commission in July 1920 Lenin said that just as the Bolsheviks in Russia supported the liberal movement during the struggle against tsarism, the Indian Com-

munists "were bound to support the bourgeois-democratic movement without merging with it."

There was a concept at one time that Lenin's theses were intended only for extremely backward countries while those of Roy, allegedly independent of Lenin's, treated the national-colonial question as applicable to more advanced dependent countries and colonies. Yet it follows directly from the above-cited speech by Lenin in the commission that he strongly recommended the tactics of a united anti-imperialist front also for colonial countries whose capitalist development in 1920 was at a level that has not been reached by many former colonial countries in our time.<sup>1</sup>

Lenin's statements, quoted above, had one common aim—to uphold his idea of a united front of all anti-imperialist forces with the proletarian (and communist) movement, remaining independent. The substitution in the adopted by the congress theses of the term "national-revolutionary" for "bourgeois-democratic" was made specifically in pursuance of this thesis. Lenin, drawing attention to the capitulatory stand of some sections of the bourgeoisie in the oppressed countries, declared that for a union to be possible between the communist and the bourgeois-democratic liberation movements, there must be real revolutionary attitudes on the part of those non-proletarian forces who would have com-

---

<sup>1</sup> In his speech at the plenary session of the 2nd Congress on July 26, 1920 Lenin specifically referred to "oppressed nations," "backward countries," "oppressed peoples," "colonial countries," "countries with pre-capitalist relations," "all colonies and backward countries."

munist support. Thus an idea of immense theoretical and practical significance came to the fore: in the epoch of socialist revolutions the national-liberation movement in no way becomes obsolete or reactionary in nature. On the contrary, a real opportunity opens before it, in the new conditions, for joint revolutionary actions with countries where the proletariat has been victorious and with Communist parties.

Revolutionary struggle has fully confirmed in practice the correctness of this conclusion and shown the harm resulting from underestimating it. Today it is regarded as natural and self-evident, but at the time this conclusion was a great scientific discovery and in 1920 Lenin had vehemently to defend his view against those who thought that the national-liberation movement had exhausted its revolutionary possibilities.

The concept which is called here "Roy's system of views" did not come about by accident. Such ideas were widely aired in the young communist movement, and all Roy did was to define them accurately. An explanation should be sought in the concrete historical situation prevailing in the colonial and semi-colonial countries following the victorious October Revolution, in the specifics of the shaping of the communist movement in those countries.

A mighty upsurge of national-liberation struggle was taking place in the East and class-conscious activity by workers and peasants was increasing. The October Revolution had exerted a powerful revolutionizing influence on the progressive forces in the Eastern countries and a communist vanguard was emerging and gaining strength both ideologically and organizationally.

Yet many prominent leaders of the emerging Communist parties and groups came from the ranks of revolutionary nationalism. Their timid and inconsistent policy of the national-bourgeois forces produced an impression upon those leaders that the national-liberation movements lacked prospects. From this the conclusion was drawn that political independence could only be won through a socialist revolution, this being viewed as the immediate task of the Communist parties in all countries from the day of their inception. When they turned to Marxism, prompted by feelings of nationalism (and they were unable to accept it as a scientific system of views) these leaders, of whom Roy was typical, were frequently incapable of shaking off their old petty-bourgeois ideology. Added to this was the view, which prevailed in some young Communist parties in the colonial countries, that since communism was the embodiment of the ideals of working people, the very proclamation of its basic postulates would almost automatically win over the hundreds of millions whose interests it objectively reflected.

In the communist movement of the West the infantile disorder of "leftism" made itself felt at that time. The basic mistake of the "Left," both in West and East, was that they took "their wish," their ideological and political attitude, for objective reality, they regarded what was obsolete for them as obsolete for the masses. The experience of the Bolshevik party was frequently studied and used in a biased fashion. "The Left" in the West concentrated on the fact that the Bolsheviks had carried out the revolution in resolute struggle against the petty-bourgeois

parties, while "the Left" in the East stressed the point that the liberal bourgeoisie in Russia had become an openly counter-revolutionary force and that democratic changes in Russia had become possible only through the victory of the socialist revolution.

Lenin's *Left-wing Communism: an Infantile Disorder* gave to the Communists of all countries a hand-book of Bolshevik experience, it also warned against the one-sided study and application of this experience. For Communists in the East of especial importance was the fact, noted by Lenin, that in the concrete situation of Russia the Bolsheviks had not refused to support the liberal bourgeoisie against tsarism, while they waged an irreconcilable ideological and political struggle against bourgeois liberalism and against any sign of its influence in the working-class movement. In *Left-wing Communism: an Infantile Disorder* Lenin described the long and strenuous struggle of the Bolshevik Party for the masses, its mammoth work in educating the masses on the basis of their own political experience, its ability "to link itself with, to keep in close touch with, and to a certain extent, if you like, to merge with the broadest masses of the working people—primarily with the proletariat, *but also with the non-proletarian* labouring masses."

Lenin firmly opposed the mechanical transfer of the tactical line of the Bolshevik Party operating in conditions of a politically independent country of medium-level capitalism to the oppressed Eastern countries whose economic and political development was immeasurably lower.

Placing a high estimation on the revolutionary enthusiasm and self-denial practised by the

young Communists of the East, he saw the colossal prospects of the emerging movement they led and acted towards them as a considerate and wise instructor.

### **The Role and Place of the Liberation Movement of the Oppressed Nations in the World Revolutionary Process**

Lenin's idea of the unity of proletarians of all lands and oppressed nations in the struggle against imperialism, set forth in the Preliminary Draft Theses met with the understanding and support of the overwhelming majority of the 2nd Congress delegates and members of the commission on national and colonial questions.

In the final version of the "Supplementary Theses" Roy's idea that "the overthrow of the capitalist system is not feasible without crushing colonial domination" was replaced by the thesis that "the destruction of colonial rule, coupled with a proletarian revolution in the metropolitan countries, will overthrow the capitalist system in Europe." Emphasis was laid on the need for joint action by the proletariat in the metropolitan countries and the revolutionary, anti-imperialist forces in the colonies. The commission pointed out that "the Third International is a militant organization which should undertake the task of uniting the revolutionary forces of all countries of the world."

Other changes were also made. The original text of the "Supplementary Theses" read: "The source from which European capitalism draws its main strength is no longer in the industrial

European countries but in the colonial possessions and dependent countries," while the final text said: "One of the principal sources from which European capitalism draws its main strength are the colonial possessions and dependent countries."

A study of the commission materials leaves no doubt that these changes also were made in keeping with Lenin's advice.

In his statement Roy claimed that by its exploitation of the colonies imperialism was provided with an opportunity to make the proletariat in the West, all the proletariat, and not just the privileged few among the workers, its ally. The allegation that the European capitalists backed by their colonial resources could give "all surplus value" to the workers of the metropolitan countries was untenable and harmful, since it counterposed proletarians and all working people in the East to their ally, the working class of the capitalist West. From an utterly false premise Roy drew the conclusion that the fate of world communism depended exclusively on the triumph of socialism in the East. Lenin took an entirely different approach to this question. He attached immense importance to unity between proletarians of all countries and oppressed nations; he regarded joint action and a united front of these forces as an absolutely essential condition for victory over imperialism; he brought to the fore the task of rallying the movements of advanced workers in all lands and all national-liberation movements around the only country at that time to have a dictatorship of the proletariat. Roy, Lenin said, had gone "too far" in his estimation of the revolutionary mov-

ement in Eastern countries. Without belittling the importance of the revolutionary movement in the East, Lenin's very keen evaluation pointed to the fallacy and impermissibility of presenting it as the only force in the struggle against imperialism.

Lenin firmly defended the principle of proletarian internationalism, stressing that the proletariat of the advanced countries and the oppressed peoples in the colonies must actively participate in the united anti-imperialist front; that both these forces were grouped around the country where the proletariat had triumphed.

