

# COMMUNIST

---

STATEMENT OF EDITORIAL BOARD

GREETINGS TO COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA

STATEMENT OF THE EDITORIAL BOARD  
ON ANTI-LENINIST CRITICISM OF  
COMRADE MAO TSE-TUNG

SOME PROBLEMS OF PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY

by Hilari Mine

MEERUT TRIAL IN INDIA AND  
THE COLONIAL POLICY OF THE LABOURITES

by N. Somin

LENINIST-STALINIST TEACHINGS ON  
NATIONS AND THE NATIONAL AND COLONIAL  
REVOLUTION

by V. V. Vassilieva

LESSONS OF STRUGGLE AGAINST KOSTOV GANG

by V. Chervenkov.

(Continued Overleaf)

---

3

---

Vol. 3

JULY-AUGUST 1950

Re. 1

OUTSTANDING CONTRIBUTION ON  
THE NATIONAL QUESTION

by I. Verkhovtsev

THE STRATEGY AND TACTICS OF LENINISM  
—A MILITANT WEAPON IN THE HANDS OF  
FRATERNAL COMMUNIST PARTIES

by V. Grigoryan

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Inland	Foreign
Annual Rs. 5	Annual 12s. or \$ 2.40
Half-yearly Rs. 3	

Single copy As. 3 or 1s. or 20c.

(Inland subscription money should be sent by Money Orders only)  
Address all correspondence and M.O.s to:

The Manager, COMMUNIST,  
R.K. Building,  
190-B, Khetwadi Main Road, Bombay 4.

Printed by M. B. Rao at the New Age Printing Press 190-B, Khetwadi Main Road, Bombay 4, and edited and published by him at "Communist" Office R. K. Building, 190-B, Khetwadi Main Road, Bombay 4.

## STATEMENT OF THE EDITORIAL BOARD

THE Editorial Board of *COMMUNIST* herewith rejects and withdraws the statement on the Editorial article of the journal *For A Lasting Peace, For A People's Democracy* dated 27th January, 1950, which was printed in the last issue of *COMMUNIST*, Vol. III, February-March, 1950.

The Editorial Board has since been conducting detailed discussions on the above-mentioned editorial article in the light of the Manifesto and the reports made at the Peking Conference of Trade Unions of Asia and Australasia (November, 1949), in the light of articles and works of Comrade Mao Tse-tung, of the recent articles and speeches of the leaders of the Chinese Communist Party and of the documents of the Soviet academicians on the colonial revolutions.

In the light of these discussions, which have now been completed, the Editorial Board has come to the conclusion that its above-mentioned statement did not represent an honest self-criticism of the utterly Left-Sectarian line which it pursued and which was propounded by it in its various authoritative statements and articles published in the *COMMUNIST* since January, 1949.

On the other hand, the Editorial Board, under the cover of a formal acceptance of the editorial article of the journal of the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers' Parties had actually taken a self-justificatory position in that statement.

In its authoritative statement and articles such as, "On People's Democracy" and "On the Agrarian Question in India" published in Vol. II, No. 1, January 1949; "Struggle for a People's Democracy and Socialism — Some Questions of Strategy and Tactics" published in Vol. II, No. 4, June-July, 1949; "On Revisionism in the light of Lenin's Teachings" published in Vol. II, No. 2, February, 1949, the Editorial Board threw overboard all the teachings of Lenin and Stalin on imperialism and colonial revolutions, produced a full-fledged Trotskyite thesis of one stage revolution.

The Editorial Board distorted Zhdanov's report and turned a blind eye to the valuable articles of the brother Parties and finally threw to the winds the principles of

fraternal relations of the world Communist brotherhood, to the extent of open slander of Comrade Mao Tse-tung and the Chinese Communist Party.

The Editorial Board thanks its readers and supporters for the political initiative and vigilance they have shown, for the sharp criticism they have levelled against its self-justificatory statement on the Editorial article of the journal *For a Lasting Peace For a People's Democracy* and against the Left-Sectarian and Trotskyite line which the Editorial Board pursued in its statements and articles.

This criticism has helped the Editorial Board a great deal to make a complete turn and to chalk out the broad lines of the new strategy and tactics of the present stage of the Indian revolution, which can serve as a basis for achieving unification of the Communist movement.

The Editorial Board herewith withdraws all the statements and articles mentioned above and requests the readers of *COMMUNIST* not to consider them as authoritative any longer.

The Editorial Board which has been reconstituted in the light of the criticism of its readers and in the light of its own self-criticism, will soon publish a detailed criticism of the above-mentioned articles and will soon publish a new statement and resolution defining the policy of the Editorial Board.

In the present number, we are publishing a resolution adopted by the new Editorial Board on the anti-Leninist criticism of Comrade Mao Tse-tung made in the article "Struggle for People's Democracy and Socialism, etc." published in *COMMUNIST* Vol. II, No. 4, June-July, 1949.

## GREETINGS TO COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA ON ITS 29TH ANNIVERSARY, JULY 1, 1950.

*The Central Committee of the Communist Party of India has sent the following message of greetings to the Communist Party of China on the 29th Anniversary of the latter on July 1:*

**T**HE Central Committee of the Communist Party of India greets the Communist Party of China on the 29th anniversary of its foundation.

This is the first time that the entire people of China are joyously celebrating the anniversary of the foundation of the Communist Party of China. They know full well that it was under the wise leadership of their Communist Party that the entire mainland of China has been cleared of the rule of the Kuomintang, the American puppets. They also know that it is under the same leadership that the liberation of Tibet and Taiwan, the implementation of agrarian reforms, the industrialisation of the country and other measures are going to be carried out, thus transforming semi-colonial China into an advanced industrial country and laying the basis for Socialism.

The entire democratic world is also happy that the 475 million people of China, under the leadership of their Communist Party, have become stable members of the international camp of peace, democracy and Socialism.

Particularly happy are the peoples of the colonial world at this first and greatest victory of People's Democracy in a colonial country. The utter defeat of American and other imperialists as well as their Chinese stooges, by the Chinese people under the leadership of the Communist Party of China, is a source of inspiration to all colonial peoples; they all see in the Chinese revolution the model for their own revolutions. The peoples of Viet Nam, Malaya, Burma, Philippines, Indonesia, have already taken to this path and other colonial people are going to take it.

The Communist Parties in the colonial world are looking upon the Communist Party of China as their model. The 29 years long history of the Communist Party of China has shown them how to unite their own people under proletarian hegemony and how to build a Lenin-Stalin Bolshevik Party in a colonial country.

While associating itself with the worldwide celebration of this anniversary, the Central Committee recalls with gratitude the direct ideological assistance rendered by the Communist Party of China to the Communist Party of India. The Open Letter which it addressed to the ranks of the Communists in India in 1933 was greatly instrumental in correcting the Left-sectarian mistakes of those days and in uniting the scattered Communist groups in India into an All-India Communist Party. The Central Committee gratefully acknowledges the invaluable aid rendered by the leadership of the Communist Party of China, through their writings and speeches to our present inner-Party discussions.

The Central Committee realises that the best way for it to celebrate the anniversary of the foundation of the Communist Party of China is to intensify its own struggle against Anglo-American imperialism and its Indian agents. For, after the utter defeat inflicted on it by the Chinese People's Liberation Army led by the Communist Party of China, the international camp of reaction is trying to make India its base of aggression against the Soviet Union, China and other democratic Socialist countries and also of intervention against the liberation struggle waged by the peoples of Burma and countries of South-East Asia."

Armed with the lessons of the Chinese Revolution as drawn by the Communist Party of China and its great leader, Comrade Mao Tse-tung, the Central Committee has pledged to unite the entire people of India against Anglo-American imperialism and its Indian stooges. The brave fighters of Telengana, Andhra, Mymensingh, etc., have already shown that the Chinese path is the path for India also. The Central Committee is sure that following this path, the Indian people can defeat the diabolical plans of Anglo-American imperialism to make India its base of aggression against the Soviet Union and China as well as of intervention against the peoples of South-East Asia, liberate their country from the imperialist grip and establish People's Democracy.

The Great Lenin prophesied that when the Indian people take their place shoulder to shoulder with the peoples of China and of the Soviet Union in the struggle for emancipation, 'there would not be the slightest shadow of

doubt what the final outcome of the world struggle would be—the victory of Socialism is fully and absolutely assured.'

A great responsibility now rests on the shoulders of the Communist Party of India to bring the great Indian people into the world front of peace, democracy and Socialism, headed by the Soviet Union, in which the Chinese people led by their Communist Party have already taken their rightful place.

There is not the slightest doubt that with the fraternal assistance of the Chinese Communist Party and the world Communist movement, the working class and the people of India will be able to discharge that responsibility and play their part in fulfilling Lenin's prophecy.

*Long live the Communist Party of China and its leader  
Comrade Mao Tse-tung!*

*Long live the fraternal solidarity of the working class  
and peoples of China and India, the struggle for  
lasting peace, People's Democracy and Socialism!*

*Long live the anti-imperialist democratic front led by  
the Socialist Soviet Union and the leader and teacher  
of the working class and progressive humanity  
—COMRADE STALIN!*

June 30, 1950.

# STATEMENT OF EDITORIAL BOARD OF COMMUNIST ON ANTI-LENINIST CRITICISM OF COMRADE MAO TSE-TUNG

Made in the article "Struggle for People's Democracy and Socialism", *COMMUNIST*, Vol. II, No. 4.

**T**HE Editorial Board of *Communist* unreservedly withdraws the entire criticism of Comrade Mao Tse-tung made in the course of an article entitled "Struggle for People's Democracy and Socialism—Some Questions of Strategy and Tactics" published in *Communist*, Vol. II, No. 4, June-July, 1949.

The Editorial Board tenders its deeply felt apologies to Comrade Mao Tse-tung and to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China. The Editorial Board is fully conscious of the fact that the unworthy attacks against Comrade Mao Tse-tung made in the *Communist* was wrong not only against the Communist Party of China but against the solidarity of the international Communist front, a criminal violation of the principle of fraternal cooperation among Communists of all countries.

This criticism was not only wrong and anti-Leninist, but also a base slander against the leader of the victorious Chinese Revolution and the Communist Party of China. Objectively it only brought grist to the mill of the villification campaign started by the Anglo-American imperialists with the sole object of maligning Comrade Mao and the Chinese Communist Party in the eyes of the peoples of the colonial countries and of disrupting the solidarity of the anti-imperialist democratic front.

The making and acceptance of such criticism and its publication in the theoretical journals like *Communist* (English), in Bengali, Marathi and Hindi publications is one of the most serious of the many mistakes committed by the Editorial Board.

If the Editorial Board had doubts about certain formulations in the writings of Com. Mao Tse-tung (if it was unable to understand the meaning of the policies pursued by the Chinese Communist Party, it was its elementary duty to have got into touch with the leadership of the Chinese Com-

munist Party to get its doubts solved by mutual discussions. This is what the solidarity of the international Communist front and the loyalty to the principle of the fraternal cooperation among Communists of all countries, demands of Communists of every country if they are to remain loyal to the cause of revolution.

• But the Editorial Board took the harmful course of making an open, abusive and uncomradely attack upon Comrade Mao Tse-tung. It was not an isolated mistake. It was a necessary part of the Trotskyite-Titoite conceptions which dominated the mind of the Editorial Board, of its effort to pursue Left-opportunist policies. The Editorial Board imagined that its Left-opportunist conceptions of the nature of the People's Democratic revolution in India, of its class alliance and strategy, which it had acquired under the influence of Titoist literature, was the last word in the application of Marxist-Leninist theory to the problems of the new stage of the colonial liberation movement.

Comrades from Andhra had submitted a document to the Editorial Board soon after the Second Party Congress (in June 1948) in which they very correctly proposed that the concrete formulation of the strategy and tactics to be pursued by the Party in its struggle to realise the programme and objective set forth by the Second Congress, should be made on the basis of the ideas developed by Comrade Mao Tse-tung in his classical work *New Democracy*.

The comrades from Andhra, who were pioneers in unleashing the agrarian revolution and in leading militant struggles of the peasants and people of Telengana, correctly pointed out that Mao's work was a brilliant contribution to the Lenin-Stalin teaching on the national liberation revolution in the colonies. They insisted that the path followed by the Chinese Communist Party in unleashing the national liberation struggle in the face of Kuomintang reaction and its white terror is the path which Indian Communists must adopt in the present phase.

The Editorial Board bent upon pushing forward its Trotskyist conception of the present stage of the Indian revolution, which denied its national liberationist and colonial character, and its Left-opportunist policies, rejected the proposal of the Andhra comrades and made a malicious attack upon Com. Mao Tse-tung.

The Editorial Board hypocritically stated that it "accepted Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin as the authoritative sources of Marxism", and that it has "not discovered new sources of Marxism beyond these".

After having declared itself the only authoritative in-

terpreter of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, the Editorial Board then pronounces the following judgement on the leader of the victorious Chinese Revolution :

"Nor for that matter is there any Communist Party which declares adherence to the so-called theory of New Democracy alleged to be propounded by Mao and declares it to be a new addition to Marxism. Singularly enough there was no reference to this new addition to Marxism in the Conference of Nine Parties in Europe, i.e., Communist Information Bureau—E.B.). Under these circumstances it is very wrong for a section of the leadership of the Central Committee to take upon itself the task of recommending new discoveries which one of the most authoritative conferences of Marxists has not thought fit to recommend. The Andhra Secretariat should have thought ten times before making such a formulation and taking an original stand on the question of this contribution. It is impermissible for Communists to talk lightly about new discoveries, enrichment, because such claims have proved too often to be a thin cloak for revisionism (Tito, Browder, etc.). (Communist, Vol. II, No. 4, p. 77)

Proclaiming itself as the pontiff of Marxism-Leninism, the Editorial Board has here pronounced the classic work on *China's New Democracy* as revisionist and has shown the amazing brazen-facedness to suggestively mention Tito and Browder in that connection.

The Editorial Board knew very well that it could not brush aside the important questions raised by the Andhra comrades and put across its Troskyite Left-sectarian policies, as long as the Party ranks continued to regard Com. Mao Tse-tung as one of the outstanding leaders of the international Communist movement—a creative Marxist and a continuator of the teaching of Lenin and Stalin on the national liberation revolution of the colonies.

That is why the Editorial Board dishonestly pitted the authority of the Nine Communist Parties' Conference against Comrade Mao in order to declare his great work as revisionist. That is why the Editorial Board went to the length of suggestively mentioning the names of Tito and Browder in the same breath as that of Com. Mao—and that at a time when the entire imperialist press was slandering him as being an "Eastern Tito".

The Andhra comrades in their document of June 1948 correctly pointed out that only the Indian big bourgeoisie had struck a deal with imperialism and had passed over to the camp of reaction and counter-revolution. Basing them-

selves on the teachings of Stalin and Mao Tse-tung, the Andhra comrades argued that the middle bourgeoisie continued to be oppressed by foreign imperialists and Indian monopoly capitalists and that the Communists, in forging the Democratic Front against Anglo-American imperialists and their Indian servitors, the Indian big bourgeoisie, will have to adopt a correct attitude towards this middle bourgeoisie. The Editorial Board, in order to bolster up its anti-Leninist, Left-sectarian and disruptive thesis that the entire bourgeoisie had lined up in the camp of reaction, that the entire bourgeoisie had to be fought, made this unworthy and slanderous attack on Comrade Mao Tse-tung.

