

WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!



**LENIN AND STALIN ON
THE DEVELOPMENT
OF THE NATIONAL
QUESTION**

M.D. Kammari

ISBN: 978-1-387-14699-4

THE NOVEMBER 8TH PUBLISHING HOUSE
OTTAWA 2023

CONTENTS

V.I. LENIN ON THE BASIC LAWS GOVERNING THE DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONS (1960).....	1
I. The Marxist Theory of Nations Developed by V.I. Lenin.....	1
II. Two Capitalist Trends as Regards the National Question and the Struggle for Proletarian Internationalism	10
III. The Basic Trend of Socialism in the Field of National Relations	28
THE DEVELOPMENT BY J.V. STALIN OF THE MARXIST-LENINIST THEORY OF THE NATIONAL QUESTION (1949).....	44
I. Substantiation of the Bolshevik Party's Program on the National Question	46
II. The Creation of the USSR — The Great Commonwealth of Socialist Nations.....	69
THE VICTORY OF THE NATIONAL POLICY OF LENIN AND STALIN — CC of the CPSU(b) (1937)	119

V.I. LENIN ON THE BASIC LAWS GOVERNING THE DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONS

The London Times has clearly confirmed the brilliant foresight of V.I. Lenin, not only in connection with the general development of world history and that of the world revolutionary workers' movement, but as regards the evolutionary path of national relationships under capitalism and socialism as well.

The theoretical foundation of these prognoses lay in the creative development of Marxism, a profound analysis of the laws governing the development of capitalism in the imperialist epoch and the proletarian revolution, and a study of the basic trends and laws in national development during that period.

I. THE MARXIST THEORY OF NATIONS DEVELOPED BY V.I. LENIN

Creatively expanding Marxist theory on national-colonial problems, Lenin evolved a profound theory of nations and researched the laws controlling their appearance, development and merger with a communist society after the victory of communism over the world as a whole. On the basis of this scientific foundation, he drafted a program and policy for the revolutionary Marxist party on the national and colonial

problems for application in the imperialist epoch.

In one of his prominent early theoretical works, which was entitled “Who Are These ‘Friends of the People’, and How Do They Combat the Social Democrats?” (Spring-Summer 1894), Lenin criticized the idealistic-populistic theory of nations, setting up in opposition to it the materialistic Marxist theory. According to populist N. Mikhaylovskiy, nations and national relationships constitute a “continuation and summarization of clan relationships.” This theory, which is current with bourgeois sociologists and historiographers, who believe in evolution from the family through the clan, tribe and nation to the state, is gainsaid by the actual history of the appearance of nations. Analysing the process by which the Russian national state developed, Lenin showed that the formation of nations and national relationships had no link with tribal development nor was it a “continuation or summarization” of the tribal system. Rather, the increased exchange among various parts of Russia, the gradually larger volume of goods turnover, the concentration of small local markets in an all-Russian market — the appearance of capitalist production relations — were the important factors.

“Since the leaders and managers of this process were the capitalist merchants, the creation of national relationships was none other than

the establishment of bourgeois relationships.”¹ Prior to the existence of the Moscow state, there were various areas and principalities with traces of feudalism; there were autonomous sectors with special forms of administration, their own armies, customs frontiers, etc. At that time national relations in the proper and strictly scientific sense of the term did not exist in Russia. “It was only with the new era in Russian history (as of the seventeenth century, approximately),” according to Lenin, “that there was a real merger of all these lands, areas and principalities into a whole.”²

These conclusions of Lenin’s constitute a further development and expansion of the theories of Marx and Engels on the “merger into one nation with a single government, legal code, national class interest and customs frontier of various independent areas with separate interests, laws, governments and customs levies as capitalism developed in the feudal states.”³

Marx and Engels also stated that the bourgeoisie shaped nations in accordance with its own form and concepts. In other words, national relationships derived from it was the emergence of bourgeois capitalist nations consolidated on the basis of capitalist development under

¹ V.I. Lenin, *Works*, Russ. ed., vol. 1, pp. 137-138.

² *Ibid.*, p. 137.

³ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Russ. ed., vol. 4, p. 428.

the rule of the bourgeoisie.

About the process of formation and the nature of these nations, Lenin wrote: "Nations are the inevitable product and form deriving from the bourgeois epoch of social development."¹

Lenin developed the only correct and specific scientific approach to the study of nations, which appear in connection with the evolution of capitalism. The revisionists (O. Bauer and K. Renner) have opposed to Marxist theory their won nationalistic and idealistic concept of nations. In their view, a "nation is a union of individuals thinking and speaking similarly", or a community of persons unrelated "to the land" but with a communal territory (K. Renner). "The nation is a community of relatively common character," or a "totality of persons by a common nature on the basis of a common fate" (O. Bauer). This theory ignores the class contradictions within bourgeois nations, picturing these as "unions of like-thinking people". It fails to relate nations and their psychic mentalities with the true grounds on which nations are based, exist and develop, including a community of language. The logical result of such a theory would be a nationalist program to promote "cultural-national autonomy." Each citizen of a state would identify with one "nation" or another or with an extraterritorial "national union" guiding the cultural affairs of the nation

¹ V.I. Lenin, *Works*, Russ. ed., vol. 21, p. 56.

(schools, etc.), constituting a juridical entity with the right to tax its citizens for cultural undertakings, and having its own parliament and ministers. General international working organizations, trade unions, co-operatives and even the Social Democratic Party would have been broken down on the basis of the extraterritorial-national principle. Not only in the stated but also in individual factories would this theory call for a breakdown into many national trade unions, co-operatives, workers' parties, etc.

“The essential basic error in this program,” wrote Lenin, “is that it attempts to put into practice the most acute and absolute nationalism carried to the extreme.”¹ This bourgeois-nationalistic program distorted the workers' movement, and undermined its international solidarity and class unity.

Opposing the idealistic theory on nations set forth by O. Bauer and K. Renner, as well as the nationalist so-called “cultural-national autonomy” program, Lenin demonstrated the importance of a common language to the unity of a population living in a common territory as well as that of a common economic existence in the larger modern nations.² Unity within the national structure of a population, including a common language, Lenin said, is an important factor in the complete command of the domestic

¹ *Ibid.*, vol. 20, p. 17.

² See *Ibid.*, vol. 7, p. 83.

market and total freedom in economic turnover.¹ On the other hand, the development of economic relationships, trade, and the bourgeois distribution of labour determine the concentration of similar dialects in a general national language and the development and spread of that tongue.

On this basis, Lenin exposed the chauvinist policy of compulsory assimilation and Russification effected under the Tsars. He criticized the nationalistic concepts and the programs for cultural-national autonomy. He adamantly opposed the introduction of a single “state language” in Russia, because it would promote the chauvinist policy of Russification. According to Lenin, this would mean the compulsory study of the Russian language, which would immediately alienate the peoples of Russia from it. The study of the great, powerful and free Russian tongue, the language of Lomonosov, Pushkin, Gogol, Turgenev, Tolstoy and Gorki should not require compulsion. In his letter to Lenin, S.G. Shaunyan spoke of his idea of making Russian the state tongue of Russia because of its great cultural significance. Lenin determinedly opposed this measure, although he never in any way denied its cultural importance for all the peoples in the nation, “...Can you not see,” he wrote, “that it (the Russian language — M.K.)

¹ See V.I. Lenin, *Works*, Russ. ed., vol. 19, p. 317 and vol. 20, p. 32.

would have even greater progressive influence if it were not compulsory? If a state language implies hickory sticks, it will be *repellent*. How can you fail to understand the psychology which is of such great importance in the national question? Given the slightest degree of compulsion the indisputably progressive significance of a united language in the centralization of a large state will be defiled, damaged and brought to nought. However, the economy is of even *greater* importance than psychology. In Russia, there is *still* a *capitalist* economy, which makes the *Russian* language essential. But you do not trust the influence of the economy and would like to ‘strengthen’ it with the billysticks of the police riffraff? Will the abolition of the wretched police methods not multiply ten times (a thousand times) voluntary unity for the preservation and spread of the Russian language?”¹

In the light of Lenin’s statements, the Marxist view on the language problem is entirely clear: full equality of nations and their languages is necessary. No state privileges should be accorded to a given nation or language. No state compulsion should be connected with the study of a language. The free development and use of all languages should be permitted. Economic requirements and political and cultural communications between persons in a multinational state naturally lead gradually to the vol-

¹ *Ibid.*, vol. 19, pp. 452-453.

untary study of the language of the majority of the population insofar as it serves as the means of international communications and the mutual enrichment of the cultures of all nations. This occurs along with the study by citizens of each nation of their own tongue. This means of international communication will strengthen naturally and systematically, but cannot be enforced. The masses themselves will determine which languages they must know and therefore must study. For example, if the Soviet national republics have introduced Russian language study in the schools, it has been entirely a voluntary matter with no pressure from the Russians, a measure taken because the knowledge of Russian opens wider the doors to the rich treasuries of Russian and world culture, and facilitates communication and cultural development. Such decisions, adopted voluntarily, have nothing in common with the compulsory study of an official state language.

Thus, from Lenin's analysis of the process of the emergence of nations based on community of language, territory, economic life and culture, stems the well-known Marxist concept of the nation as set forth in "Marxism and the National Problem" written by J.V. Stalin in 1913. His definition contains another aspect of nationality — a community of mind evidenced in the special peculiarities of national cultures. This is undoubtedly a product of communal economic life and the common history of devel-

opment and emergence of the nation as well as its interrelationships with other nations. Neither in theory nor in practical politics can this factor be ignored, as Lenin stressed more than once.

The bourgeois nationalists attempt in vain to disprove Lenin's theory on the nation question, and do not shrink from even the grossest distortions in this cause. Ideologists believing in "national communism" combat Leninism under the pretext of criticizing "Stalinism". However, they are well aware that Stalin's work criticized the idealistic theories of O. Bauer and K. Renner, and that Lenin valued highly the program for territorial-national autonomy which Stalin wrote under his guidance and supervision. Nonetheless, the revisionists would have us believe it is Stalin alone, not Lenin, with whom they would take issue. For example, revisionist ideologists assert that "Stalin's theory" on the national question is riddled with "idealism," "pragmatism" and "hegemonism". They state that Stalin simply took the "old Austro-Marxist cultural-linguistic definition of the nation" uncritically, and added to it "elements having to do with economic relationships in a given territory". They assert that he viewed the nation from a purely idealistic point of view as the emergence of a "special consciousness based on technical-economic relationships and community of interests." Such a distortion of the true import of Stalin's concepts could only be perpetrated by those who assume that readers will not

refer to Stalin's works or will not have them available. The revisionists also dispute the Marxist differentiation between the two types of nations —bourgeois and socialist — on the grounds that nations do not have a class nature. This is despite the fact that such a nature is ascribed to them in all Marxist-Leninist teachings, and in direct statements by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, and is completely consistent with the actual facts. It is here that the bourgeois-nationalistic nature of the theories of these "critics" of Marxism becomes apparent. In this instance they overlook the fact that bourgeois nations are composed of opposing and antagonistic classes, and that the bourgeoisie leads these nations, implementing bourgeois policies in the name of the nations and educating them in a nationalist spirit.

II. TWO CAPITALIST TRENDS AS REGARDS THE NATIONAL QUESTION AND THE STRUGGLE FOR PROLETARIAN INTERNATIONALISM

Lenin laid a firm basis for the proletarian policy in regard to the national question and worked out the objective law governing the development of capitalism in the field of national relationships. In his article "Critical Notes on the National Question" (1913) he wrote: "In the development of capitalism there are two historical trends as regards the question of nations.

The first is an awakening of national life and national movements — the struggle against national oppression and the creation of a national state. The second is the development and intensification of all relationships between nations, the elimination of national boundaries, the creation of an international union of capital, and, in general, of international economy, politics, science, etc. The two trends comprise the essence of the global law governing capitalism. The former is dominant during the early stage of development, and the latter characterizes the mature phase — capitalism changing into a socialist society. The Marxist national program takes both trends into account.”¹

The development of capitalism inevitably leads to the creation of nations, establishes national life and feelings, and results in a struggle against any national oppression. It creates a trend toward the creation of a national state. This is evidenced by the history of the entire national movement, and in particular by the current struggle of colonial and semi-colonial peoples against imperialism. Many new independent states have been established since the Second World War as a result of the defeat of German fascism and Japanese militarism, the establishment of a world socialist system, the victory of national-colonial revolutions, and the breakdown of the imperialist colonial system. These

¹ V.I. Lenin, *Works*, Russ. ed., vol. 20, p. 11.

include the Chinese and Korean People's Republics, the Vietnamese People's Republic, the independent Republics of India, Indonesia and Burma, Pakistan, the Arab states and the republics of African peoples.

As early as 1914 Lenin wrote: "National movements did not first develop in Russia nor were they especially typical of it. All over the world the epoch of the complete victory of capitalism over feudalism was linked with national movements. The economic basis for these movements was the fact that total success in goods production demanded that the bourgeoisie find a domestic market, have a state with a united territory and a population speaking a single language, eliminate all hindrances to the development of that language, and promote its literary reinforcement... The establishment of *national states* which are best able to meet these requirements of modern capitalism therefore constitutes a trend pursued by each and every national movement. All major economic factors lead in that direction, and for the whole Western Europe — as a matter of fact for the entire civilized world — the national state is *typical* of and normal in the capitalist period."¹ Recognizing this phenomenon, Lenin's program, apart from demanding full equality for every citizen regardless of language or nationality, called for the right of self-determination and the right to sepa-

¹ V.I. Lenin, *Works*, Russ. ed., vol. 20, pp. 368-369.

rate and form its own state for each nation.

In discussing this same trend, Lenin expressed himself as firmly opposed to the theory and program of cultural-national autonomy, which denies nations the right of political self-determination, i.e. the right to separate and form their own national states. Lenin stressed the fact that the demand for the right of separation for oppressed nations, without which the internationalist education of the masses in dominating nations is incomplete, does not imply that we urge such separation. It is only that we systematically and unwaveringly adhere to the principle of equality and democracy in nations in the establishment of separate states. Lenin based his conclusions on the fact that when these principles are implemented, the majority of previously oppressed nations will not want to separate, but to live in union with equal nations.

In defending the principle of democratic centralism in the organization of the national and multinational state, Lenin demonstrated that it does not at all limit local freedom, initiative and independent action in the resolution of local problems. It is therefore in complete harmony with the principle of territorial national autonomy. It is a principle which guarantees the freedom, equality and democracy of all nations. Rather than hindering their free action or rights, it aids them in their overall development.

In a letter to S.G. Shaumyan written in 1913 Lenin explained: "Autonomy is *our* plan for the

establishment of a democratic state. Separation is not our plan. We do not advocate it at all. In general, we oppose it. However, we stand for the *right* to separate thinking. This applied to the reactionary believers in Great Russian nationalism, for example, although it damaged the cause of national co-existence. Sometimes *closer* relationships may result *after* a free separation!”¹

On this basis, Lenin adamantly opposed the project of federation in terms of the conditions prevailing in the bourgeois-landowners’ Russia. However, as is generally known, he did accept it as a transitional form during the establishment of the multinational socialist state. In the letter to Shaumyan quoted above he also wrote: “In principle, we oppose federation — it weakens economic relations, and is an unsuitable form for a single state. You wish to separate? Be damned, then, if you will forsake economic relationships, or rather, if oppression and friction within the ‘cohabitation’ system are such that they harm those relationships.”²

Lenin acknowledged the validity of federation under capitalist conditions, but only under certain terms: with democracy systematically implemented within the federation.

Marxism favours a type of state, national or multinational, in which the maximum freedom, democracy and equality have been guaranteed

¹ V.I. Lenin, *Works*, Russ. ed., vol. 19, pp. 453-454.

² *Ibid*, p. 453.

for all nationalities, since only on such a basis can friendly co-operation and progress come about. Lenin frequently pointed out the fact that in principle Marxism opposes separatism and that it cannot support a movement, including national reactionary movements, when they conflict with the interests of the working people and the international revolutionary workers' movement, or the will of the working people of the nation. The program and policies implemented by the party of the proletariat in the field of national relationships on the basis of Lenin's theories proved excellent. This was because they embody the two trends in capitalism on the national question in their contradictory unity.

Marx and Engels described these two trends in the Manifesto of the Communist Party. Lenin made an original contribution to the study of this problem, as follows: first, he demonstrated that the contradictory internal relation between the two trends is the result of the general law governing capitalist development in terms of national relationships. Secondly, he worked out the specific nature of the development of these trends in the imperialist epoch. Third, he drafted a Party program on the basis of these trends, as regards the problem of nations. This formed the foundation for a national policy of the Marxist Party for use in the new epoch, and indicated the importance of taking these trends into account in the pursuance of a proletarian

policy with a view to implementing the victory of the socialist revolution and the construction of socialism and communism.

The general law governing capitalist national relations as worked out by Lenin gave the Party more profound and expanded grounds for its fight against all types of bourgeois nationalism and for proletarian internationalism.

Lenin set forth the theory of the trend toward internationalizing the economy, political and cultural life, especially during the imperialist epoch. He proved repeatedly that capitalism, restrained by national boundaries, establishes international trusts, banks, a world economy and a world market.

He also believed that a national and multinational state were typical of capitalism, i.e. corresponded to its economic bases. Is there not a logical contradiction in this theory?

Not at all. The point is that the internationalization of economic life in the capitalist epoch takes place under the reactionary, compulsory systems of colonial enslavement, wage enslavement and exploitation of the people. The Marxist-Leninist struggle is not opposed to efforts to internationalize economic, political and cultural life, but against the compulsory and reactionary means of so doing under capitalism. Imperialism, social-chauvinism, reformism and centrism in the Second International and in modern revisionism tend to whitewash these forms and support colonialist policies.

History has shown that the multinational bourgeois states develop either as colonial empires, if highly developed capitalist countries, and perpetuate backwardness, feudalism and slavery in their colonies, which are centres of national and racial oppression; or they themselves are such backward, feudal centres. An example of the latter case was Tsarist Russia, as were the Austro-Hungarian and Turkish Empires.

On the other hand, facts show that the best developed states in Europe which are free from national oppression were national states.

We can see that the numerous recently created people's states in Asia and Africa, which are free of the colonial yoke, are generally national states. Of course, there are exceptions. The most important of these is multiracial and multinational India. This is explained by the fact that its peoples have lived in close conjunction, linked by close economic, political and cultural ties and historical traditions for thousands of years, and have striven for unity.

The division of the old India into the new India and Pakistan on the basis of religion was, naturally, a reactionary one, as it inflamed religious passions, dulled the class consciousness of the working people and hindered the struggle they were waging against imperialism and feudalism.

Because of bourgeois ideology and politics, the two capitalist trends on the national ques-

tion are oriented toward an irreconcilable contradiction which finds its distorted expression in state chauvinism, cosmopolitanism, racism, notions of world domination on the one hand and the promotion of nationalism for oppressed nations on the other.

If the ideology of state chauvinism and racism — the belief in world domination by a “superior race” or nation and the concept of the inequality of races, which provide the grounds for national-colonial oppression — is unquestionably reactionary, Lenin saw in the national aspirations of oppressed nations an objective progressive aspect in the bourgeois-democratic struggle for national independence and freedom from imperialism.

Marxism-Leninism favours this struggle, but simultaneously pursues its task of freeing the masses from the influence of any nationalism which would dim the class consciousness of the working people.

Bourgeois nationalism and proletarian internationalism are two directly contradictory and irreconcilable programs — two differing policies as regards the national question. The ideology of Marxist-Leninist beliefs on proletarian nationalism are founded and surpass bourgeois concepts on nationalism principally on the basis of the decisive and crucial significance of class contradictions, antagonisms and interests in any social movement in a class society, including nationalist movements.

Marxism, which is irreconcilable with nationalism, is “pure, refined, civilized and just.”