He wrote: "...the socialist revolution will not be solely, or chiefly, a struggle of the revolutionary proletarians in each country against their bourgeoisie—no, it will be a struggle of all the imperialist-oppressed colonies and countries, of all dependent countries against international imperialism. Characterizing the approach of the world social revolution in the Party Programme we adopted last March, we said that the civil war of the working people against the imperialists and exploiters in all the advanced countries is beginning to be combined with national wars against international imperialism." If we compare this statement with the appraisal Lenin made in his speech at the commission of the 2nd Congress we see that he did not regard the struggle against imperialism as mostly "Western" or mostly "Eastern." He viewed it as one world revolutionary process with the working class as its vanguard.

Lenin was the first to indicate the significance of the awakening of the oppressed and exploited masses of the East and the "Eastern route" open-



ing before the world revolution. He was also the first to see the danger of proclaiming this route to be the only one. "For every truth," he wrote a few months before the 2nd Congress of the Comintern, "if 'overdone' (as Dietzgen senior put it), if exaggerated, if carried beyond the limits of its actual applicability, can be reduced to absurdity, and is even bound to become an absurdity under these conditions."

That part of Roy's statement which declared that the "Eastern route" of world revolution was the only correct one, came from the same source—the persisting petty-bourgeois, voluntarist notion of the character and course of the revolutionary process, which fed the leftist trends opposing Lenin's thesis of rallying all anti-imperialist forces in the oppressed countries. Very important here was a lack of confidence in the possibilities of the proletariat of the oppressor nations, which, in Roy's view, moved towards complete freedom from exploitation not through revolutionary struggle with "their own" capitalists but by becoming almost their ally in colonial plunder. And this was said at a time when the revolutionary proletarians of the European countries were storming the citadels of capitalism.

Roy's thesis that the "Eastern route" of revolution was, in effect, the only one, naturally could not be, nor was it supported by the Congress. History has shown how right Lenin was in drawing serious attention to Roy's mistake. The acceptance of Roy's line would have caused immense harm to the world communist movement. His concepts could hardly conceal a system of views and actions basically alien to Marxism-Leninism.

## **The Communist Movement in the East**

The tasks of the Communist Parties of the colonial and dependent countries at the initial stage of the communist movement in the East were set forth by Lenin in his address to the 2nd All-Russia Congress of Communist Organizations of the Peoples of the East on November 22, 1919. He said: "...relying upon the general theory and practice of communism, you must adapt yourselves to specific conditions, such as do not exist in the European countries; you must be able to apply that theory and practice to conditions in which the bulk of the population are peasants, and in which the task is to wage a struggle against medieval survivals and not against capitalism. That is a difficult and specific task, but a very rewarding one, because masses that have, hitherto, taken no part in the struggle are being drawn into it, and also because the organization of communist cells in the East gives you an opportunity to maintain the closest contact with the Third International. You must find specific forms for this alliance of the foremost proletarians of the world with the labouring and exploited masses of the East whose conditions are in many cases medieval." Thus Lenin saw the establishment of close mutual links between the revolutionary movement in the East and the progressive proletarians of the world as a major task of Communists.

Roy and other "Leftists" claimed that "organized socialist or communist parties already existed in most Eastern countries" and their task in

all cases was immediate struggle for socialist revolution. They categorically rejected any idea of the Comintern giving aid to the national-liberation movement and denied the very existence of the anti-imperialist aspect of nationalism. In fact they advocated that the communist movement should be divorced from the broad toiling masses in the backward countries to whom the awakening of national consciousness was the first step in active participation in political life. Roy asserted that the masses had turned away from the nationalists and demanded that the Comintern assist exclusively in the establishment and development of a communist movement which, according to him, should keep out of the national-liberation struggle.

Lenin attached primary importance to forming and consolidating organizationally and politically a proletarian vanguard in the oppressed countries, believing that if the budding Communist Parties in the East used correct tactics, broad prospects were open to them to win over the masses and take leading positions in the liberation movement. At the same time he warned the Communists of the East against artificially accelerating the formation of mass Communist Parties at an early stage of the proletarian movement.

It was at one time believed that in 1920 the Comintern held a different view since the final published text of the seventh supplementary thesis stated that "the primary and most necessary task is to set up Communist parties that will organize the peasants and workers and lead them to revolution and the establishment of Soviet republics."

It followed from this thesis, as published in 1934, that the Communist parties in the oppressed countries found themselves, from their very inception, in a situation where conditions had so matured that they could act as the sole leader of the mass revolutionary movement on a national scale. Yet these views were opposed by Lenin and were excluded from the original text of Roy's theses.

But this is not all. The above quotation from the seventh supplementary thesis is followed by this conclusion: "Thus the masses in the backward countries will be able to attain communism not through capitalist development but under the guidance of the class-conscious proletariat of the advanced capitalist countries." In point of fact the word "thus" is meaningless in this context. If, as was asserted above, the primary task of the Communists in the East at that stage was to set up Communist parties capable of leading a victorious revolution in their countries, then it is poor logic to conclude that the masses in the backward countries would come to communism under the leadership of the proletarians of the advanced capitalist countries.

All that remains to be added is that the proletarian parties in the colonies are dealt with in the next (eighth) thesis. The initial text of this thesis reads: "In most colonies there already exist organized socialist or Communist parties which have close relations with the mass movement," while the text approved by the Congress mentioned "organized revolutionary parties seeking to establish close links with the working masses." The thesis stated that the Western Communist parties should help the revolutionary

movement in the colonies through proletarian parties.

These glaring contradictions obviously required clarification, all the more so since many well-known pronouncements of Lenin testify that he saw the primary and most necessary task of Communists to be their work in mass organizations of working people.

In his report at the plenary sitting of the Congress of July 26, 1920 Lenin substantiated the possibility of backward countries' transition to socialism by-passing the capitalist stage; among the major conditions of this transition, along with assistance on the part of the victorious proletariat, he named the need to arouse in the masses a striving to undertake independent political activity and organization. He stressed in this connection that "it is the bounden duty of Communist parties, and of the elements that are prepared to found Communist parties, to conduct propaganda in favour of peasants' Soviets everywhere, backward countries and colonies included. Wherever conditions permit, they must make immediate attempts to set up Soviets of the working people." Lenin pointed out once again in the same report that the Communist parties should immediately, and in all parts of the world, begin work in this direction. Thus the question of non-capitalist way of development mentioned in the seventh supplementary thesis was, in Lenin's view, most closely linked with the setting up of mass political organizations of working people, the "Soviets of the exploited." It could naturally be assumed that a mistake was made in the 1934 publication of the document in that section of the seventh supplement-

ary thesis which dealt with the immediate founding of Communist parties. Moreover one would expect the thesis, as adopted by the Congress, to mention the political organizations of the working people of the East through which Communists would exert influence on the masses.

A study of the Congress materials, in particular the English text of the resolutions on the national and colonial questions which were used in 1934 by the compilers of the "Minutes of the Communist International Congresses. Second Comintern Congress" confirms the assumption that a mistake was made in the translation of the seventh supplementary thesis. The text from which the translation was made actually said that "the basic and most necessary task is the formation of a non-party organization of peasants and workers..."<sup>1</sup>

Comparison of the seventh supplementary thesis in its true wording with the cardinal points made by Lenin in his report at the plenary session of July 26 reveals their complete identity. Lenin and the Comintern as a whole then considered the basic and most necessary task of Communists in their work with the masses in the oppressed countries to be the formation of mass national-revolutionary organizations of working people, "non-party organizations" which would be a way of implementing the "ideas of Soviet organization" in pre-capitalist conditions. Lenin regarded this to be "the bounden duty" of Communist parties and elements prepared to

---

<sup>1</sup> The corrected stenographic account of the Congress session in Russian mentioned the formation of "non-Communist parties."

found such parties and insisted that Communists should immediately embark upon its accomplishment.