The Editorial Board dishonestly and without any proof, suggested that Mao's programme of New Democracy was based on the reformist conception of collaboration with sections of the bourgeoisie. Comrade Mao Tse-tung was falsely accused of propounding that the New Democratic regime to be created by the victorious revolution would be promoting "capitalism" and that he was completely negating "the transitional anti-capitalist character of the economic order under People's Democracy" and denying the perspective of advance to the construction of Socialism.

The Editorial Board picked up isolated phrases and paragraphs out of context from the writings of Mao to "prove" this lie and proclaimed arrogantly that:

"Some of Mao's formulations are such that no Communist Party can accept them; they are in contradiction to the world understanding of the Communist Parties."  
(Communist, Vol. II, No. 4, p 78)

Once again the international Communist movement is pitted against Com. Mao. It is slyly suggested that Mao's Marxism is of a doubtful brand and has little in common with that of the international Communist movement, thus once again lending a hand to the slander campaign of the imperialists.

The Andhra comrades in their document of June 1948 had drawn pointed attention to the fact that the Anglo-American imperialists had launched since March 1948 a furious and armed offensive against the rising national liberation movement in the countries of South-east Asia, and that the brutal repression and white terror launched by the Nehru-Patel Government against the democratic forces headed by the Communist Party of India was a part of this imperialist offensive.

The Andhra comrades quite correctly proposed that the Indian proletariat and Communists must in this situation

follow the path taken by the Chinese Communist Party in leading the liberation struggle of the Chinese people against imperialism and the Kuomintang reactionaries. They proposed that the Communists must concentrate on the task of unleashing the militant struggles of the peasants for urgently needed agrarian reforms in the rural areas of Bengal, Andhra and North Malabar. They unfolded the perspective of a protracted struggle and dogged resistance.

But the Editorial Board had already adopted an anti-Leninist analysis of the agrarian question in India. This analysis denied the dominance of feudal relations in India and negated the task of rallying all the peasantry in the struggle to wipe out feudal and semi-feudal landlordism. The Editorial Board, therefore, not only rejected the proposal to adopt the path followed by the Chinese people, but went one step further to give a falsified and slanderous interpretation of the history of the Communist Party of China.

The Editorial Board quoted a long passage from the Colonial Thesis of the Sixth Congress of the Communist International (July-August, 1928), which drew lessons from some of the mistakes committed by the former leadership of the Communist Party of China. From this passage, the Editorial Board drew the utterly false Trotskyist conclusion:

"Why had the Chinese to go through the protracted civil war? Just because the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party at times failed to fight for the hegemony of the proletariat, for bringing the majority of the masses in alliance and under the leadership of the proletariat, because it followed tactical policies which led to disaster." (*Ibid*, p. 84)

How utterly bankrupt and dishonest is this effort of the Editorial Board to undermine the prestige of the Chinese Communist Party and its leadership in the eyes of the Party ranks, can be seen from the following facts:

a) Already in August 1927, Comrade Stalin had replied to the Trotskyist opposition which had sought to slander the Chinese Communist Party in a similar way. Stalin said :

"The fact that the Communist Party in China grew in a very short period from a small group of 2,000 into a mass Party of 60,000 members...the fact that the Chinese Communist Party has succeeded in arousing millions of peasants from their torpor...the fact that the Chinese Communist Party has succeeded in so brief a period in gaining all these achievements is due incidentally to the fact that it followed the path outlined by Lenin—the path indicated by the Communist International...only ultra-Left renegades and ad-

venturists can doubt this." (J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1947, pp. 251-2)

The Editorial Board suppressed this fact from its readers.

•b) The present leadership of the Chinese Communist Party headed by Comrades Mao Tse-tung, Chu Teh and others came to the helm of affairs some twenty years ago. It did so by waging a determined struggle against both Right and Left deviations from Marxism-Leninism, by fighting for the correct Lenin-Stalin strategy and tactics of leading national liberation struggles. Under the leadership of Comrade Mao Tse-tung, the Chinese Communist Party mastered the tactics of realising proletarian hegemony in the liberation struggle and became a mighty force, rallying the vast masses of the peasantry capable of achieving its final historic victory. The Editorial Board said nothing about this.

c) Already in 1935, when the Chinese Communist Party under the leadership of Comrade Mao Tse-tung had waged the "protracted civil war" against Chiang Kai-shek for eight long years the Communist International at its Seventh Congress paid a warm and glowing tribute to the Communist Party of China and characterised it as a model for all colonial countries. Comrade Mao Tse-tung was elected to the Executive Committee of the Communist International. The Editorial Board suppressed this fact from its readers.

This villification of the Communist Party of China and the slander of its great leader, Mao Tse-tung, indulged in by the Editorial Board is a serious crime against the Communist movement, against proletarian internationalism.

It arose not merely out of the political ignorance and petty bourgeois arrogance of the Editorial Board. It was a necessary part of the Editorial Board's Titoist Left-opportunist policy.

It was the outcome of the anti-international trend in the Editorial Board which manifested itself in the slanderous criticism of the brother Communist Parties made in the article on Revisionism (*Communist*, Vol. II, No. 2, February 1949) and in the publication of the correspondence of the Australian and British Parties. It expressed itself in the failure to publish articles of the leaders of the Chinese Communist Party in the *Communist*. It finally expressed itself in the suppression of the Peking Manifesto and the delay in the publication of the editorial of the organ of the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers' Parties.

In making and publishing this criticism of Mao Tse-tung,

the Editorial Board is guilty of lending indirect support to the vicious slander initiated by the Anglo-American imperialists. It is guilty of the attempt to create a barrier between the leader of the victorious Chinese revolution and the masses and the people of India, preventing them from learning from the invaluable theoretical and practical experience of the great Chinese Party. The Editorial Board is guilty of a serious breach of the discipline and solidarity of the international Communist movement, of violating the principle of fraternal cooperation between the Communists of all countries.

In its recent meeting, the Editorial Board, after thorough discussion and on the basis of the criticism of its readers and the self-criticism of its own members, condemned the Trotskyite, Left-sectarian line, initiated and propounded by it in a series of articles and authoritative statements. The meeting condemned the serious anti-international trend manifested in these articles. The making and publishing of the slanderous criticism of Comrade Mao and the Chinese Communist Party was one of the worst manifestations of this trend. The meeting of the Editorial Board therefore took the decision to reconstitute itself.

## II

It is necessary to refute in detail the criticism of Comrade Mao Tse-tung made by the Editorial Board in the course of its statement on Strategy and Tactics and to draw the lessons on the significance of the invaluable teaching and experience of the great Chinese Revolution for the Indian Communists and for the Indian people, to wage a persistent struggle against bourgeois nationalism which is the source of Left-opportunist deviation and of the "anti-international" trend in the old Editorial Board; to educate the vanguard of the working class in the spirit of proletarian internationalism.

The statements on People's Democracy and on Strategy and Tactics adopted by the Editorial Board denied as the Trotskyists did on the Chinese question, the anti-imperialist character of the Indian revolution and the colonial character of India's economy, after the imposition of the Mountbatten Award. As a result of this Left-opportunist understanding, the Editorial Board negated the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and national liberationist character of the present stage of the revolution in India.

In its statement on Strategy and Tactics in the course

of Section III, the Editorial Board has made an utterly wrong criticism of Comrade Mao Tse-tung's important work *New Democracy*. The Editorial Board has not only ridiculed the idea that this book contained a valuable contribution to the Lenin-Stalin theory of national liberation revolutions in the colonies and semi-colonies, but has gone to the length of condemning this great work as "revisionist" and placing it on a par with Browder's reformism and Tito's Trotskyism. This impudent and bankrupt criticism of Comrade Mao's great work is the best exposure of the 'Left'-opportunist understanding and line of the Editorial Board.

Comrade Mao's *New Democracy* was the product of the integration of Marxist-Leninist theory with the revolutionary practice of the Chinese people's liberation struggle led by the proletariat. That is why it has the most valuable lessons for the proletariat and the Communist Parties in India and the other colonial countries.

In his *New Democracy* Comrade Mao Tse-tung defined the New Democratic revolution in the colonies and semi-colonies as an anti-imperialist, anti-feudal revolution, under the leadership of the working class and the Communist Party. The central slogan of this revolution was the New Democratic republic of all *anti-imperialist classes*, in which the leading role belonged to the working class. This revolution was a part of the proletarian Socialist world revolution. The accomplishment of the first stage of the revolution culminating in the setting up of the People's Democratic Republic and the People's Democratic dictatorship of the anti-imperialist classes led by the working class opens the way to the second stage, the building of Socialist society.

In propounding these great ideas which have been brilliantly confirmed by the historic victory of the revolution in China, Comrade Mao Tse-tung uttered a sharp warning against mixing the two stages. Condemning the theory of "a single revolution" which the Chinese Trotskyists were putting forward, Comrade Mao said that it was an "entirely subjective thought" which purports to "accomplish both the political revolution and the social revolution in one stroke" in utter disregard of the development of the revolution, i.e., the necessity of a period of transition between one revolution and another. Such talk by confusing the two stages of the revolution tends to injure the cause of revolution by diminishing the importance of the democratic tasks to be carried out at the present juncture. (*New Democracy*, PPH, 1950, p. 20)

The Editorial Board in its statements on People's Democracy and on Strategy and Tactics has committed this very



Trotskyist mistake against which Comrade Mao warned. This is exactly the reason why the Editorial Board belittled the importance of Mao's great work on *New Democracy* and had the conceit to suggest that it was not applicable to the present stage of our revolution in India and to suggest in so many words that it was no new contribution to the Lenin-Stalin teaching on the strategy and tactics of colonial revolutions. (ref. *Communist*, Vol. II, No. 4, p. 77)

Comrade Mao Tse-tung's *New Democracy*, first published in China ten years ago in January 1940, is a brilliant application of the Lenin-Stalin teachings of the strategy and tactics of the national revolution in the colonies, to the tasks and problems of the Chinese revolution. That book inspired hundreds and thousands of Chinese Communists to give correct leadership to the progressive forces of the Chinese people, who at that time were passing through difficult times, fighting on the one hand the war of resistance against Japanese aggression, while at the same time they were being subjected to a treacherous assault by the Kuomintang reactionaries.

The basic ideas about the New Democratic revolution in China developed in this book have not only stood the test of time but have been fully confirmed by the subsequent development and the victorious outcome of the revolution in China.

The ideas developed by Comrade Mao in his *New Democracy* have been further developed and concretised by him in his later articles especially in the article "Dictatorship of People's Democracy" (*For A Lasting Peace, For A People's Democracy*, No. 14 (41), July 15, 1949). He sums up the lessons and experience of the Chinese revolution in the following words.

"We have acquired invaluable experience and the essence of this experience consists of the following three factors: a disciplined Party equipped with the theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, using the method of self-criticism and closely linked with the masses; an army led by this Party; a united front of different revolutionary sections of society and groups led by this Party. Basing ourselves on these three factors we won the main victory." (*For A Lasting Peace, For A People's Democracy*, No. 14 (41), July 15, 1949)

The editorial article of the organ of the Information Bureau which outlined the tasks of the Indian Communists and thus threw a sharp light on our Left-sectarian mistakes, has emphasised exactly these main lessons of the rich experience of the Chinese revolution.

## III

Comrade Mao Tse-tung diligently assimilated the teachings of the great Stalin on the perspectives of the Chinese Revolution and correctly expounded them in his *New Democracy* written ten years ago. Basing himself on Stalin's article "International Significance of the October Revolution" written in 1918, Comrade Mao wrote:

"Since the publication of the article, Stalin has again and again developed the theory regarding the colonial and semi-colonial revolution, its separation from the old type, and its transformation into a part of the proletarian Socialist revolution." (*China's New Democracy*, PPH, Bombay, 1950, p. 7)

In this book written in the beginning of the Second World War, Comrade Mao emphasised the fact that with all imperialist countries as her enemies China cannot attain her independence without the aid of the one Socialist country (USSR) and the international proletariat. China must join the anti-imperialist front and take part in the world revolution. He very correctly characterised the People's Democratic revolution in China as

"a new type of revolution, wholly or partly led by the proletariat, the first stage of which aims at setting up a New Democratic society, a new state of the combined dictatorship of all revolutionary classes." (*Ibid*, p. 6)

Already ten years ago he foresaw the perspective of the Chinese revolution—a People's Democratic revolution led by the proletariat directly passing over into Socialist revolution, without having to pass through a capitalist development, in alliance with and with the fraternal assistance of the Socialist Soviet Union—a perspective which is today not a distant goal but an objective of practicable achievement especially with the signing of the treaty of friendship and mutual assistance between the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union.

In his *New Democracy*, Comrade Mao wrote:

"The first stage of China's revolution (which again is divided into many sub-stages according to its social character, is a new bourgeois democratic revolution, not the newest proletarian Socialist revolution, though it long ago in the past became a part of the latter, and is a magnificent part, a magnificent ally of it at the present. The first step or stage of

this revolution is certainly not to, and certainly cannot, establish a capitalist society dictated by the bourgeoisie, but to establish a New Democracy ruled by the alliance of several revolutionary classes. After the accomplishment of this first stage, it will be developed into the second stage—to establish the Socialist society of China." (*Ibid*, p. 9)

In his article on "The Dictatorship of People's Democracy" written on the eve of the formation of the People's Democratic Government of China, Comrade Mao Tse-tung further concretised these ideas. He emphasised the fact that the victory of the Chinese revolution would not have been possible nor would it have been possible to consolidate victory after it had been achieved, had it not been for the Soviet Union, for its epoch-making victory over German and Japanese fascism, for the emergence of the People's Democracies in Europe and for the growing struggle of the proletariat in the capitalist countries, and for the growing struggle of the oppressed peoples in the East. He summed up:

"Internationally we belong to the anti-imperialist front, headed by the Soviet Union and for genuine friendly aid we must look to this front and not to the imperialist front."

Internationally, it is the alliance with the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies — the fact that China is now an integral part of the anti-imperialist democratic front headed by the Socialist Soviet Union—that secures and consolidates China's national independence and facilitates her transition towards Socialism.

Internally, it is the leadership of the working class headed by the Communist Party which follows the course indicated in the teachings of Lenin and Stalin, and the alliance with the peasantry, which forms the basic condition for the successful development of the dictatorship of the People's Democracy in China and for its transition through People's Democracy to Socialism and Communism.

Comrade Mao has laid the greatest stress on this in the article mentioned above:

"Alliance of the working class, the peasantry and the urban petty bourgeoisie, and chiefly the alliance of the working class with the peasantry, for it comprises 80 to 90 per cent of China's population, constitutes the basis of the dictatorship of the People's Democracy. Imperialism and the Kuomintang reactionary clique were overthrown primarily by the force of the working class and the peasantry. The transition from the New Democracy to Socialism depends, in

the main, on the alliance of these two classes. The working class must lead the dictatorship of the People's Democracy, for only the working class is the most far-sighted, just, unselfish and consistently revolutionary class. The history of all revolutions shows that without the leadership of the working class the revolution is doomed to failure. But under the leadership of the working class the revolution will be victorious." (*For A Lasting Peace, For A People's Democracy*, No. 14 (41), July 15, 1949)

All this shows how Comrade Mao has developed and concretised in the true spirit of Lenin-Stalin teachings the ideas about the transition of People's Democracy to Socialism in China, which he formulated ten years ago in his *New Democracy*.