“The nationalist principle, historically speaking, is inevitable in a bourgeois society,” wrote Lenin, “and in analysing such a society, Marxism acknowledges the historical necessity for such a movement. However, so that this recognition will not be confused with an apology for nationalism, it should be strictly limited to approval of the progressive aspects of such movements. It should not result in the clouding of the proletarian mind with bourgeois ideology.”¹

The struggle of the masses against national oppression, against colonialism and against imperialism is without a doubt a progressive phenomenon. It is the duty of the proletariat to aid the people in ridding themselves of all national oppression in the interests of its own class struggle. This latter battle is hindered and clouded by national bickering resulting from national oppression and inequality. Hence it is the absolute duty of Marxists to promote systematic and strict democracy in dealing with all aspects of the national question. But the support of national prejudices, division or a lack of faith among the working people of various nations would constitute taking a nationalist stand.

Bourgeois-reformist theoreticians analyse

¹ V.I. Lenin, *Works*, Russ. ed., vol. 20, p. 18.

the national question as a matter apart from social problems — as an independent problem isolated from the economic and political regime, the nature of the state authority, and class relationships. This abstract-idealistic concept of the question, which they claim is “classless” or “above class”, is entirely inconsistent with a scientific viewpoint. Politically, this constitutes hypocrisy, a kind of sleight-of-hand. There is not, and never could be, in a class society, a single program in regard to the national question which would fail to promote the interests of one class or another.

Each class has its own concept and proposed solution to the national problem, which naturally serve the interest of that class.

Now, however, the question of which class has interests which coincide or correspond with those of the majority in a nation during a given historical epoch or at a given moment, and which has interests in conflict with those of the majority or the national as a whole, is another matter.

Lenin, in his article “The National Pride of the Great Russians,” written in 1914, demonstrated that “The interests, not to be confused with the indomitable pride, of the Great Russians, coincide with the socialist interests of the Great Russian (and all others) proletariat,” and that it is the landowners and capitalists who deride and sell out the true interests of the nation and the motherland, while their social-

chauvinist supporters and flunkeys not only are traitors to the motherland but to the proletarian brotherhood of nations as well, i.e. the cause of socialism the world over. Stressing the progressive, and even revolutionary, role played by the bourgeoisie and capitalism in establishing large, progressive nations free of the oppression of feudal monarchy, during the period of bourgeois-democratic revolutions and national liberation movements in Europe and later in Asia, Lenin also showed that the monopoly bourgeoisie in the principal capitalist countries and in the powerful states became the greatest oppressor of colonial peoples and the world as a whole.

During the imperialist epoch, as Lenin stated, there is a typical and characteristic division of the world in general into a handful of imperialist states and dominant nations on the one hand, and a majority of oppressed and dependent nations and countries on the other. This aspect of imperialism, as regards the national question, is carefully overlooked by all the supporters of colonialism, social chauvinism, reformism and revisionism. They depict colonial empires which are centres of cruel racial and national oppression and exploitation as free societies of nations. They continue to attack the concept of national independence, sovereignty and free self-determination for the peoples of dependent countries and colonies. They regard national sovereignty as an outdated concept contradictory to the "forward march of histo-

ry”; the patriotic strivings of the peoples for freedom and independence they identify with nationalism. They demand the establishment of “national federations” and “world government”, to be effected, naturally, under the aegis of the imperialist states. Such are the beliefs of the leaders of the right-wing socialists in France, the labourites in England, the reformists in Austria and other parties of the “Socialist International”.

The tremendous significance of Lenin’s program is made even more obvious under current conditions. This program calls for the total equality of nations, with the right of free self-determination, separation and the establishment of separate states. He who opposes this program is an enemy of free nations and a deliberate or unwitting defender of imperialism. The communists support all national liberation movements, including those which are bourgeois, insofar as they propound these ideas. The communists oppose revisionism and “national communism”, whose advocates deny the need for struggle to promote the leading role of the proletariat in national liberation movements. Taking into account the lessons of history and the present situation, they give warning to the working people of the fact that a national bourgeoisie is most unsystematic and unstable in defending the freedom and independence of nations, and that it will compromise with imperialist and domestic reactionary forces which op-

pose the interests of the working people. For this reason the creation and strengthening of a united national and people's anti-imperialist front does not hinder, but on the contrary directly embodies, the promotion of the proletariat's leading role and hegemony. Such is the general and objective law which leads all nations from capitalism and pre-capitalist relationships to socialism.

It is only the working class which is capable of continuing a systematic battle against oppression and exploitation, including national oppression, which can serve as the liberator of all nations from the stifling rule of imperialism and capitalism, and can create a society within which there will be neither social nor national oppression. This Marxist-Leninist assertion is not only a theoretical view, but a reality as well. It has become fact for the more than 30% of humanity which is constructing a new society. From the Marxist point of view, therefore, the national question must always be regarded in a specific historical-dialectical light, i.e. all the dialectical aspects of social development in the various epochs and countries must be taken into account in terms of the various relationships between classes within a country and on an international level, inter-relationships between nations, the development of class contradictions within nations, the level of the organization and consciousness of the working masses in various nations, etc., etc.

Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin all related the solution of the national question to the achievement of a proletarian regime. They regarded the question of nationalities in various countries from the point of view of the interests of the international proletariat and the struggle for democracy and socialism the world over.

In the period of bourgeois-democratic revolution, national movements and aspirations formed a part of those upsurges. During socialist revolutions, however, national liberation movements become the objective allies of proletarian revolution, and, as a result, are naturally regarded by Marxists as a part of the world socialist movement, although almost all such movements were originally bourgeois-democratic.

In 1916, forecasting the advance of the epoch of world socialist revolution, Lenin described the national liberation movement as a part of the international socialist movement. It was also very clear to him that such movements were bourgeois-democratic in nature, particularly in the colonies, economically backward countries, and peasant areas in the Orient with semi-feudal, semi-patriarchal and semi-colonial structures. He stated that socialist revolution in the imperialist epoch constitutes an era in itself which combines proletarian revolutionary movements for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie in developed capitalist countries, and an entire series of democratic and revolutionary move-

ments — including those which are national-liberational — in non-developed, backward and oppressed countries. This results from the law of inequality of economic and political development under capitalism, especially during the imperialist epoch.

While the proletariat in the more developed capitalist countries overthrows the bourgeoisie and cuts off attempts at counter-revolution to re-establish capitalism, oppressed nations do not await such strength, but take advantage of the weakening of world imperialism and the bourgeoisie in various colonial states and overthrow foreign colonial domination by a series of uprisings.

The history of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the entirety of the development of the national liberation movement in the Orient — China, India and the rest of Asia — as well as Africa, has entirely confirmed Lenin's brilliant prognosis.

In this regard, the possibilities for the transition of peoples to socialism by skipping the difficult stage of capitalism, as set forth by Lenin, are of extreme importance to the peoples of economically underdeveloped countries, who comprise more than half of the population of the globe. Lenin enlarged on this matter in his address to the Second Congress of the Communist International in 1920. He stressed that "With the help of the proletariat of advanced countries, others may advance to socialism and

communism while bypassing the capitalist stage of development.”¹ Lenin developed this idea even prior to the October Revolution, in 1916.

On behalf of the Russian working class and people, he stated: “We will try to render to other people’s selfless cultural assistance, in the expressive phrase of the Polish Social Democrats, i.e. to help them initiate the use of machinery, to facilitate their work, to promote democracy and the achievement of socialism.”²

This wise foresight and the generous promise made by Lenin on behalf of the working class and the Russian people were transformed into reality and have been implemented systematically and unceasingly since the earliest days of the victory of the Great October Revolution. The Russian working class and the people as a whole have provided tremendous and selfless political, economic and cultural aid to all the other peoples of Russia, especially the previously oppressed population of the far north, Siberia, Central Asia, Kazakhstan and the Caucasus. They have aided peoples living under pre-capitalist conditions to develop their state, economy and culture. They facilitated and accelerated their progress toward democracy and socialism by means of bypassing the painful stage of capitalism.

The peoples of the USSR have rendered and

¹ V.I. Lenin, *Works*, Russ. ed., vol. 31, p. 219.

² *Ibid.*, vol. 33, p. 55.

are rendering selfless brotherly aid to all the people's democracies: the Mongolian People's Republic, the Chinese People's Republic, the Korean People's Democratic Republic, and the Vietnamese Democratic Republic in the construction of socialism, the development of their economies and the strengthening of their freedom and independence. It is also a well-known fact that the peoples of the USSR are providing enormous selfless material, economic and cultural aid to the peoples of India, Indonesia, Burma, Afghanistan, the United Arab Republic, Iraq, Ethiopia and others in Asia and Africa who have recently freed themselves from the yoke of colonialism. This aid has helped to develop their economies, to train cultural personnel and to strengthen their political and economic independence.

The national liberation movements in dependent countries and colonies which are not yet free of the yoke of imperialism are intensifying along with the breakdown of imperialist colonial systems. The contradictions and national antagonisms within the camp of the principal imperialist colonialist states are becoming more and more acute. The establishment of the so-called "common European market" has as its purpose the rallying of imperialists against socialism, the workers' movement in Europe and the liberation movements of the peoples in Asia and Africa. However, it will inevitably intensify the national contradictions among the imperial-

ists themselves and will make a resurgence of national propaganda, chauvinism and racism necessary. These are already evidenced in the ravings of the fascist revanchists in Western Germany and the re-establishment of Nazi anti-Semitism there. Also, the beastly forms taken by the ideology and practices of the advocates of racial oppression and discrimination, which are being implemented by the ruling classes in the Union of South Africa and the Southwestern African Territory mandate, the Belgian Congo and the British colonies in Africa, and the racial discrimination in the attitude towards the millions of Negroes in the USA are well-known. All of these make it necessary for us to intensify our efforts to lay bare colonial, racist, chauvinist and nationalistic ideology, and to propagandize the ideology of proletarian internationalism and friendship among peoples, as called for in the decisions adopted by the CC of the CPSU on Party Propaganda.

III. THE BASIC TREND OF SOCIALISM IN THE FIELD OF NATIONAL RELATIONS

Leninist principles and the program for a national Party policy have been fully implemented in the USSR. The right of free self-determination, including separation and the formation of an independent national state; full equality and freedom of development for all nations, national and ethnographic groups and

national minorities in all sectors of public life; and the abolishment of all national and national-religious favouritism have all been brought about. In the process of constructing socialism, actual economic and cultural equality among nations has been achieved; in place of the old bourgeois nations divided into antagonistic classes and headed by the bourgeoisie and its nationalist parties, new, socialist nations have developed and flourished, and have united in a monolithic moral-political unity within the socialist regime, led by the working class and its internationalist Party, which educates all working people in a spirit of proletarian internationalism, friendship among peoples and Soviet patriotism.

A people's culture has developed and flourished in the USSR. It is national in form, socialist in content, and internationalist and all-peoples in basic tendencies.

The extreme, almost total, illiteracy of the population of national areas in the northern and eastern parts of Tsarist Russia has been eliminated in the course of the development of the cultural revolution. A system including all levels of education was established with unheard of speed, the national cultures of formerly oppressed nations were encouraged and numbers of national cadres constituting a socialist intelligentsia were established. The socialist nations of the USSR became the most educated and cultured nations in the world. For example, in Jan-

uary 1959, there were 18 university graduates and 263 graduates of secondary and junior secondary schools per 1,000 population in the USSR; 19 and 263 respectively in the RSFSR; 17 and 286 in the Ukraine; 21 and 261 in Azerbaijan; 21 and 344 in Latvia; 21 and 304 in Estonia; 28 and 289 in Armenia; and 38 and 315 in Georgia. The Byelorussian, Cossack, Uzbek, Lithuanian, Moldavian, Kirghiz, Tadzhik and Turkmen SSR's lag somewhat behind in secondary and higher education, but even here, the level exceeds that in foreign countries, not only in the Orient, but in Europe as well. Furthermore, the speed of the educational upsurge is amazing. Between 1939 and 1959, the number of secondary school graduates per 1,000 population in the USSR and the RSFSR increased to a total of 340% of the number in the former year. That in the Ukrainian SSR increased to 310% of the earlier figure; that in Byelorussia to 330%; in Moldavia — 460%; the Tadzhik SSR — 800%; the Uzbek SSR — 600%; and the Kirghiz — more than 700%.

During this same period, the number of university graduates increased to 300% of the earlier figure in USSR; 330% in the Moldavian SSR; 430% in the Turkmen SSR; 500% in the Tadzhik SSR; and 650% in the Lithuanian and Kirghiz SSRs!

In the cultural sector, the USSR is implementing a law on the systematic and proportionate development and gradual equalization

of the general cultural level and standard in all nations on the basis of aid to backward nations such that they may attain the level of those better developed and more advanced. This law is being conscientiously applied. This process is also being carried out throughout the socialist camp in connection with the gradual equalization of their economic development. For example, industrial production had increased by 1958 to more than 250% of the prewar output in the German Democratic Republic, 330% in Czechoslovakia, almost 400% in Romania, more than 400% in Hungary, more than 550% in Poland, approximately 900% in Bulgaria, 1,800% in Albania, 1,000% (in eight years) in China and 350% in the Korean People's Democratic Republic, despite the serious destruction due to war and foreign intervention.¹ Such an equalization in economics (and later in cultural development) is impossible under the conditions in a capitalist system, where the law of uneven economic and political development, the law of maximum exploitation of superprofits from colonies, the law of bourgeois competition, colonial and national domination and oppression, subjection and exploitation of some countries by others are operative. The peoples of the USSR, previously oppressed, deprived of their rights, existing like animals under patriarchal pre-

¹ See Extraordinary 21st Congress of the CPSU, Stenographic Report, Russ. ed., vol. 1, p. 67.

capitalist relationships and fated by the bourgeois landowners' regime to poverty, hunger, disease, ignorance, illiteracy and oblivion, have experienced rebirth into a new and happy life. They rapidly created a national state, a socialist economy and industry, a socialist intelligentsia and a socialist culture. On this basis, the great and brotherly Leninist friendship between the peoples of the USSR has flourished. It was in the USSR that the Leninist principles of proletarian internationalism practically embodied in the Leninist program for resolving the national question first emerged victorious.

In connection with the victory of socialism in the USSR and the creation of a world socialist system, the problem of the basic policy to be pursued under socialism as regards national relations of course arises. It naturally requires profound, specific and thorough research. Here we can only set forth the general outline as propounded by Lenin. In his works he many times emphasized the fact that the purpose of socialism is not only the liberation, voluntary union and rapprochement, but also the merger, of all nations into a united communist society. As the abolishment of classes and class differences may lead humanity, through a transitional period, to achieve the dictatorship of the proletariat, "the transitional period, too, through the total liberation of oppressed nations, i.e. their free separation, will lead to an inevitable merger among all

nations.”¹

Thus the freedom from and separation of one nation from another may lead to a merger of those nations. This seems to many who have become accustomed to thinking in a formalistic-logical manner as a logical contradiction or even a paradox. However, such is the dialectical truth in the historical development of nations. In reality, there is no other egress from the compulsory unification of nations under capitalism and imperialism except voluntary unification on the basis of full equality of rights and actual equal status under socialism.

The tendency toward the internationalization of economic life dominant in the imperialist epoch in fact means the oppression and exploitation of one country by another, colonial plundering and seizure, the striving of “civilized” nations to dominate “uncivilized” countries, the suppression of freedom, sovereignty and peoples’ independence, and of their efforts toward national consolidation and the establishment of national states. Hence, the development of contradictory trends toward the elimination of compulsory forms of imperialist “unification” of peoples is inevitable. This trend has been on the increase since the victory of the socialist revolution in the USSR and the establishment of a world socialist system. The struggle between these two contradictory and irreconcilable

¹ V.I. Lenin, *Works*, Russ. ed., vol. 22, p. 136.

trends is inherent in the history of establishment and existence of all colonial empires. It is precisely this which leads to the breakdown of these empires and the entire colonial imperialist system. In its place separate and independent nations and national states arise.

Thus current events entirely confirm Lenin's theory of the "inevitability of the period of transition to full liberty for all oppressed nations" leading to a complete merger.

Socialism entirely eliminates social and national oppression, and thus provides full freedom for the widest scope of free development, awakening and strengthening for all nationalities and nations which were oppressed under capitalism. Consequently, in the early period of the existence of the total world socialist system, there will be a trend toward the establishment of nations which have not been able to take complete form under capitalism. This phenomenon we have seen already in the example provided by the USSR. It is now taking place in China and other Oriental countries. However, these processes are based on a new, socialist foundation, and new socialist nations striving not for separation but for voluntary unification are emerging.

The basic and principal trend in socialism and socialist nations from the time of their establishment is a tendency toward voluntary rapprochement and brotherly collaboration on the basis of the principles of proletarian interna-

tionalism.

The development and prosperity of socialist nations and their cultures rests on the foundation of an ever-increasing rapprochement and brotherly collaboration among them in all fields of life. For this reason it is wrong to view this prosperity and rapprochement as two separate or conflicting trends, or as aspects which may contradict one another. In reality, the true contradiction arising from these phenomena under socialism is caused by the remnants of capitalism in the national relations sector — the remnants of bourgeois nationalism, cosmopolitanism and state chauvinism.

It is these very vestiges and their “carriers” who are out of step with the general systematic and progressive processes of rapprochement between socialist nations and the partial processes of voluntary merging between small nations, tribes, ethnographic and national groups, into large, progressive socialist nations. By idealizing all of the past, including its backward aspects, by defending all national peculiarities including pre-socialist forms and social relationships, the supporters of these vestiges of nationalism not only hinder the rapprochement between their nations and others, but also their internal development and prosperity. Those who display remnants of state chauvinism fan to a flame the remnants of local nationalism.

Hence the necessity for combatting all capitalist remnants in the field of national relation-

ships as well as remnants of nationalism, and the need for educating the working people of all nations in a spirit of socialist patriotism and internationalism.

The peoples of the USSR have entered into a period of expanded construction of communism — an era of further rapprochement and prosperity for socialist nations in all the branches of economic, political and cultural life. The task to be performed in Soviet social sciences is the study of these processes, the clarification of the future potential for the development of national relations on the basis of the construction of socialism and communism. The economic foundation for these processes is the public ownership of the means of production, socialist relations of production, and a conscientious and systematic increase in and development of socialist distribution of labour among the national socialist republics. On such a basis the mutual exchange of information between nations and the mutual enrichment of their cultures and languages will develop increasingly.

The process of partial voluntary mergers among small ethnographic groups, tribes and nations with larger socialist nations will intensify even further. There is no doubt that the tendency toward a rapprochement between closely related languages, and even their combination and standardization, as a result of expanded communications between the users and developers of these languages, will progress. The great

progressive importance of the Russian language as a means of international communications among the peoples of the USSR and in the promotion of their cultural development will become even greater.

Data in the 1959 all-union census indicates the nature of these processes which are occurring under our very eyes. For example, Russian is considered the native language by 10.2 million people other than the 114.4 million of Russian nationality (of which 99.8% considered it their native tongue). This means that the Russian language is not for them merely a means of international communication, but a basic tool, the means for their cultural and creative development. The partial process of the merger of nations in terms of language is especially intensive among small ethnographic groups and nationalities which do not inhabit a given territory in a compact group, but are scattered over other larger nations. For example, only 16.5% of the Karaimi, 20.8% of the Jews, 22.3% of the Aleutians and 34.7% of the Izhortsy consider the original tongue of their nations as their native language. About 40% of the Roma and Finns, 39% of the Bashkirs, 30% of the Saaris, 28% of the Karelians, 22% of the Mordovians and 18% of the Evenians consider the language of their nations as their native tongue. The mastery of the tongue of another nation as their native language is practised by national groups as large as the Belorussians, of whom 16% do so; the

Ukrainians — 13%; the Tartars — about 8%; the Letts — about 5%; the Uzbecks, Azerbaijani, Cossacks, Armenians, Georgians and Lithuanians — 2.3 to 1.3%; and the Russians — 0.2%. These processes of partial merger in terms of language are indications of the deeper and more extensive processes of rapprochement between nations within the fields of economics, politics, culture and of the socialist community of their psychological backgrounds, which reflects the common socialist nature of their lives.