Lenin objected to Roy's assertion in the commission on the need to reject union with the bourgeois-democratic forces in the colonies and his claim that the destiny of world communism depended exclusively on the triumph of communism in the East. He showed that Roy's views were quite unfounded because, for one thing, the Indian Communists, up till that time, had not been able to form a Communist Party despite of the country's five million proletarians and 37 million landless peasants. This did not mean, however, that Lenin posed the task of immediately organizing a mass Communist Party in India (in point of fact, this was Roy's view). While emphasizing the exceptional importance of the formation and activity of a Communist party Lenin let it be understood clearly that the numerical growth of the proletariat and landless peasantry in a colony in itself does not furnish all the prerequisites for setting up a mass Communist party.

The attempts of certain Communists to proclaim the national-liberation movement in the colonial and dependent countries as doomed to disintegration and quick death, and their desire to "repaint" it a communist colour caused Lenin profound anxiety. In this he saw the danger of the communist elements being dissolved in the broad democratic liberation stream. Lenin categorically stated the need "under all circumstances" to "uphold the independence of the proletarian movement even if it is in its earliest embryonic form," not to merge with the bourgeois

democracy of the colonies. He specially changed the original version of Roy's thesis where it said that "it does not necessarily follow" from the bourgeois-democratic character of the tasks of the first stage of revolutions in the colonies "that the leadership of revolutions in colonies should be given to bourgeois democrats" to read "it does not at all follow." While advancing the idea of a united front Lenin at the same time considered the refusal of Communists to struggle for the leadership of revolution absolutely unacceptable in all cases, since this would turn them into an appendage of bourgeois democracy. But those who thought that Communists could win leadership without daily, painstaking struggle to win over the masses, that all popular movements in the colonial and dependent countries were in essence communist, those who paid lip service to establishing the hegemony of the proletariat, in effect, advocated the loss of the independent character of the proletarian movement. The sectarians imbued the proletarian movement with the ideology of petty-bourgeois nationalism whose danger and very existence they failed to see.

The principled and irreconcilable struggle Lenin waged against sectarian distortions on the national and colonial question was a struggle for the formation of real Communist parties in Eastern countries, for their independent class character, for correct tactics which suited the actual conditions and ensured close links with the masses.



## **Leninist Foreign Policy and the National-Liberation Movement**

The revolutionary transformation of the world, initiated by Russia's working class and peasantry in October 1917, has affected all spheres of social life. An end has been put to undivided capitalist domination in international relations, just as in industry and in state and political administration. Prior to October 1917 capitalism determined the sum and substance and the method of international relations, reducing the latter in the long run to relations between the advanced countries apropos of colonies, on the one hand, and to those of colonial rule, on the other. After the October Revolution this monopoly was undermined, international relations acquired a truly global character, with more and more countries becoming the subject rather than the object of these relations.

Right from the first the world's first socialist state declared war on imperialism and colonialism, aggression and plunder, taking a firm stand for peace and equality among the peoples, and

extending the hand of friendship to the oppressed countries and nationalities. Lenin's analysis of the problems of the national-liberation movement contained in the theses of the 2nd Congress of the Comintern is fundamental and still holds good. As Bhowani Sen, member of the Indian Communist Party's national leadership, notes, the theses "by setting the task for communist parties in the colonial and dependent countries, gave fillip to the anti-imperialist forces, and the national-revolutionary upsurge..."<sup>1</sup>

In view of the balance of forces in the world at that time, Soviet Russia's endeavour did not always bring tangible results. Imperialists resorted to both crude military force and so-called peaceful methods to settle international issues, including colonial problems, to their liking. And yet, it was solely due to Moscow's support that Afghanistan was able to uphold its independence in the clash with British colonialism, and Turkey, to rebuff the West European imperialist intervention and maintain its national statehood.

The early 30s witnessed very important developments. The Soviet Union, which had just embarked on the path of industrialization, bought half the world export of industrial equipment, spending all its gold reserves on it. Nevertheless it began helping newly-emancipated states economically and technically. The textile complexes in Kayseri and Nazilli in Turkey and the first grain elevators and other projects in Iran and Afghanistan were constructed under conditions of genuine equality, business-like cooperation and non-interference.

---

<sup>1</sup> New Age, October 15, 1967, p. 8.

On the eve of the Second World War, when Paris and London surrendered one position after another to Nazi Germany, up to the shameful Munich Agreement, in the hope of turning Hitler eastwards, the Soviet Union strongly opposed the appeasement policy whereby colonies were nothing more than small change in the gamble of imperialist predators. Particulars of the appeasement policy, which have come to light today, are appalling for their glaring cynicism.

On February 3, 1936 a conference presided over by the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Anthony Eden, discussed three ways in which Germany could be pacified: the cession of colonies, the cession of the Rhineland and economic concessions.

The officials unanimously supported suggestions that the Cameroons at least should be returned to Germany, the *Observer* wrote in its January 14, 1968 issue. The only one to object was Captain Clauson, Assistant Secretary to the Colonial Office, who wrote in his memorandum that the return of colonies to Germany would present her with a source of war supplies: "The reasons for which Germany desires a return of colonial territory are surely in themselves sufficient reason for refusing the request," concluded Captain Clauson." It is clear that Clauson's objections were based exclusively on military strategic considerations rather than on humanitarian principles.

The nature and impact of Soviet foreign policy on international relations were determined by the economic, political and cultural advances of the Soviet people. The victory of the Soviet

Union in the Great Patriotic War, the Soviet people's tremendous contribution to the struggle against fascism opened up new prospects for the peoples fighting for self-determination. The oppressed peoples realized that, in contrast to their Western "benefactors", the Soviet Union continued to advocate their inalienable rights even in the grimmest days of the war during the Hitler army drive on Moscow. On September 24, 1941 the Soviet Government issued a Declaration stating that the Soviet Union "champions the right of each nation to sovereignty and territorial integrity. In its foreign policy the Soviet Union is led by the principle of self-determination of nations."

Through the efforts of the Soviet Union the principles of equal rights and self-determination were formalized in the UN Charter (Articles 1 and 55) as fundamental principles of this organization's activity. By the joint efforts of the socialist and many Afro-Asian states American imperialism was prevented from turning the UN into an instrument of pressure and diktat. Amitai Etzioni, an ideologist of American imperialism, complains that while the United States may initially have been quite willing to allow the United Nations to act as a genuine embryo of world authority, it felt it was the Soviet Union that prevented the United Nations from acquiring such status.

The initiative in getting the UN General Assembly to adopt the Declaration on the "Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples" in 1960 and subsequent moves of the Soviet Government indicate the Soviet Union's

unceasing effort in recent decades to attain the complete and final eradication of colonialism.

The struggle to wipe out the last bridgeheads of colonialism that the Soviet Union and other socialist countries are waging along with the developing states of Asia, Africa and Latin America is concurrent with the resolute actions being taken by the peoples of South Africa against the racist regimes. The last sessions of the UN General Assembly and the work of its committees were largely devoted to the struggle against racism in the SAR and Rhodesia and exposure of the unseemly manoeuvres of London which acts in cahoots with the Salisbury racists.

Racism in South Africa is all the more dangerous with the backing of the NATO military machine and the most extremist US imperialist circles. Clearly visible along the way are the signs of how deeply the United States is involved in the affairs of South Africa, writes Albert J. Meyers, an American correspondent from Johannesburg, in a rather boastful vein. The identity of imperialist views and objectives and attempts to establish an impregnable bastion that would halt the African peoples' liberation movements and be the means of launching a counter-offensive underlie the USA-SAR "gentlemen's" alliance.

To remove the racist barrier from the path of the African peoples is the historic mission of all progressive nations, and the Soviet Union is tirelessly working to achieve this.

The "third world" today is heterogeneous from economic, political and social viewpoints. This is due to the specific historical conditions

under which independence was acquired, the varied forms and degrees of imperialist interference in those countries' affairs, and the different alignment of class forces within each country. This group of states includes regimes with a progressive socio-political orientation which profess a non-capitalist way of development and anti-democratic dictatorships which serve as puppets for the imperialist powers.