## IV

The Editorial Board completely ignored this brilliant exposition given by Comrade Mao of the perspective of the People's Democratic revolution in China, and of the course of its transition to Socialism under the leadership of the working class. In the course of the article "Struggle for People's Democracy and Socialism", the Editorial Board has made an utterly dishonest criticism of the exposition given by Comrade Mao Tse-tung of the transitional measures which the People's Democratic state will have to take to consolidate its victory and to prepare the pre-requisites for the transition to building of Socialism (ref. *Communist*, Vol. II, No. 4, p. 78).

The Editorial Board wrongly attributed to Comrade Mao the view that he stood for the promotion of capitalism as the dominant economy in the period immediately following the victory of the People's Democratic revolution.

A distorted interpretation was given of the following quotation from Mao Tse-tung's Political Report to the Seventh Congress of the Communist Party of China (April 24, 1945) which the Andhra Secretariat had quoted in their document to refute the argument of those who said that at this stage of the revolution itself we have to fight against the entire bourgeoisie, against the entire capital:

"Some people cannot understand why the Communists, far from being anti-pathetic to capitalism, actually promote its development... What China does not want is foreign capitalism and native feudalism, it does not oppose native

capitalism." (Mao Tse-tung, *The Fight For A New China*, New Century Publishers, New York, 1945, p. 38)

The Editorial Board, without bothering to see what this formulation of Comrade Mao actually meant, and in which context it was made and quoted by the Andhra Secretariat, at once proceeded to deliver the following tirade:

"Is it not elementary Marxism that if you undertake to promote capitalism you will be inevitably promoting the dictatorship of the capitalist class... It is obvious that this promoting capitalism would mean promoting the rule of a fascist clique like Chiang's clique, for capitalism can only exist as fascism in China in present-day conditions." (*Communist*, Vol. II, No. 4, p. 79)

This is not honest criticism, but the cheapest demagoguery and slander, which only proves that the Editorial Board consists of complete ignoramuses who know nothing of the teaching of Lenin and Stalin on the transitional measures which the proletariat, having come to power, must take in order to create conditions for the transition from capitalism to Socialism.

Comrade Mao had nowhere spoken of the necessity of absolute development of capitalism in China. He spoke of the development of capitalism in the same restricted sense in which Lenin also speaks of in the following passage for instance:

"Without changing its essence, the proletarian state may permit free trade and the development of capitalism only within certain bounds and only on the condition that the state regulates (supervises, controls, determines the forms and methods of, etc.) private trade and private capitalism." (Lenin, *Selected Works*, Moscow, Two-Vol. Ed., Vol. 2, p. 761)

The Editorial Board by making this bankrupt criticism only proved its complete ignorance and repudiation of Lenin's and Stalin's teaching on the NEP, on the transitional economic measures which the proletariat in power must take in order to create conditions for the transition from capitalism to Socialism. Stalin has pointed out that Lenin's teachings on the New Economic Policy are universally applicable and "will be absolutely indispensable for every capitalist country in the period of dictatorship of the proletariat". This prophecy is today being fulfilled in the countries of People's Democracy, where the economic policy pursued today conforms to all the basic principles of NEP. Comrade Mao Tse-tung was making a brilliant application

of these teachings of Lenin and Stalin when he was defining how the People's Democratic state will have to adopt a correct policy towards middle industrial and trading bourgeoisie, in order to consolidate its power against the forces of foreign and native reaction and create the pre-requisites for the transition towards the building of Socialism. Not to see this but to talk of "horrifying" and "loose formulations" of Comrade Mao is nothing but the blind arrogance of dogmatists who refuse to learn from creative Marxism of the great leaders of international Communism.

The Editorial Board had before it the whole report in the course of which Comrade Mao had explained how the stage of the New Democratic revolution is distinct from the stage of the Socialist revolution and how the tasks of the former which are in the main anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and national liberationist, cannot be mixed with those of the latter which are the final liquidation of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism and Communism. In the same report Comrade Mao had also explained how the successful People's Democratic revolution would prepare the pre-requisites for the establishment of Socialism by "restricting capital"—by ensuring that "all native or foreign enterprises that are either of the nature of monopolies... for instance, banking, railways, shipping, etc.... should be managed by the state (i.e., People's Democratic state) so that private capital may not control the livelihood of the people."

Predicting the future course of the Chinese revolution, J. V. Stalin had pointed out years ago that

"when the working class wins hegemony in the Chinese revolution and consolidates its alliance with the peasantry and with the working people of town and country, it will be able to overcome resistance of the national bourgeoisie to achieve the complete victory of the bourgeois democratic revolution and later to shift it gradually to the course of Socialist revolution with all the consequences arising therefrom." (J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Russ. Ed., Vol. IX, p. 222)

The revolutionary regime formed under the leadership of the proletariat, pointed out J. V. Stalin, will be

"a regime of transition to the non-capitalist or to be more precise, Socialist development of China." (J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Russ. Ed., Vol. VIII, p. 366)

Comrade Mao not only asserted in general terms this Stalinist teaching about the 'non-capitalist' development of China after the victory of the People's Democratic revolu-

tion, but he also posed and solved the concrete problems of such a development. Comrade Mao, of course, knew that

"in a country dominated by small production in agriculture, you cannot decree Socialism and large-scale agriculture the next day—for the simple reason that the means of production for large-scale agriculture are not there and the majority of the small producers must be won over and convinced." (Communist, Vol. II, No. 4, pp. 79-80)

There was no justification whatsoever for the patronising criticism made by the Editorial Board:

"Mao confuses the toleration of commodity production, small-scale production, private production under conditions of people's rule and nationalisation of big industries and banks with promoting capitalism and completely eliminates the transitional anti-capitalist character of the economic order under People's Democracy." (Ibid, p. 80)

But in its unseemly effort to discredit Comrade Mao, the Editorial Board has failed to take note of the glaring fact that Comrade Mao has based his policy on just this anti-capitalist character of the economic order under People's Democracy—a policy which is of the utmost importance for the consolidation of the victory of the People's Democratic revolution, for the complete smashing up of the aggressive plans of American imperialism and its agents, which are by no means ended.

This is what Comrade Mao said in his report to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China on December 25, 1947:

"The New Democratic revolution is to eliminate only feudalism and monopoly capitalism, only the landlord class and the bureaucratic bourgeoisie (big bourgeoisie)—not capitalism in general and not the petty and middle bourgeoisie. Owing to the backwardness of China's economy it will still be necessary to permit the existence, for a long period, of the capitalist economy represented by the broad petty bourgeoisie and the middle bourgeoisie even after the nationwide victory of the revolution.

"Furthermore in accordance with the division of labour in the national economy, the development of all sections among them beneficial to the national economy will still be necessary; they will still be an indispensable part of the entire national economy.

"The petty bourgeoisie includes small-scale industrial and commercial capitalists who hire workers and employees.

But besides these, there are the broad, independent, small industrial and commercial businessmen who do not hire workers or employees. With regard to these small industrial and commercial businessmen, it goes without saying that they should be firmly protected. After the nationwide victory of the revolution the New Democratic state will have in its hands enormous state capital which controls the economic pulse of the entire country, taken over from the bureaucratic bourgeoisie. It will also have the agricultural economy emancipated from the feudal system. Although for quite a long time the agricultural economy will still be basically scattered and individual, it can be guided step by step in the direction of cooperatives in the future. Under these conditions the existence and development of small and middle capitalist elements are not at all dangerous.

"The same applies to the new rich peasant economy which will necessarily come into being in the rural areas after the agrarian revolution.

"Adopting the ultra-Left, erroneous policies toward petty bourgeois and middle bourgeois economic elements as our Party did in the period from 1931 to 1934 must absolutely not be permitted to recur." (Turning Point in China, New Century Publishers, New York, 1948, pp. 16-17)

These profound conclusions of Comrade Mao Tse-tung have now been incorporated in the Common Programme of the victorious People's Republic of China. Article 30, Chapter 4 of the Common Programme lays down:

"The people's government shall encourage the active operation of all private economic enterprises beneficial to the national welfare and people's livelihood and foster their long-term development."

But this is not promotion of capitalism as a dominant economy. This is guaranteed by the fact that:

"State-owned economy is of a Socialist nature. All enterprises vital to the economic life of the country and to the people's livelihood shall come under the unified operation of the state. All state-owned resources and enterprises are the common property of all the people. They are the main material basis of the People's Republic for the development of production and the creation of a prosperous economy and are the leading forces of the entire social economy." (Article 28, Chapter 4 of the Common Programme)

It is guaranteed by the fact that the People's Democratic state led by the working class ensures the workers employed

in the private-owned enterprises, proper living conditions and the protection of their rights of trade union organisation and collective bargaining as against the employers.

Under these conditions the relative expansion of the small capitalist sector of economy only enables the People's Democratic state to consolidate the gains of the revolution, strengthens the power of the working class and creates the conditions for the march towards Socialist development, for the struggle to eliminate private-owned capitalist economy, for the complete squeezing out of the capitalist elements.

Thus we see that the Editorial Board has utterly refused to understand the rich content of the Lenin-Stalin policy of consolidating the regime of People's Democracy in China, pursued by the Chinese Communist Party and its leader Comrade Mao. Its conceited and ignorant criticism of Comrade Mao follows from its 'Left'-opportunist and anti-Leninist understanding of the stage of the revolution, and the new class alignment in India, after the crossing over of the big bourgeoisie to the side of imperialism and counter-revolution. The Editorial Board dogmatically stuck to its 'Left'-opportunist conception that the *entire bourgeoisie* had gone over to the camp of imperialism and reaction. It refused to understand that it was the Indian big capital (Birla-Tata-Dalmia), like the Chinese big capital (Four Families), that was interlocked with British colonial capital, and now with American monopoly, and was acting as their agent in maintaining India under foreign imperialist domination and as their colonial base. It refused to see that this imperialist-big bourgeois-landlord combine was not only oppressing workers, peasants and the petty bourgeoisie but also injuring the interests of sections of the middle bourgeoisie as well. The Editorial Board did not distinguish between the Indian big bourgeoisie and the other sections of the bourgeoisie and failed to see that it is the former that is placed in the seat of power and is collaborating with imperialists as their agents.

Thus it is not Mao's formulations on the development of capitalism that run counter-revolutionary, but it is the views of the Editorial Board which repudiated the Lenin-Stalin teachings on NEP and on the restricted development of capitalism which they imply, which advance the slogans of fighting straightaway against the entire bourgeoisie, without reckoning with realities, which are counter-revolutionary. That is why the Editorial Board refused to see the necessity of adopting a correct attitude towards the middle bourgeoisie and towards the rich peasants. That is why it

refused to learn anything from the great success the Chinese Communist Party achieved in forging a single united front of unprecedented breadth and depth, and which ensured their historic victory over the treacherous Chiang Kai-shek and his imperialist supporters. The significance of this experience is summed up thus:

• "The Communist Party of China and the People's Liberation Army of China earned the respect, recognition and love of all the people. A single united front, unprecedented in breadth and depth and unifying the workers, the peasants, the urban petty bourgeoisie, the national minorities and certain sections of the middle industrial and trading bourgeoisie was created inside the country. The petty and the middle bourgeoisie in China suffered oppression and persecution at the hands of the reactionary big bourgeoisie, the landlord class and the Kuomintang power (which was in the hands of monopoly capital). The petty and middle bourgeoisie is not or very little connected with imperialism. That is why this bourgeoisie, according to the definition of Mao Tse-tung 'a real national bourgeoisie', enters into a united front of struggle against internal reaction and foreign imperialism. **The basis of this united national front is the alliance of the working class and the labouring peasantry under the leading role of the working class.**" (V. M. Maslennikov, "On Leading Role of the Working Class in the National Liberation Movement of the Colonial Peoples", *Colonial Peoples' Struggle for Liberation*, PPH, Bombay, 1950, p. 28)

At the same time it is necessary to remember that the bringing of the middle bourgeoisie into such a united front cannot be achieved without conducting a correct struggle against this section of the bourgeoisie, which wavers during the course of the revolution between the reactionary bloc of the big bourgeoisie and imperialism on the one hand and the camp of democratic revolution on the other, supporting at one time the former and joining at others the latter. This is what Comrade Mao Tse-tung said about a section of this bourgeoisie in his report to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China in December 1947:

"In areas ruled by Chiang Kai-shek there is a section of the upper petty bourgeoisie and the middle bourgeoisie (i.e., the national bourgeoisie — Y.H.) who, though small in number have reactionary political tendencies — these are the Rightist elements among these classes. They disseminate illusions about American imperialism and Chiang Kai-shek's reactionary bloc. They oppose the People's Democratic

revolution. As long as their reactionary tendencies can still influence the masses we should carry on the work of exposing such tendencies among the masses who have been under their influence. Blows should be delivered at their political influence among the masses, so as to liberate the masses from their influence." (Mao Tse-tung, "Present Situation and Our Tasks", quoted by Yu Huai in *People's China*, Vol. I, No. 1, Jan. 1, 1950, pp. 9-10)

The experience of the Chinese Communist Party shows that the task of bringing this section of the bourgeoisie, the middle bourgeoisie, into the common front against internal reaction and foreign imperialism, was very important for the final victory of the People's Democratic revolution in China and for its further consolidation against imperialist intervention.

But to carry out this task correctly it is necessary to take into account the dual nature of this section of the bourgeoisie:

"Blows at the reactionary political tendencies on the part of the Rightist elements of the national bourgeoisie and adequate educational and reforming work among the national bourgeoisie—all these compose the content of the struggle against the national bourgeoisie at various stages and in various periods of the revolution." "It is exactly because of this fact (dual nature of the national bourgeoisie) that struggle must necessarily be conducted in an appropriate manner against the national bourgeoisie while uniting with it." (Yu Huai, "On the Role of the National Bourgeoisie in the Chinese Revolution", *People's China*, Vol. I, No. 1, pp. 10 and 9)

This aspect of the Chinese experience and of the teaching of Comrade Mao Tse-tung is a concrete application of the historic analysis given by Comrade Stalin, of the role of the national bourgeoisie, of its compromising and revolutionary sections in the anti-imperialist liberation struggles of the peoples of colonies and semi-colonies, particularly of India and China, (Speech to the Students of the University of the Toilers of the East, 1925). The Editorial Board has dogmatically ignored and repudiated this teaching of Comrade Stalin on the role of the two sections of the national bourgeoisie and on the strategy and tactics of the proletariat in the struggle for consolidating its hegemony in the national liberation struggle.

It is of the utmost importance for the Indian Communists to diligently study this experience garnered by the Chinese Communist Party in the course of its historic revolutionary struggle. This is all the more important today when the national liberation struggle of the Indian people, which is now being led by the Indian working class, has entered into a new phase, when the resolute struggle of working class, peasantry and other progressive forces for a living wage, land and democracy, are rising to a higher form of struggle for land and for national liberation.

It would be impossible for us to raise the countrywide people's liberation struggle to a higher level and to lead it to victory unless we learn to bring the great masses of the peasantry under the leadership of the proletariat, unless we learn to draw them into the revolutionary struggle against feudal landlordism and for land.

The vast experience of the Chinese Communist Party in unleashing the agrarian revolution, in combining the peasants' struggle for land with the people's liberation struggle against the imperialists and other bourgeois collaborators, in consolidating workers'-peasants' alliance under proletarian hegemony through the different stages of this struggle, is of immense importance to the Indian Communists.