These are progressive processes which demand concrete study. The transition towards communism will be effected more or less simultaneously by all the countries in the world socialist system in accordance with the law governing the systematic equalization of the economic and cultural levels of all countries. This law is in direct contradiction to that governing the uneven economic and political development of the various countries in the capitalist world, which permits the speedy development of certain countries at the expense of others (especially backward and dependent countries and colonies). It condemns the majority of the countries within the capitalist system to an ever-increasing lag in progress.

The establishment of a world socialist system has led to the emergence and increasing development of the international socialist distribution of labour and co-operation between industry in the various countries within the system.

This links the peoples, their countries and the peoples' economies in a cohesive unit. Rather than damage to any one of them, mutual benefits for each of them and for the system as a whole are derived.

As is well-known, the tendency toward the establishment of a united world economy emerged under capitalism, especially in the imperialist epoch. The national economies were essentially transformed into links in the world capitalist economy, and national capitalist markets became links in the world capitalist market. However, the desperate competitive battles which occur between capitalist countries, on the world capitalist market in particular, are common knowledge. This is to say that private capitalist property, which creates competition and anarchy in production, separates not only individuals but also nations and creates the "national egotism" upon which the "national communist" ideologists dwell.

The public, socialist ownership of the means of production eliminates competition and productional anarchy. It requires the planned development of production on a state level, and, after the world triumph of socialism, on a global scale.

In place of bourgeois competition with its principle of "strangling the weaker in order to emerge the victor", socialism promotes competition based on a humanitarian principle: "aid the backward to achieve common progress." This is

wholly consistent with the principle of proletarian internationalism in the relationships between socialist countries. Thus the public ownership of the means of production unites entire peoples and leaves no room for “national egotism”. The international socialist distribution of labour and co-operation in industry, science and technology, and mutual aid between socialist countries, and the ever-developing and strengthening cultural relations between them indicate a process of rapprochement and prospering of the various nations, and the establishment of the conditions necessary for their complete merger in the higher stage of communism following the total triumph of communism the world over. Lenin linked the process of the merging of nations with that of the withering away of the state, and thus with the elimination of state borders between nations. This is possible only on the basis of the victory of socialism, at least in the majority of the principal capitalist countries.

Lenin stressed the fact that state and national differences will persist long after the victory of socialism on a world scale, and thus proletarian internationalism does not involve ignoring national differences and peculiarities of various countries, but requires a creative application of the overall basic principles of socialism and communism such as to account for them and utilize common principles properly to reconcile national and state differences and peculiarities.

Without such action the struggle for the victory of communism cannot succeed.

The improvement of planned guidance of the economy requires that the economic potential and needs of all republics and their prospective economic and cultural development be carefully taken into account, and that prompt note be taken of new developments in the lives of the people, their new potentialities and needs. It must always be borne in mind in this connection that the primary prerequisite for successful development of the country and all the republics therein is the rallying of every effort of the peoples in the Union; a strengthening, rather than a weakening, of the principle of democratic centralism in the administration of the economy; and the combination of the centralization required in a large, planned socialist economy and broad initiative on the part of the people's masses of all nations. This is the most important law governing the development of national relationships on the basis of a socialist economy. The ideological foundation for the strengthening of the brotherly friendship between peoples under socialism is an organic combination of socialist patriotism and internationalism.

These concepts are being implemented by our Party and by the other brotherly communist parties in their practical work. Thus increasing new successes are being achieved in the struggle toward communism. The Seven-Year Plan for the development of the people's economy calls

for further all-sided economic and cultural upsurge on the part of all peoples in the USSR.

The experience of the USSR in resolving the question of nationalities, in organizing brotherly collaboration among nations, in rallying friendship among various peoples, and in educating them in a spirit of proletarian internationalism embodying the great and lifegiving ideas of Leninism, is being studied all over the world. This experience arms the brotherly communist parties and peoples of other countries for their struggle toward freedom and independence, peace and friendship with other peoples.

Developing the Marxist theory on nations and setting forth the world law governing capitalism in the field of international relations, Lenin provided the solid theoretical foundation for a national program for all Marxist parties. He worked out the profoundly thought-out grounds for national movements, proved their significance in regard to the victory of the socialist revolution, and on the other hand, the importance of the socialist revolution to the victory of national liberation movements. He determined the path and forecast the development of national relationships in the period of transition from capitalism to socialism and in the period of construction of socialism and communism. Thus he established the basis for Party policies on the problem of nations. Lenin's theories still inspire national liberation movements throughout the world, as well as their vanguard,

the leading elements in these movements. His great ideas inspire and guide the development of friendly brotherly relationships between the nations within the USSR and others in the world socialist system.

THE DEVELOPMENT BY J.V. STALIN OF THE MARXIST- LENINIST THEORY OF THE NATIONAL QUESTION

Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin, the genius who is continuing the great cause of Lenin, has developed the theory of Marxism-Leninism applicably to the new epoch in history which is rightly called the Stalin epoch. This is the epoch of proletarian revolutions and of the proletarian dictatorship, the epoch of the building of communism in the USSR, the Soviet epoch in the history of society. Applicably to this Soviet epoch, J.V. Stalin also developed the Marxist-Leninist theory of the national question.

Defining Lenin's new contribution to the solution of the national and colonial question, J.V. Stalin stated that Lenin proceeded from the basic initial ideas advanced by Marx and Engels in analysing the events in Ireland, India, China, the Central European countries, Poland and Hungary in the period of pre-monopolist capitalism. Lenin and Stalin based themselves on these ideas and developed them applicably to the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution.

“Lenin's new contribution in this field,”
said Comrade Stalin, “was:

“a) he gathered these ideas into one

harmonious system of views on national and colonial revolutions in the epoch of imperialism;

“b) he connected the national and colonial question with the overthrow of imperialism;

“c) he declared the national and colonial question to be a component part of the general question of the international proletarian revolution.”¹

In close collaboration with V.I. Lenin, Comrade Stalin elaborated these questions of the theory and tactics of the socialist revolution and of the proletarian dictatorship. Comrade Stalin created the Marxist theory of the nation, worked out from all aspects the Party's program and policy on the national question, developed the ideas of Leninism applicably to the *Soviet* period, and further elaborated the national question in connection with the tasks of the proletarian dictatorship and of the building of communist society. J.V. Stalin elaborated from all aspects the questions concerning the building of a multinational socialist state, the abolition of national oppression and of the actual inequality of nations, the organization of collaboration between the new, Soviet, socialist nations

¹ The above excerpt is from “Interview with the First American Trade Union Delegation” (see V.I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Two-vol. ed., vol. 1, Part 1, Moscow 1950, p. 52).

on the basis of the Soviet system, on the basis of socialism, and the development of the culture of the socialist nations, i.e., culture which is national in form and socialist in content. Comrade Stalin elaborated the question of the united front between the Soviet socialist nations and the international working-class movement for emancipation and with the liberation movements of the oppressed peoples of the dependent countries and colonies, regarding these latter movements as the heavy reserves of the socialist revolution. J.V. Stalin developed and raised to a new and higher stage the ideology of proletarian internationalism and friendship among the nations.

The works of J.V. Stalin provide a comprehensive, profound and scientific substantiation of the Bolshevik Party's program and policy on the national question and serve as a guide for all fraternal Communist Parties.

I. SUBSTANTIATION OF THE BOLSHEVIK PARTY'S PROGRAM ON THE NATIONAL QUESTION

Lenin and Stalin began to elaborate the national question at the very birth of the Bolshevik Party. This is understandable, because it was impossible to build a revolutionary proletarian party in a multinational state and to define its policy and tactics in the struggle for socialism without a scientific, Marxist solution of the na-

tional question.

Lenin called Tsarist Russia a “prison of the nations.” Comrade Stalin says that Russia “was the home of every kind of oppression — capitalist, colonial and militarist — in its most inhuman and barbarous form.”¹ Russia was a multinational country. For this reason, the working-class movement in Russia was faced with exceptionally difficult and complicated tasks such as the proletariat in no other country in the world was faced with. The Russian proletariat had to find the proper approach to the multinational peasantry among the oppressed nations in Russia.

From the very outset of his revolutionary activities J.V. Stalin exposed bourgeois nationalism and, in conjunction with Lenin, championed the principle of *proletarian internationalism* as the basis of Russian Social-Democracy, in opposition to the Bundists, Caucasian Federalists and nationalists who camouflaged themselves with socialist phraseology; he developed the idea of the *hegemony of the proletariat* in the national-liberation movement. J.V. Stalin developed these ideas in the course of the struggle against the nationalism of the majority in the Mesame-dasi group,² in the struggle against the nationalism preached by Noah Jordania. These

¹ J.V. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, Moscow 1947, p. 16.

² The first Social-Democratic organization in Georgia.

ideas are also reflected in the leading article in the first issue of the newspaper *Brdzola*, 1901, entitled "Statement by the Editors," in a comprehensive program article entitled "The Russian Social-Democratic Party and Its Immediate Tasks" published in the same newspaper No. 2-3 (cf. *Collected Works*, vol. 1), and in his subsequent works.

J.V. Stalin's work *How Social-Democrats Understand the National Question* (September 1904) is a splendid commentary on the national program of the RSDLP. In it, Comrade Stalin substantiates and develops the Party's theory and program of the national question and subjects to destructive criticism the opportunist principle of splitting up the proletariat according to nationality, the attempts of the opportunists and nationalists to divide the working class by means of national barriers. J.V. Stalin champions the consistently international type and principle of building the proletarian class organizations and emphasizes that the destruction of national barriers and the amalgamation of the workers irrespective of nationality in united proletarian organizations are decisive conditions for the victory of the working class. In this work, J.V. Stalin stands forth as a great theoretician on the national question, wielding the Marxist dialectical method with masterly skill. This work contains in the germ the ideas that he later developed in his work *Marxism and the National Question*.

Exposing the ideology of nationalism, J.V. Stalin brilliantly employs the Marxist dialectical method in solving the national question, creatively develops the idea of proletarian internationalism, substantiates and concretizes the principles of the Bolshevik program on the national question, i.e., the right of nations to self-determination, champions complete equality of rights for all citizens irrespective of sex, religion, race or nationality, and the rallying of all the workers in Russia irrespective of nationality around a *single* proletarian party and in united workers' organizations built up on the *international* principle.

Such was the starting point of the *proletarian* solution of the national question — a solution that ensured the *hegemony of the proletariat* in the national-liberation movement; such was the starting point of the *proletarian, international* way of liberating the oppressed nations elaborated by Lenin and Stalin.

In order utterly to expose nationalism and scientifically to substantiate the Party's program and policy on the national question, it was necessary to elaborate the Marxist theory of the nation. This was done by J.V. Stalin in his work *Marxism and the National Question* (January 1913).

The bourgeois ideologists, and the reformists after them, look at a nation from the metaphysical and idealistic point of view; they regard a nation as something fixed once and for all;

they reduce a nation to a mystical “national spirit,” to a “national character and will,” to a “national soul” or to “racial blood and soul”; they try to deduce nation from “national consciousness and will” and not, on the contrary; to deduce a nation’s consciousness and will from the conditions of its material existence.

J.V. Stalin exposed the anti-scientific and reactionary character of these theories and countered them with the scientific, Marxist theory of the nation.

A nation is not something eternal and immutable. Nation is an historical category: historically, nations arise for the first time in the epoch of rising capitalism, of the elimination of feudal disintegration. The development of capitalism, trade and the market, links up different regions with populations speaking the same language in a single economic whole.

Nation must not be confused with race and tribe; a national community must not be confused with a racial or tribal community, as the bourgeois sociologists do, because nations arise in the process of fusion of people of different races and tribes.

Scientifically generalizing the process of the rise and development of nations, J.V. Stalin has given the following classical, Marxist definition of a nation:

“A nation is an historically evolved, stable community of people which arose on the basis

of a common language, territory, economic life and psychological make-up manifested in a common culture.

“It goes without saying that a nation, like every other historical phenomenon, is subject to the law of change, has its history, its beginning and end.”¹

It is only when all these four attributes are present that we have a nation, Comrade Stalin explains; it is enough for even one of them to be absent for a nation to cease to be a nation.

This theory of a nation has received general recognition in the Bolshevik Party. In his work *The National Question and Leninism*, written in 1929 and first published in vol. 11 of his *Collected Works*, Comrade Stalin criticizes attempts to “supplement” this definition of a nation with a fifth attribute, namely, the possession by a nation of its own, separate national state. According to the scheme of the authors of this “supplement,” only such nations could be recognized as nations as have their own state separate from others, and all the oppressed nations which have no independent statehood would have to be deleted from the category of nations. Comrade Stalin showed that, in theory, this scheme leads to absurd conclusions, and in politics it leads to the justification of national imperialist oppression. This scheme was to the advantage of the

¹ J.V. Stalin, *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, Moscow 1940, p. 7.

bourgeois nationalists who opposed the amalgamation of the national Soviet Republics in a single Union State — the USSR.¹

Having created a Marxist theory of the nation, J.V. Stalin criticized the bourgeois-nationalist theories of O. Bauer and K. Renner, the chief theoreticians of the Second International on the national question. Bauer and Renner defined a nation as a people possessing a “common culture,” as “a union of similarly thinking and similarly speaking persons” not bound by a common territory and economic life. Bauer even went further and asserted that a common language is not an essential attribute of a nation. This theory divorced nation and national character from the historical soil, from the material basis on which a nation arises, lives and develops. Confusing nation with race, tribe or religious caste, this theory regards a nation as something immutable and eternal. As Comrade Stalin said, Bauer’s “nation” differed in no way from the mystical “national spirit” of the spiritualists; it is not a living, really active nation, but something elusive, invisible and transcendental.

From the rise of Leninism as Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions right up to the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, two theories and two programs on the national question contended

¹ J.V. Stalin, *The National Question and Leninism*, Moscow 1950, pp. 8-10.

against each other in the working-class movement: one was the Russian, Bolshevik, revolutionary Lenin-Stalin theory; the other was the reformist, Austrian Bauer-Renner theory, which was accepted by Kautsky, and following him, by the Trotskyites, the Bund and the other nationalist groups in Russia.

Basing themselves on their idealistic and metaphysical theory of the nation, Bauer and Renner included in their program the demand for the artificial creation of nations, for the amalgamation of people not bound by a common language, territory and economic life in separate national communities for the purpose of administering the respective nation's "cultural" affairs. On the basis of this theory the program of so-called "cultural-national autonomy" was built. Comrade Stalin showed that this program is both utopian and reactionary. Its aim is artificially to unite in a nation people whom the development of capitalism is constantly, daily, compelling to migrate from one country to another, in search of work for example. This program is reactionary because its aim is to shut the workers within the shell of their nation, to subject them to the ideology of bourgeois nationalism, to shatter international proletarian solidarity. This program actually did lead to the break-up of Austrian Social-Democracy, trade unions and other workers' organizations into separate national groups; it led to the collapse of the international unity of the working-class move-

ment in Austria-Hungary, to national bickering, to the growth of nationalism and chauvinism. This was a *reformist* program; its aim was to solve the national question not on the basis of revolution, but on the basis of reform, of “slight amendments” of the Constitution of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. It was a *nationalist* and *imperialist* program; it was based on the principle of the integrity of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, which oppressed other nations (the Slavs) and with this in view degraded the right of nations to self-determination to miserable and meagre “cultural-national autonomy.” Pursuing the aim of preserving the state power and privileges of the dominant nation, it perpetuated the oppression of the Slavonic nations by the Germans.

Comrade Stalin countered the bourgeois-nationalist ideology, theory and program of the parties of the Second International with the thoroughly consistent, scientific, Marxist world-outlook, with the Marxist theory and method of solving the national question, with the proletarian international method of solving the national question, the only correct method.

As Comrade Stalin teaches us, the Marxist solution of the national question requires that strict account be taken of the economic, political and cultural environmental conditions in which nations live, and that these conditions be regarded from the angle of their process of *change and development*, i.e., in conformity with

the requirements of Marxist dialectics. A solution which is correct for a nation in one period and under one set of conditions will be unsuitable in another period and under another set of conditions. A solution which is correct for one country and for one nation may prove to be unsuitable for another country and another nation.

*“The concrete historical conditions as the starting point, the dialectical presentation of the problem as the only correct way of presenting it — such is the key to the solution of the national problem.”*¹ (My italics. — M.K.)

In conformity with this dialectical, Marxist presentation of the national question, J.V. Stalin linked its solution in our country in the period preceding the First World War with the tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, and in the period of the First World War and the 1917 Revolution in Russia with the tasks of the *socialist* revolution.

J.V. Stalin pointed out that a condition for the solution of the national question is the radical democratic transformation of the state, i.e., *revolution*; but at the same time, he emphasized that complete peace among the nations, i.e., the complete and actual solution of the national

¹ J.V. Stalin, *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, Moscow 1940, p. 22.

question is possible only under socialism. He took as his starting point Lenin's theory that the bourgeois-democratic revolution must grow into the socialist revolution; he took into account the opening of the epoch of imperialism, of imperialist wars and the growth of national-liberation movements this inevitably brings in its train. "When in 1912 we Russian Marxists were drawing up the first draft of our national program," Comrade Stalin relates, "no serious movement for independence yet existed in any of the border regions of the Russian Empire. Nevertheless, we deemed it necessary to include in our program the point on the right of nations to self-determination, i.e., the right of every nationality to secede and exist as an independent state. Why? Because we based ourselves not only on what then existed, but also on what was developing and impending in the general system of international relations; that is, we took into account not only the present, but also the future."¹

With the foresight of genius, Comrade Stalin perceived this future and as early as 1913 pointed to the connection between the solution of the national question and the opening of the epoch of imperialism, and imperialist wars and with the complications, crises and revolutions these would bring in their train. Noting that

¹ J.V. Stalin, *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, Moscow 1940, p. 177.

Russia is situated between Europe and Asia and that “the growth of democracy in Asia is inevitable,” Comrade Stalin wrote: “The growth of imperialism in Europe is not fortuitous. In Europe, capital finds itself restricted, and it is striving towards foreign countries in search of new markets, cheap labour and new fields of investment. But this leads to external complications and to war... It is quite possible, therefore, that a combination of internal and external factors may arise in which one or another nationality in Russia may find it necessary to raise and settle the question of its independence. And, of course, it is not for Marxists to create obstacles in such cases.”¹ This thesis of Comrade Stalin’s was subsequently fully confirmed during the war and after the war, in the period of the October Socialist Revolution.

Basing himself on the conditions of the new epoch, J.V. Stalin substantiated the Party’s *program* slogan of *the right of nations to self-determination*, including the right to secede, and the need for *international solidarity of the workers* irrespective of nationality in united proletarian organizations as *most important points in the solution of the national question*.

J.V. Stalin exposed the nationalism of the theoreticians of the Second International (O. Bauer and K. Renner) which they had so cunningly camouflaged with socialist and interna-

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 49.

tionalist phraseology. He pointed out that the principle of dividing the workers according to nationality that they advanced served to corrupt the workers by imbuing them with the ideology of bourgeois nationalism and cultivating national bigotry.

The principle advanced by the Bolsheviks that proletarian organizations must be built on an international basis was, on the contrary, *a tremendous lesson in proletarian internationalism.*

Proletarian internationalism cannot be reconciled with bourgeois nationalism. One or the other principle must triumph. There is no middle course: conflicting principles triumph over one another, they are not to be reconciled. In solving the national question J.V. Stalin consistently adhered to the principle of proletarian internationalism, the principle of Bolshevik partisanship. The theoretical principles of the Party's program on the national question elaborated by J.V. Stalin were a masterly generalization of the revolutionary experience and practice of the Bolshevik Party, of the practical activities the Bolsheviks conducted in Russia under the guidance of Lenin and Stalin.