It stands to reason that the Soviet Union's relations with countries where reactionary regimes prevail differ from those with progressive states of Asia and Africa. We have established close friendly relations with the young states which have taken the road of socialism. And it is natural that as these states advance towards their goal, our relations with them strengthen and acquire new aspects and depth.

## II

Imperialism has not reconciled itself to the current situation in the "third world." It will not accept the fact that it was forced to retreat and allow the majority of Asian and African states to secure their positions as politically independent entities. In his book *The United States in a Disarmed World* A. Wolfers, an American, finds the present status quo undesirable. Washington resorts to different measures to change this status quo: ideological subversion, economic pressure, overt aggression—export of counter-revolution.

During the past 70 years there have been 60 cases of armed USA interference in the int-

ernal affairs of Latin American countries. The post-war years have seen a whole series of gendarme actions by the Pentagon and the CIA in Asia and Africa. A total of 1057 thousand Americans are involved in the US military-political "establishment" in Asia. This "establishment" is employed for waging criminal wars in Southeast Asia. The more diehard American politicians and top brass do not hesitate to urge the use of atomic weapon against the "Asiats." General Twining goes as far as to recommend preventive use of the atomic weapon to preclude possible subversive activities (by which he means national-liberation movements) and limited wars before they begin.

In conditions of unending "local" wars and growing militarist threats with regard to the "third world" states, the military might of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries is assuming particular importance. As British observer E. Burnst states, "arguments in favour of a preventive war disappeared" with the development of invulnerable retaliatory forces in the USSR.

Two theories have recently gained currency among certain political circles, including some "third world" leaders.

Advocates of the first theory urge the Soviet Union and other socialist countries to use their military might on an increasing scale, in practically all cases, to support liberation movements irrespective of the place, scope or nature of the said movements. It is obvious that this theory is based on the Maoist conception of export of revolution. The purpose behind this theory is to prove that the Soviet Union avoids using force

because it fears the imperialists.

Soviet people, reared on the Leninist principles of internationalism, detest adventurism and empty verbiage. Lenin repeatedly criticized the inclination for revolutionary-sounding phrasemongering which boils down to "...the repetition of revolutionary slogans irrespective of objective circumstances at a given turn in events, in the given state of affairs obtaining at the time. The slogans are superb, alluring, intoxicating, but there are no grounds for them; such is the nature of the revolutionary phrase."

Twice during the lifetime of one generation the Soviet people fought with unparalleled effort and tension against the major forces of imperialist aggression in order to restore peace for all. The USSR has never shirked responsibility for the destinies of mankind and world progress. This, however, does not signify that the USSR makes an absolute of the principle of armed aid. In the age of the atomic weapon, appeals to square accounts with imperialism by using the armed forces of the socialist countries are extremely adventuristic. They are rather intended to disguise a reluctance to carry out the task of welding a powerful and united mass anti-imperialist movement.

Proponents of the second theory appeal to the Soviet Union to reduce its military and economic expenditures in order to step up its help to the "third world" countries. Paradoxically enough, some leaders manage to find place for both conceptions, contradictory as they are, in their political kit.

Each nation has the sacred right to wage liberation war against the colonialists, and there can



be no coexistence as far as this question is concerned. As before, the Soviet Union is providing all-round support to the national-liberation movements, thus demonstrating the profound sense of internationalism typical of the Soviet people. American journalist William Pomeroy writes in his book *Half a Century of Socialism. Soviet Life in the Sixties*: "The deep-seated indignation and the passionate expressions of solidarity with the Vietnamese people that I encountered everywhere among the Soviet people were to me a testimony of the proletarian internationalism they have imbibed under socialism... No one to whom I spoke in the Soviet Union ever argued against the idea of armed revolutionary struggle in any country, given the right conditions."

The Vietnamese leaders have spoken on many occasions about the Soviet Union's great contribution to the struggle against American imperialism. The West also keeps track of Soviet military supplies to Vietnam. General Earle Wheeler, Chairman of the US Joint Chiefs of Staff, states with concern that Soviet supplies now amount to two million tons per year. Soviet military strategic items—machines, raw materials and munitions—have helped the Vietnamese to halt the barbarous aerial war of attrition conducted by the Pentagon north of the 17th parallel for more than three years.

Professor Roger Hilsman of Columbia University, ex-Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, admits that "with Soviet aid, the North Vietnamese have set up the most formidable anti-aircraft screen the world has even known." The learned diplomat, estimating the

damage caused by criminal US bombings in terms of dollars does not seem to be much concerned about the spilled blood of peaceful civilians and the destroyed dams and irrigation canals on the Red River. Indeed, these things do not fit into Prof. Hilsman's bookkeeping calculations. But that is neither here nor there. One thing is quite clear. The assistance given by the USSR and other fraternal countries to the Vietnamese people is an important factor in Vietnam's heroic struggle. The newspaper *Nhanh Dan* of the Vietnamese Workers' Party dealt a sound rebuff to the slanderers who cast aspersions on the Soviet Union's attitude to Vietnam and Soviet foreign policy in general. Analyzing the recently signed agreement on Soviet economic and military help to Vietnam, this newspaper wrote: "This is a fresh manifestation of the steadily developing combat friendship and solidarity between the fraternal peoples of Vietnam and the Soviet Union. The agreement proves once again the determination of the Communist Party, Government and people of the Soviet Union to increase aid and support to our people in the struggle against US aggression, to save our country, for complete victory."

The Soviet Union has taken a firm stand in support of the Arab states, victims of Israeli aggression inspired by the most extremist imperialist circles in the West in June 1967. Analyzing the consequences of Israeli aggression, the Conference of Arab Communist Parties held in July 1968 noted that despite the heavy material and moral damage suffered by the Arab countries, the aggressor failed to attain his ends. The position taken by the Soviet Union and other

socialist countries proved to be the decisive factor.

The "hotheads," to say nothing of hypocritical dogmatists in Peking, seizing on the opportunity to add to their political capital, criticized the USSR for not throwing its armed forces into the Arab-Israeli conflict. However, the Arab leaders themselves answered this ill-advised criticism. As a matter of fact, it was not in the interests of the Arab states, the victims of aggression, to protract and intensify the military conflict. President Nasser pointed out in an interview granted the *Look* magazine editor, William Attwood, that the Arab states had not counted on the Soviet Union's direct participation in the armed conflict with the Israeli aggressors. The military potential and political prestige of the Soviet Union and its unswerving support of liberation movements have become a kind of guarantee against export of counter-revolution which imperialism practises with increasing frequency under the present circumstances.

### III

"All our policy and propaganda," Lenin said, "are directed towards putting an end to war and in no way towards driving nations to war."

In keeping with this fundamental Leninist proposition, the Soviet Union adheres to the principle of peaceful co-existence which is one of the cardinal points in its foreign policy. "The Soviet Union has always favoured the maintenance of normal relations with all countries and the settlement of international issues through negotiations rather than by war. At the same time it must be emphatically stressed that the princ-

iple of peaceful coexistence is inapplicable to relations between the oppressor and the oppressed, between the colonialists and the victims of colonial rule."

Peaceful coexistence is therefore something diametrically opposite to the "freezing" of the class and national-liberation struggle. It has ensured conditions for the oppressed nations to score telling victories over colonialism and neo-colonialism, using armed force when circumstances call for it. This struggle is taking place in conditions attending the historical confrontation of world socialism and moribund capitalism, at a time when the political, economic and military might of socialism is growing steadily.

Support of liberation movements by the Soviet Union and other socialist states has enabled the process of emancipation to take place in countries where feudal and pre-feudal survivals are still strong, where class stratification is barely discernible, with practically no proletariat or national bourgeoisie. As a rule, imperialism had a military advantage in each individual case, and yet it was forced to retreat. Consequently, a series of formerly enslaved countries and peoples were able to smash the infamous system of colonialism and regain freedom with minimum losses. Two-thirds of the former colonies won independence by peaceful means, many of them without firing a single shot. These facts alone reveal the inadequacy of unquestioned support of world war as the means of liberating peoples from imperialist oppression.