The Andhra comrades, who have the experience of leading the great Telengana struggle, had very correctly raised a pertinent point:

"Our revolution in many respects differs from the classical Russian revolution, and is to a great extent similar to the Chinese revolution. The perspective is likely not that of general strikes and general rising leading to the liberation of the rural side, but the dogged resistance and prolonged struggle in the form of an agrarian revolution culminating in the coming into power of the democratic front."

But the Editorial Board instead of giving a straight answer to this question rejected the Chinese path outright. They accused the Andhra comrades of reformism, of counterposing the Russian way to the Chinese way and of ignoring the hegemony of the proletariat. Actually it was the Editorial Board itself which was guilty of reformist sabotage and disruption of the struggle for unleashing the agrarian revolution. Holding fast to its 'Left'-opportunist analysis of the agrarian question and talking loud of fighting

revolution. As long as their reactionary tendencies can still influence the masses we should carry on the work of exposing such tendencies among the masses who have been under their influence. Blows should be delivered at their political influence among the masses, so as to liberate the masses from their influence." (Mao Tse-tung, "Present Situation and Our Tasks", quoted by Yu Hwai in *People's China*, Vol. I, No. 1, Jan. 1, 1950, pp. 9-10)

The experience of the Chinese Communist Party shows that the task of bringing this section of the bourgeoisie, the middle bourgeoisie, into the common front against internal reaction and foreign imperialism, was very important for the final victory of the People's Democratic revolution in China and for its further consolidation against imperialist intervention.

But to carry out this task correctly it is necessary to take into account the dual nature of this section of the bourgeoisie:

"Blows at the reactionary political tendencies on the part of the Rightist elements of the national bourgeoisie and adequate educational and reforming work among the national bourgeoisie—all these compose the content of the struggle against the national bourgeoisie at various stages and in various periods of the revolution." "It is exactly because of this fact (dual nature of the national bourgeoisie) that struggle must necessarily be conducted in an appropriate manner against the national bourgeoisie while uniting with it." (Yu Hwai, "On the Role of the National Bourgeoisie in the Chinese Revolution", *People's China*, Vol. I, No. 1, pp. 10 and 9)

This aspect of the Chinese experience and of the teaching of Comrade Mao Tse-tung is a concrete application of the historic analysis given by Comrade Stalin, of the role of the national bourgeoisie, of its compromising and revolutionary sections in the anti-imperialist liberation struggles of the peoples of colonies and semi-colonies, particularly of India and China, (Speech to the Students of the University of the Toilers of the East, 1925). The Editorial Board has dogmatically ignored and repudiated this teaching of Comrade Stalin on the role of the two sections of the national bourgeoisie and on the strategy and tactics of the proletariat in the struggle for consolidating its hegemony in the national liberation struggle.

It is of the utmost importance for the Indian Communists to diligently study this experience garnered by the Chinese Communist Party in the course of its historic revolutionary struggle. This is all the more important today when the national liberation struggle of the Indian people, which is now being led by the Indian working class, has entered into a new phase, when the resolute struggle of working class, peasantry and other progressive forces for a living wage, land and democracy, are rising to a higher form of struggle for land and for national liberation.

It would be impossible for us to raise the countrywide people's liberation struggle to a higher level and to lead it to victory unless we learn to bring the great masses of the peasantry under the leadership of the proletariat, unless we learn to draw them into the revolutionary struggle against feudal landlordism and for land.

The vast experience of the Chinese Communist Party in unleashing the agrarian revolution, in combining the peasants' struggle for land with the people's liberation struggle against the imperialists and other bourgeois collaborators, in consolidating workers'-peasants' alliance under proletarian hegemony through the different stages of this struggle, is of immense importance to the Indian Communists.

The Andhra comrades, who have the experience of leading the great Telengana struggle, had very correctly raised a pertinent point:

"Our revolution in many respects differs from the classical Russian revolution, and is to a great extent similar to the Chinese revolution. The perspective is likely not that of general strikes and general rising leading to the liberation of the rural side, but the dogged resistance and prolonged struggle in the form of an agrarian revolution culminating in the coming into power of the democratic front."

But the Editorial Board instead of giving a straight answer to this question rejected the Chinese path outright. They accused the Andhra comrades of reformism, of counterposing the Russian way to the Chinese way and of ignoring the hegemony of the proletariat. Actually it was the Editorial Board itself which was guilty of reformist sabotage and disruption of the struggle for unleashing the agrarian revolution. Holding fast to its 'Left'-opportunist analysis of the agrarian question and talking loud of fighting

capitalist elements in the countryside, pursuing Left-adventurist tactics in the cities, the Editorial Board systematically neglected and disrupted the developing of the anti-feudal struggle of the peasantry in certain areas. It completely ignored the central lesson of the revolutionary experience of the Chinese Communist Party and remained deaf to the clarion call of the Peking Conference of Trade Unions of Asian and Australasian Countries until the editorial article of the Information Bureau's organ roused it.

The enormous significance of the Chinese revolutionary experience to the working class of all colonial countries was specially emphasised in the Manifesto of the Peking Conference of Trade Unions of Asian and Australasian Countries and in the editorial article in the organ of the Information Bureau. The latter had drawn pointed attention of the Indian Communists to the important formulation made by Comrade Liu Shao-chi in the course of his inaugural address to the Peking Conference of the Trade Unions of Asia and Australasia:

"The path taken by the Chinese people... is the path that should be taken by the people of many colonial and dependent countries in their struggle for national liberation."

The path taken by the Chinese people is the correct application of the Lenin-Stalin teaching of securing the hegemony of the proletariat in the national liberationist and anti-feudal revolution in the colonies and semi-colonies, to the concrete conditions of the Chinese revolution. The final victory of the Chinese revolution, and the experience of the postwar phase of the national liberation struggles in the countries of South-East Asia—Viet Nam, Burma, Indonesia, Malaya, Philippines, etc., has completely proved the general applicability of the path taken by the Chinese people.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung has brilliantly summed up the essence of this Chinese experience. Basing themselves on the well-known generalisation of Com. Stalin namely, that "*the characteristic and the advantage of the Chinese revolution is the armed people against the armed counter-revolution*", the Chinese Communist Party and Comrade Mao Tse-tung came to the correct conclusion that "in China without armed struggle there will be no place for the proletariat, no place for the people, no place for the Communist Party and no victory of the revolution." In the early months of 1928, in conditions of nationwide Kuomintang white terror, the Chinese people, led by the Communist Party of China, established a number of small revolution-

ary bases as the starting point of the strategy to safeguard the revolutionary forces and to combat the counter-revolutionary forces.

Comrade Mao has summed up the essence of the path taken by the Chinese people in the following terms:

"It is erratic to ignore the principles of armed struggles, the revolutionary wars, guerilla warfares and political work in the army.

"Faced with such enemies, questions arise concerning the special revolutionary bases. The great imperialist powers and their reactionary allied armies in China have always indefinitely occupied the important Chinese cities. If the revolutionary force refuses to compromise with foreign imperialism and its servile underlings, but contrarily, to struggle to the very end, and if the revolutionary force is to accumulate and nurture its own strength and avoid fighting decisive battles with the powerful enemies when its own strength is not yet ascertained, then it must turn the backward remote rural areas into progressive strong bases, turning them into great military, political, economic and cultural revolutionary strongholds. Then from these strongholds, the revolutionary force can start to drive out the malicious enemies based on the large cities encroaching upon the villages; also from these strongholds, the revolutionary forces may, through prolonged struggles, gradually achieve total success. Under such conditions, and because of the unbalanced condition of the Chinese economic development (the rural economy is not entirely dependent on urban economy), and of the vastness of China's territories (there is immense space for the revolutionary forces to fall back to), and of the disunity and conflicts existing in the Chinese anti-revolutionary camp and of the fact that the main force of the Chinese revolution, the Chinese peasantry, is under the leadership of the Communist Party, thus, on the one hand, there is a great possibility for the Chinese revolution to succeed, first and foremost, in the countryside... Thus we can understand why these prolonged revolutionary struggles, starting out from such special strongholds, are composed chiefly of peasant guerilla warfares under the leadership of the Communist Party of China. It is erratic to ignore the principles of rural districts as revolutionary bases, the strenuous work amongst the peasantry and guerilla warfare.

"But in stressing upon the importance of armed struggle, we must not overlook the other form which revolutionary struggles must take, for without the other form of revolutionary struggles, armed struggles alone cannot be victorious. In



stressing upon the importance of the work in the rural bases, we do not mean to give up the work in cities and towns or in other rural districts which have not yet become bases, for without these, the revolutionary strongholds would become isolated, and the revolution would be a failure. Because the ultimate aim of the revolution is to secure the town strongholds from the enemies, and without sufficient work done in the cities and towns, this aim can never be achieved." ("The Chinese Revolution and the Communist Party of China", *China Digest*, Vol. V, No. 10, p. 16)

Summing up the experience of the 22 years of armed struggle of the Chinese Revolution, Comrade Chu Teh writes:

"This armed struggle of the Chinese people is not an isolated purely military struggle. It is an armed struggle based on the firm alliance of the workers and peasants, uniting, at the same time, with other people among the broad masses.

"This armed struggle is closely linked up with, and is inseparable from, the peasants' agrarian revolution. Had there been no support for the peasants' agrarian revolution, it would have been impossible to organise such an armed struggle. If the proletariat had not united with the peasants and with the other forces in the countryside capable of being won for a broad united front, had it adopted 'Leftist' adventurism in its policies, it would not have been possible to direct the armed struggle to victory...." (*For A Lasting Peace, For A People's Democracy*, No. 17, (44), Sept. 1, 1949)

The Editorial Board's rejection of the path taken by the Chinese people led to the advocacy of the reformist sabotage and disruption of the developing anti-feudal struggles of the peasantry. It led in practice to refusal to struggle to realise proletarian hegemony, to forge alliance with the vast masses of the peasantry and to lead them in the revolutionary struggle for land, merging the same with the struggle for national liberation against imperialism and its lackeys.

Chinese experience teaches important lessons as to how the proletariat and its Party coordinate the struggle for the agrarian revolution in the rural areas, with the struggle of the working class and other democratic forces in the cities, how it secures proletarian hegemony in the struggle for national liberation, and how it gathers together and strengthens the revolutionary force with which it delivers crushing blows against the imperialist oppressor and its agents till final victory is won.

In this connection it is of the utmost importance to ponder deeply over the following very important formulations made by Comrade Liu Shao-chi in his report to the Peking Conference of Trade Unions of Asia and Australasia:

"The rule of the imperialists and their lackeys in the colonies and semi-colonies deprives the people of all democratic rights as it had done in China in the past. Persecuted and hounded by the imperialists and their lackeys in the cities where white terror reigned, our revolutionaries were compelled to seek refuge in the countryside and mountains and to defend their lives with armed force. However, had such armed struggle been confined to defence alone, it would inevitably have been crushed by imperialism and its hirelings. Thus, the revolutionaries had to be closely linked with the peasants as well as with all other people who opposed imperialism, to use all ways and means to smash repeated offensives and break through the encirclement organised by imperialism and its hirelings; they could not but organise regular revolutionary armies to smash the armies of the imperialists and their lackeys. However, it was precisely because of this that it was possible to build up a strong revolutionary army and ultimately drive out the forces of imperialism and its lackeys and win victory in the national liberation struggle. It is quite clear that without such armed forces to defend themselves, the peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies will not be able to achieve anything for themselves. The existence and development of working class organisation and the existence and development of a national united front are closely connected with the existence and development of such an armed struggle. This is the inevitable path of many colonial and semi-colonial peoples in the struggle for their independence and national liberation."

## VI

The Editorial Board not only rejected the path taken by the Chinese people but sought to give the same dishonest interpretation of the course of the Chinese revolution which the Trotskyites gave and which Stalin sternly refuted (ref.: Section I). The Editorial Board quoted a long extract from the Colonial Thesis of the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International (1928), distorted its meaning and drew from it the false conclusion that the Chinese people had to go through a protracted civil war because the Chi-

nese Communist Party committed reformist mistakes, because it was unable to fight correctly for the hegemony of the proletariat.

But the Editorial Board hid from the Party ranks how the Seventh Congress of the Communist International which met in 1935 evaluated the achievements of the Chinese Communist Party during the seven long years of civil war. Comrade Wilhelm Pieck in his report on the activities of the Communist International said:

"The Chinese Revolution provides the first model of a colonial revolution in which the ideological and also, in its initial form, the state hegemony of the proletariat is realised. In the Chinese working class the colonial proletariat has proved in practice its ability to settle great historical problems, to maintain the complete economic and political independence of the country, to completely abolish feudal survivals, to put an end to large landed proprietorship, to excise the cancer of usury, and to undertake revolutionary changes that clear the way for Socialism." (W. Pieck, "The Activities of the ECCI" Reports of the World Congress of the Communist International, Workers' Library Publishers, New York, 1935 p. 60)

Thus the protracted civil war was a model example and a source of inspiration to the proletariat and the peoples of the colonies:

"The Communist Party of China sets an example for all Communists of the colonies and dependent countries." (Ibid, p. 96)

Comrade Pieck summed up the achievements of the eight years of civil war which the Chinese Communist Party fought between the years of the Sixth and Seventh World Congresses of the Communist International:

"...the great road which the Communist Party of China has traversed in the interval between the Sixth Congress and the Seventh, a road that fills the hearts of the Communists of all the world with pride and joy (Warm applause). The comrades showed us how the Party has grown into a mighty mass organisation, how a Red Army was created and how the new Soviet state was established. They showed us how former workers, peasants, artisans and students have developed into military commanders and statesmen and how under the leadership of the Party, a people of 450,000,000, downtrodden and martyred by the imperialists, is waging a fight for its emancipation." (Ibid, p. 96)

The great experience of these early years of the civil war during which the Chinese Communists, in the face of

Kuomintang's armed might and white terror, created their People's Liberation Army and established people's power in the first liberated areas, has great lessons for the peoples of the colonial countries, particularly in the present period. It is particularly important for us to know and understand the source of their strength and the secret of these achievements of theirs. Comrade Wang Ming has explained it thus in his report:

"Our Party is true to the teachings of one who, after the death of Lenin, continued to develop further the theory and tactics of Marxism-Leninism in general, and the theory and tactics of Marxism-Leninism as applied to colonial revolutions in particular, who developed the theoretical foundations of the strategy and tactics of the Chinese Revolution—to the teachings of the great Stalin!

"The Communist Party of China has grown and become strong on the basis of an irreconcilable struggle against counter-revolutionary Trotskyism and liquidationist Chen Tu-hsiuism, against the semi-Trotskyist Li Li-hsianist line and counter-revolutionary Lo Chang-lunism. It has grown and become strong on the basis of an active participation in and leadership of various forms of mass struggle in the anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution. It is precisely this growth of the forces of the Communist Party of China that permits it boldly and decisively to raise in a new manner the question of the anti-imperialist united front." (Wang Ming, "The Revolutionary Movement in the Colonial Countries", Reports of the World Congress of the Communist International Workers' Library Publishers, New York, 1935, p. 33)

The relentless struggle against Right-reformist opportunism, as well as against "Left"-sectarian opportunism, which Comrade Mao Tse-tung carried on, while guiding the course of the Chinese revolution through its various stages and zig-zags during two decades and more, has extremely valuable lessons for Indian Communists.