How highly V.I. Lenin appraised the theoretical and practical political significance of this experience and its generalization by J.V. Stalin can be seen from the letter Lenin wrote to A.M. Gorky in February 1913, in which the experience in building the Party organization and in conducting Party activities on internationalist

principles as was done in the Caucasus under Stalin's leadership is described as the *only correct proletarian* solution of the national question.¹

On learning that some of the members of the editorial board of *Prosveshcheniye* proposed to consider Stalin's article as a subject for debate, Lenin emphatically opposed this: "Of course, we are absolutely opposed," he wrote. "The article is *very good*. This is a burning question, and we will not yield one iota of our principles to the Bundist riffraff."²

J.V. Stalin's work was a comprehensive substantiation of the Bolshevik Party's program on the national question and delivered a crushing blow at the theories of the Bundists, Liquidators, Mensheviks and Trotskyites who were poisoning the working-class movement with the venom of nationalism.

Lenin highly appraised this work of Stalin's and singled it out as the best in the whole of the theoretical Marxist literature on the national question. In his article "The National Program of the RSDLP" (December 1913), Lenin wrote:

"In theoretical Marxian literature... the principles of the Social-Democratic national program have already been dealt with recently (in this connection Stalin's article

¹ V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, 4th Russ. ed., vol. 35, p. 58.

² *Ibid.*, vol. 19, p. 535, Note 130.

stands in the forefront).”¹

Stalin’s work *Marxism and the National Question* was the most important Bolshevik pronouncement on the national question in the prewar international arena. It was the Bolshevik theory of and program declaration on the national question.

“Two methods, two programs, two outlooks on the national question were sharply contrasted in this work — that of the Second International and that of Leninism. Stalin worked with Lenin to demolish the opportunist views and dogmas of the Second International on this question... Stalin, in this work, presents a Marxist theory of nations, formulates the principles of the Bolshevik solution of the national problem (which demands that it be treated as part of the general problem of the revolution and inseparably from the entire international situation in the era of imperialism), and gives the theoretical foundation of the Bolshevik principle of international working-class solidarity.”²

Defending the Bolshevik program and policy on the national question against the attacks of the Trotskyites at the Seventh (April) Confer-

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 488.

² *J.V. Stalin, A Short Biography*, Moscow 1951, pp. 45-46.

ence of the RSDLP (Bolsheviks) in 1917, J.V. Stalin said:

“Insofar as it is steering a course for the socialist revolution, Social-Democracy must support the revolutionary movement of the nations against imperialism.

“Either we deem it necessary to create a rear for the vanguard of the socialist revolution in the shape of the peoples who are rising against national oppression — in which case we are laying a bridge between the West and the East — in which case we are really steering a course for the world socialist revolution; or we do not do so — in which case we will find ourselves isolated, in which case we renounce the tactics of utilizing for the purpose of destroying imperialism all revolutionary movements among the oppressed nationalities.”¹

This is a remarkably clear and profound substantiation of the new, Leninist-Stalinist presentation of the national question in connection with the course that was taken for the socialist revolution.

When organizing the victory of the Great October Revolution, Lenin and Stalin taught the Party to direct the stream of the national-liberation movement of the oppressed peoples into the channel of the socialist revolution.

¹ J.V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Russ. ed., vol. 3, p. 56.

“The triumph of the revolution — such is the only path of liberation of the peoples of Russia from national oppression...

“Either the peoples of Russia support the workers’ revolutionary struggle for power — in which case they will achieve emancipation, or they do not support it — in which case they will no more see emancipation than they will see their own ears.”¹

This is how Comrade Stalin presented the question in all its acuteness on the eve of the October Revolution, exposing the bourgeois counter-revolution, its policy of national oppression, the very policy that threatened the “dissolution” of Russia which the bourgeois press hypocritically accused the Bolsheviks of causing. The Bolshevik Party pursued the line of the voluntary amalgamation of nations on the basis of free self-determination, complete equality of rights and mutual confidence and friendship among the nations, for only such an amalgamation could be real and durable.

In his article “The October Revolution and the National Question,”² J.V. Stalin showed concretely how the fundamental contradictions of capitalism on the national question are solved in the process of growth of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into the proletarian revolution and with the establishment of the prole-

¹ J.V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Russ. ed., vol. 3, p. 209.

² *Ibid.*, vol. 4.

tarian dictatorship, and how, in this connection, the character and significance of national movements undergo a radical change: the bourgeois-national movement passes into the camp of imperialist reaction; the socialist movement of the workers and peasants of the oppressed nationalities triumphs on the basis of the struggle to establish the power of the Soviets.

Generalizing the experience of the first year of the proletarian dictatorship, J.V. Stalin said: "the national question is entirely determined by the conditions of the social environment, by the character of the ruling power in the country and, in general, by the whole course of social development."¹

The bourgeois conception of self-determination of nations was exposed in the course of the revolution. The socialist conception of the principle of self-determination of nations triumphed; the Party's Lenin-Stalin slogan: "all power to the toiling masses of the oppressed nationalities" but not to the national bourgeoisie, triumphed. Sweeping aside the chauvinist and cosmopolitan theories of the Trotskyites who asserted that the socialist revolution "annuls" the principles of self-determination of nations and defence of the fatherland, J.V. Stalin emphasized: "Actually, not the principles of self-determination and 'defence of the fatherland,' but their bourgeois interpre-

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 155.

tation is annulled.”¹

Developing further the *new* contribution that Leninism made to the treasury of Marxism on the national question, J.V. Stalin emphasized that the presentation and solution of the national question in Leninism differs radically from the way this question was presented and solved in the period of the Second International.

Comrade Stalin points to four fundamental points that distinguish the *new* presentation of the national question in Leninism:

The *first point* is that the national question, as a part, has been merged with the general question of the emancipation of the colonies, as a whole...

The *second point* is that the vague slogan of the right of nations to self-determination has been replaced by the clear revolutionary slogan of the right of nations and colonies to political secession and the formation of independent states...

The *third point* is the disclosure of the organic connection between the national and colonial question and the question of the power of capital, of the overthrow of capitalism, of the dictatorship of the proletariat...

The *fourth point* is that a new element has been introduced into the national question — the element of real (and not merely juridical) equalization of nations (helping and encourag-

¹ J.V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Russ. ed., vol. 4, p. 166.

ing the backward nations to raise themselves to the cultural and economic level of the more advanced nations), as one of the conditions necessary for securing fraternal co-operation between the toiling masses of the various nations (cf. "The National Question Presented"¹). This presentation of the national question, given in 1921, J.V. Stalin developed also in his subsequent works, particularly in his lectures *The Foundations of Leninism* (April 1924).

The parties affiliated to the Second International looked at the national question from the *reformist* angle as a separate, independent question having no connection with the question of overthrowing imperialism, of the proletarian revolution, i.e., they looked at it from the metaphysical, idealistic, *bourgeois* angle. Leninism, in complete conformity with the requirements of the dialectical method, examines the national question in connection with the proletarian class struggle, the proletarian revolution and the proletarian dictatorship.

From the very outset the leaders of the Second International carefully evaded (and now evade) the question of the liberation of the peoples of the dependent countries and colonies from imperialist oppression. They usually confined the national question to a narrow range of questions that chiefly concerned the so-called

¹ J.V. Stalin, *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, Moscow 1940, pp. 98-101.

“civilized” nations. They did not dare to put white and coloured, “civilized” and “uncivilized” peoples on a par and thus tacitly agreed with the racial ideology and policy of imperialism. The leaders of the Second International (O. Bauer, K. Renner, K. Kautsky and others) slipped into the *bourgeois* interpretation of the right of nations to self-determination. They converted the idea of self-determination from a weapon in the struggle against annexations into an instrument for justifying annexations. Leninism exposed this deception by *widening* the conception of self-determination and interpreting it as the right of the oppressed peoples of dependent countries and colonies to complete secession, as the right of nations to independent state existence. The idea of self-determination was thus transformed from an instrument for deceiving the masses “into an instrument for exposing all and sundry imperialist aspirations and chauvinist machinations, into an instrument for the political education of the masses in the spirit of internationalism.”¹

The parties affiliated to the Second International were content with declarations about “equal rights for nations,” and “equality of nations,” and obscured the fact that under imperialism, when one group of nations (the minority) lives by exploiting another group of nations (the

¹ J.V. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, Moscow 1947, p. 60.

majority), “equality of nations” is just a hypocritical phrase, a mockery of the oppressed and exploited nations. Leninism exposed these mendacious declarations and stated that declarations about “equality of nations” that are not backed by direct support of the struggle for liberation waged by the oppressed nations are empty, and false.

Revealing the extremely profound contradictions of imperialism and showing that the bankruptcy of its policy on the national-colonial question is inevitable, J.V. Stalin proved that the tendency to create national states and the tendency towards the amalgamation of nations are *irreconcilable* under imperialism, because the latter cannot exist without exploiting colonies and forcibly keeping them within the framework of an “integral whole,” because imperialism can “unite” nations only by annexations and colonial conquests, which inevitably leads to a struggle of the oppressed nations against the violent forms of imperialist “amalgamation” of nations, leads to the break-up of multinational colonial powers. “For communism, on the contrary, these tendencies are but two sides of a single cause — the cause of the emancipation of the oppressed peoples from the yoke of imperialism; because communism knows that the union of nations in a single world economic system is possible only on the basis of mutual confidence and voluntary agreement, and that the road to the formation of a voluntary union of nations

lies through the separation of the colonies from the 'integral' imperialist 'whole,' through the transformation of the colonies into independent states."¹

Taking into account the contradictions of imperialism, Lenin and Stalin teach that socialists belonging to ruling bourgeois nations must insist on the right to "free *secession*" for oppressed nations, whereas socialists belonging to oppressed nations must insist on "free amalgamation."

The "critics" of Leninism claimed that these demands were "contradictory" and even paradoxical. But Lenin and Stalin teach that there is not, nor can there be, any other road to internationalism and the voluntary, i.e., the genuine amalgamation of nations. Such are the dialectics of history, the dialectics of the preparations for the victory of the proletarian revolution as the chief and decisive condition necessary for the liberation of the peoples from the yoke of capitalism.

Such is the *proletarian, international* method of liberating the oppressed nations, the method hammered out by the Party of Lenin and Stalin and tried and tested by the experience of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

Bourgeois nationalism as an ideology and policy, as a method of "solving" the national

¹ J.V. Stalin, *The Foundations of Leninism*, Moscow 1950, p. 108.

question, has been exposed, shattered, refuted by life itself, it has met with utter bankruptcy.

As Comrade Stalin points out, the October Revolution proved “the possibility and expediency of the *proletarian, international* method of liberating the oppressed nations as being the only correct method, having demonstrated in practice the possibility and expediency of a *fraternal union* of the workers and peasants of the most diverse nations on the principles of *voluntariness* and *internationalism*.”¹

Direct proof of this is provided by the development and consolidation of the multinational Soviet Socialist State and the efflorescence of the friendship among the nations of the USSR.

II. THE CREATION OF THE USSR — THE GREAT COMMONWEALTH OF SOCIALIST NATIONS

The building of our multinational socialist state opened a *new, Soviet* stage in the development of the Marxist-Leninist theory of the national question. Generalizing the experience of the building of this state and directly guiding the practical solution of the national question in the USSR, J.V. Stalin presented a profoundly Marxist-Leninist substantiation of the Soviet

¹ J.V. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, Moscow 1947, p. 201.

state's national policy and defined the ways and forms of the fraternal collaboration of the nations on the basis of the Soviet system, the ways of forming, consolidating and developing the socialist nations and their culture, which is national in form and socialist in content.

The fundamental principles of the Party's policy on the national question were formulated and scientifically substantiated by Lenin and Stalin long before the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

They were proclaimed immediately after the victory of the October Revolution in the "Declaration of Rights of the Nations in Russia," written by J.V. Stalin and published on November 16, 1917, signed by V.I. Lenin and J.V. Stalin.

The policy proclaimed in this historic document did not remain a mere declaration, as usually happens in the practice of bourgeois states. It was implemented forthwith resolutely and consistently, in the Stalin style, under the direct guidance of J.V. Stalin, then People's Commissar for the Affairs of the Nationalities.

The implementation of this policy led to an efflorescence of friendship among the nations of the USSR such as has never been witnessed in history before; and it transformed these nations into an invincible force, into a bulwark of the freedom and independence of all the nations in the world.

On Lenin's recommendation, the Bolshevik

Party entrusted the work of directly guiding the implementation of the Party's and Soviet government's national policy to J.V. Stalin, knowing that nobody was better trained than he for this work. In the first years after the October Revolution, J.V. Stalin was obliged to solve the most complicated problems connected with the Party's and Soviet government's national policy amidst the conditions of the fiercest class struggle and at the same time to direct decisive operations on the different fronts in the war against the armies of the interventionists and of the bourgeois-landlord counter-revolution.

It was only the genius of V.I. Lenin and J.V. Stalin that could ensure the implementation of the Party's correct line and policy in that complicated situation. Rebuffing the Trotskyites and nationalist deviators who were attacking J.V. Stalin, Lenin categorically declared that there was no other candidate for the post of People's Commissar for the Affairs of the Nationalities except J.V. Stalin, just as there was no other candidate for the post of People's Commissar of the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection. (J.V. Stalin had simultaneously to direct both these People's Commissariats.) "It is a gigantic task," said V.I. Lenin; it involved the solution of the most important problems of the proletarian dictatorship. Lenin pointed out that bourgeois states had been trying to solve the national problem for hundreds of years, but success had not been achieved anywhere, not

even in the most democratic bourgeois republics. The Soviet system had created the possibility of solving this problem from the very outset; but in order to achieve the solution a leader was required who enjoyed the confidence of the broad masses of all the nationalities, who could be trusted to find correct, principled and just solutions of the complex problems of national interrelationships, to remove the age-long ill feeling and injustices that had been engendered by the rule of the exploiting classes. Nobody could mention a candidate other than Comrade Stalin, said Vladimir Ilyich.¹

As People's Commissar for the Affairs of the Nationalities, Comrade Stalin brilliantly solved the extremely complex problems of national policy, performed gigantic theoretical and practical work in creating the national Soviet Republics and in creating and developing our multinational Soviet state. There is not a single national Soviet Republic in the creation of which Comrade Stalin did not take a decisive, leading part, and in the development of which he did not render practical assistance. It was under the direct guidance of Lenin and Stalin that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was created.

The masterly generalization of the experience of the revolutionary masses in building up

¹ V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, 4th Russ. ed., vol. 33, pp. 281-82.

the Soviet state made by Lenin and Stalin led to their discovery of the most suitable forms of uniting the national Soviet Republics in a single Union State — the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR).

The Party and the Soviet state were then faced with a complex, gigantic, historic task, namely, to draw into the work of socialist construction those peoples in the USSR which at the beginning of the Revolution had been in the most diverse stages of social development, from the patriarchal-nomad way of life of the outlying regions to the highly-developed industrial centres of the country. The Soviet system had first been set up in the central parts of the Union by the Russian workers; the task now was to make the tribes and peoples in our country understand this system and accept it as their own; it was necessary to build up the great commonwealth of Soviet socialist nations. Here it was necessary constructively to apply and develop the Marxist method and the Marxist science of society. The questions of self-determination, federation and autonomy were presented in a new way. Before the October Revolution, Lenin and Stalin had repeatedly opposed the application of the principle of federalism to the state structure of Russia and regarded it as a step backward toward further national segregation. The question of federation presented itself quite differently after October 1917, amidst the struggle against the bourgeois-nationalist counter-

revolution and foreign intervention, when many of the peoples of our country were torn from each other, and when federation became a step forward to the amalgamation of the nations on a *Soviet socialist* basis, which facilitated friendly co-operation among the nations within the framework of a multinational Union state. J.V. Stalin showed the fundamental difference between Soviet federation based on the principle of complete equality and voluntary amalgamation, and bourgeois federation, which is based on the principle of inequality, discrimination and the oppression of some nations by others.

In conformity with the principles of dialectics, J.V. Stalin teaches that Soviet federation and autonomy are not something fixed, once and for all, that they permit of the most diverse forms of development. He particularly emphasizes the flexibility of Soviet autonomy and the diversity of its forms as its specific features and merits. This flexibility made it possible to deal with all the diverse national relationships, stages of historical development and class differentiations within the nations.

The correctness of the Party's policy on the national question, the flexibility and diversity of forms of Soviet autonomy and federation, enabled Soviet rule "to lay a road for itself" to the most remote outlying regions of Russia, "to rouse to political life the most backward masses of most diverse nations, to bind these masses with the centre by the most diverse threads — a

task that has not only not been carried out, but not even undertaken (they dared not undertake it!), by any other government in the world.”¹

Generalizing the experience of creating the RSFSR, J.V. Stalin pointed out that this type of federation was the sought for and already found form of state union that was needed to enable the Soviet Republics to develop and to preserve their existence amidst the capitalist encirclement, for “not a single Soviet Republic taken alone can regard itself as secure against economic exhaustion and military destruction at the hands of world imperialism.”²

The common interests of defence and the necessity of restoring and developing the productive forces that had been destroyed by the war, J.V. Stalin pointed out, “imperatively dictate the political union of the various Soviet Republics as the only means of escaping imperialist bondage and national oppression.”³

A federation of Soviet Republics, he also pointed out, is

“that general form of political union which makes it possible:

“a) to guarantee the integrity and economic development both of the individual republics and of the federation as a whole;

¹ J.V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Russ. ed., vol. 4, p. 355.

² J.V. Stalin, *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, Moscow 1940, p. 81.

³ *Ibid.*

“b) to embrace the various social, cultural and economic conditions of the various nations and peoples, which are at different levels of development, and accordingly to apply one form of federation or another;

“c) to bring about the peaceful co-existence and fraternal collaboration of the nations and peoples which have in one form or another thrown in their lot with that of the federation.”¹

The experience of the RSFSR, generalized by Comrade Stalin, revealed the advantages of the Soviet federation as the state form of the Union of Soviet Republics and thereby prepared the ground for the amalgamation of all the Soviet Republics in one Union Socialist state. This state — the USSR — was created under the direct guidance of Lenin and Stalin.

The Soviet state did not confine itself merely to establishing the political and juridical equality of nations, although this in itself was an achievement of world-historic importance, which not a single bourgeois republic, even the most democratic, can claim.

Under the guidance of the Bolshevik Party, the Soviet state set the task of abolishing the actual inequality of nations. “The crux of the national problem in the RSFSR,” said Comrade Stalin at the Tenth Congress of the Party, “lies

¹ J.V. Stalin, *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, Moscow 1940, p. 81.

in the obligation to put an end to that actual backwardness (economic, political and cultural) which some of the nations have inherited from the past and to afford the backward peoples the opportunity of catching up with Central Russia politically, culturally and economically.”¹

This meant, among other things, that the inhabitants of the former outlying colonial regions, numbering about 25,000,000, which had not managed to go through the stage of industrial capitalism and which were several historical epochs behind Central Russia, had to “pass from primitive forms of economy to the stage of Soviet economy without passing through the stage of industrial capitalism.”²

The Bolshevik Party and the Soviet state, under the leadership of J.V. Stalin, and with the assistance of the Russian working class and the Russian people, carried out this great task in an amazingly short historical period. This, too, reveals the immense advantages of Soviet democracy; it shows that Soviet democracy is a million times more democratic than any bourgeois democracy, which cannot and is unwilling to abolish national oppression, let alone actual national inequality. As is known, the bourgeois imperialist states are based on the oppression and exploitation of the peoples of colonies and dependent countries by a handful of dominant

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 91

² *Ibid.*, p. 92.

bourgeois nations.

J.V. Stalin showed that the source of the advantages of Soviet democracy lies in its very *economic* basis, in the nature of the socialist system of economy. Proving that the Soviet, socialist way of solving the national problem is the only correct and durable way, J.V. Stalin said:

“Whereas private property and capital inevitably disunite people, inflame national enmity and intensify national oppression, collective property and labour just as inevitably, bring people closer, undermine national enmity and abolish national oppression. The existence of capitalism without national oppression is just as inconceivable as the existence of socialism without the emancipation of oppressed nations, without national freedom.”¹

He showed that both the *economic* basis of the Soviet system and its *political* “superstructure” facilitate the voluntary amalgamation of nations, whereas in bourgeois society private property and the bourgeois state, its policy, inevitably lead to oppression, enmity and disunion among nations.