What other than the policy of coexistence could have helped pact-ridden Iran, Turkey and Pakistan to tear themselves away from the bear

hug of American imperialism and pursue a more independent foreign policy?

Peaceful coexistence is a prerequisite for carrying through the disarmament programme. It would release considerable sums to be spent on urgent economic needs of the "third world." It has been estimated that the world's annual military spending approaches 120,000 million dollars. This sum would be enough to build 30-40 power generating and industrial complexes of global significance, such as huge industrial complexes in the basins of the Nile, Niger and Congo in Africa, in the Sahara, in the basins of the Ind, Gang and Mecong in Asia, in the foothills of the Andes and in South America.

As Jawaharlal Nehru would say, without peace all our hopes are shattered and turn to dust. Sowing the seeds of hatred among the young independent states, neo-colonialists seek to exhaust them in internecine wrangle. The slightest difficulty with the budget due to increased military spending frustrates the none-too-extensive economic plans of the Asian and African countries.

Moved by the worthy desire to stop bloodshed and preserve peace in Hindustan, the Soviet Union undertook to mediate in the Indo-Pakistani armed conflict. The Tashkent Conference, its results and the favourable world response graphically demonstrated the peoples' confidence in the Soviet Union's peace-seeking foreign policy.

In the solution of bilateral, regional and global international problems, the Soviet Union always considers the interests of developing countries. This was evident during preparations for draw-

ing up the Treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The final version takes into account numerous suggestions and wishes from the "third world."

Critics of the Treaty from right and left continue to assail the "diktat" and "conspiracy" of the two great powers—the Soviet Union and the United States. Lamentably, this allegation, spread for a definite purpose by Peking propaganda and taken up by advocates of anti-communism, has gained acceptance among the political leaders of some developing states.

The Soviet Union, while campaigning for peace, disarmament and a ban on weapons of mass destruction, clearly realizes that imperialists' aspirations revolve around revenge and export of counter-revolution. The post-war years have seen a sequence of military conflicts between imperialism and national-liberation forces, with the West waging rearguard, but nevertheless fierce, life-and-death battles. In these conditions the struggle for peace and disarmament is not a pacifist call for appeasement but a struggle to curb the aggressor.

The unity of the "third world" and socialist countries in the struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism is an indispensable condition for the further advance of the Afro-Asian countries along the road of peace and progress, for consolidation of their international positions and implementation of a truly independent policy. The overwhelming majority of these countries pursue a policy of nonalignment. And it is to be noted that this policy can only be realized when the country in question counts on the might of the world socialist system. When this policy amounts

to sheer manoeuvring between the two systems and capitalizing on the contradictions between these systems, it sooner or later turns against anti-imperialist unity.

It is therefore quite natural that the policy of nonalignment has been debated in recent years. This policy is determined by both the intermediary position of the "third world" on the international scene and the balance of class and political forces in each of these countries.

Paradoxically enough, nonalignment is sometimes interpreted as being contrary to the interests of the young Afro-Asian countries fighting against imperialism and neo-colonialism. Nonalignment by no means signifies a passive attitude or, even less so, "neutrality," regardless of whether it concerns the national-liberation movement in a given region or universal peace and security. It is abundantly clear that interpretation of nonalignment as "passivity" or "neutrality" would mean encouragement of the policy of imperialist aggression and neo-colonialism.

Imperialism has always opposed the policy of nonalignment. John Foster Dulles termed it "amoral." He sought to directly involve the Afro-Asian states in the military political blocs of imperialist powers (CENTO and SEATO). Today imperialism is trying to attain the same ends by different methods. Frontal attack has given way to the strategy of protracted siege. People in the West are already counting up the benefits they hope to gain from this more pragmatic approach to the policy of nonalignment.

Thus, British observer C. O'Brien notes with satisfaction that alignment with the West *de facto* is obvious among some large and small

nonaligned states. He is quick to assure his bosses that the nonaligned countries will eventually become a reserve in the "international anti-communist strategy."

Washington's injunctions for the nonaligned countries to keep equally distant from military political blocs, that is, from Moscow and Washington, is in keeping with the theory of "pure (or complete) nonalignment." Behind the smoke-screen of "complete nonalignment" the political leaders of some countries are trying to conceal their self-seeking desire to obtain economic and technical aid from both West and East. Others go farther than that, hoping to build a third bloc that would be termed "nonaligned." These tendencies willy-nilly play into the hands of imperialists whose policy is to isolate the "third world" from the Soviet Union, to separate whole detachments of the world revolutionary movement.

The Soviet Union supports the policy of nonalignment in the belief that, with the current disposition of forces in the world, such a policy may help the developing countries to strengthen their political and economic independence and throw off the unbearably heavy burden of arms race. At the same time, attempts to knock together some special bloc under the auspices of the nonalignment policy and thus weaken the anti-imperialist front do not dovetail with the aspirations of the peoples of the "third world" countries; nor do they accord with the aims of the world revolutionary movement.

Nonalignment can exist only on anti-imperialist basis, since the interests of the entire "third world," like those of individual young



states, are diametrically opposed to imperialist policy.

#### IV

Economic cooperation between socialist countries and developing states has acquired particular importance in the present situation. Soviet foreign trade policy favours the growth of an independent national economy in the developing countries. Now, when the struggle for economic independence has come to the fore in the majority of Afro-Asian and Latin American countries, the role of Soviet help can hardly be overestimated.

The Afro-Asian states began their struggle for economic independence in highly unfavourable conditions.

The rate of economic growth is decreasing in the "third world." From 4.9 per cent in the early 50s and 4.5 per cent in the late 50s it fell to 4.4 per cent in 1960-66. In per capita terms, taking into account the rapid growth of the population, the increment in gross national product has dropped to 2 per cent. According to UN estimates, this trend will continue.

Striving to contain the developing countries within the system of the world capitalist economy and capitalist market, the West is making a determined effort to halt their economic cooperation with the socialist countries. "The United States still puts much pressure on the third world countries not to trade, receive aid, or allow their leaders even so much as to visit the Soviet Union," confesses Amitai Etzioni in his book *Winning without War*.

However, international economic ties constitute that form of relations between peoples which Lenin characterized as "force more powerful than the wishes, the will and the decisions of any of the governments of classes that are hostile to us. That force is world general economic relations, which compel them to make contact with us."

During 1963-67 Soviet trade with the developing countries increased by 35 per cent, while the total amount of Soviet trade rose by 25.6 per cent. The "third world" share in Soviet trade turnover in 1967 was 11.7 per cent compared with 5.2 per cent in 1955. But the significance of the economic ties of the Soviet Union with Asian, African and Latin American countries is not merely a matter of extent. Economic cooperation with the Soviet Union helps these countries do away with the moribund relationships and develop new productive forces of society making it possible to achieve economic independence in the shortest time possible.

Today, although the West's positions are still strong with respect to trade and economic relations with the "third world" (three-fourths of trade turnover), the international economic policy of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries prevents imperialism from having a monopoly on the export of goods and technical equipment and know-how to the developing countries and from being the sole purchaser of their export staples.

The course of social development proves Lenin's thesis that it is the economic progress of the socialist countries that has the greatest impact on the world revolution.

Over 600 industrial, agricultural and other projects are being constructed in Asian and African countries with the help of Soviet design organizations and Soviet personnel. The Soviet Union is mainly interested in helping to build industrial enterprises of primary economic importance which will form the industrial basis of those countries. The steel works in Bhilai and Bokaro will provide India with half its 1970 steel production. When the high Aswan Dam is fully completed it will extend the cultivated area in the UAR by one-third providing at the same time a 10-fold increase in power output over 1959.