During the first stage of the Chinese revolution (1925-27) Comrade Mao fought the Right-reformist opportunism of those who adopting a conciliatory attitude towards Kuomintang reactionaries like Chiang Kai-shek or Wang Ching-wei, advocated liquidation of the peasants' revolutionary struggle for land. Comrade Mao firmly upheld the Stalinist line that the proletariat must lead peasants' revolutionary struggle against feudalism and for land, in order to support the national liberation struggle against imperialism, in order to defeat the treachery of the Kuomintang reactionaries.

During the period of anti-Japanese war (1937-45) Com-

rade Mao again severely condemned the opportunism of those who, adopting a conciliatory attitude towards Kuomintang reactionaries headed by Chiang Kai-shek, wanted to liquidate the peasants' struggle for land by saying that it would break the anti-Japanese united front with Kuomintang. Comrade Mao firmly upheld the Stalinist teaching on the Chinese revolution that the proletariat must lead the peasant war, must develop the armed struggle of the peasantry for land. Comrade Mao kept Stalin's warning given in 1927 firmly in view:

"The anti-imperialist united front in China will be all the stronger and more powerful, the sooner and more thoroughly the Chinese peasant is drawn into revolution."

During the ten-year period of the civil war (1927-37), when the Chinese proletariat was leading the agrarian revolutionary movement, Comrade Mao sternly opposed the Left-sectarian opportunism of those who tended to forget the extremely important political factors of anti-imperialism, who ignored the fact that China's revolution, even after Chiang Kai-shek's betrayal, remained basically national liberationist in character and directed towards the overthrow of imperialist domination. He firmly kept in view Stalin's warning uttered in 1927:

"The bourgeois democratic revolution in China is directed not only against feudal remnants. It is at the same time directed against imperialism."

This basic fact created favourable conditions for the Chinese proletariat and its Party to create a broad united people's front, embracing workers, peasants, the petty bourgeoisie, revolutionary intelligentsia and sections of the bourgeoisie which were prepared to support the struggle against imperialism and its Kuomintang lackeys. Comrade Mao correctly and persistently guided the Party in building such a front under the leadership of the working class and its Communist Party.

It was this fight against Right-reformist opportunism as well as against "Left"-sectarian opportunism conducted by Comrade Mao which enabled the Chinese Communist Party to correctly wield the weapon of Stalinist revolutionary strategy and tactics and lead the revolution to victory. It enabled the Chinese Communist Party to go on developing the armed struggle on the one hand, while at the same time carrying out the mobilisation of the broad masses in the cities and areas which were under the domination of imperialism and Kuomintang reaction on the other, by skilfully

combining revolutionary activities and organisation with open legal struggle of the masses in these latter areas and thus muster powerful revolutionary forces to launch an offensive on the reactionary rule of imperialism and its stooges at the ripe moment.

## VII

Such are the lessons which arise out of Comrade Mao's struggle against Right and Left deviations from Marxism—Leninism. These are of particular importance to the ranks of Indian Communists at the present time, when they have to conduct a ruthless struggle against all trends of bourgeois national reformism and for the complete liquidation of Left-sectarianism, when they have to wield the weapon of criticism and self-criticism in order to reunify the movement on the basis of the correct Lenin-Stalin strategy and tactics, so that it can place itself at the head of the rising upheaval of national liberation struggle.

The criminal attack on Com. Mao Tse-tung was published just at the time when the great People's Liberation Army of China, led by the Communist Party and its leaders Mao Tse-tung and Chu Teh, had begun its final victorious march for the liberation of the entire Chinese soil from the grip of the Kuomintang clique and its American protectors. It did incalculable harm to our movement. It prevented Communist cadres from leading a powerful mass movement of solidarity with the victorious Chinese revolution, from explaining to the masses of our people the significance of the triumph of the popular revolution in China which was one of the most devastating blows delivered against the imperialist system since the Great October Revolution. It prevented them from assimilating and applying to our conditions the teachings of Comrade Mao Tse-tung, the rich revolutionary experience of the great Chinese Communist Party.

All this shows very clearly how strong is the influence of bourgeois nationalism in the leadership of our movement, and in the leading Communist cadres and how weakly developed is our loyalty to the principle of proletarian internationalism.

The warning voice of the editorial of the organ of the Information Bureau, and the clarion call of the Peking Conference of Trade Unions of Asia and Australasia have awakened us. The leadership and the ranks of our movement

are now engaged in a mighty collective effort to correct the past Left-opportunist mistakes, to sharpen and finalise our understanding of the new political line in the light of self-criticism, of the past experience of mass struggle, to regroup our forces and to unify them solidly for the practical execution of the new tactical line.

It is the duty of the Editorial Board to wage a consistent ideological struggle against bourgeois nationalism, which is the common root of our Right-reformist as well as Left-opportunist deviations.

It is necessary for the Editorial Board to initiate a systematic campaign to educate the vanguard of the working class in the spirit of proletarian internationalism.

The Editorial Board, therefore, resolves as follows:

(a) Correct Marxist-Leninist exposure of bourgeois nationalist ideologies such as liberalism, petty bourgeois anarchism and Gandhism, especially the latter, must form part of the education syllabus for Communist cadres. The Editorial Board must concentrate on systematic ideological exposure of Gandhism as practised by the Congress leaders through propaganda articles.

(b) The Editorial Board must devote special attention to the exposure of the ideological propaganda and policies of the leaders of the Socialist Party. Exposure of the Gandhian propaganda which these leaders carry on among the masses to emasculate them and sabotage their struggle is an important part of the struggle against bourgeois nationalism. It is equally important to expose the cosmopolitanism and "neutrality" of these leaders showing them up as the agents of reactionary British Labour leaders, as the anti-Soviet propagandists of the American warmongers.

(c) The Editorial Board must take steps to acquaint the Communist ranks with the most important authoritative documents of the struggle against bourgeois nationalism and for proletarian internationalism started by the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers' Parties with its historic resolution on the "Situation in Yugoslavia".

(d) To organise and facilitate the systematic study of the authoritative documents and reports of the Chinese Communist Party, its history and the writings of its leaders, the Editorial Board must publish all these and make them available to Communist ranks and enable them to assimilate the experience and lessons of the Chinese revolution.

In conclusion, the Editorial Board gives its solemn pledge to the Communist Party of China, to its leader Mao Tse-tung and to the international Communist movement,

that it will wage a tireless ideological struggle against bourgeois nationalism and to steel the vanguard of the Indian working class in the spirit of Stalinist proletarian internationalism, so that it may be capable of unleashing and heading the mighty national liberation struggle of our people and enable them to take their rightful place in the great anti-imperialist and democratic camp led by the Soviet Union, in the fight for lasting peace, People's Democracy and Socialism.

# SOME PROBLEMS OF PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY IN THE LIGHT OF LENINIST - STALINIST TEACHINGS ON DICTATORSHIP OF PROLETARIAT

by Comrade HILARY MINC,  
Member of the Political Bureau of  
the Polish United Workers' Party

**T**HE theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat is the fundamental and central part of the science of Marxism-Leninism.

Marx and Engels created the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat, established theoretically the necessity of smashing the bourgeois state machine and showed that, as a result of the proletarian revolution, the proper content of the period of transition from capitalism to Communism can only be the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Lenin fought mercilessly against revisionist and centrist attempts to distort and efface the Marxian theory of the state, the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"The fundamental thing in Leninism is the problem of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the elaboration of this problem, the substantiation and the concretisation of this problem", wrote Comrade Stalin. (*Stalin Problems of Leninism*, Moscow, 1947, p. 126)

As Comrade Stalin indicated, the new elements which Lenin introduced into the teachings on the dictatorship of the proletariat consist of the fact that he:

(a) discovered the Soviet form of government as the state form of the dictatorship of the proletariat;

(b) deciphered the formula of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and defined it as a special form of class alliance of the proletariat and the peasantry, with the proletariat playing the leading role in this alliance;

(c) laid particular emphasis on the fact that the dictatorship of the proletariat is the highest type of democracy in

class society, expressing the interests of the majority (the exploited) as against bourgeois democracy which expresses the interests of the minority (the exploiters).

(See : Stalin, Interview given to the first American Labour Delegation, *Lenin's Selected Works*, Two-Volume, English Edition, Moscow 1947, Vol. I, p. 40)

Comrade Stalin the co-creator and continuator of Lenin's work, creatively developed further the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the state and the dictatorship of the proletariat, victoriously directed and directs its realisation.

Similarly as Lenin, in the struggle against the revisionists and centrists, safeguarded the Marxian theory of the state and the dictatorship of the proletariat from distortion and effacement and raised this theory to a new, higher level by generalising upon the historical experience of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, so Stalin, in the struggle against the Trotskyites and the right-wing deviationists, safeguarded Leninism from distortion, from effacement and generalising upon the historical experience of the period of the general crisis of capitalism and upon Socialist construction developed the Marxist-Leninist theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat, in this way developing the science of Marxism-Leninism creatively and universally. On the basis of Stalin's teachings and under his leadership the Soviet Socialist State developed into a mighty and invincible power, the building of Socialism in the USSR was completed, and in the USSR, the period of a gradual transition towards Communism was commenced.

On the basis of Stalin's teachings and under his leadership the mighty, invincible Soviet Socialist State smashed Hitler Germany. As a result of this victory, the world front of capitalism was broken in a number of new places and Stalin's brilliant prophecy, made still in 1934 was completely fulfilled :

"And let not Messieurs the bourgeoisie blame us if some of the governments so near and dear to them, which today rule happily 'by the grace of God' are missing on the morrow after such a war." (*Stalin, Problems of Leninism*, Moscow 1947, p. 464)

On the shambles of these governments "by the grace of God", the states of People's Democracy have arisen.

The class nature of these states is the realisation of the dictatorship of the proletariat through the hegemony of the proletariat; their aim is the building of Socialism in their countries.

The states of People's Democracy, which arose as a result of the victory of the USSR over Hitlerism develop on the basis of the experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat and Socialist construction in the USSR, of the theoretical generalisation of this experience given by Comrade Stalin and of the priceless direct indications and advice of the CPSU (B) and Comrade Stalin personally.

"All nations", wrote Lenin, "will come to Socialism—this is inevitable, but they will not all reach it in the same way, every one will contribute its specific nature in one or another form of democracy, in one or another variant of the dictatorship of the proletariat, in one or another tempo of the Socialist transformation of the various aspects of social life." (Lenin, "A Caricature of Marxism", *Collected Works*, Fourth Russian Edition, Vol. XXIII, p. 58).

The Communist and Workers' Parties in the People's Democracies, basing themselves on Stalin's teachings, his indications and advice, have understood the particular traits of the international situation and the specific internal situation of their countries in the period after the Second World War and on this basis they have determined their specific way of exercising the function of the dictatorship of the proletariat, forging a variant of it, People's Democracy, and in this way they marked out the best and most advantageous, in the given historical conditions, road towards Socialism in their countries.

On the other hand, the science of Marxism-Leninism developed by Stalin, was a weapon with the aid of which the Communist and Workers' Parties in the People's Democracies grasped the fact that the road of their countries towards Socialism is the result of the victorious path of the USSR, that their type of state is a variant of the dictatorship of the proletariat and that, as Lenin wrote :

"The transition from capitalism to Communism, will certainly create a great variety and abundance of political forms, but their essence will inevitably be the same : **the dictatorship of the proletariat.**" (Lenin, "The State and Revolution", *Selected Works*, English Edition, Vol. II, p. 164)

On the basis of this consciousness, the right-wing and nationalist deviation which sought to present the road of People's Democracy as a "third" road between Socialism and capitalism and to oppose the road of People's Democracy to the Soviet road was overcome and smashed.

Therefore, the arising and successful development of the People's Democratic states is not only still one more

proof of the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the state and the dictatorship of the proletariat developed by Stalin, it is the further development of this theory under new historical conditions, a development which took place on the basis of Stalin's teachings and under the direct ideological influence of the CPSU (B) and Comrade Stalin personally.

## I

In the science of Marxism-Leninism the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat is inseparably linked with the concept of the proletarian revolution. The dictatorship of the proletariat is the instrument and principal content of the proletarian revolution.

"The question of the proletarian dictatorship," Comrade Stalin wrote, "is above all a question of the main content of the proletarian revolution. The proletarian revolution, its movement, its scope and its achievements acquire flesh and blood only through the dictatorship of the proletariat. The dictatorship of the proletariat is the instrument of the proletarian revolution, its organ, its most important mainstay . . ." (Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, Moscow 1947, p. 39)

The tremendous social upheaval which took place after the war in the countries of Southern and Southeastern Europe, an upheaval which resulted in the consolidation in these countries of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of the People's Democratic state, had the character of a proletarian revolution, of a Socialist revolution. It was, however, a Socialist revolution which was achieved in special historical conditions, differing from those in which the Great October Socialist Revolution occurred.

What did the difference of these conditions consist of?

1. The People's Democracies were liberated by the Soviet Army. The coming of the Soviet Army made possible the growing of the national liberation struggle conducted by partisan forces into a national liberation war conducted in state form at the side of the Soviet Union by the entire nation and its regular army which arose with Soviet aid. The working class which led the struggle against the occupant, now gained extensive possibilities of seizing political power and carrying out a broad struggle for the abolition of the capitalists and landowners.

"The working masses, the working class, and its political organisations had a class ally in the Soviet Army, an

ally who liberated the nation from the yoke of Hitlerite slavery, an ally who by his very presence rendered powerless the camp of reaction and made it incapable of dealing by force of arms with the revolutionary movement, an ally who guaranteed that the imperialist powers would not decide the fate of a given country against the interests of the people." (Boleslaw Bierut, Speech delivered at the Unification Congress of the Polish Workers' Party and the Polish Socialist Party on December 15, 1948).

It is a historical fact that in the countries which were occupied by the imperialist Anglo-Saxon armies, as for example France or Italy, the working class, in spite of the great scope of the national liberation struggle and the tremendous role and influence of the Communist Party in this struggle, was unable to seize power and these countries, under the influence of brutal imperialist force, was unable to depart from the road of capitalism.

In this way, in distinction to the Soviet Union, where the Socialist proletarian revolution was carried out without any external aid and exclusively with internal forces, the Socialist revolution in the People's Democracies was based in its sources on the aid and power of the Soviet Union and its Army.

2. The revolutionary struggle of the masses under the leadership of the working class and its Communist and Workers' Parties against the landowners and the capitalists was intertwined in the upheaval with the national liberation war against the Hitlerite occupants.

Rosa Luxemburg in her time, when formulating erroneous conceptions on the national question which later were to be a burden upon the ideology of the Communist Party of Poland, advanced a thesis in her polemics with Lenin to the effect that "there can be no more national wars", understanding by this, that the epoch of national wars was passed, due to the consolidation of imperialism and the imperialist division of the world between the great powers.