“Thus the irreconcilable contradiction between the process of economic amalgamation of the peoples and the imperialist methods of ac-

¹ J.V. Stalin, *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, Moscow 1940, p. 79.

completing this amalgamation was the cause of the inability, helplessness and impotence of the bourgeoisie in finding a correct approach to the solution of the national problem."¹ This is the basis of the inherent unsoundness, the organic instability and one of the reasons of the collapse of multinational bourgeois states.

Whereas in the bourgeois world, Comrade Stalin points out, "where capitalist democracy prevails and where the states rest on private property, the very basis of the state fosters national enmity, conflicts and struggle, here, in the realm of the Soviets, where the power is built not on capital, but on labour, where the power is built not on private property, but on collective property, where the power is built not on the exploitation of man by man, but on hostility to such exploitation, here, on the contrary, the very nature of the regime fosters a natural striving on the part of the toiling masses towards amalgamation in a single socialist family."²

The experience of building up the Soviet state has fully confirmed these postulates. The Soviet state succeeded in eliminating the hostility among the nations which had been fomented for centuries by Tsarism and the exploiting classes which provoked mutual national massacres and pogroms.

J.V. Stalin showed that the Soviet type of

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 122.

² *Ibid.*, p. 110.

state amalgamation of nations, which is based on the principle of complete equality and voluntary amalgamation, leads “to a gradual and enduring amalgamation of formerly independent nationalities in a single independent state.”¹

Such is the law of development of the Soviet multinational state.

“Thus, in the Soviet system the proletariat has found the key to the solution of the national problem, has found the way to organize a durable multinational state on the basis of national equality and voluntary consent.”² J.V. Stalin appraised the creation of the USSR as the crowning edifice on the foundations of the peaceful and fraternal co-operation of the nations that had been laid as far back as 1917, as the creation of a mighty socialist power capable of influencing the international situation in the interests of the working people, as a new and decisive step towards the amalgamation of the working people of all countries in a single, world Socialist Republic, as the prototype of such an amalgamation.

J.V. Stalin utterly exposed the reactionary, anti-national essence of bourgeois “democracy” on the national question. All the so-called “democratic” constitutions of bourgeois states, he pointed out, are the constitutions of *dominant* nations, are *nationalist constitutions*, aimed

¹ J.V. Stalin, *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, Moscow 1940, p. 110.

² *Ibid.*, p. 124.

against national minorities, against weak, small, oppressed and dependent nations.

Unlike the nationalist bourgeois constitutions, the Constitution of the USSR is profoundly *international*, for it proceeds from the premise that all nations and races have equal rights, that differences in colour and language, cultural level, level of economic and political development, or any other differences between nations and races cannot serve as grounds for justifying inequality of nations and races. The great Stalin Constitution of the USSR proceeds from the premise that all nations and races, irrespective of their past and present status, irrespective of whether they are weak or strong, should enjoy equal rights in all spheres of social life. The Soviet Constitution provides for legal penalties for all manifestations of propaganda of national enmity as a heinous crime against the main foundations of the Soviet, socialist system. In Soviet society there are no privileged and dominant, oppressed and unequal nations or races. Not national descent but the individual capabilities and individual labour of the citizen determine his position in Soviet society. The specific feature of the Stalin Constitution, the Constitution of Victorious Socialism, is its *consistent*, thoroughly developed *socialist democratism*.

Our people have endearingly called their Constitution the Stalin Constitution not only because J.V. Stalin is the creator of this, the

greatest charter in the history of nations, in the history of mankind, but also because it was under his leadership that they achieved those splendid victories that are fixed and sealed in that Constitution. The Stalin Constitution has firmly fixed and sealed complete equality and free development for all the races and nations in the USSR. For the peoples in the capitalist countries the Stalin Constitution serves as a program of struggle; for the peoples of the USSR it is a summation of their victories; it spiritually arms the peoples of our country, rouses their sense of national Soviet pride, mobilizes them for the struggle to achieve new victories for communism.

All the nations and nationalities in the USSR are today developing on a single economic basis, the basis of socialist economy, of advanced socialist industry and socialist agriculture. The formerly backward, outlying, colonial regions which had no industry, no working-class cadres and no national intelligentsia of their own, are now, thanks to the implementation of the policy of socialist industrialization, collectivization of agriculture and accelerated tempo of development, full-fledged national republics, with their own advanced industry, advanced agriculture, cadres of skilled workers, and cadres of a national intelligentsia, scientists, writers and artists. The Soviet socialist system — such is the basis of the consolidation and development of the Soviet socialist nations, which in

class composition, spiritual features and social and political strivings differ fundamentally from the old bourgeois nations which arose and developed on the basis of the bourgeois order. J.V. Stalin gave a classical characterization of the old bourgeois nations and of the new socialist nations in 1929, in his splendid work *The National Question and Leninism*. In this work he made a profound generalization of all the new features the Great October Revolution and the building of socialism had introduced in the sphere of national relationships; he disclosed the new basis of the development of nations under the Soviet system, pointed to the rise of new, Soviet, socialist nations and to the fundamental difference between them and the old, bourgeois nations. With the foresight of genius, he depicted the nations' prospects of development in the period of the victory of socialism in one country and indicated the conditions necessary for the merging of nations and national languages and cultures after the victory of communism has been achieved all over the world.

Characterizing the nations of the USSR, Comrade Stalin said:

“These are the new, Soviet nations, which developed and took shape on the basis of the old, bourgeois nations after the overthrow of capitalism in Russia, after the elimination of the bourgeoisie and its nationalist parties, after the establishment of

the Soviet system.

“The working class and its internationalist party are the force that cements these new nations and leads them. An alliance between the working class and the working peasantry within the nation for the elimination of the relics of capitalism in order that socialism may be built triumphantly; abolition of the relics of national oppression in order that the nations and national minorities may be equal and may develop freely; elimination of the relics of nationalism in order that friendship may be knit between the peoples and internationalism firmly established; a united front with all oppressed and unequal nations in the struggle against the policy of annexation and wars of annexation, in the struggle against imperialism — such is the spiritual, social and political complexion of these nations.

“Such nations must be qualified as socialist nations.”¹

These new, socialist nations arose on the ruins of the old, bourgeois nations as a result of the liquidation of capitalism, as a result of their radical transformation in the spirit of socialism.

Comrade Stalin showed that bourgeois and socialist nations are entirely different historical types of nations, the socialist nations being

¹ J.V. Stalin, *The National Question and Leninism*, Moscow 1950, pp. 15-16.

more united and viable than any bourgeois nation “because they are exempt from the irreconcilable class antagonisms that corrode the bourgeois nations, and are far more representative of the whole people than any bourgeois nation.”¹

Comrade Stalin ridiculed the “theoreticians” who “overlooked the whole epoch of the formation of socialist nations in the Soviet Union, nations which arose on the ruins of the old, bourgeois nations,” who refused to see the radical difference between the old, bourgeois and the new, socialist nations, refused to recognize these new, socialist nations.

The Soviet socialist nations were brought into being by the Great October Socialist Revolution. At their cradle stood the geniuses and leaders of the Revolution — V.I. Lenin and J.V. Stalin. They were led and trained in the spirit of internationalism by the great Party of Lenin and Stalin. The Soviet socialist nations developed in the direction indicated by J.V. Stalin on the basis of the Soviet, socialist system.

Comrade Stalin showed that the liquidation of the exploiting classes, the victory of socialism, radically changed the entire socio-economic and moral and political complexion of the nations in the USSR. The Soviet socialist nations consist today of a working class, a peasantry and an intelligentsia who are in friendly relations with one another and the distinctions be-

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

tween whom are being obliterated. The Soviet nations are socialist nations free from exploitation and class antagonisms, nations with new, Soviet, socialist moral and political features and psychological make-up. They constitute the great commonwealth of socialist nations — the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The amalgamation of the Soviet Republics did not take place without contradictions and struggle, for there were factors that hindered and counteracted this amalgamation. In his theses and report on “National Factors in Party and State Development,” J.V. Stalin, at the Twelfth Congress of the RCP(B), pointed to three main factors that hindered amalgamation: growth of dominant-nation chauvinism; the actual economic and cultural inequality of the nations inherited from the past; the growth of local nationalism due to the partial revival of capitalism in the first stage of the New Economic Policy. The actual inequality of the nations could not be eliminated in a short space of time; for that many years of persevering economic and cultural development was needed. This inequality has been eliminated as a result of the implementation of the Lenin-Stalin national policy, accelerated tempo of industrialization, and the development of the industry, agriculture and culture of the formerly oppressed and backward nationalities.

The growth of industry in the USSR as a whole was extremely rapid, but in the formerly

economically backward countries it was still more rapid. Thus, in 1940, industrial output in the USSR was 12 times as much as that in 1913. In the same period, gross industrial output in the Kazakh SSR increased 22.2-fold; in the Byelorussian SSR 23-fold; in the Karelo-Finnish SSR nearly 50-fold; in the Kirghiz SSR 160-fold; and in the Tajik SSR 242-fold! This served as the basis for the growth also of the national culture of the formerly oppressed peoples; an immense cultural revolution took place in the lives of these nations.

In 1940, the number of children attending school in the USSR as a whole was four times as high as that in the 1914-15 school year. In Kirghizia, however, the number was 44 times as high; in Uzbekistan 68 times; and in Tajikistan 660 times. From complete illiteracy and absence of culture, the formerly oppressed nations in the outlying regions have reached the pinnacles of socialist culture. More than 40 nationalities which had no written language before each acquired one under Soviet rule. The number of schools, universities, colleges, recreation centres, theatres, libraries and cinemas in these republics has increased immensely.

In 1947 there were in the Byelorussian SSR 26 colleges, in the Uzbek SSR 33, in the Kazakh SSR 23, in the Azerbaijan SSR 17, in the Armenian SSR 14, in the Tajik SSR 7, in the Kirghiz and Turkmenian SSR 6 each. In 1914, however, there was not a single college in the territory of

any of these republics.

The Ukrainian, Byelorussian, Armenian, Azerbaijan, Kazakh, Georgian, Uzbek, Latvian, Lithuanian and Estonian SSR have each their own Academy of Sciences; in other republics there are branches and bases of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR.

As a result of the gigantic work conducted by the Party and the Soviet state numerous cadres of a Soviet intelligentsia have been trained among these nationalities, numerous specialists, scientists, writers and artists.

Another factor that hindered amalgamation and the establishment of proper relations between the working class in Central Russia and the peasants in the non-Russian outlying regions was the survivals of the former mutual distrust among the formerly oppressed nations themselves and particularly their distrust, fomented by the policy pursued by Tsarism and the exploiting classes, towards the Russian nation. This distrust could be overcome only by the consistent application of the Lenin-Stalin national policy; by careful consideration on the part of the Russian workers and communists for the specifically national characteristics, ways of life, culture, interests and requirements of the working people of the formerly oppressed nations; by rendering them disinterested assistance; by prolonged joint struggle against their "own" and foreign oppressors and exploiters; and by co-operation in the work of building so-

cialism. It is precisely by applying this policy that the Russian working class and the Russian people have won the confidence and support of all the peoples of the USSR and of the freedom-loving peoples all over the world.

Quite deservedly, J.V. Stalin has characterized the Russian people as *the most outstanding of all the nations that constitute the Soviet Union*, as the guiding force of the Soviet Union among all the peoples of our country, as the leading people, gifted with a clear mind, staunch character and revolutionary range of action.

Generalizing the experience of building up our multinational socialist state, J.V. Stalin showed that the radical change that had taken place in the economic and class structure of the USSR as a result of the liquidation of the exploiting classes and the victory of socialism caused radical changes also in the sphere of national relationships. When the first Constitution of the USSR was adopted, said J.V. Stalin, the relations among the peoples of the USSR had not yet been properly adjusted, the survivals of distrust towards the Great-Russians had not yet disappeared, the "centrifugal forces still continued to operate." These centrifugal forces had their source in private property and the exploiting classes who continued to inflame national passions and sow distrust among the peoples of our country.

"Under those conditions it was neces-

sary to establish fraternal co-operation among the peoples on the basis of economic, political and military mutual aid by uniting them in a single, federal, multinational state.”¹

The Soviet government had a very clear conception of the difficulties attending this task; it had before it the unsuccessful experiments in forming multinational states in bourgeois countries. But, J.V. Stalin pointed out, “it knew that a multinational state which has arisen on the basis of socialism is bound to stand every and any test.”² And indeed, the experiment in forming a multinational socialist state was completely successful. This was a victory for the Lenin-Stalin national policy of world-historical importance. The stability of the multinational Soviet state may “well be envied by any national state in any part of the world.” The Soviet state stood the supreme test in the fires of the Great Patriotic War against the fascist invaders, a test that no other state in the world could have passed; and not only did it stand the test but emerged from it stronger and more steeled than it was before, because the mighty motive forces of Soviet society, the friendly co-operation of the workers, peasants and intelligentsia, Soviet patriotism, friendship among the peoples and

¹ J.V. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, Moscow 1947, p. 546.

² *Ibid.*

their moral and political unity, had grown stronger. Generalizing the experience of the war, Comrade Stalin said that “the Soviet state system is a system of state organization in which the national problem and the problem of the collaboration of nations have found a better solution than in any other multinational state.”¹ The Soviet socialist system has endowed the nations of the USSR with invincible strength.

The great commonwealth of socialist nations was built up and it gained strength in the course of the uncompromising struggle the Party of Lenin and Stalin waged against nationalism of all shades and colours.

Dominant-nation chauvinism was the chief danger because it threatened to undermine the confidence of the formerly oppressed nations in the Russian proletariat, J.V. Stalin pointed out; it was the most dangerous enemy; it had to be crushed in order to liquidate the danger of chauvinism in general. But this did not mean, said J.V. Stalin, that a struggle had to be waged only against dominant-nation chauvinism, because the intensification of the class struggle between socialism and capitalism activated also local nationalism; dominant-nation chauvinism and local nationalism were two sides of the same phenomenon that was inimical to the proletarian dictatorship. The deviations within the Party

¹ *Speech Delivered at the Election Meeting in the Stalin Election District, Moscow, February 9, 1946, p. 11.*

towards nationalism reflected the pressure of the bourgeoisie, of its policy and ideology, upon the unstable, opportunist elements that had penetrated the Party.

J.V. Stalin gave an exhaustive and profound definition of the class essence of the deviations towards dominant-nation chauvinism and local nationalism at the Twelfth, Sixteenth and Seventeenth Congresses of the Party; at the same time, he indicated the way to overcome these deviations, the way to eliminate these survivals of capitalism in the minds of people as regards the national question. The deviators towards dominant-nation chauvinism came out under the flag of "internationalism," and in the name of "internationalism" they demanded that a course be taken towards the liquidation of the national Soviet Republics, towards assimilation, departure from the course of developing the culture of the different nations. Chasing after this sham "internationalism," Comrade Stalin pointed out, the deviators towards dominant-nation chauvinism fell into the net of most reactionary Kautskyian chauvinism. Kautsky, also under the flag of "internationalism," had developed the German chauvinistic idea that in the event of the victory of the proletarian revolution in Germany, the Czechs would inevitably be assimilated by the Germans.

The deviation towards local nationalism obscured the class antagonisms and the class struggle within each nation; it strove to divert

the given nations from the general current of socialist development; it saw and emphasized only what could alienate the nations from each other and failed to see what drew the working people of the different nations together in their struggle for socialism. The deviation towards local nationalism reflected the discontent of the moribund exploiting classes among the formerly oppressed nations with the regime of the proletarian dictatorship, their striving to segregate themselves in their own national bourgeois states and to establish their class rule there. The danger of this deviation lay in that it cultivated bourgeois nationalism, weakened the unity of the working people of the USSR and played in to the hands of the interventionists.

As J.V. Stalin pointed out, the two deviations towards nationalism had a common source, namely, the striving of the bourgeoisie and the bourgeois nationalist elements to adapt the proletariat's internationalist policy to the nationalist policy and class interests of the bourgeoisie. The deviations towards nationalism were particularly dangerous because they sapped the most important source of the strength and invincibility of the nations of the USSR, namely, friendship among the nations. Nationalism, said J.V. Stalin, "is the last position held by the bourgeoisie, from which it must be dislodged in order finally to vanquish it."¹

¹ J.V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Russ. ed., vol. 4, p. 91.

Hence, the danger of nationalist survivals also becomes clear. The capitalist encirclement is constantly striving to reanimate the survivals of capitalism in people's minds, particularly in the sphere of the national question. That is why, said Comrade Stalin, we must always keep our powder dry in the struggle against all and sundry manifestations of nationalist survivals. J.V. Stalin's directions, and all his works, serve our Party and all the fraternal Communist Parties as a weapon in their struggle against the bourgeois nationalists, against the nationalist-fascist clique of Tito, Rajk, Traicho Kostov and Co., against the right-wing socialists and other agents of Anglo-American imperialism.

Generalizing the experience of building up our multinational Soviet state, Comrade Stalin showed that this experience refuted and shattered all the race theories and legends circulated by the exploiting classes to the effect that from time immemorial the world has been divided into "inferior" and "superior" races, into coloured people and whites; that the former are incapable of promoting civilization and are therefore doomed to be the objects of exploitation of the so-called "superior" races. Socialist practice in the USSR has shown that the non-European peoples who had formerly been the objects of ruthless colonial exploitation and national oppression have also been "drawn into the channel of Soviet development, are not a bit less capable of promoting a *really* progressive

culture and a *really* progressive civilization than are the European nations.”¹

Of exceptional importance in the struggle against nationalism and in educating the working people in the spirit of proletarian internationalism, friendship among nations and in the development and efflorescence of the national cultures of the peoples of the USSR is the theory, created by J.V. Stalin, that their culture is national in form and socialist in content.

In advancing this theory, Comrade Stalin proceeded from Lenin’s thesis that there are “two nations” in every bourgeois nation and two cultures in every national culture in bourgeois society.²

The “national culture” advocated by the bourgeois nationalists is the landlord, clerical and bourgeois “culture” which predominates under the conditions of capitalism. That is why Lenin described the slogan “national culture” under the conditions prevailing in bourgeois-landlord Russia as reactionary. Developing Lenin’s thesis applicably to the epoch of the proletarian dictatorship, J.V. Stalin said at the Sixteenth Congress of the Party:

“What is national culture under the rule of the national bourgeoisie? It is culture that

¹ J.V. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, Moscow 1947, p. 201.

² V.I. Lenin, *Critical Remarks on the National Question*, Moscow 1951, pp. 17-18, 31.

is *bourgeois* in content and national in form, having the object of doping the masses with the poison of nationalism and of strengthening the rule of the bourgeoisie.

“What is national culture under the proletarian dictatorship? It is culture that is *socialist* in content and national in form, having the object of educating the masses in the spirit of socialism and internationalism.”¹

J.V. Stalin exposed the enemies of the Party who tried to identify national culture under the conditions of the Soviet system with national culture under the conditions of capitalism and on these grounds to reject the slogan of national culture in general, claiming that Lenin had done so. Comrade Stalin showed that in combatting the slogan of national culture under the bourgeois order, “Lenin struck at the bourgeois *content* of national culture, but not at its national form.”²

Already at the Tenth Congress of the Party, on the basis of J.V. Stalin’s report, a resolution was adopted under Lenin’s guidance which served as a practical program of the Party’s work in developing national culture under the conditions of the proletarian dictatorship.

In his speech “On the Political Tasks of the University of the Peoples of the East” (1925),

¹ J.V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Russ. ed., vol. 12, p. 367.