With respect to the current scientific and technological revolution, it is particularly important for the young countries to have access to the latest developments in science, and the Soviet Union is giving the Afro-Asian peoples considerable scientific and technical assistance. Soviet assistance includes the construction of over a hundred educational and medical establishments and research centres in the developing countries, the training of specialists for Asian, African and Latin American countries at Soviet schools and colleges and the sending of Soviet specialists—teaching personnel, physicians and other professions to 28 Asian and African countries. Incidentally, the number of students from the developing countries being trained at Soviet educational institutions more than doubled from 1961 to 1966, while the number of Soviet specialists working in those countries quadrupled over the same period.

For the countries that have taken the non-capitalist road, their development would be in-

conceivable without drawing on the experience of socialist construction in the USSR, without multifold relations with the socialist community, without its economic and technical assistance.

The USSR gives Afro-Asian and Latin American countries extensive support at international economic forums such as conferences on trade and development in the UN framework. The programme of concrete measures to promote economic development and improve the conditions of trade with the developing countries was set forth in the Soviet Union's Memorandum on preparations for the second decade of development, which was submitted to the 22nd session of the UN General Assembly.

The imperialist circles have not abandoned their attempts to undermine the growing economic ties of the Soviet Union and other socialist states with the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. With this in view, Western propaganda-mongers have peddled a theory which divides the world into "poor" and "rich" nations. This "theory" has found supporters in some developing countries too.

Exploiting this far-fetched conception, exponents of imperialism are trying to shift part of the blame for the economic backwardness of the "third world" on the socialist countries. When we speak of the historic duty to render economic help to the developing countries, writes Indian economist Lal in answer to the above theorists, we have the former colonial powers in mind. However, when we want mutual assistance and support, we turn to the socialist countries.

Back in 1919 speaking at the 2nd Congress of the communist organizations of the peoples of

the East, Lenin said: "...in the East the masses will rise as independent participants, as builders of a new life, because hundreds of millions of the people belong to ... underprivileged nations, which until now have been objects of international imperialist policy."

His words have proved prophetic. The peoples of Asia and Africa are becoming full-fledged participants in international policy. With the emergence of their countries on the world scene, international relations have become truly world-wide.

In their strenuous effort to develop statehood and achieve political and economic independence the Asian, African and Latin American countries are greatly helped by the Soviet Union.

Throughout its more-than-fifty-year history the Soviet Union has unswervingly supported liberation movements and stood for cooperation on the basis of equality and selfless friendship. Soviet foreign policy contributes to the creation of favourable conditions for the Afro-Asian peoples to advance towards their chosen goal—complete independence, peace and progress.

*A. Lavrishchev*

## **The Soviet Union and the Developing Countries**

The Great October Socialist Revolution, accomplished under Lenin's leadership, ushered in a new era, that of building a new world free from social and national oppression. For the national-liberation movement in the colonial and semi-colonial countries it brought swift growth and marked the beginning of the crisis of the colonial system of imperialism.

The Soviet people's victory over the most reactionary forces of imperialism in the Second World War also had a tremendous influence on the national-liberation movement.

Along with the growth of Soviet might and influence in world affairs, the formation and strengthening of the world socialist system there has been a weakening of the imperialist countries' positions, and sharpening and deepening of the general crisis of capitalism. The world balance of forces has changed to the advantage of socialism and this has created conditions that favour victory for the national-liberation revolutions in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

## **Soviet Policy towards Oppressed Countries and Peoples**

The revolutionary processes that developed as a result of the October Revolution led to the disintegration of the colonial system. Whereas in 1919, colonies, semi-colonies and dominions accounted for 72 per cent of the world's territory and 69 per cent of its population, in 1967 countries still in colonial dependence were less than four per cent of the territory and only 1.1 per cent of the population of our planet. The downfall of colonial empires resulted in the formation of more than 70 new sovereign states.

The successes scored by the popular national-liberation struggle, in turn, further undermined the foundations of imperialism and strengthened the positions of socialism. "A major feature of the 50-year period after the October Revolution," said L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, at the joint jubilee meeting of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet and the RSFSR Supreme Soviet in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, "is the merging of the national-liberation movement and the struggle of the working class into one revolutionary torrent. The 1,500 million people living in the former colonies and semi-colonies have gained independence and emerged as an active force on the political scene. This has extended the bounds of the world revolutionary movement and accelerated social progress."

Peoples fighting to win, preserve and consolidate their national independence have always considered the Great October Socialist Revolut-

ion to be the banner of their struggle.

Expressing the Indian people's attitude to the October Revolution, Jawaharlal Nehru wrote that the Soviet Revolution had far advanced human society and kindled a powerful flame which could not be extinguished, that it had laid the foundations for a new civilization to which the world would move.

The policy of the Soviet state with regard to the oppressed countries and peoples has invariably been one of all-round support for their liberation struggle and fraternal cooperation. This was stressed in the earliest documents of the Soviet Government drafted by Lenin himself or with his direct participation.

Lenin considered the strengthening of the young Soviet state and making it a highly influential factor in the world to be not only the most important national tasks of the working people of Russia, but also their most important internationalist obligation. "In a revolutionary sense," Lenin said, "the international situation changes depending on the course of the struggle between Soviet Russia and the rest, the capitalist countries. The main thing is to strengthen Soviet Russia and make it invincible. This will bear on the struggle in oppressed and colonial countries."

The principles of Soviet policy in respect of peoples fighting for their freedom and independence, as formulated during the early years of Soviet Government, were further developed in a number of Soviet Communist Party decisions and documents. "The CPSU considers fraternal alliance with the peoples who have thrown off colonial or semi-colonial yoke to be a corner-



stone of its international policy," says the Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. "This alliance is based on the common vital interests of world socialism and the world national-liberation movement. The CPSU regards it as its internationalist duty to assist the peoples who have set out to win and strengthen their national independence, all peoples who are fighting for the complete abolition of the colonial system."

### **Defence in International Organizations of Newly-Free Countries**

At all international forums the Soviet Union has invariably lined itself on the side of peoples fighting for freedom and independence, against imperialist encroachments on their sovereign rights and interests.

The Soviet Union has rendered great assistance to the Arab peoples in their anti-imperialist fight. In 1946, in the UN Security Council it supported Syria and the Lebanon by demanding the withdrawal of British and French troops from the territories of these countries. It took action against attempts by the imperialist powers to establish spheres of influence in the former Italian colony of Libya. It was essentially due to the Soviet Union's defence of the right of the Libyan people to self-determination that the UN General Assembly proclaimed Libya's independence. In the United Nations the Soviet government also defended the interests of the Moroccan and Tunisian peoples, and in 1961 denounced France's aggression against Tunisia. The Soviet Union's active support helped Tunisia to succeed

in having French troops withdrawn from Bizerta. Soviet representatives in the United Nations consistently supported the just cause of the Algerian people in their courageous fight for national liberation.

Again, in 1947, in the UN Security Council, the Soviet government uphold the Egyptian Government's demand to have British troops evacuated from Egypt and Sudan. The Soviet people welcomed the 1952 national-liberation, anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution in Egypt. The Soviet government firmly supported Egypt in nationalizing the Suez Canal Company. At the international conference on the Suez question held in London on August 16-23, 1956, on the initiative of the Western powers, the Soviet Union exerted every effort to frustrate imperialist attempts to re-establish, in one form or another, foreign monopoly domination over the Suez Canal.

In the second half of the 50s, the imperialists, alarmed at the vigorous spread of national-liberation revolutions in the Middle East, decided to resort to force in order to protect or restore colonial regimes there, choosing Egypt as the principal object of their punitive measures. Egypt was chosen because it was in the vanguard of the anti-imperialist struggle in the Middle East and had become a kind of bridge across which the wave of national-liberation revolutions was spreading from Asia to the continent of Africa. On October 30, 1956 Britain, France and Israel, with the tacit consent of US imperialists, launched their war of aggression against Egypt. The Soviet Government immediately put before the UN Security Council the demand that

urgent measures be taken to stop the aggression and stated its readiness to assist in curbing the aggressors and defending the victims of aggression, to restore peace by dispatching to Egypt appropriate air and naval forces.