In answer to Rosa Luxemburg, Lenin in 1916 wrote the following on this question :

"One cannot maintain that such a transformation (of the imperialist war into a national one—H.M.) is impossible; if the proletariat of Europe were to prove itself impotent for some twenty years; if the given war (the imperialist war of 1914—H.M.) were to end in victories like the Napoleonic ones and in the subjugation of a number of national states capable of existence; if some extra-European imperialism (above all

Japanese and American) were to maintain itself also for some twenty years, without passing into Socialism — for example as a result of a Japanese-American war—then a great national war in Europe would be possible." (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Fourth Russian Edition, Vol. XXII, p. 296)

This brilliant hypothesis of Lenin's was fully confirmed. During the Second World War, Europe was the arena of a great liberation struggle of a number of nations against the Hitlerite yoke. This struggle was closely connected with the great war of the Soviet nation in the defence of its homeland. The guiding force of the struggle against the German occupants was the working class and its Communist and Workers' Parties. The working class and its Communist Parties closely linked the national liberation struggle with the struggle against the capitalists and landowners, discredited by capitulation to Hitlerite Germany or collaboration with it—and with the struggle for the overthrow of the rule of capitalists and landowners.

In this way, at the sources of the Socialist revolution in the People's Democracies lies the intertwining, already during the period of the occupation, of the national liberation struggle with the revolutionary struggle against the capitalists and landowners.

Herein lies the second trait which differentiates the Socialist revolution in the People's Democracies from the October Revolution.

3. In the People's Democracies the formation of the People's Democratic state as the organ of the dictatorship of the proletariat took place in a long-term process. The bourgeoisie and the landowners as well as their political organisations were not smashed by a frontal attack of the working masses.

The political arena was not completely cleared. In the existing political system many organisations were active which not only vacillated in relation to the great tasks of the Socialist revolution, but were thoroughly hostile towards them and aimed at the restoration of capitalism.

The concrete setting of internal and international circumstances often called for an at least partial sharing of the government, on the part of the Communist and Workers' Parties, not only with their wavering allies but also with thoroughly bourgeois parties. Hence, the apparatus of bourgeois power was not broken fully or in all its sectors—and hence, the relatively slow tempo of great social transformations, etc. In the process of a long and stubborn class struggle, the discrediting and shattering of hostile political

organisations, the overcoming of the vacillations of political allies, the forging—through the united front—of the organic unity of the working class; in the process of extending the foundations of a new system among the masses of the nation, the activation of these masses in the ever growing conviction that the new system is *their* system; in the process of fortifying the apparatus of the new state power and purging it from bourgeois trash, deepening the social transformations, extending the front of the class struggle and directing the fire of this struggle not only against the large capitalists and landowners but also against the village rich; in the process of a long number of difficult but victorious class battles—the new states of People's Democracy fulfil the functions of the dictatorship of the proletariat in an ever greater scope and with ever greater effectiveness.

It is clear that boundaries in nature and society are "conventional" and "movable" as Lenin said. The process of the crystallisation of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the People's Democracies occurred differently in various countries. The point of departure in respect to the composition of forces, the achieved degree of breaking the old apparatus, etc., also differed in these countries.

In the light of the long duration, complicated nature and difficulties of this process, it is clear and understandable why the formulation of the People's Democracy as fulfilling effectively the functions of the dictatorship of the proletariat—a formulation which called for the theoretical generalisation of the experiences of People's Democracy—was given by Comrades Dimitrov and Bierut at the end of 1948.

Thus, in distinction from the Soviet Union, where the dictatorship of the proletariat was fixed in the form of Soviet power from the first days of the Socialist revolution, the crystallisation of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the People's Democracies took place in a long lasting and difficult process.

Herein lies the third trait which differentiates the Socialist revolution in the People's Democracies from the October Revolution.

Regardless of the divergence of the social upheaval in the People's Democracies from the October Revolution, this upheaval accomplished the same historical tasks.

Political power was snatched from the hands of the bourgeoisie and passed into the hands of the working class and the working peasantry. Large and medium industry, banks and transport became the property of the state and the landowners were expropriated. The People's Demo-

cracies left the capitalist world and ceased to be subject to capitalism's laws of development, which gave them the possibility of entering the road of Socialism.

Thus, both in respect to the fulfilled historical tasks and in respect to the class driving forces, the Socialist upheaval accomplished in the People's Democracies, is of the same type as the October Revolution and possesses all the traits of the proletarian Socialist revolution.

The fact that the social upheaval in the People's Democracies decided and solved a number of the tasks of the bourgeois democratic revolution (for example—the liquidation of feudal survivals in agriculture) does not in any case change its character of a Socialist revolution, for the Great October Socialist Revolution also resolved "in passing" a number of tasks of this type.

There is no doubt that the point of departure for the formation of right-wing and nationalist deviations in the Communist and Workers' Parties is precisely the denial of the fact that the great social upheaval that has been accomplished in the People's Democracies has the character of a Socialist revolution. The right-wing and nationalist deviationists do not wish to see the fundamental, revolutionary, Socialist content of this upheaval—they bring to the forefront only the fact that the upheaval was closely connected with the war of national liberation. This is the source of opportunism in the treatment of the question of the national front. Comrade Bierut, in unmasking the opportunist, right-wing and nationalist stand of Comrade Gomulka, characterised this opportunism as follows:

"What does opportunism in the question of the national front consist of? In the fact that it loses sight of the hegemony of the working class. Herein lay the error, the actual stand of opportunism.

"Similarly to all the revolutionary parties in the whole world, we have never put forth the slogan of the national front as anything else but a front in which the working class and the workers' party is the guide, leader and chief. Any other way of comprehending the national front must be opportunist. This opportunism lay in the stand of a certain part of the comrades who later erred in a right-wing, opportunist and nationalist deviation on a number of other sectors of work. In their position the false approach to the national front was that trait which led them to errors." (Boleslaw Bierut, Concluding Speech at the Third Plenum of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party, November 13, 1949)



The negating of the hegemony of the proletariat and of its Socialist aims in the national front is closely connected in the stand of the right-wing and nationalist deviationists with a narrowing of the tasks of the working class solely to the tasks of the war of liberation, of the bourgeois democratic revolution—it is closely connected with the negation of the fact that the upheaval which took place in the People's Democracies is of the same class type as the Great October Socialist Revolution.

It is connected with the counterposing of the road of the People's Democracies to the Soviet road, with acting against the deepening of the upheaval, the extension of the front of class struggle to embrace the kulaks and the decisive entry upon the road of Socialist construction in town and country. Finally, it is connected with the creation of radically false petty theories regarding the system of People's Democracy as a third, intermediary road between the capitalist and the Soviet roads.

The People's Democratic States which arose as a result of a Socialist revolution, and have crystallised into an instrument of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the span of a long and difficult process, are states which set for themselves the task of building a classless Socialist society.

Therefore, although capitalist elements are still strong in many fields of the economy of these countries and the small production economy which is still dominant in the villages is the foundation for the formation of these elements; although elements of the old bourgeois apparatus still rest in many of the sectors of the state apparatus of these states and the terrain has not yet been completely cleared of the remnants of the broken bourgeois state apparatus and the remnants of broken bourgeois political formulations—the People's Democratic States are states of a Socialist type.

Lenin wrote in 1918 as follows:

"There has been no one as yet, who if he asked himself a question regarding Russia's economy, would deny that this economy is of a transitory nature. No Communist would deny, it seems, also the fact that the expression—Socialist Soviet Republic—signifies that the Soviet Power is determined to carry out the transition to Socialism, and that it does not in the least signify a recognition of the new economic order as a Socialist order." (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Third Russ. Ed., Vol. XXII, p. 513)

At the Third All-Union Congress of Soviets, Lenin said:

"We have never erred in this matter and we know how difficult is the road leading from capitalism to Socialism—but we are bound to state that our Soviet Republic is Socialist because we have entered this road and these words will not be empty words." (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Third Russ. Ed., Vol. XXII, p. 213)

These words of Lenin can be applied in full to the People's Democratic States. These are states in which Socialism has not yet conquered ultimately, but in spite of this, these are states which have set for themselves the decided task of building a Socialist society and the successful course of this construction indicates in full that this decision is not based on empty words. Thus, they are Socialist states, in their class nature of the same type as the Soviet State in that phase of its development when antagonistic social classes still existed in it. Thus, they are states of Socialism under construction, as was the USSR in its first phase of development (before it became the State of victorious Socialism).

In the Socialist States of People's Democracy, derived from a Socialist revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat is exercised, as a result of different historical conditions, in a different form than the Soviet form.

"At the foundations of our difference from the Soviet road," Comrade Bierut stated, "lies the all-sided aid of the Soviet Union and support on the experiences and achievements of the victorious dictatorship of the proletariat in the USSR." (B. Bierut, "The Ideological Foundations of the Polish United Workers' Party.")

Regardless of this difference, the People's Democratic form of the dictatorship of the proletariat fulfills the same functions as the Soviet State in the first phase of its development. These functions include, primarily, the forcible suppression of the resistance of the overthrown classes of exploiters within the country. This suppression of the exploiters' resistance takes place in our country often in different forms than in the Soviet Union during the first phase of its development. As is known, the bourgeoisie and other classes of exploiters were at that time deprived of the right to participate in the elections to the Soviets, which is not the case in the People's Democracies where the universal right to vote exists. Lenin did not consider the limitation of the electoral rights of the bourgeoisie as an indispensable condition of the dictatorship of the prole-

tariat. On the contrary, Lenin considered that these limitations arose on the setting of the specific conditions of the Russian Revolution and wrote that this limitation

"...is not **absolutely necessary** for the exercise of the dictatorship, it is not an **essential** earmark of the logical concept 'dictatorship' it does not enter as an **essential** condition into the historical and class concept 'dictatorship'.

"The necessary earmark, the essential condition of dictatorship, is the **forcible** suppression of the exploiters as a **class**." (Lenin, "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky", *Selected Works*, Vol. II, p. 380)

In his article *Lenin and Stalin on the State form of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat*, D. I. Chesnokov correctly writes :

"On the one hand, the peculiarities of the country's internal development, the relation of the class forces and tension of class conflicts—on the other hand, the specific nature of the international situation, determine the form, methods and scale of the force employed by the proletariat against the exploiters. For the working class, force is not the goal, but solely the means for suppressing the resistance of the bourgeoisie and consolidating the workers' state. The 'degree' of force is determined mainly by the 'degree' of the bourgeoisie's resistance and its 'fury' in the struggle with the proletariat and the working classes in general." (*Problems of Philosophy*, No. 3, 1948).

Historical conditions have caused the dictatorship of the proletariat to be realised in the People's Democracies in a different form than the Soviet. This form is the most advantageous, best and most adapted to the conditions of these countries, and is for them the most suitable road for the transition to Socialism.

One must, however, be fully aware of the fact that this most advantageous, in given historical conditions, form has also a number of negative aspects and dangers connected with it. The dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet form arose as a result of the frontal attack of the working masses led by the working class on the exploiters' class and its state apparatus. It swept away and shattered rapidly and radically the machine of the bourgeois state, bourgeois political formations, bourgeois norms and legal regulations, the privileged positions of the church hierarchy, etc., etc.

In his work, *The Foundations of Leninism*, Comrade

Stalin particularly emphasises Lenin's statement in which Lenin affirms that:

"The Soviet organisation of the state alone is capable of **immediately** and effectively smashing and finally destroying the old, i.e., the bourgeois, bureaucratic and judicial apparatus." (My emphasis—H.M.) (Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, Moscow 1947, p. 43)

It is clear that the People's Democratic form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, due to the circumstances of its development and formation, cannot accomplish "immediately" and "finally" these tasks of clearing the terrain for Socialist construction with the same sweep and consistency.

Therefore, even at present, after years of a long and difficult process of the crystallisation of the People's Democratic State as a variant of the dictatorship of the proletariat which retains the fundamental levers of power—the People's Democracies still trail behind themselves long "tails", made up of obsolete institutions and norms of the past period—and at times, even of particular elements of the old bourgeois state apparatus which have not been subjected to revolutionary transformation. This hampers the development of Socialist construction and creates certain dangers, for, in definite circumstances, the "tails" from the preceding period become still advantageous points of entrenchment for the class enemy. In connection with this one should keep in mind that historical survivals of this type should be not only not preserved and prolonged but, on the contrary, should be liquidated most rapidly at a rate conforming to the specific conditions and relations of class forces of each country.

Historical development has shown, in accord with the science of Marxism-Leninism, that the existence of two forms of the dictatorship of the proletariat—the Soviet and People's Democratic forms—is possible.

The People's Democratic form has proved itself, in the special historical conditions which arose in a number of countries after the Second World War, to be vital and effective.

This proves once again the brilliance of Stalinist thought, which, on the basis of the generalisation of new historical experience, was able to resolve creatively the problem of the essence of the new state form—the People's Democracy.

It is a fact that a new chapter, rich in content, on the People's Democracy has been contributed to the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the state, the Socialist revolution and

the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is a fact that this new chapter has been contributed on the basis of Stalin's teachings and under his direct ideological influence and leadership.

## II

In developing the Leninist theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat, Comrade Stalin elaborated in detail the problem of the system of functioning of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the problem of its "mechanism", i.e., the problem of the Bolshevik Party as the leading force of the Soviet State and the "transmission" of the Party to the masses: the trade unions, Soviets, cooperatives, Young Communist League, etc.

"The Party is the organised detachment of the working class but the Party is not the only organisation of the working class. The proletariat has also a number of other organisations, without which it cannot properly wage the struggle against capital: trade unions, cooperative societies, factory and works organisations, parliamentary groups, non-Party women's associations, the press, cultural and educational organisations, youth leagues, revolutionary fighting organisations (in times of open revolutionary action), Soviets of deputies as the form of state organisation (if the proletariat is in power), etc. The overwhelming majority of these organisations are non-Party, and only a certain part of them adhere directly to the Party, or represent its offshoots." (Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, Moscow, 1947, p. 86)

And further on, Comrade Stalin writes:

"... all these organisations should work in one direction for they serve one class, the class of the proletarians. The question then arises: who is to determine the line, the general directions, along which the work of all these organisations is to be conducted? Where is that central organisation which is not only able, because it has the necessary experience, to work out such a general line, but, in addition, is in a position because it has sufficient prestige for that, to induce all these organisations to carry out this line, so as to attain unity of leadership and to preclude the possibility of working at cross purposes?" (*Ibid*, p. 86)

Such an organisation is the Party of the proletariat.

Does this "mechanism" of the dictatorship of the proletariat function and in what fashion, in the conditions of its People's Democratic form?

It is clear that it functions fully, for without this mechanism, whose core is the leading role of the workers' party, there is no and can be no dictatorship of the proletariat.

In the People's Democracies, the Communist and Workers' Parties were "an *instrument* in the hands of the proletariat for the conquest of the dictatorship" (Stalin), they elaborated the general line which led to the conquest of this dictatorship, and now, when the dictatorship of the proletariat is already achieved, they are the instrument "for the strengthening and extension of the dictatorship." (Stalin)

The Communist and Workers' Parties elaborate the general line, which aims at the most rapid and effective building of Socialism, and having sufficient authority, they stimulate to action on this line the central and local government organs, the trade unions, youth organisations, the cooperative movement, press, etc.

Without this leading role of the Party as the highest form of the class union of proletarians, without the coherence and discipline of the Party and without the confidence in it of the broad masses, the dictatorship of the proletariat not only would not be able to strengthen and extend itself, in order to lead to the complete victory of Socialism, but it would not be able even to maintain itself.