² *Ibid.*

J.V. Stalin showed that there is no contradiction between the national form and the socialist content of the culture that is created under the conditions of the Soviet system. We are building proletarian socialist culture. But proletarian culture, which is socialist in content, assumes different forms and modes of expression among the different nations which have been drawn into the work of socialist construction, depending upon the different languages, ways of life, and so forth.

Comrade Stalin exposed Kautsky's chauvinistic theory according to which already in the period of the victory of socialism in one country languages and nations must merge. Generalizing the experience of the Socialist Revolution in the USSR, Comrade Stalin pointed out that the Revolution had roused to life many previously unknown or little-known new nationalities, many "forgotten" peoples and nationalities; that it endowed them with new life and new development. He predicted that the same would happen in other multinational and particularly in colonial and dependent countries; as a result of revolutionary upheavals in countries like India "scores of hitherto unknown nationalities, each with its own language and its own distinctive culture," will emerge on the scene.¹

This thesis of J.V. Stalin's exposes and up-

¹ J.V. Stalin, *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, Moscow 1940, p. 184.

sets the various bourgeois cosmopolitan theories of the present-day Anglo-American imperialists who are pursuing the policy of forcible assimilation, the absorption of all nations and races by the “superior,” “universal” Anglo-American “race.”

Of exceptional theoretical and practical importance are J.V. Stalin’s prescient statements concerning the future of nations, national languages and national cultures made in his work *The National Question and Leninism*.

Already in his work *Marxism and the National Question* (1913), J.V. Stalin had pointed out that a nation, like every other historical phenomenon, is subject to the law of change, has its history, its beginning and end. In developing this thesis further he proceeded from the views expressed by V.I. Lenin.

Lenin taught that the aim of socialism is not only to abolish all segregation of nations, “not only to draw nations together, but also to merge them.” But this cannot take place without a prolonged struggle against imperialism and social-chauvinism for the liberation of the oppressed nations. “Just as mankind cannot achieve the abolition of classes except by passing through the transitional period of the dictatorship of the oppressed class, so mankind cannot achieve the inevitable merging of nations except by passing through the transitional period of the complete liberation of all oppressed nations, i.e., their

freedom to secede.”¹

After the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, V.I. Lenin concretized these theses and pointed out that national and state differences between nations and countries “will continue to exist for a very, very long time even after the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established on a world scale.”² The attempt to abolish them in the period of the proletarian dictatorship in one country he described as an “absurd dream.”

Substantiating and developing these theses, J.V. Stalin points out that it would be wrong to assume that the abolition of national differences and the merging of nations, national languages and cultures will take place immediately after the defeat of world imperialism, at one stroke, by “decree from above.” Attempts to bring about the merging of nations by decree from above, by means of coercion, can only play into the hands of the imperialists; they would be fatal to the cause of liberating the nations and of organizing their fraternal co-operation. Such a policy would be on a par with the anti-national, reactionary policy of assimilation that was pursued by the Tsarist, Turkish, Persian, Prussian and Austrian assimilators, and is now being

¹ V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, 4th Russ. ed., vol. 22, pp. 135-36.

² V.I. Lenin, “*Left-Wing*” *Communism, an Infantile Disorder*, Moscow 1950, p. 127.

pursued by the Anglo-American imperialists who are striving to thrust upon all nations their Anglo-American "way of life," their corrupt, reactionary bourgeois "culture," in order to enslave all the nations and establish their world domination. But history shows that, being anti-national and counter-revolutionary, the assimilation policy is always, in the long run, doomed to inevitable failure.

In his work *The National Question and Leninism*, J.V. Stalin gives a forecast of genius of the probable course of "events, as regards the development of nations directly after the defeat of world imperialism."

Comrade Stalin points out that the first stage of the period of the world dictatorship of the proletariat will be the stage of the final liquidation of national oppression and of mutual national distrust, the stage of arranging and strengthening international intercourse among the nations, of the growth and efflorescence of the formerly oppressed nations and languages.

"Only in the second stage of the period of the world dictatorship of the proletariat, as a single socialist world economy is built up in place of the capitalist world economy — only in that stage," said Comrade Stalin, "will something in the nature of a common language begin to take shape; for only in that stage will the nations feel the need to have, in addition to their own national lan-

guages, a common international language — for convenience of intercourse and for convenience of economic, cultural and political co-operation. Consequently, in this stage, national languages and a common international language will exist side by side. It is probable that, at first, not one world economic centre will be formed, common for all nations and with one common language, but several zonal economic centres for separate groups of nations, with a separate common language for each group of nations, and that only later will these centres combine into one common world socialist economic centre, with one language common to all the nations.”¹

This scientific prediction of genius is based on a profound analysis of the laws governing the development of society.

Comrade Stalin teaches that national distinctions and languages will begin to die out and make way for a world language common for all nations only in the third stage of the period of the world dictatorship of the proletariat — when the world socialist system of economy has become sufficiently consolidated and socialism has become part and parcel of the life of the peoples, and when practice has convinced the nations of the superiority of a common lan-

¹ J.V. Stalin, *The National Question and Leninism*, Moscow 1950, pp. 27-28.

guage over national languages.

Developing these theses at the Sixteenth Congress of the Party, Comrade Stalin pointed out that the period of building socialism in the USSR was the period of the efflorescence of national cultures that are socialist in content and national in form:

“The national cultures must be allowed to develop and unfold, to reveal all their potentialities, in order to create the conditions for merging them into one common culture with one common language in the period of the victory of socialism all over the world. The efflorescence of cultures that are national in form and socialist in content under the proletarian dictatorship in one country *for the purpose* of merging them into one common socialist (in form and in content) culture, with one common language, when the proletariat is victorious all over the world, when socialism has become the way of life — herein, precisely, lies the dialectics of the Leninist presentation of the question of national culture.”¹

In his masterly work *Marxism in Linguistics*, J.V. Stalin exposed N.Y. Marr’s vulgar theory that language is a superstructure and his formulation of language as “class language,” which

¹ J.V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Russ. ed., vol. 12, p. 369.

led to the denial that a given language is the language of the entire people, of the entire nation. J.V. Stalin proved that a language has always been a *single and common* language for all the members of the given clan, tribe, nationality or nation, for all the members of society, irrespective of their class status. He showed that the development of language is determined by the development of society, that the development of languages proceeded from the primitive, ancient languages of the clans and tribes to the languages of the nationalities, and from the latter to the languages of the nations, which are a continuation and development of the languages that were born in hoary antiquity. He also showed that there is no need for a language revolution in the period of the Socialist Revolution, as Marr and his pupils claimed, because the already evolved national languages can serve the socialist nations and their culture equally as well as they had formerly served the bourgeois nations and their culture. Language is the national form of a given culture. At the same time, J.V. Stalin pointed to the radical difference between the laws of development of national languages under the conditions of socialism and those under the conditions of forms of society in which there are class antagonisms, particularly in capitalist society. He pointed out that in the epoch preceding the victory of socialism on a world scale, when the exploiting classes are the dominant force in the world, when national and co-

lonial oppression is still in force, when national segregation and mutual distrust among nations are fostered by state distinctions, when equality of nations has not yet been established and when the conditions for peaceful and friendly co-operation among the nations and languages do not yet exist, the development of language does not proceed by way of co-operation and the mutual enrichment of languages, but by way of assimilation, the defeat of some languages and the victory of others. It will be altogether different under the conditions of socialism, especially after the victory of socialism on a world scale, when world imperialism will no longer exist, when the exploiting classes will have been overthrown, when national and colonial oppression will have been abolished, when national segregation and mutual distrust among the nations will have been superseded by mutual confidence and rapprochement among nations, when equality of nations will have been established, when the policy of suppressing and assimilating languages will have been abolished and the co-operation of nations will have been established. Under these conditions, the national languages will be able freely to enrich each other in the course of co-operation. "It goes without saying," Comrade Stalin points out, "that under these conditions there can be no question of the suppression and defeat of some languages and the victory of others. Here we will have to deal not with two languages, one of

which will sustain defeat and the other will emerge victorious from the struggle, but with hundreds of national languages, from among which, as a result of long economic, political and cultural co-operation among the nations; the most enriched, single zonal languages will at first emerge, and later, these zonal languages will merge into one, common international language, which, of course, will be neither German, nor Russian, nor English, but a new language, which will have absorbed all the best elements of the national and zonal languages.”¹

In these theses J.V. Stalin has drawn a wonderfully clear prospect of the development of the socialist nations, their national languages and cultures, both in the period of the victory of socialism in one country, namely, our country, and in the period of the victory of socialism in other countries, and in the whole world. They are an exceptionally striking manifestation of J.V. Stalin’s genius for scientific foresight; they are a splendid example of his masterly handling of materialist dialectics and reveal him as the greatest theoretician in creative Marxism. They serve as guides in all the social sciences, in philosophy, in the science of the state, in law, language, the theory of literature, art and of culture as a whole, as well as in the practical activities of the Communist Parties in all countries in the world, especially in the sphere of national poli-

¹ J.V. Stalin, *Marxism in Linguistics*, Russ, ed., p. 54.

cy.

It follows from the Lenin-Stalin theory of the nation and national culture that on the national question the Communist Parties must consistently adhere to the principle of proletarian internationalism, that they must champion the right of nations to self-determination, including the right to secede from the imperialist states that oppress them and form their own, independent national states; they must champion the *proletarian, international* method of liberating the oppressed nations, train the nations in the spirit of internationalism and fraternal cooperation in the struggle against imperialism and in the building of socialism; they must fight for the transformation of the bourgeois nations into socialist nations on the basis of the Socialist Revolution and the socialist system; they must do all in their power to promote the development of the national statehood, national economy and culture — national in form and socialist in content — of all nations, and particularly of the formerly oppressed nations, in order to enable them to enter the current of socialist development in the only way possible for them. It follows from the Lenin-Stalin theory of the nation and national culture that internationalism is engendered in culture not by belittling, impoverishing and least of all by suppressing national culture (the assimilation policy), but by developing cultures that are national in form and socialist in content. Socialist culture trains

the working people in the spirit of internationalism, in the spirit of full equality and friendly cooperation among all nations and races, in the spirit of Soviet patriotism, which is not based on racial and nationalist prejudices, but on friendship among nations, on love of our Socialist Motherland; it harmoniously combines the national traditions of the peoples with the common vital interests of all the working people of the USSR. Soviet patriotism trains the people to love their own national culture and to respect the culture of other nations. In our epoch it is impossible to be an internationalist unless one is a Soviet patriot. Proletarian internationalism finds its highest historical incarnation in Soviet patriotism and friendship among the nations of the USSR; it is uncompromisingly hostile to the anti-patriotic ideology of bourgeois cosmopolitanism and national nihilism. "National nihilism," Comrade Stalin points out, "only harms the cause of socialism, for it plays into the hands of the bourgeois nationalists."¹

The Soviet people are patriots and internationalists. They proceed from the thesis that "every nation, big or small — it makes no difference — has its own, specific qualities, specific features, peculiar to itself and not possessed by other nations. These specific qualities are the contribution each nation makes to the common treasury of world culture and augments, enrich-

¹ J.V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Russ. ed., vol. 4, p. 91.

es it. In this respect all nations — big and small — are in the same position, and each nation is the equivalent of every other nation.”¹ Comrade Stalin showed that internationalism in culture means respect for the cultural creativeness of all nations; this internationalism is engendered, fostered and developed on the basis of the development and efflorescence of the culture — national in form and socialist in content — of all the socialist nations and not by impoverishing national cultures and obliterating their specific national features.

It was quite natural, therefore, that the nations of the USSR, whom the Party of Lenin and Stalin has trained in the spirit of socialism, proletarian internationalism and friendship among the nations, saved world civilization from the fascist vandals and are today at the head of the camp of socialism and democracy, in the van of the struggle for lasting, democratic world peace.

The USSR is a great commonwealth of socialist nations which are creating a new, higher, genuinely progressive, worldwide, communist culture under the leadership of the Party of Lenin and Stalin. This commonwealth grew, gained strength and vanquished all its enemies — internal and external — thanks to the wise Lenin-Stalin national policy and the ideology of friendship among nations.

¹ *Bolshevik*, 1948, No. 7, p. 2.

Friendship among the nations of the USSR is the expression of the internationalism of the Soviet, socialist nations, the internationalism that is embodied in the very organization of our multinational socialist state, in the organization of the Soviet social and state system, in its culture and ideology, in the self-sacrificing labours and heroic feats of the Soviet people, the Soviet patriots; it is the internationalism of nations which have been liberated from exploitation and exploiters, the internationalism of liberator nations. The nations of the USSR are fighting in the cause, the victory of which will guarantee the liberation of all toiling humanity from the yoke of capitalism. Precisely for this reason the international proletariat and the working people of all countries support the USSR and its policy. This is the source of the strength, the might and invincibility of the nations of our country. The nations of our country became free and invincible thanks to the Lenin and Stalin policy of friendship among the nations, to the fact that they have remained true to the ideas of proletarian internationalism. So long as this friendship exists, says Comrade Stalin, we need fear no enemies. Therefore, we must continue to “*remain true to the end to the cause of proletarian internationalism, to the cause of the fraternal alliance of the proletarians of all countries.*”¹

¹ J.V. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, Moscow 1947, p. 519.

The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution involved a new presentation of the national and colonial question. Generalizing the experience of the Revolution and of movements for national liberation, Lenin and Stalin further elaborated the question of the alliance of these movements with the Land of Victorious Socialism for the common struggle against imperialism. Lenin emphasized that after the Soviet Republic had been formed it was no longer possible to confine ourselves to proclaiming the drawing together of the working people of the different nations, that "it is necessary to pursue a policy that will achieve the closest alliance of all the national and colonial liberation movements with Soviet Russia, the form of this alliance to be determined by the degree of development of the communist movement among the proletariat of each country, or of the bourgeois-democratic liberation movement of the workers and peasants in backward countries among backward nationalities."¹ Such is the chief condition for the liberation of the oppressed nations from the yoke of imperialism.

Developing this thesis of V.I. Lenin's in the struggle against the bitterest enemies of communism, J.V. Stalin pointed out that in our times the genuine revolutionary and internationalist is "he who without reservation, without

¹ V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, 4th Russ. ed., vol. 31, p. 124.

hesitation, without conditions, is ready to defend the USSR because the USSR is the base of the world revolutionary movement, and it is impossible to defend, to promote this revolutionary movement, unless you defend the USSR.”¹

J.V. Stalin teaches that the mutual co-operation and friendship of the people’s democracies and their co-operation with the USSR are the chief conditions for the upswing and efflorescence of these people’s democracies on the socialist development front, the chief guarantee against encroachments upon their freedom and independence by imperialism. That is why, whoever, no matter in what guise, strives — as the fascist-nationalist Tito-Rajk-Traicho Kostov clique is doing — to undermine this co-operation and friendship is the worst enemy of communism, of the working-class movement and national-liberation movement, is an agent of United States imperialism.

The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the appearance of the Soviet Republic, which has abolished national and colonial oppression in the territory of a vast state and has struck a mortal blow at imperialism, inspired the oppressed nations of the Eastland of the whole world, created for them a mighty bulwark and shining beacon indicating the road to liberation, united them in a common fighting front against imperialism, and actually convert-

¹ J.V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Russ. ed., vol. 10, p. 51.

ed this front into a part of the world socialist revolution against world imperialism.

“This means that the October Revolution has *ushered in* a new era, the era of *colonial* revolutions which are being conducted *in the oppressed countries* of the world *in alliance* with the proletariat and *under the leadership* of the proletariat...

“The era of undisturbed exploitation and oppression of the colonies and dependent countries *has passed away*.

“The era of revolutions for emancipation in the colonies and dependent countries, the era of the awakening of the *proletariat* in these countries, the era of its *hegemony* in the revolution, *has begun*.”¹

The October Revolution ushered in a new period in the history of the movements for national liberation and in the solution of the national and colonial problem. Characterizing the Bolshevik Party’s policy in that period, J.V. Stalin points out that the chief thing here is to link the solution of the national problem with the destiny of the socialist revolution.

“The Party held that the overthrow of the power of capital and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the expulsion of the imperialist troops from the

¹ J.V. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, Moscow 1947, p. 202.

colonial and dependent countries and the securing of the right of these countries to secede and to form their own national states, the elimination of national enmity and nationalism and the strengthening of international ties between peoples, the organization of a single socialist national economy and the establishment on this basis of fraternal co-operation among peoples constituted the best solution of the national and colonial question under the given conditions.

“Such was the policy of the Party in that period.”¹

This period, said Comrade Stalin in 1929, “is still far from having entered into full force, for it has only just begun; but there is no doubt that it will yet have its decisive word to say.”²

Twenty years have passed, and we see striking confirmation of J.V. Stalin’s forecast, we see how this period is more and more entering into full force, determining the destiny of the hundreds of millions of inhabitants of the colonies and dependent countries.

V.I. Lenin pointed out that the outcome of the world struggle between capitalism and communism depends in the long run on the fact that the inhabitants of Russia, India and China constitute the vast majority of the population

¹ J.V. Stalin, *The National Question and Leninism*, Moscow 1950, p. 33.

² *Ibid.*

and that since the victory of the October Revolution this majority is being drawn into the struggle for its emancipation with unprecedented rapidity. With the victory of the Chinese people over imperialism and the formation of the Chinese Democratic Republic, the people's democracies in Europe and Asia, together with the Soviet Union, account for a population of about 800,000,000 — more than a third of the population of the globe!

As far back as 1925, Comrade Stalin said from the rostrum of the Fourteenth Congress of the Party that the forces of the revolutionary movement in China were immense, that they had not yet made themselves properly felt, and that they must make themselves felt in the future:

“The rulers in the East and West who do not see these forces and do not reckon with them to the degree that they deserve will suffer for this.”¹

Truth and justice are entirely on the side of the Chinese revolution, said Comrade Stalin.

“That is why we sympathize and will continue to sympathize with the Chinese revolution in its struggle to liberate the Chinese people from the yoke of the imperialists

¹ J.V. Stalin, *Political Report of the Central Committee to the Fourteenth Congress of the CPSU(B)*, Moscow 1950, p. 48.

and to unite China in a single state. Whoever does not and will not reckon with this force certainly stands to lose.”¹

J.V. Stalin further pointed out that the foreign imperialists who are trying to turn back the course of China’s history with the aid of guns, artillery, would meet with inevitable failure, because “the laws of history are more potent than the laws of artillery.”

Comrade Stalin pointed out that the Chinese revolution would not proceed along the “Kemalist” road, the road of the ordinary, restricted bourgeois revolution, that it would proceed along the road of an anti-imperialist, people’s revolution and bring about the creation of an anti-imperialist people’s government which would lead China along the road of socialist development.

All these forecasts of genius have been brilliantly confirmed.

With the victory of Chinese democracy, the struggle for national liberation waged by the peoples of Asia, the Pacific and the whole of the colonial world has risen to a new and higher stage. The victory of the Chinese people greatly augments the forces and strengthens the positions of the camp of socialism and democracy that is headed by the USSR and is fighting for lasting democratic world peace. This victory has

¹ *Ibid.*

struck another crushing blow at the whole of the colonial system of imperialism which is experiencing a profound crisis.

The *hegemony of the proletariat* in the movements for national liberation in the colonies and dependent countries is the *new* and *decisive* factor that lends them stability, organization and invincible strength and leads to victory over imperialism. As Comrade Stalin warned, the national bourgeoisie in these countries are more and more openly entering into a compact with the foreign imperialists and betraying the national interests of their countries.

Another new factor in the movement for national liberation is that the developed capitalist countries in Western Europe which have fallen under the yoke of the United States imperialists are also being more and more drawn into it. These movements for national liberation are from the very outset developing under the *hegemony of the proletariat*, under the leadership of its communist vanguard, and are directly merging with the struggle for *socialism*. Evidence of this is provided by the struggle the peoples of Europe waged against the Hitler yoke during the Second World War, by the struggle they are now waging against bondage to Anglo-American imperialism, and by the establishment of the people's democracies in Eastern and South-Eastern Europe.

The bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries of Europe are now acting as the allies of aggressive

American imperialism which is preparing a new world war. That is why, as is stated in the decisions of the Information Bureau of Communist Parties, the Communist and Workers' Parties in the capitalist countries "consider it their duty to merge into one the struggle for national independence and the struggle for peace, indefatigably to expose the anti-national, treasonable character of the policy of bourgeois governments that have become direct agents of aggressive American imperialism, to unite and rally all the democratic patriotic forces of their country around the slogans calling for an end to be put to the disgraceful bondage which finds expression in servile subordination to the American monopolies, and for a return to an independent foreign and domestic policy conforming to the national interests of the peoples."¹

The existence of the Soviet Union is the decisive factor that facilitates and determines the successes and victories of all the peoples' movements for national liberation in the dependent countries and colonies, because its very existence in itself puts a curb on the dark forces of reaction, inspires the oppressed peoples to fight for their liberation and facilitates this liberation.

The movements for national liberation are gaining victories because, and insofar as, they

¹ *Meeting of the Information Bureau of Communist Parties, in Hungary in the latter half of November 1949*, pp. 13-14.

lean on the might of the USSR, enter into ever closer alliance with the USSR and rally around it, as Lenin and Stalin taught; these movements are gaining victories because they are headed by the working class and the Communist Parties which are armed with the revolutionary Lenin-Stalin theory, strategy and tactics, and are fed and inspired by great Stalin.

Stalin — the name of the genius, continuator of the great teachings and cause of Marx, Engels and Lenin, has become the symbol and fighting banner of the liberation of the peoples from the yoke of imperialism, the banner of proletarian internationalism. The great ideas of the Lenin-Stalin friendship and fraternity of the nations which are building a new world are today inspiring hundreds of millions of the common people in all parts of the world to fight for their emancipation.

The Great October Socialist Revolution and socialism triumphed in the USSR under the banner of proletarian internationalism, under the great banner of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. This banner has rallied around itself the great commonwealth of socialist nations of the USSR; it is rallying around the USSR and the people's democracies. This banner will rally around itself the whole of toiling mankind and will lead to the creation of the great world commonwealth of socialist nations.

THE VICTORY OF THE NATIONAL POLICY OF LENIN AND STALIN

CC of the CPSU(b)

The fifteen years of Soviet power in Georgia represent splendid pages in the new history of the people of Georgia.

Under the banner of the national policy of Lenin and Stalin, the peoples of Soviet Georgia in close collaboration with the peoples of the whole of the Soviet Union are successfully and victoriously building socialism.

I

The national policy of Tsarism was a policy of colonization and Russification, of merciless peoples' oppression and exploitation of the enslaved.

In its policy of conquest in the South and East, Russian Tsarism dug deep with its preying claws into the body of the peoples of Georgia. With the backing of the princes, nobles and landowners of Georgia, at the expense of concessions to them of the right to exploit and plunder the masses, Tsarism strove to consolidate and maintain its rule in Georgia.

The enslaved peasantry of Georgia rose up time and time again against the oppression and violence of the landlords and Tsarist autocracy.

In 1812-13 the peasants rose up in Cachaetia; in 1841, in Guria; in 1857, in Mingrelia; in 1858, in Imeretia.

The Tsarist generals, princes and landowners organized a bloody bacchanalia to suppress the revolutionary uprisings of the peasants.

“The insurgent villages”, wrote General Yermolov, the governor of Georgia, “were devastated and burned down, the gardens and vineyards were cut down to the roots, and for many years to come these traitors will not return to their original state. Extreme poverty will be their punishment.”¹

Waves of revolutionary struggle by the toilers of Georgia rose up with new forces against the autocracy, when the working class of Georgia and the Trans-Caucasus came onto the scene of class struggle.

The years 1902-05 were years of constant unrest, uprisings of the peasants and strikes by the workers.

Vorontsov-Dashkov, governor of the Caucasus, was compelled in “a most loyal document”, addressed to the Tsar in the year 1907, to admit the extreme stubbornness with which the toiling masses of Georgia were fighting for their emancipation against the autocracy, the landowners and capitalism.

“At the time of my arrival in this re-

¹ Records of General Yermolov during the period of his governorship of Georgia. Printed in 1868.

gion”, wrote Vorontsov-Dashkov, “the revolutionary movement, obviously connected with the movement throughout the empire, had taken on dimensions dangerous to the state. I immediately placed Tiflis under martial law. At the same time part of the Tiflis province and the whole of the province of Kutais were in the throes of unrest among the peasant population, accompanied by the destruction of the estates of the landlords, the refusal by the peasants to render services, refusal to recognize the village authorities, the forcible seizure of private lands, mass felling of trees in the grounds of governmental and private country villas... In Tiflis, Baku and other towns in these parts strikes by workers of all trades, including domestic workers, took place almost every day...

“As a result of the general strike of postal, telegraph and railway workers, the province of Kutais was completely cut off from Tiflis. All railway stations within its confines were seized by armed revolutionaries. The Surama tunnel was blocked up by two engines dispatched from opposite ends for the purpose of preventing the movement of troops from Tiflis...

“At the slightest action taken, the rural governing authorities were subjected to raids and their property burned down by crowds of peasants. Meetings and demonstrations have been taking place throughout

the villages, and the idea of the equality of the classes, the abolition of capitalism, and changes in the existing system of government are openly propagated... Various repressive measures were adopted by the governing authorities of the Caucasus against the movement among the Georgian rural masses described above. Ever since 1902, troops have been sent to Guria time and time again, penalties were inflicted on the rural councils, and agitators were arrested and exiled to distant parts..."

This is how the really scared Tsarist satrap reported the revolutionary movement of the Georgian workers and peasants.

Even a satrap like Vorontsov-Dashkov was compelled, in a strictly secret letter addressed to the Tsar, to recognize the extreme hardship of the economic conditions of the Georgian peasantry, apparently trying to justify himself in the eyes of the Tsar and to lay the responsibility for the revolutionary events taking place in Georgia onto his predecessors in the governorship of Georgia and the Caucasus.

"The abolition of feudal rights in the confines of the Trans-Caucasus and especially in Georgia", he wrote, "was conducted in conditions especially advantageous to the landlords and disadvantageous to the peasantry; moreover,... it increased the land service of the peasants for the landlords above the average existing in the feudal

days... The fiscal contribution to the state is collected, legally or illegally... If part of the peasant lands becomes overgrown with trees, it is turned over to the item covering fiscal contribution on state forests; if another part of the peasants' land finds itself under water owing to a river changing its course, it comes under the heading of state fishing rights... Things have come to such a pass that the nut trees grown by the villagers themselves in their own yards come under the heading making them liable to state contributions.

“The peasants, with a total area of land twice as large as the area under private ownership, pay twenty times more than the private owners in monetary taxes alone.”

This exploitation of the toiling masses of the peasantry was supplemented by the arbitrary acts of the nobles, princes, officials and police.

Bribery and violence were the rule in the rural courts and rural governing bodies. Together with the officers of the Tsarist police, the Georgian landowners flogged, tortured and mercilessly exploited the toilers.

The countless punitive expeditions and exaction of penalties were accompanied by bestial cruelty and violence. In the interests of colonizing the country, German colonists, Greeks from Anatolia, Turkish Armenians and Russian dissenters were increasingly allowed to settle in Georgia.

Out of the total expenditure of the rural bodies, amounting to 4,670,000 rubles, 57 per cent was spent on the upkeep of the police, and only 4 per cent on national education. The policy of Russification was carried through the schools. There were few schools and the system of teaching in the schools was on an extremely low level.

The direct result of this policy of Tsarism was that the bulk of the population was illiterate.

“Tsarism deliberately cultivated patriarchal-feudal oppression in the outlying regions in order to keep the masses in a state of slavery and ignorance. Tsarism deliberately settled colonizers on the best spots in the outlying regions in order to force the natives into the worst areas and to intensify national enmity. Tsarism restricted, and at times simply did away with, the native schools, theatres and educational institutions in order to keep the masses in intellectual darkness. Tsarism frustrated the initiative of the best members of the native population. Finally, Tsarism suppressed all activity on the part of the populace of the border regions.”¹

But while the Tsarist autocracy was establishing a bloc with the national bourgeoisie,

¹ Stalin, *The Policy of the Soviet Government on the National Question in Russia*, 1920.

princes, nobles and landlords of Georgia, so as to stabilize its oppression of the toiling masses of the enslaved nationalities by trying to inflame enmity between the different nations, the advanced representatives of the working class and toiling masses of Russia and Georgia established a close international fighting alliance against the autocracy, against capitalism.

The foremost proletarians of Russia heartily greeted the heroic struggle of the workers and peasants of Georgia and the Caucasus against Tsarist autocracy, and offered them their support.

The following decision was passed by the Third Congress of the RSDLP (Bolsheviks) in connection with the revolutionary activities of the peasants in Georgia in 1905:

“Bearing in mind

“1. That the special conditions of the social and political life of the Caucasus favoured the creation there of the most militant organizations of our Party;

“2. That the revolutionary movement among the majority of the population of the Caucasus both in the towns and in the villages has already reached the stage of a popular uprising of the whole people against the autocracy;

“3. That the autocratic government is already sending troops and artillery into Guria and is preparing to mercilessly crush all the most important centres of the uprising;

“4. That the victory of the autocracy over the uprising of the people in the Caucasus, facilitated by the fact that the population there is composed of different nationalities, will have the most harmful consequences for the success of the uprising in the rest of Russia;

“This Third Congress of the RSDLP, therefore, in the name of the class-conscious proletariat of Russia, sends warm greetings to the heroic proletariat and peasantry of the Caucasus and instructs the central and local committees of the Party to adopt the most energetic measures to spread information concerning the state of affairs in the Caucasus in the widest possible manner, through pamphlets, meetings, workers’ conferences, exchange of views in circles, etc., and also for timely support to the Caucasus by all means at their disposal.”¹

In their support of the unstable throne, the governor and the Tsarist generals, in collaboration with the Georgian princes and nobles and helped by the treachery of the Georgian Mensheviks and nationalist parties, mercilessly meted out punishment against the toiling masses of Georgia, against the revolutionary workers, suppressing any action on their part with fire and sword. The Tsarist government spread the bones of the best revolutionary representatives

¹ Resolution of the Third Congress.

of the Georgian people all along the long road from Georgia to Siberia.

Such was the “national policy” of the Tsarist autocracy.

II

During the years between the victory of the October Socialist Revolution in Russia and the establishment of Soviet power in Georgia, the latter country suffered almost three years of the rule of the Menshevik nationalists.

Not only did the Menshevik rulers of Georgia not provide the toiling masses of Georgia with freedom, not only did they not bring about the economic and national-cultural regeneration of Georgia, but, on the contrary, they disorganized the economic life of the country which was weak enough as it was, they caused the healthy shoots of culture which had developed among the people themselves to decay, they betrayed and sold the Georgian people to the imperialists of the West with their support of the oppressive hand of the princes, nobles, landlords and kulaks in Georgia. Under the rule of the Mensheviks, the Georgian people again experienced severe suffering.

While appealing for “democratic liberties”, the Mensheviks at the same time openly and cynically betrayed the interests of the Georgian people to the bourgeoisie and imperialists.

“I know”, said Noy Jordania, the leader

of the Menshevik government, “that enemies will say that we are on the side of the imperialists. That is why I must say most forcibly here: I prefer the imperialists of the West to the fanatics of the East.”¹

And the Mensheviks preferred the imperialists of the West to the revolutionary liberation of the toiling masses, which was coming from the East.

The Mensheviks concealed their mercenary conduct in favour of the imperialists of the West, under cover of “democratic” talk about the “independence” of Georgia.

With regard to the arrival in Georgia of the German troops of occupation, the Menshevik government of Georgia made the following statement on June 13, 1918:

“The Georgian government informs the population that the German troops who have entered Tiflis have come at the invitation of the Georgian government itself, with a view to defending the borders of the Georgian democratic republic, in full accordance and on the instructions of the Georgian government.”²

The independence of Georgia became an out and out deception; actually the arrival of Ger-

¹ Stenogram of the First Session of the Constituent Assembly, January 14, 1920, p. 5.

² See the newspaper *Borba* (Struggle), June 13, 1918, No. 92.

man troops in Georgia meant that it was occupied and seized in its entirety by the German imperialists. As Lenin said, "It was an alliance between German bayonets and the Menshevik government against the Bolshevik workers and peasants."

After the German revolution in November 1918, the Germans were compelled to leave Georgia. Their place was taken by the English army of occupation.

The Mensheviks pretended that the English occupants had also been "invited" by the Georgian government for the purpose of defending the borders of the Georgian Democratic Republic and in "full accordance" with and on the "instructions" of the government.

On December 22, 1918, on the occasion of the entry into Georgia of the English troops of occupation, the government of Georgia sent the following note signed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, E. Gegechkori to the chairman of the English Mission, Colonel Jordan:

"1. The Georgian government does not consider it necessary to introduce foreign troops on Georgian territory in order to keep order as the government itself has sufficient forces at its disposal for this purpose.

"2. If the introduction of troops is for any other purpose, the Georgian government categorically declares that such cannot take place without the agreement of the Georgian government."

In reply to this lying, sham declaration by Gegechkori, the chairman of the English Mission, Jordan, wrote the following to the Menshevik government on December 23, 1918, the following day:

“Acting on instructions received by me from General Thompson, Commander of the allied forces in Baku, I would ask your Excellency to set aside accommodation for one brigade of infantry, one brigade of artillery and 1,800 horses, and also suitable accommodation for Headquarters. I am sure that my request will be granted and that every assistance will be afforded to the entrance of the allied troops. I shall be very much obliged if you will send me a car and an officer tomorrow to show me the accommodation which you have set aside for the allied troops.”¹

This is how the British command talked to the “Independent” Georgian government of the Mensheviks, knowing full well that Gegechkori’s “objections” against the introduction of British troops had been made merely to pull wool over the eyes of the toilers of Georgia and that the Menshevik government would agree with pleasure to the entry into Georgia of units of a British army of occupation.

¹ *Documents and Materials on the Foreign Policy of Trans-Caucasus and Georgia*, Soviet Publication, Tiflis, 1919.

As we know, this was the case.

The “independent” rulers of Georgia actually were the bribed puppets who danced to the tune of the agents of the English imperialists.

“When a life-and-death struggle is raging between proletarian Russian and the imperialist Entente, only two possibilities confront the outlying regions:

“*Either* they join forces with Russia, and then the toiling masses of the outlying regions will be emancipated from imperialist oppression;

“*Or* they join forces with the Entente, and then the yoke of imperialism is inevitable. There is no third solution.”¹

During the period of its rule in Georgia, Georgian Menshevism brought to its logical culmination its long road of treachery and betrayal of the working class and toiling masses, began by it during the years before the beginning of the struggle for the Soviet government.

On April 28, 1918, in the Trans-Caucasian Seim, one of the leaders of the Georgian and Russian Menshevism, Iraklii Tseretelli, said:

“When Bolshevism originated in Russia, and when the hand of death was raised there over the life of the state, we fought with all the strength at our disposal against Bolshevism, for we understood that a blow deliv-

¹ Stalin, *The Policy of the Soviet Government on the National Question in Russia*, 1920.

ered against the Russian nation and the Russian state was a blow against the whole of democracy. We fought there against the murderers of the state, the murderers of the nations, and we shall fight here against the murderers of the nations with the same self-sacrifice.”¹

These flowery phrases of Tseretelli signified that the Mensheviks preferred a bloc with the whiteguards, the avowed enemies of the Soviet government, to any sort of rapprochement with the Bolsheviks.

Indeed, at a conference of representatives of the reactionary Kuban government and white-guard armies, held on September 25, 1918, in Yekaterinodar, at which Generals Denikin, Alexeyev, Romanovsky, Dragomirov and Lukomsky were present, E. Gegechkori, the Georgian Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Menshevik government, made the following frank declaration:

“On the question of our attitude to the Bolsheviks, I may state that the struggle against Bolshevism within our boundaries is a merciless one. We are crushing Bolshevism with all the means at our power as an anti-state movement which menaces the integrity of our state, and I think that in this respect we have already given a number of proofs

¹ From the stenographic report of the session of the Trans-Caucasian Seim, April 26, 1918.

which speak for themselves... At the same time I consider it my duty to remind you that the services we have rendered you in the struggle against Bolshevism should also not be forgotten... We are now all aiming our blows at the one spot which at the present moment is a hostile force both for you and for us..."¹

By acting as the lackeys of the Western imperialists, by entering into a bloc with the whiteguards against the October Socialist Revolution, by supporting the acts of oppression undertaken by the bourgeoisie, princes, nobles and landowners in Georgia, the Georgian Mensheviks strengthened capitalism and doomed the working class and the toiling masses of peasants in Georgia to heavy torture and exploitation.

"There is no doubt," said Noy Jordania, "that every state, within the bounds of bourgeois society, will in one way or another serve the interests of the bourgeoisie. The Georgian state can also not avoid this at all. To get rid of this is pure utopia and we are not in the least striving after such a situation."²

And the Georgian Mensheviks faithfully served the interests of the bourgeoisie.

¹ *Documents and Materials on the Foreign Policy of Trans-Caucasus and Georgia.*

² N. Jordania, *Two Years. Reports and Speeches*, p. 111.

All their talk about socialism was mere bluff to deceive the toiling masses.

“You think,” said Noy Jordania, “that if the government is a Socialist one, it must bring about socialism. That is the view of the Bolsheviks... We think otherwise. We say that when socialism is established in other countries, then it will be established here also.”¹

By the autumn of 1920, the economic crisis in Georgia was at an extremity. The supplies left in Georgia by the former Tsarist army had all been used up. The majority of the factories and works were not working. Railway transport had completely broken down. The Georgian village was experiencing ruin and poverty. The head of the government, Noy Jordania, was compelled to admit the following:

“A short time ago we said that we were racing towards catastrophe in the economic sense... But now this supposition has already justified itself. Now each of us is most acutely feeling the effects of bitter reality. We have already arrived at the catastrophe.”²

Accordingly, by that time the enormous supplies left behind in Tiflis by the former Russian army had been completely consumed.

The Assistant Minister of Labour, Eradze,

¹ Speech in the Georgian Parliament, June 16, 1918.

² Speech at an economic conference.

speaking at a Congress of Railwaymen in Georgia in 1920, said:

“Today the working class of Georgia is passing through a severe, acute economic crisis. Their poverty and need are extreme, and henceforth we can expect a rapid, severe process of physical degeneration among our class. Not a single democratic class or group in our society is in such a hopeless position as the workers in the towns.”¹

This is how Mr. Eradze summed up the results of the Menshevik policy in Georgia.

The toiling masses of Georgia replied to this treacherous policy of the Mensheviks by an uprising.

In the years 1918, 1919, 1920, waves of uprisings against the rule of the Mensheviks, led by the Bolshevik organizations, rose high in Georgia. The peasants of Guria and Mingrelia, the peasants of the districts of Gorrisk, Dushetia, Lagodekh, and others, and of the Kutais and Lechhum counties rose up in revolt, as did the peasants of Abhasia. In 1920, the toiling masses of South Osetia rose up in arms. There were strikes among the basic masses of the workers of Tiflis, Kutais, Poti, Chiatur and other towns.

The Menshevik government used fire and sword against the revolutionary activities of the workers and peasants of Georgia.

¹ *Archives of the Trade Union Movement*, No. 3, Item No. 280.

Noy Jordania tried to justify the treacherous, bloody struggle against the revolutionary activities of the toiling masses in the following way:

“Although you should not have been surprised at the peasant revolts against us,” said Jordania, “we have so far forgotten Marxism and fallen victims to the muddled outlook of the Socialist Revolutionaries that up to now many of us regard these insurgents as revolutionaries, and reluctantly agree to adopt repression against them. It is time we returned to Marx and stood firm guard over the revolution, against peasant reaction.”¹

And so by hiding behind loud phrases, by falsifying Marxism, and under the banner of whiteguard, interventionist counter-revolution, the Mensheviks meted out punishment to the revolutionary workers and peasants.