The courageous resistance put up by the Egyptian people who enjoyed the active support of the Soviet Union, compelled the aggressors to abandon their intervention and leave Egyptian soil. But a year later the situation in the Middle East was again sharply aggravated: in October 1957 NATO troops were brought to the borders of Syria, and NATO naval forces and the US Sixth Fleet were concentrated off the Syrian coast.

On October 16, 1957, the Soviet Foreign Minister, A. A. Gromyko, sent the Chairman of the UN General Assembly the Soviet proposal on armed assistance for Syria to be rendered by the United Nations member-states should Syria be attacked. The proposal emphasized that the Soviet Union was prepared to send its armed forces to suppress aggression and punish violators of the peace. The Syrian people very much appreciated the Soviet Union's fraternal assistance which helped frustrate the aggressive imperialist schemes.

In 1958 the imperialist powers again employed their armed forces in the Middle East. This was their reaction to the national-liberation revolution in Iraq. In July 1958 US troops were brought into the Lebanon and British troops into Jordan to exert pressure on Iraq by creating a military spring-board near its borders.

At an emergency session of the UN General Assembly, thanks to the stand taken by the Soviet Union and other peace-loving states, an imp-

ortant victory was gained over the aggressors: the General Assembly passed a resolution demanding the withdrawal of foreign troops from the Lebanon and Jordan. The imperialists again had to retreat—in October 1958 US troops left the Lebanon and British troops were withdrawn from Jordan.

When Israel, encouraged by imperialist powers, particularly the USA, in June 1967 committed acts of aggression against the UAR, Syria and Jordan, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries immediately came to the defence of rights and interests of the Arab peoples. On Soviet initiative meetings of Party and government leaders of the seven European socialist countries were held in Moscow and then in Budapest; their participants demanded an end to the Israeli aggression and the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the invaded territories. An emergency session of the UN General Assembly, again on Soviet initiative, was convened to consider the question of eliminating the consequences of Israeli aggression.

As a result of the vigorous support the Arab countries received from the Soviet Union and other socialist states imperialist plans to overthrow the progressive regimes in the UAR and Syria were foiled.

The peoples of South and Southeast Asia have had Soviet support when opposing imperialist encroachments and seeking to strengthen their independence. The Soviet Union supported the Indian people's fight for the liberation of their territories of Goa, Daman and Diu from the yoke of Portuguese colonialists.

The governments and public of India and

Pakistan were highly appreciative of the Soviet position in the Indo-Pakistani armed conflict in August 1965. Through the initiative and good offices of the Soviet Government a meeting took place in Tashkent between President Ayub Khan of Pakistan and Prime Minister Bahadur Shastri of India, which on their request was also attended by A. N. Kosygin, Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. This meeting ended in the signing of a declaration providing for the establishment of good-neighbourly relations between these two big Asian countries.

The Soviet Union also gave the Indonesian people its support in their fight for freedom and independence. This was a big factor in their being able to free West Irian from the yoke of the Dutch colonialists.

Peoples of Indo-China have always had substantial Soviet support in their struggle against imperialist aggression, for the right to chart their own destinies. At the 1954 Geneva conference on Indo-China the USSR played an active part in drawing up agreements for a cessation of hostilities in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia on the basis of recognition of these countries' independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. The conclusion in 1962 of a new international agreement on Laos was to a considerable extent due to the Soviet Union's efforts.

African peoples, fighting to strengthen their national independence and end colonialism once and for all also enjoy the support of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The USSR has rendered the people of the Congo (Kinshasa) all-round assistance in their struggle against imperialist attempts to restore colonialism in the

country. "The Soviet Union," said the prominent leader of the African national-liberation movement Patrice Lumumba, "was the only country among the great powers that has from the very beginning supported the people of the Congo in their fight."

Soviet representatives in various international organizations put forward and support demands that the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and "Portuguese" Guinea be granted independence from the Portuguese.

The Soviet Union supports the African peoples in their fight against the racist despotism of the colonialists and their accomplices. It does not maintain diplomatic, consular or trade relations with the racist regime in the Republic of South Africa, has refused to recognize the racist regime that usurped power in Southern Rhodesia and has declared its readiness to support the Zimbabwe people in their just struggle for genuine national independence.

In the United Nations and other international organizations, representatives of the Soviet Government and of various Soviet public organizations have consistently supported the Latin American peoples in their fight against the expansionist US policy, for the consolidation of their independence.

The Soviet state has performed a great service to the national-liberation movement. It was the first to demand the complete liquidation of colonialism, considering this to be a matter of urgency. In 1960 the Soviet delegation proposed to the Fifteenth Session of the UN General Assembly that it adopt a declaration on granting, without delay, complete independence to all colonial

countries, and other non-self-governing territories. The General Assembly welcomed this initiative and adopted the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, based on the Soviet proposals. The Declaration said, among other things, that the UN General Assembly solemnly proclaimed the necessity to put an end, without reserve and delay, to colonialism in all its forms and manifestations. At the following session of the UN General Assembly, again on the Soviet Union's proposal, a special committee with representatives from 24 countries was set up to handle the Declaration's implementation. This committee, on which there is a Soviet representative, despite opposition from the imperialist powers, directs its efforts towards promoting the liberation of the peoples in the Portuguese colonies in Africa and the liquidation of the survivals of colonialism the world over.

In 1965 the USSR once again made a very important initiative in defence of the freedom and independence of all peoples. The Soviet Government submitted to the Twentieth Session of the UN General Assembly a draft declaration on the impermissibility of intervening in the internal affairs of states and the protection of their independence and sovereignty. This proposal was welcomed by the overwhelming majority of Asian, African and Latin American countries, 109 of the then 117 member-states voting for it.

Owing to the efforts of Soviet Government and public delegations to the United Nations, many world bodies are increasingly meeting the interests of countries and peoples fighting for freedom and national independence.

## **All-Round Assistance to Newly-Free Countries**

From its very first years, the Soviet state, despite the Civil War and imperialist intervention, rendered both material and military assistance to neighbouring countries that were fighting for independence. Nowadays the provision of Soviet material aid and military equipment to newly-free countries has become a major international factor. Recipients of such assistance are the UAR, Syria, Algeria, Yemen, Mali, Guinea, Cambodia and a number of other newly-free countries.

The peoples of the newly-free countries have enjoyed the support of the socialist countries, above all the Soviet Union, during their fight to achieve political and economic independence.

The Soviet Union's trade with the young sovereign states grows continually and faster than that with the non-socialist world. In the period 1955-65 it has increased almost sixfold. Soviet exports to Asian, African and Latin American countries are mostly goods used for production purposes. In 1966 the developing countries accounted for more than 30 per cent of all Soviet exports of plant and equipment as against 10 per cent in 1955.

The Soviet Union grants the newly-free countries credits on favourable terms (at 2.5-3 per cent interest per annum as against 5-6 per cent in credits given by the imperialist powers). These credits are used to pay for Soviet machinery, mostly full sets of modern plant and equipment. The largest Soviet credits have been extended to the UAR, India, Afghanistan, and Algeria.



In 35 developing countries 220 industrial enterprises built with Soviet assistance are now in operation.

In the UAR alone, more than one hundred industrial projects are being built with Soviet help, among them the Aswan hydro-electric power and engineering complex, the biggest in Africa. It began to supply power in early November 1967. In India scores of industrial projects have been or are being built with Soviet help. The output of the Bhilai Iron and Steel Plant built several years ago has been increased to 2.5 million tons of steel a year. Another iron and steel plant now being built in Bokaro will have an even greater capacity. A great many important projects for different branches of economy have been built or are under construction in other Asian and African countries—Afghanistan, Syria, Yemen, Nepal, Cambodia, Burma, Ceylon, Turkey, Guinea, Ethiopia, Algeria, Somalia, Sudan and Mali.