In 1920 Lenin wrote:

"Certainly, almost everyone now realises that the Bolsheviks could not have maintained themselves in power for two-and-a-half months, let alone two-and-a-half years, unless the strictest truly iron discipline had prevailed in our Party, and unless the latter had been rendered the fullest and unreserved support of the whole mass of the working class, that is, of all its thinking, honest, self-sacrificing and influential elements who are capable of leading or of carrying with them the backward strata." (Lenin, "Left-wing Communism" *Selected Works*, Moscow, 1947, Vol. II, p. 573)

These words of Lenin can be applied in full to the historic role which the Communist Parties played in the achievement and maintenance of the dictatorship of the proletariat and play in its extension and strengthening.

Although there is a complete, fundamental harmony in the functioning of the mechanism of the dictatorship of the proletariat, based on the leading role of the Party, in

both the Soviet and People's Democratic form of the dictatorship—a certain specific nature does exist, however, at the present stage of development of the People's Democratic form. This specific nature lies in the existence of not only one, single party, the party of the proletariat, but also of other political organisations and parties, which function mainly in the field of the peasant and petty-bourgeois strata.

It must be, however, stated distinctly that these parties do not possess any more the character of political organisations representing the interests of "antagonistic classes whose interests are hostile and cannot be reconciled" (Stalin).

A number of these political organisations and parties are derived historically from the era of the bourgeois state. In the period after the Second World War, when the Socialist revolution was developing in the People's Democracies and an arduous struggle was being waged for the consolidation and crystallisation of the dictatorship of the proletariat, some of these parties were the more or less wavering allies of the Communist and Workers' Parties while some of them held openly hostile positions in relation to them.

However, in the process of the great class battles which took place in the People's Democracies, in the process of smashing and liquidating the hostile bourgeois-landowner political formations, in the process of detaching the toiling and exploited masses from the bourgeoisie, the overcoming of the vacillations of the masses of middle peasants and the fortifying of the workers-peasants alliance as the basis of the dictatorship of the proletariat — these parties changed their class nature. In this period a thorough revision of their ideology, a thorough cleansing of their leadership and apparatus took place. At present, these parties recognise the general political line, worked out by the Communist and Workers' Parties which aims at the building of Socialism, as binding for them and corresponding to the interest of the social strata amongst which they function. These parties develop their practical activity along this line. These parties recognise also, both in theory and in practice, the leading role of the Communist and Workers' Parties.

In these circumstances, the class nature of these parties and their function must be and are fundamentally different from the class nature and function of parties of the bourgeois state. In the present stage of development of the People's Democracies, these parties are fulfilling in reality the function of singular ally formations, a singular bridge for the leading detachment of the working class to a part of

the working masses, especially to the peasants. Hence, entrance of the representatives of these parties into the government does not in any case endow the governments in the People's Democracies with the character of coalition governments in the bourgeois meaning of the word, does not deprive them of coherence and compactness, does not infringe in principle their unity of action and does not undermine the stability and durability of the people's power.

It should not be forgotten, however, that the existence of these parties, while historically justified, necessary and purposeful in the present stage of development of People's Democracy, can, in certain circumstances, be connected with definite dangers derived from the fact that the class enemy attempts to entrench himself in some of the sectors of these parties.

There is no doubt that the further development of People's Democracy will consolidate, deepen and extend the leading role of the Communist and Workers' Parties in the entirety of the country's political life, in forms that correspond for each country and each period.

In any case, it is clear that the prediction formulated by Comrade Dimitrov in 1948, to the effect that progressive social development "does not lead to a multitude of parties and small groups", has been already confirmed by the uniting of particular parties, which has taken place in some of the People's Democracies and, undoubtedly, will be also confirmed by the future developments of the political life in the People's Democracies.

In developing the theory of Marxism-Leninism, Comrade Stalin made a great, new contribution to the teachings on the Party of the proletariat. For the Communist and Workers' Parties of the People's Democracies, that part of the Leninist-Stalinist teachings, which deals with the problem of the Party as the vanguard of the working class, is especially timely.

Here is what Comrade Stalin writes on this problem:

"But in order that it may really be the vanguard, the Party must be armed with revolutionary theory, with a knowledge of the laws of the movement, with a knowledge of the laws of revolution. Without this it will be incapable of directing the struggle of the proletariat, of leading the proletariat. The Party cannot be a real party if it limits itself to registering what the masses of the working class feel and think, if it drags at the tail of the spontaneous movement, if it is unable to overcome the inertness and the political indifference of the spontaneous movement, if it is

unable to rise above the momentary interests of the proletariat, if it is unable to elevate the masses to the level of the class interests of the proletariat. The Party must stand at the head of the working class; it must see further than the working class; it must lead the proletariat, and not follow in the tail of the spontaneous movement." (Stalin, **Problems of Leninism**, Moscow, 1947, p. 81-82)

Without the Party as the *vanguard* of the working class, without the Party as the "political leader of the working class" (Stalin) there is and can be no dictatorship of the proletariat capable of consolidating, developing and strengthening itself.

It is understandable, therefore, that the traitors and spies of the Tito clique, preparing since long ago a counter-revolutionary coup in Yugoslavia at the behest of American imperialism, recognised as the fundamental element of their traitorous work, the deprivation of the Communist Party of its role as the *vanguard* of the working class by detaching it from the working class and dissolving it in the so-called National Front.

It is also not a matter of accident that the bearers of the Right-wing and nationalist deviation, led by Comrade Gomulka, wanted to deprive our Party of the role of the vanguard of the working class by detaching it from revolutionary traditions, by uniting with the Polish Socialist Party (PSP) without first shattering the Right wing of the PSP, and not on the platform of Marxism-Leninism. This, undoubtedly, would have transformed the Party into a "diffused, shapeless, disorganised 'formation'" (Stalin) and would have had the most disastrous results for the development of the Socialist revolution in Poland.

The Communist and Workers' Parties in the People's Democracies, due to the specific conditions in which they arose and developed, do not as yet possess in full the traits of a Bolshevik Party, although they fulfil in principle the functions of the leading detachment of the working class.

Hence, the immense and intensive organisational work that is being carried out at present by the Communist and Workers' Parties of the People's Democracies, in order to make up for the delay, in order to assimilate in full Bolshevik methods of organisational work, in order to purge themselves of hostile and foreign elements, to prevent the effacement of the line between the Party and the class -- and in order to perform the function of the political leader of the working class, completely, universally, and in a Bolshevik manner.

In developing the Leninist teaching on the Party, Comrade Stalin formulated as a law of the development of the Party, the strengthening of the Party by the purging of opportunist elements.

"Our Party," Comrade Stalin writes, "succeeded in creating internal unity and unexampled cohesion of its ranks primarily because it was able in good time to purge itself of the opportunist pollution, because it was able to rid its ranks of the liquidators, the Mensheviks." (Ibid, p. 91)

This Stalinist law has been fully confirmed by the development of the Communist and Workers' Parties in the People's Democracies.

During the period when the direct task facing the People's Democracies was only the struggle for the consolidation of regained statehood and the reconstruction of national economy, the opportunist elements in the parties did not as yet reveal themselves fully.

When, however, a new stage of development began, when the building of the foundations of Socialism and the sharp struggle against the capitalist elements in town and country became a direct task, in the period which coincided with an ever more acute division of the world into the camp of imperialism and the camp of peace—in this period the opportunist elements in the parties revealed their features and sought to turn the parties from their proper road.

We know from our own experience that the routing of the Right-wing and nationalist deviation in our Party fortified it, and armed it for the accomplishment of the tasks of the leading detachment of the working class, the directing force of the dictatorship of the proletariat, carrying out the transition to Socialism.

Basing itself on Stalin's teachings and his ideological influence, the dictatorship of the proletariat in the People's Democracies develops and strengthens itself—the Communist and Workers' Parties directing it—develops on the road of Bolshevik theory and practice.

The experience of the state and Party building in these countries is a further splendid confirmation and development of the Leninist-Stalinist teachings on the "mechanism" of the functioning of the dictatorship of the proletariat and on the guiding role of the Party as the vanguard of the working class.

## III

In 1939, at the Eighteenth Congress of the CPSU (B), Comrade Stalin presented a profound, thorough analysis of the development of the Soviet Socialist state and determined two phases of this development: the first, the period from the October Revolution to the liquidation of the exploiting classes—and the second the period from the liquidation of the capitalist elements of town and country to the complete victory of the Socialist system of economy and the enactment of the new Constitution.

The principal task in the first phase, Comrade Stalin writes:

“Was to suppress the resistance of the overthrown classes, to organise the defence of the country against the attack of the interventionists, to restore industry and agriculture and to prepare the conditions for the elimination of the capitalist elements. Accordingly in this period our state performed two main functions.”

And further on, characterising these two main functions, Comrade Stalin states:

“The first function was to suppress the overthrown classes inside the country.

“The second function was to defend the country from foreign attack.

“Our state had yet a third function: this was the work of economic organisation and cultural education performed by our state bodies with the purpose of developing the infant shoots of the new, Socialist economic system and re-educating the people in the spirit of Socialism. **But this new function did not attain to any considerable development in that period.**” (My italics—H. M.) (Stalin: *Problems of Leninism*, Moscow, 1947, p. 636-7)

In regard to the second phase, the principal task of this period, as Comrade Stalin stated, lay in the organisation of the Socialist economy, corresponding to which, the functions of the Socialist state also changed.

The function of suppressing resistance inside the country fell and died away. In its place arose the function of safeguarding the Socialist property. The function of armed defence of the country from external attack was completely preserved and, as Comrade Stalin writes:

“The function of economic organisation and cultural education by the state organs also remained, and was deve-

loped to the full. Now the main task of our State inside the country is the work of peaceful economic organisation and cultural education. As for our army, punitive organs and intelligence service, their edge is no longer turned to the inside of the country but to the outside, against external enemies.

• “As you see, we now have an entirely new, Socialist state, without precedent in history and differing considerably in form and functions from the Socialist state of the first phase.” (Ibid, p. 637)

In the light of Comrade Stalin's analysis of the development of the Socialist state and the determined two phases of its development it should be, it is clear, affirmed that the People's Democracies are in the first phase, in the period when the main task is the breaking of the resistance of the overthrown classes and the preparation of conditions for the liquidation of the capitalist classes. However, in new historical conditions, this first phase of development of the Socialist state takes a somewhat different course in the People's Democracies than took place in the USSR.

Wherein does this difference chiefly rest?

It rests in the fact that due to basing themselves on the USSR, the People's Democracies were able to approach relatively faster the realisation of the economic-organisational and cultural-educational functions of the Socialist state. This was caused by the following circumstances:

1. Due to the support on the might and aid of the USSR the People's Democracies avoided armed imperialist intervention. It is true that the overthrown classes of exploiters benefited and benefit from the close aid of the imperialists, and here and there, on the basis of this aid, attempts at armed resistance arose — as, for example, in Poland, during a certain period of the activities of the bands and the underground which had even some elements of a civil war—but all these attempts of resistance cannot be compared in their destructive results with the burdens, devastations, and tension of forces brought about by the armed imperialist intervention in the USSR and the long lasting civil war which grew on its ground. As is known, the rebuilding of the country in the USSR was able to begin, due to the armed imperialist intervention only in four to five years after the October Revolution. In Poland, on the other hand, where the armed resistance of the overthrown classes did relatively the greatest scope and lasted the longest, it was unable to halt for an instant the work of rebuilding the country.

Therefore, in the People's Democracies, industry and agriculture were restored already in the first phase of the development of the Socialist state and already in the first phase of development production, especially in industry, has very considerably surpassed the prewar level.

2. The People's Democracies benefit from the very first instant of their formation, from the all-sided aid of the Soviet Union in the form of deliveries of goods, food help, commodity and investment credits, technical aid, cultural assistance, etc.

In the recent past the mutual aid of the People's Democracies carried out on the basis of the Mutual Economic Aid Council has begun to play an evermore important role.

3. The People's Democracies have the possibility of benefiting and benefit from the experience of the Soviet Union, of marching on the path it has cleared. This saves them many vain efforts, many unsuccessful attempts and pursuits, much national energy, labour and material costs which otherwise would be expended without the proper effect.

These are the circumstances which cause a relatively more rapid development of the economic-organisational work in the People's Democracies than in the USSR in the first phase of its development. This has, of course, a highly positive bearing on the entirety of the development of these countries.

Having avoided, due to basing themselves on the force and aid of the USSR, imperialist intervention, the People's Democracies also did not have to pass through the stage of War Communism in their economy, the necessity of which in the USSR was primarily caused precisely by imperialist intervention.

The economy of the People's Democracies was and is based up to the present on the taking over by the state of the principal economic positions (large and medium industry, the banks, transport, etc.), on the permitting within definite limits and utilisation of market relations and on such a planned direction of economic life on the basis of the principal economic positions — as to cause the growth of the Socialist sector and development in the direction of Socialism.

Comrade Stalin foresaw brilliantly already in 1928 that:

"The New Economic Policy with its market relations and the utilisation of the market relations is absolutely necessary for every capitalist country in the period of the dictatorship

of the proletariat." (Stalin, *Collected Works*, Russ. Ed., Vol. XI, p. 145)

This brilliant prediction of Comrade Stalin was completely confirmed by the development of the economy of the People's Democracies which at present are in a period having many common practical traits and many analogies with the Soviet NEP (New Economic Policy) period.

But the NEP is not only the permitting on definite conditions and utilisation of market relations.

"NEP", Comrade Stalin states, "is the Party's policy which permits of the struggle between the Socialist and the capitalist elements, and is calculated to bring about the victory of the Socialist elements over the capitalist elements. In actual fact NEP only began as a retreat, but the calculation was that in the course of this retreat our forces would be regrouped and we would launch an offensive. As a matter of fact, we have been pursuing the offensive for several years now and are doing so successfully, developing our industries developing Soviet trade, and pressing hard upon private capital." (Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, Moscow, 1947, p. 172)

In the People's Democracies where the permitting and utilisation of market relations was not a period of retreat because here, there had been no period of War Communism which eliminated these market conditions, the offensive against the limitation and gradual dislodging of capitalist elements is taking place. As a result of this development the perspective of the total liquidation of capitalist elements becomes ever more clearly apparent, similarly to the plan outlined and accomplished in the USSR under Stalin's leadership—i.e., through the industrialisation of the country and the gradual collectivisation of agriculture. It is precisely this perspective formulated in the resolution of the Information Bureau on the issue of the situation in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, which caused in our Party, amongst others, the complete unmasking of features by the Right-wing and nationalist group led by Comrade Gomulka, and the unsuccessful attempt to turn back our Party from the road leading to the realisation of Socialism.

The Right-wing and nationalist group in our Party was thoroughly routed, and the attempt to turn our Party back from its road towards the realisation of Socialism, ended in infamous disaster and bankruptcy.

There is no doubt, as well, that our country like all the other People's Democracies, suppressing the resistance of the bourgeoisie, developing its defensive power on the

support of the USSR, will extend ever more the economic-organisational and cultural-educational function of the Socialist state so that, as a result of the liquidation of the capitalist elements, the liquidation of the antagonistic social classes and the victorious building of Socialism, this function becomes the principal and fundamental function of our Socialist state.

#### IV

Comrade Stalin, in developing the theory of the state, and in particular, the theory of the Socialist state has contributed a new chapter to this theory, dealing with the question of the state in the period of Communism.

This is what Comrade Stalin stated on this question in 1939, in the report to the Eighteenth Party Congress:

"We are going ahead, towards Communism. Will our state remain in the period of Communism also?"