“It is night. Fire is visible on all sides,” so runs the diary of Jugel, the Menshevik punitive expedition leader, former chief of the “people’s” guard, who led the suppression of the peasant uprisings, “they are the homes of the insurgents burning. All around us the Osetin villages are alight. With my soul at rest and a clear conscience I gaze up-

¹ N. Jordania, *Two Years*, p. 119.

on the ashes and clouds of smoke.”¹

Such was the “national policy” of the Mensheviks.

During the period of Menshevik rule in Georgia, the country was visited by Karl Kautsky, MacDonald, Snowden, Vandervelde, and other leaders of the Second International. They hypocritically called the bacchanalia and demoralization of Menshevism, its treachery in favour of imperialism, and the oppression of the toiling masses, a “socialist paradise”. But these loud phrases of the leaders of the Second International could not cover up the disgraceful collapse and bankruptcy of Georgian and international Menshevism, as witnessed in Georgia.

The Georgian Mensheviks are the foulest, most perfidious traitors to the Georgian people. They tore Georgia away from revolutionary Russia, and together with the Dashnak and Mussavatists of the Trans-Caucasus, converted it into a jumping-off ground for foreign intervention and bourgeois-whiteguard counter-revolution against the Soviet government.

The Mensheviks inspired and organized the reactionary forces of the nobility, the princes, the clergy and the bourgeoisie against the revolutionary movement of the workers and peasants of Georgia. The Mensheviks pursued a policy of brutal national jingoism and set the peoples of Trans-Caucasus one against the other.

¹ Jugel, *The Heavy Cross*.

The organized bloody drives against the national minorities of Georgia, the Osetins, the Abkhassians, the Armenians and the Adjarians. The Georgian Mensheviks, together with the Mussavatists and Dashnaks, were the organizers of the Zamhora pogrom of revolutionary soldiers. They treacherously fired on a meeting of the workers of Tiflis in the Alexander Gardens. Together with the Dashnaks, they organized blood-letting fratricidal war between the Georgians and Armenians.

The hearts of the toilers of Georgia are filled with tremendous hatred towards the Menshevik traitors.

It is the lot of the miserable remnants of the Mensheviks today to wander, in emigration, around the backyards, ante-chambers and back entrances of the agents of the imperialists in the West.

On February 25, 1921, the Georgian people, supported by the Russian proletariat and the workers' and peasants' Red Army, overthrew the rule of the Mensheviks and set up a Soviet government, and, under the banner of Lenin and Stalin, took the high road to victories in the field of socialist construction.

III

In the fifteen years that the Soviet government has existed in Georgia, the toilers there have achieved tremendous successes in building the economic and national-cultural life of their

country. These successes are the triumph of the national policy of the Bolshevik Party.

The establishment of Soviet power has led to a stormy growth of economic and cultural construction in Georgia.

Georgia has changed from a colony of Russian Tsarism, "a country more agrarian even than Russia" (Lenin), and has become an advanced industrial and agrarian republic.

While capital investments in the industry of the USSR during the First Five-Year Plan amounted to 506 per cent of the figure for the whole of the restoration period, in Georgia in industry alone it was 934 per cent. The increase in capital investments for 1934 throughout the Soviet Union was 19.4 per cent and for Georgia 32 per cent. In 1936, the increase in capital investments in industry is to be 17.7 per cent, and for Georgia 38.4 per cent.

While for the whole of the Soviet Union the production of electrical energy in 1934, as compared with 1913, rose by 1,331 per cent, the figure for the same period of time for Georgia was 2,259 per cent.

While the total production of the whole of industry in the Soviet Union amounted in 1935 to 542 per cent of the 1913 figures, for Georgia it amounted to 1,908 per cent.

The total production of the whole of Georgian industry in 1935 rose to 473 million rubles and in 1936 will amount to 600 million.

During the First Five-Year Plan, capital investments in the national economy of Georgia

amounted to 700 million rubles, while during the year 1935 alone, 401 million rubles were invested. The plan for 1936 provides for capital investments in Georgia to the amount of 616 million rubles.

During the fifteen years that the Soviet government has existed in Georgia, a number of entirely new branches of industry have been built up. The share of industry in the general production of the national economy of Georgia has increased to 74.9 per cent.

The industrial and economic development of Georgia is being built up on the basis of a powerful supply of electrical power. By the end of 1935, the capacity of the electrical power stations of Georgia was 105,000 kilowatts, and in 1936 it will increase to 162,000 kilowatts, as against 8,000 in 1913.

Only under the Soviet government have the rich resources of hydro-electrical power obtainable from the headlong rush of the mountain rivers been widely exploited.

The Chiatura manganese industry has been technically re-equipped. The Soviet government has already invested 45 million rubles in the manganese industry and will invest another 17 million in 1936. Last year 1,180,000 tons of manganese were obtained.

With the Chiatura manganese as a base, a large ferrous-manganese works has been erected in the town of Jugeli (Zestafony).

The old Tkvibula coal mines have been reconstructed. New Tskvarchela coal mines have

been equipped by the Soviet government.

Large oil refineries have been erected in Batum, which deal with three million tons of crude oil per year. Considerable work is being undertaken to discover oil deposits in the Shiraka steppes of Georgia.

The earth in Soviet Georgia is rich in the most varied kinds of minerals. A coal and ore industry has been constructed and is developing on a wide scale. The rich earth of Georgia has been put to the service of socialist construction, among other things, barytes, lithograph stone, diatomites and marble being prepared. In 1935-36, the production, of arsenic, molybdenum has been undertaken. In 1936, a start has been made with the building in Kutais of a huge works for the production of fertilizers.

Light and food industries have been created on a large scale. The value of the output of light industry increased from 2,155 thousand rubles in 1923-24 to 87,557 thousand in 1935, in other words, increased 40 times.

The value of the output of the food industry increased from 9 million rubles in 1928 to 71 million in 1935; 90 per cent of the total production falling to the share of the factories and works built since the Soviet government was established.

23 million rubles were invested in the forestry and timber industries of Georgia during the First Five-Year Plan, while 41 million rubles have been invested in them during three years of the Second Five-Year Plan alone. In Zugdidi,

the important Ingursk paper works is under construction, its annual productivity to be 24,000 tons of various kinds of high-class paper.

Altogether, during the period that the Soviet government has been in power in Georgia, a total of 117 different kinds of industrial enterprises have been constructed and completely re-equipped; and they represent 96.7 per cent of the total lands invested in the industry of Georgia.

Transport in Georgia by rail, water, road and air is also developing: 200 kilometres of new railroad have been constructed; 183 kilometres of main railway lines have been electrified. A new port is under construction on the Black Sea coast, at Ochemchira; 4,462 kilometres of paved main roads and improved roads have been completed; 50 motor routes connecting district centres with the railway stations, and serving to connect the different towns, stretch over a distance of 2,590 kilometres. In 1935 there was a regular service of Soviet airplanes flying over eight air routes.

The national policy of Lenin and Stalin of industrializing the national republics and raising them to the level of the foremost republics in the Soviet Union is embodied in all this great work of industrial construction in Georgia.

By mastering the advanced technique of the industry built up, by raising the productivity of labour on the basis of socialist competition, "shock" methods and the application of Stakhanov methods of work, under the leadership of the Bolshevik organizations of Georgia, the

working class that has grown up is successfully fulfilling and overfulfilling the tasks set by the Party and the government.

The successes of Soviet Georgia are also tremendous as regards the improvement and socialist reconstruction of agriculture.

On the direct instructions of Lenin and Stalin, irrigation works have been widely developed. The Soviet government has irrigated over 100,000 hectares of land.

The swampy lands of the Kolhida plain lay untouched for centuries and were a hotbed of malaria fever. It was only the Soviet government which set about draining the Kolhida swamps. 45 million rubles have already been expended in the fulfillment of this task; 16,837 hectares have already been drained, and part of this area is being used to establish plantations of tea and citron fruits.

The total sown area in Georgia has grown from 738,000 hectares to 947,000 during the last fifteen years.

A tremendous piece of work is being done by the Bolsheviki of Georgia in connection with the development of valuable and technical cultures. The total area under tea plantations before the revolution amounted to 894 hectares. In their struggle to make the Soviet Union an independent country as regards tea, the Bolsheviki of Georgia have increased the area under tea plantations to 34,000 hectares in the year 1935. During the last three years, the harvest on the tea plantations has been doubled. In 1935

over 12.5 million kilograms of green tea leaves were collected on the plantations. The tea industry of Georgia can now produce tea which is in no way inferior to Ceylon tea.

Before the revolution, the area under citron cultures did not exceed 500 hectares. By the year 1935, this area had already increased to 3,280 hectares. Last year Soviet Georgia gave the Land of Soviets about 200 million citron fruits. By decision of the CC of the CPSU and the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR, the area under citron fruits in Georgia must be increased to 20,000 hectares by 1940. The Bolsheviks of Georgia have started a struggle for the fulfillment of this task and there is not the slightest doubt that it will be successfully fulfilled. And Soviet Georgia will give the toilers of the Soviet countries not millions, but thousands of millions of citron fruits!

There are also the valuable cultures like eucalyptus trees, ether bearing plants and others. During the last two years alone, about one million eucalyptus trees have been planted, and by 1940 no less than 10 million trees will have been planted.

Georgia provides the highest grades of export tobacco — “trapezund” and “samsun”. In 1935 the tobacco plantations covered approximately 20,000 hectares; for purposes of export and for the production of high grade cigarettes, 15,875 tons of high class tobacco from Georgia and Abkhasia were collected and dispatched to the Moscow, Leningrad, Kharkov and other

tobacco factories in the Soviet Union.

One of the most important branches of agriculture in Georgia is the cultivation of grapes. When the Mensheviks ruled Georgia, there was a decline in this sphere. Phylloxera destroyed whole hectares of vineyards. During the last few years the reduction in the area of vineyards has been stopped, and an increase has begun. During the period 1932-35, up to 4,000 new vineyards have been established. Cuttings from American vines have been planted over an area of 690 hectares. The total area of vineyards today is over 39,000 hectares. The grapes cultivated in Georgia supply the country with the best, high-class wines.

During the last five years alone new gardens have been laid out over an area of 12,000 hectares, the total area reaching the figure of 50,000 hectares. In the year 1935 over 21,000 tons of different kinds of fruit were delivered to the state.

Silk-worm production in Georgia is an important branch of economy, and has begun to flourish rapidly. In 1935, the silk growers of Georgia overfulfilled their plan, producing 2,552 tons of high quality cocoons.

By carrying out the instructions of the Party, the Bolsheviks of Georgia brought about a change in the development of livestock breeding in 1934-35 and this branch of economy is rapidly rising. The plans covering the increase in the number of heads of cattle, large and small, were overfulfilled in 1935.

Advanced technical methods are being embodied in the agriculture of Soviet Georgia. Agriculture is being mechanized.

37 machine and tractor stations have been set up in the various districts of Georgia; 1,710 tractors and tens of thousands of different types of agricultural machinery are at work on the socialist fields.

254 state farms, including 117 large ones, have been set up in Georgia.

In the agricultural enterprises (in the state farms, machine and tractor stations, and so on) 26,000 permanent agricultural workers are engaged.

The tremendous work performed in Soviet Georgia to reconstruct agriculture is the embodiment of the national policy of Lenin and Stalin.

Before the revolution there was an acute land hunger in Georgia. Tens of thousands of peasants could find no outlet for their labour, and to avoid dying of starvation went to earn their livings far beyond the confines of Georgia. Today, as a result of the growth of industry and the development of agriculture, with the introduction into agriculture of valuable and technical cultures, an insufficiency of labour power is already making itself felt, while the intensive conduct of agriculture has created all the conditions necessary for a prosperous life for the collective farm peasantry.

The Bolsheviki of Georgia achieved all these successes in the development and improvement of agriculture through creating and strengthen-

ing the collective farming system. On January 1, 1936, 70 per cent of the peasant farms of Georgia were in collective farms. The collective farms are growing and gathering strength on the basis of the Stalinist statutes governing agricultural artels. With every year that passes their incomes are growing and the value of the work day is rising. In Georgia there are already a number of collective farms whose total income is over a million rubles. These are "millionaire" collective farms.

In these collective farms the value of each work day for the individual collective farmer has increased from 15 to 20 rubles; the average income per family belonging to the collective farm has reached the figure of from 8,000 to 12,000-15,000 rubles a year; while if the income from their kitchen gardens is taken into account, many hundreds of collective farmers in 1935 found themselves with an income of from 20,000 to 25,000-30,000 rubles, and certain individual families as much as 40,000 rubles.

The collective farming peasantry of Georgia are well fed, prosperous and happy. The collective farmers are full of song as they work on the tea; citron, tobacco, vine and other plantations.

The towns of Georgia are growing and being planned and beautified. During the last two years alone, 1934-35, 93 million rubles have been spent on municipal works and housing in Tiflis, and in 1936, 66 million rubles will be spent. Places like Kutais, Poti, Chiatura, which have become industrial towns, are also being

planned and beautified.

The capitals of the autonomous republics and regions — Batum in Adjara, Sukhumi in Abkhazia and Stalinir in South Ossetia — are being similarly dealt with. There is not a single regional and industrial centre in Georgia where similar activity is not going forward.

Georgia is the health resort of the Soviet Union. There are such excellent health resorts on the Black Sea coast and in the mountains of Georgia as Borjomi, Abastuman, Tshaltubo, Gulripsh, Gagra, Kobuleti, Bakuriani, Akhtala, Java, Bakharo, Shovi, Mahinjauri and Zeleny Mys. Thousands of toilers come to Georgia from all corners of the Soviet Union to restore their health.

Considerable work has been carried out to reconstruct and improve these health resorts. Tshaltubo, a health resort renowned throughout the whole of the Union, has been rebuilt. In 1936 building operations will begin on a new health resort, Mendji, where the waters are in no way inferior to those of Matsesta and Kislovodsk.

A total of more than 70 million rubles has been invested in the building of health resorts in Georgia during the period of the existence of the Soviet government.

Soviet power has ensured the real blossoming of the culture of the peoples of Georgia, culture national in form and socialist in content.

Soviet Georgia will meet the twentieth anniversary of the October Socialist Revolution as a

country where everybody is literate. Universal, compulsory, elementary education for children has been introduced. Today, 614,000 scholars are studying in the elementary and secondary schools of Georgia. There are 19,000 teachers working in elementary and secondary schools.

Under Tsarism there was not a single university in Georgia, but under the Soviet government 19 universities have been opened. In almost all these educational institutions the teaching is carried on entirely in the Georgian language.

During the period of the existence of the Soviet government, the universities in Georgia have trained 14,000 people of working class and peasant origin as engineers, agronomists, doctors, teachers, economists and others qualified to carry on the task of socialist construction.

Education is carried on in the native language in the schools and educational institutions of Georgia. The Russian language is also taught in the schools of Georgia.

There has been a big development of scientific research work under the Soviet government. 120 of the most varied scientific research institutions have been set up, and the work of many of these institutes are of great scientific value for the whole of the Soviet Union.

Art and literature are flourishing. The Rustaveli and Mardjanishvili State Theatres have produced a number of highly artistic plays, which have advanced them to the ranks of the best theatres in the Soviet Union. In Georgia

today 47 theatres are open, of which three-quarters are conducted in the Georgian language.

The Soviet government organized a cinema industry in Georgia. A cinema factory has been constructed in Tiflis. The State Cinema Industry of Georgia has produced 80 Soviet films.

Physical culture is developing on a broad scale. On January 1, 1936, 110,000 sportsmen passed the Ready for Labour and Defence test and were presented with the badge known as the GTO. The sportsmen of Georgia have established a number of records covering the Soviet Union. During the 15 years of the existence of the Soviet government in Georgia, over 35 million books have been published. *The works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin have been published in hundreds of thousands of copies in the Georgian language.*

Writers and poets are growing up in Soviet Georgia. In their works they depict the problems and the heroic story of socialist construction. Soviet artists, architects and sculptors are growing up, who are enriching Soviet culture with new works of art.

The old generation of intellectuals have linked their fate fast with the toiling masses of Georgia; and together with them, shoulder to shoulder, are working to build up socialism. They have rallied around the Soviet government, around the Communist Party.

During the 15 years of the existence of the Soviet government in Georgia new and strong

forces of Soviet intellectuals have grown up from among the workers and peasants. These new forces, brought into being by the Soviet government, are filled with unbounded loyalty to it.

When the Tsarist autocracy called up the sons of the toilers of Georgia to join the army, it sent them into distant parts of the Empire, fearing to leave them armed in their native towns and villages. Today, *Soviet Georgia has its own national divisions which are the faithful fighting units of the mighty, glorious workers' and peasants' army of the great Land of Soviets.*

In all this we have the embodiment of the national policy of Lenin and Stalin, under whose banner the toiling masses of Georgia liberated themselves from the yoke of Tsarism and the Menshevik rulers, and are confidently marching along the road to a happy, joyful life.

The steadfast realization of the national policy of Lenin and Stalin ensures that the peoples of Georgia and the Trans-Caucasus live in staunch friendship and peace. Instead of the former national strife, inflamed by Tsarism and the Mensheviks, friendship and collaboration flourishes among the peoples of Georgia.

The autonomous republics and regions which go to make up the Georgian Republic — Soviet Adjaria, Soviet Abhasia and Soviet South Osetinia — are growing and gathering strength.

Great is the friendship among the toiling peoples of Georgia, great is the friendship between

the toiling peoples of Georgia and the peoples of Azerbaidjan and Armenia.

Comrade Molotov, the head of the Soviet government, said the following about this friendship between the peoples of Soviet Caucasus:

“In the Trans-Caucasus, with its many nationalities, where, for a long time a fierce struggle raged between the toilers of different nationalities, a struggle inflamed in every possible way by the capitalists and henchmen of the Tsar, we have brought about a situation where this struggle has been finally eliminated and where, in place of this struggle, the lives of all the toilers of the Trans-Caucasus are flourishing in an atmosphere of peace.”

A big part in achieving these successes was played by Comrade Ordjonikidze, Comrade Stalin's comrade-in-arms, under whose leadership the Bolsheviks of Georgia and the Trans-Caucasus consolidated and organized the Soviet government and routed the Mensheviks and those who deviated on the national question, educating broad masses of the toilers in the spirit of proletarian internationalism.

The deviators on the national question tried during the first years after the Soviet government was established to turn the Bolshevik organizations of Georgia from the right road. The national-deviation current in the ranks of the Communist Party of the Bolsheviks of Georgia

constitutes an opportunist current which reflected the pressure upon various strata of the Party organizations by kulak-bourgeois-nationalist and Menshevik elements. The national-deviation current, having taken the road of struggle against the correct national policy of the Party, lowered itself to the platform of Georgian Menshevism. The national-deviation current was jingoism on the offensive reflecting the great-power bourgeois nationalism of the Georgian Mensheviks and national democrats. The national-deviation current reflected the interests and demands of the nobles, landowners and kulaks of Georgia.

Only by mercilessly crushing the national-deviation current did the Communist Party of Georgia ensure that the national policy of Lenin and Stalin would be successfully carried out, leading the work of socialist construction in Georgia and educating the masses in the spirit of internationalism.

In the struggle for these victories of socialist construction, the Bolshevik Party of Georgia has become strong and has rallied still closer around the CC of the CPSU and Comrade Stalin.

Under the banner of the national policy of Lenin and Stalin, under the wise leadership of the Bolshevik Party, the toilers of Georgia are confidently marching forward to new victories for socialism.



THE NOVEMBER 8TH PUBLISHING HOUSE

Catalogue available at november8ph.ca

NEPH would be glad to have your comments on this book, its design, any corrections and suggestions you may have for future publications. Please send them to info@november8ph.ca

Communist Party of Canada (Marxist-Leninist)

Read *TML Monthly and Daily!*

Support CPC(M-L)!

cpcml.ca