The training of national personnel is another form of assistance rendered by the Soviet Union to the developing countries. During the period 1961-65 alone, more than 100,000 skilled workers and other specialists from among the local population were trained by Soviet engineers and technicians at Soviet-assisted projects. Higher schools and specialized training centres have, with Soviet help, been established in a number of Asian and African countries. In 1966, in the UAR alone there were 25 such centres. Tens of thousands of specialists from the developing countries have been trained at Soviet industrial enterprises and educational establishments.

The economic, financial and technical assist-

ance given developing countries by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries is designed primarily to develop their key branches and promote the most advanced forms of economy in order to free them of dependence on foreign capital and raise living standards.

Soviet assistance makes possible the development of progressive trends in economic and social life. It stimulates the formation and growth of the state sector in the national economy and promotes a policy of industrialization. All this leads to numerical growth and better organization of the working class, to the enhancement of its role in political and social life, thus providing broader possibilities for carrying out progressive economic and social reforms.

Cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries permits the newly-free countries to more effectively repulse the neo-colonialist policy of imperialism, limiting the latter's opportunities to exert economic pressure on them. This, in particular, has been convincingly proved by imperialism's failure to suppress the Arab peoples' liberation movement through economic blockade.

### **Principles of Soviet Cooperation with Newly-Free Countries**

The Soviet state, acting on the principle of proletarian internationalism, not only pioneered genuine equality in relations between big and small, strong and weak countries, but has worked tirelessly to make the principle of equality univer-

sal in international relations. It initiated the extension in the United Nations of the rights of former colonial and semi-colonial countries and has persistently worked to further their broader cooperation in solving the most important fields of contemporary world politics. It was with the Soviet Union's active support that the Twenty-eighth Session of the UN General Assembly adopted amendments to the United Nations Charter providing for increased membership on the major UN bodies—the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council, of representatives from the developing countries. It was on Soviet initiative that the Sixteenth Session of the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution on setting up the eighteen-state Disarmament Committee on which seven seats are reserved for representatives of Asian, African and Latin American countries.

In its relations and cooperation with the developing countries in all spheres—political, economic and cultural the Soviet Union has always been guided by the principle of equality.

The assistance given by the Soviet Union and other socialist states is in no way contingent upon terms detrimental to the developing countries' independence, sovereign rights and dignity. The Soviet Union has never sought any special advantages or privileges. It and the other socialist states base their economic relations with the developing countries on complete equality and mutual advantage.

Its consistent adherence to the principle of equality is highly appreciated by peoples struggling to attain political and economic independence. Many heads of state and government lead-

ers as well as political and public figures of newly-free countries have commented on this. "We understand," said President Sekou Toure of the Republic of Guinea, "that the population of the Soviet Union is scores and scores of times greater than the population of our country, that the resources of our small country are immeasurably smaller than those of the great Soviet Union. And it is the more encouraging to realize that equality has always been a feature of relations between our two countries—the great one and the small one."

Cooperation between the Soviet Union and the young sovereign states has been maintained not only through contacts at government level, but also in the sphere of inter-Party relations and through contacts between public organizations. Ties between the CPSU and the Communist Parties in the developing countries are being strengthened. In recent years contacts and friendly relations have begun to take shape between the CPSU and the national-democratic parties leading the struggle of patriotic forces for the emergent countries' national revival.

The principles underlying relations between the socialist states and the newly-free countries cannot be equated with the principle of peaceful coexistence, on which relations between states with opposing socio-economic systems are based. Soviet relations with young national states increasingly tend towards friendly cooperation aimed at strengthening the anti-imperialist front and stepping up the struggle for the complete elimination of colonialism. Countries that have freed themselves from colonialism regard the Soviet Union as their sincere and disinterested

friend. They know well that the policy of the USSR and actually the very existence of the great socialist power constitute a major factor in safeguarding their independence against imperialist encroachments.

### **Soviet Experience and Newly-Free Countries**

The most important task of the newly-free countries at the present stage of development of the national-liberation revolutions is to do away with the grim legacy of colonialism in the economic and social fields. They have to break up the economic structure which had been set up to meet the interests of colonialists, force the foreign monopolies out of the economy, create and develop their national economies, and raise the people's living and cultural standards.

In tackling these problems the young sovereign states meet tremendous difficulties caused by the extremely low level of development of the productive forces and the lack of the necessary means of accumulation. A detrimental factor is the policy of the imperialist countries which seek to frame their economic relations with these countries in such a way as to keep them economically backward and dependent on foreign monopolies. Despite their efforts to expand their economies, economic growth rates in most of the newly-free countries clearly tend to go down, and agricultural production does not meet the increasing demands resulting from population growth.

The search for ways and means of rapidly overcoming economic backwardness has become

an urgent task for all the developing countries. Politicians and statesmen in some of them are coming to realize that the capitalist path of development will not rid them either of poverty or economic backwardness and dependence. The experience of the Latin American countries is instructive: they gained their political independence more than 150 years ago, but to this day most of them have achieved neither prosperity nor economic independence and remain agricultural and raw materials appendages of US imperialism.

The newly-free peoples are being increasingly attracted by the experience of the Soviet Union which, in a short historical period, overcame the economic backwardness inherited from the tsarist regime to become one of the leading nations in the world economically, scientifically and culturally.

The experience of the Soviet Central Asian and Transcaucasian republics, which during Soviet times, made the great leap from backwardness to progress is of special value for the newly-free countries. One example will suffice to show how vast are the changes that have taken place in these republics. The Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic, for instance, generates five times as much electricity as did the whole of tsarist Russia in 1913, more than that of Iran, Turkey, Pakistan and Afghanistan combined, though these countries have 37 times the population of Azerbaijan.

The choice of ways and means of development has become a topical problem of world politics and is closely related to that of the balance of forces in the contemporary world. This is why a

sharp class struggle has developed round this problem both within the developing countries and on the world arena. The imperialist powers, supported by their agents and reactionary forces in the developing countries, are doing their utmost to keep these countries within the capitalist orbit. However the progressive forces in these countries are more actively opposing the neo-colonialist policy of imperialism, stepping up their struggle for complete independence and democratic changes, to improve the people's lot. In this struggle they enjoy the support of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

The half-century experience of the Soviet state most strikingly demonstrates the advantages of socialism over capitalism, conclusively proving that it is socialism that offers the opportunity of most rapidly overcoming backwardness and advancing the economy and culture.

The attractive force of the ideas of socialism, the example of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries has resulted in a number of young states—among them UAR, Algeria, Syria and Burma—taking a non-capitalist path, and some other newly-free countries beginning to plan their economies.

Within the "third world," the application of Soviet experience is not confined to countries that have chosen a socialist orientation. Many developing countries are implementing such measures as the nationalization of certain enterprises and branches of the economy, placing limits on foreign capital investment and restrictions on landed property and the landowners' arbitrary rule, as well as building up a state economic sector, introducing the elements of planning, and

strengthening state control over the economy. These measures indicate a progressive trend which is expressed in varying degrees. These processes imply the intensification and further development, under the impact of the historical experience of the Soviet Union, of the national-liberation revolution in the newly-free countries.

The anti-imperialist struggle is an objective basis for alliance between world socialism and the world national-liberation movement, for friendly cooperation between the Soviet Union and the newly-free countries.

In some developing countries reactionary forces, with the support of imperialist powers, succeed in seizing power. Ignoring the vital interests of their peoples, reactionary governments and outright puppets of imperialism pursue hostile policies in respect of the socialist countries. The imperialists and their agents can still gain temporary successes in their struggle against the patriotic forces in certain countries, can deceive certain sections of the population in the former colonies. But they can no longer either intimidate or lead the popular masses who have thrown off the shackles of colonial slavery; they are no longer able to hold up the revolutionary process which has become the major factor in world progress.

The maintenance and growth of friendly relations and cooperation between the Soviet Union and emerging countries which fully meets the interests of both socialism and the national-liberation struggle has become a major trend in contemporary international relations.