"Yes, it will, unless the capitalist encirclement is liquidated, and unless the danger of foreign military attack has disappeared. Naturally, of course, the forms of our state will again change in conformity with the change in the situation at home and abroad.

"No, it will not remain and will atrophy if the capitalist encirclement is liquidated and a Socialist encirclement takes its place." (Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, Moscow, 1947, p. 637-638)

This extension and deepening of the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the state was based on a profound elaboration of the problem of the internal and external functions of the state and on a thorough definition and determination of the consequences and dangers, deriving from the existence of the capitalist encirclement.

In this same report to the Eighteenth Party Congress, which contributed a new chapter to the theory of the state, Comrade Stalin, raising an objection to those who considered, that since there were no more antagonistic classes in the USSR, then the state was also unnecessary, stated:

"These questions not only betray an underestimation of the capitalist encirclement, but also an underestimation of the role and the significance of the bourgeois states and their organs, which send spies, assassins and wreckers into our country and are waiting for a favourable opportunity to attack it by armed force." (Ibid, p. 632)

And further on Comrade Stalin says:

"Is it not surprising that we learned about the espionage and conspiratorial activities of the Trotskyite and Bukharinite leaders only quite recently, in 1937 and 1938, although, as the evidence shows, these gentry were in the service of foreign espionage organisations and carried on conspiratorial activities from the very first days of the October Revolution?"

This blunder "is to be explained by an underestimation of the strength and consequence of the mechanism of the bourgeois states surrounding us and of their espionage organs which endeavour to take advantage of people's weaknesses, their vanity, their slackness of will, to enmesh them in their espionage nets and use them to surround the organs of the Soviet State." (Ibid, p. 632-633)

The People's Democracies are not in a capitalist encirclement in the sense that the USSR was, when it was the only Socialist state in the world.

The People's Democracies find a powerful support in the mighty Soviet Union.

But the People's Democracies along with the Soviet Union face an imperialist camp, armed to the teeth, and led by the American warmongers.

In the great anti-imperialist camp of peace and Socialism, the People's Democracies are less strong links than the USSR. In their countries there are still remnants of the routed classes of exploiters, and especially the class of the village rich, remnants of the bourgeois state apparatus and bourgeois political formations. The connections of some strata with native and foreign capitalism are still fresh; a broad stratum of people's intelligentsia has not yet emerged; the organs of justice and the organs of struggle with foreign intelligence services have not yet grown firm and acquired sufficient experience; the Communist and Workers' Parties do not possess as yet the Bolshevik characteristics in full.

Therefore, it is understandable that the imperialists direct their blows and attacks at the People's Democracies and that for a long time already they have been setting up long-range plans, aimed at detaching these countries from the USSR and guiding them onto the road of capitalism.

The provocation of many years, standing of the spying Tito band for the benefit of the imperialists, the provocation, diversion and espionage of many years' standing of the Rajk and Kostov band, of the Titoite band in Hungary and Bulgaria, the provocation of many years' standing of the prewar police counter-intelligence agents in our Party, which spread on the ground of the opportunism and absolute lack



of revolutionary vigilance on the part of Comrades Gomulka and Spychalski, all this shows, how dangerous is the under-estimation of the mechanism of the internal and external action of the class enemy.

"We cannot for an instant", said Comrade Bierut, "lose sight of the class enemy and his cunning and insidious moves. Be vigilant! This is an order which should accompany every one of us constantly, in every moment of our Party's, professional and social work, as well as at every step of our collective and personal life. As long as the chess enemy exists and acts—we must be vigilant. To be vigilant means to hasten the destruction of the imperialists, to fortify the foundations of Socialist construction." (B. Bierut, **Report delivered at the Third Plenum of the Central Committee of the PUWP**, November 11, 1949)

There is no doubt that basing themselves on Stalin's teaching and experiences of the CPSU (B), the Communist and Workers' Parties of the People's Democracies will be able to intensify their revolutionary vigilance and frustrate even the most satanic in their insidiousness provocations of the foreign imperialists and of the native bourgeoisie and landowners.

The People's Democracies arose as the result of a Socialist revolution, occurring in special historical conditions. This revolution was of the same type, in class nature, as the Great October Socialist Revolution. The state in the People's Democracies is a state of the Socialist type, of the same type in class nature as the Soviet state. The Soviet and People's Democracy form of the state are variants of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The Socialist state in the People's Democracies differs from the contemporary Soviet state:

1. In the difference of historical conditions and the derived therefrom difference in the forms of exercising the dictatorship of the proletariat.

2. In the different phase of development in which it rests, the different stage of historical development; in the People's Democracies, antagonistic social classes still exist, capitalism has not been completely liquidated and Socialism only being built. In the USSR, there are no antagonistic social classes, capitalism has been totally liquidated, Socialism has been built and a Communist society is being built.

Under these circumstances, what is and what can be the tendency of development of the People's Democracies?

This tendency can only be and is—to make up for the historical delay, to build Socialism on the basis of the experience of the USSR. It is clear that as the People's Demo-

cracies will pass over from the first phase of development of the Socialist state to the second, the divergences of system in relation to the USSR will decrease.

The line of development of the USSR and the line of the People's Democracy are not in any case parallel lines which if they intersect anywhere, then only at infinity. On the contrary, the line of development of the People's Democracies tends sharply towards the second phase of development of the Socialist state, towards a Socialist society.

What does the direction of this line signify?

It signifies nothing else than the striving towards making up the historical delay, catching up with the USSR, and marching together with it and under its leadership towards Communism.

Armed with Stalin's teaching, we shall reach this goal.

—NOWE DROGI,

Organ of the Central Committee  
of the Polish United Workers'  
Party, No. 6

## THE MEERUT TRIAL IN INDIA AND THE COLONIAL POLICY OF THE LABOURITES

By N. SOMIN

THE powerful factor in the new era ushered in by the victorious Great October Socialist Revolution is the labour movement in the colonial countries. One of its advance detachments — the young labour movement in India—has inscribed many a vivid page in the history of the struggle for India's national liberation from the British colonial yoke. As far back as in 1908, in the article, *Inflam-mable Material in World Politics*, V. I. Lenin wrote with reference to the first political general strike of the workers in Bombay:

“And in India too the proletariat has already matured sufficiently to wage a class conscious and political mass struggle.” (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Russ. Ed., Vol. XII, p. 306)

The working class of India demonstrated its growing militancy and strength during the powerful revolutionary upsurge in that country after the October Socialist Revolution. More than 500,000 workers took part in the nearly 400 strikes in British India in 1921; there were more than 200 strikes embracing 507,000 workers in 1928. The average number of days per striker in 1921 was 12.5 and in 1928 62.5.

Three general strikes took place in India in 1928-29: two textile workers' strikes in Bombay—in the course of which the large revolutionary trade union, the Girni Kamgar Union, was formed, and the railwaymen's strike on the G.I.P. Line. The strikes of 1928-1929 strengthened the solidarity of the Indian proletariat and its role in the national liberation movement and in the political life of the country in general. The role of the proletariat in the national liberation movement in India had particularly grown during the second strike of the Bombay textile workers in 1929 which had a very pronounced political character, and the active boycott of the so-called Royal Commissions of Simon and Whitley.

It was this period that saw the beginning of the slow but steady process of extrication of the workers from the ideological and organisational captivity of the national-reformist bourgeoisie. An expression of this process was the formation of workers' and peasants' parties. The Bombay and Bengal Workers' and Peasants' Parties were formed in 1927 in Bombay and Calcutta respectively. Similar parties were formed in 1928 in Punjab and in the Central and United Provinces. An Indian National Workers' and Peasants' Party was founded in Calcutta in December, 1928.

In spite of all their shortcomings at that period, the workers' and peasants' parties had a progressive platform of struggle for the national independence and democratic transformation of India. In a number of cases they allowed the leaders of the left-wing trade union movement to combine forces under Communist leadership.

The influence of the Indian labour movement was instrumental in stirring up the peasant movement. Beginning with refusal to pay taxes and debts to the usurers, the peasant movement rapidly progressed to armed action and was drawn into the general vortex of the struggle for India's independence.

Peasant disturbances took place in 1929 in different parts of the vast country; in Punjab, in the Central Provinces, in the Madras and Bombay Presidencies, in Burma, in Alwar, in Kashmir, in the Northwest Frontier Province, etc. Already in the autumn of 1928 the *Bombay Chronicle* directed attention in its leading article to the general agitation observed of late among the Indian peasantry. (*The Bombay Chronicle*, October 17, 1928.)

“The Indian Statutory Commission” headed by John Simon arrived in India in 1928 for the purpose of preparing proposals for a revision of the Indian “constitution”. There was not a single Indian on this Commission. This alone was evidence of the truly imperialist character of the “constitution” reform in India contemplated by the Conservative Government of Baldwin. The arrival of the Simon Commission supplied an impact to a further upsurge in the struggle of India's people against the colonial yoke of the British imperialists.

The leaders of the Indian National Congress adopted a compromising stand on the question of the Simon Commission. They were inclined to find a common language with the British and prepared to confine themselves to the demand for Dominion Status for India. But in the big industrial centres of Bombay, Calcutta and other cities, the workers were holding demonstrations under the slogans

"Out with Simon from India!" "Long live complete national independence!"

And in 1929 similar anti-imperialist protests of the workers greeted the Whitley commission sent for the ostensible purpose of investigating the conditions of the working class in India. In reality, this Commission was seeking means for paralysing the Indian workers' movement.

Employing specifically proletarian methods of struggle, the Indian working class infused greater vigour into the national liberation movement of the peoples of India against the British colonial oppressors. And that is why British imperialism tried with all possible methods to crush the Indian labour movement. It resorted to the use of police terror, of clubs against workers' demonstrations. Strikes and demonstrations were ruthlessly suppressed by armed forces. Shooting became a matter-of-fact practice.

The repressions of the authorities in India were supplemented by the British imperialist propaganda campaign for "exposing" the Indian Communists, representing them as "agents of Moscow". At the annual meeting of the Anglo-Indian Association in Calcutta, in January, 1929, the British Colonel Gidney declared that the greatest menace to India at that moment was Communism which was spreading with dangerous speed and which had taken especially deep root in the trade union movement (*The Forward* January 25, 1929). A statement in this sense was also made by Lord Irwin, Viceroy of India and head of the British colonial administration in India, at a meeting of the European Association, in December, 1928. Irwin tried to find ways of forestalling the "Communist danger" in India by combining police terror and a "liberal" labour policy. The work of the Communists, he said, would unquestionably be far less successful if existing injustices were eliminated. In order to fight Communism successfully, he went on, the Government and the manufacturers must show to the workers that they and not the Communists are the true friends of the workers. (*The Bengali*, December 18, 1928). But the British authorities in India failed to eliminate the "injustices" and to become the "true friends" of the workers. The "liberalism" of the executioners took on the form of still more severe violence and repressions against the working class.

The anxiety felt by the British authorities in India was reflected in the annual "Statement" for 1929-1930 submitted to parliament by the Anglo-Indian government. The authors of the "Statement" were anxious at the "spreading Com-

munist propaganda and influence, especially in the big industrial cities". It recognised that it was for the specific purpose of forestalling the "Communist danger" in India that the Public Safety Bill was proposed by Lord Irwin, the Viceroy, as an emergency measure, (Statement exhibiting the moral and material progress and conditions of India, 1929-1930). Even the meek and obedient specially picked "Legislative Assembly" of British India refused to accept the bill.

The reactionary British officials of the administration in India headed by the Viceroy refused to recognise the national liberation struggle of the Indian people as a profoundly natural historical development. With the bluntness native to them, they preferred to explain the struggle of the Indian people for their independence by "intrigues of Moscow", by the "activities of Comintern agents". The Anglo-Indian officials could not comprehend the fact that the faithfulness of revolutionary Marxism to life accounts for the fact that it finds keen response among the workers and peasants of India and that its appeal to the masses was strengthened by the very policy of colonial oppression pursued in India by British imperialism.

The coarse methods of persecution and brutal terror employed by the British colonial rulers against the advanced leaders of the Indian labour movement were to be "justified" in the course of the Meerut trial. This trial was held in the small town of Meerut (near Delhi); it lasted more than four years and aroused deep resentment among the progressive public and working class the world over. At this trial British imperialism tried to persuade the world that there was a "monstrous conspiracy" of the Communists and to pose as the "saviour" of the world from the "Communist menace".

It was with far-reaching aims in mind that the Viceroy of India, the Conservative Lord Irwin (who subsequently adopted the name of Lord Halifax, one of the principal initiators and 'heroes' of the Munich policy) instituted in 1929 prosecutions against 32 Indian trade union leaders for activities regarded perfectly legal in the mother country. According to the lying version of the Anglo-Indian police and of the British prosecution, the 32 arrested leaders of the left-wing trade union movement had allegedly conspired for the purpose of overthrowing the rule of the British King in India, and replacing His Majesty's Government by a proletarian dictatorship. The British authorities in India maintained that the main responsibility for this "Conspiracy" rested with the Communist International.

The representatives of the Crown at the trial asserted that the Communist International had allegedly organised and financed a conspiracy, that the Workers' and Peasants' Party existing in India at that time was just a screen for the operations of the Communist Party of India. (And this notwithstanding the fact that it was well known that the Communist Party of India did not yet crystallise into a national organisation at that time. The isolated groups of the Indian Communists united into a party only in 1933, i.e., after the conclusion of the Meerut trial).

The trial lasted from March 20, 1929 through August 3, 1933. The police of the British authorities in India had been preparing the case since 1928. Thirty-two people were arrested in March, 1929, and held for trial with the full consent of Baldwin's Conservative cabinet. On June 8, 1929, it was succeeded by the second Labour Government of MacDonald which remained in power until August 24, 1931. The trial continued under the second Labour Government which refused to put an end to the judicial farce against the advanced representatives of the Indian working class. The proceedings of the last two years of the trial (August, 1931 through August, 1933) were held under the Government of MacDonald.

The Meerut trial was a glaring example of imperialist terror in a colonial country intended to weaken and crush the national liberation struggle. The British authorities in India hoped that by staging this farce they would succeed in beheading the revolutionary trade union movement and intimidate the masses by arrests and the court action. At the same time the British authorities in India wanted to scare the Indian national bourgeoisie with the "Communist revolution" bogey in order to make it more tractable and compromising in its relations with British imperialism.

Thus, the Meerut trial was to be used as a pretext for greater terror against the Communists; it was meant to hinder the formation of the Communist Party of India. (In their book *Rise and Fulfilment of British Rule in India*, London, 1935, the bourgeois historians Thompson and Garratt, admit openly that all the anti-Communist trials held in India in the period between the two world wars had as their sole purpose the unleashing of terror against the working class and the Communists. p. 631.) But the Meerut judicial provocation was designated to be more than an act against the left-wing trade union movement in India; it was intended to influence the political situation right in Britain. It was an attempt by the Conservative to repeat their old "Comintern letter" on a large scale.

General elections to parliament were scheduled to take place in May, 1929. The March 1929, arrests in India as well as the opening of the political trial were intended to influence the election campaign in favour of the Conservatives. The Meerut trial was designed by the Conservative Government of Baldwin to play up the "Communist danger" which was allegedly threatening the entire capitalist world. It was intended to use the trial also for preparing ideological ground for a new anti-Soviet intervention. Thus, the Meerut trial was conceived by the Anglo-Indian authorities as a combined punitive and "prophylactic" measure against the national liberation movement in India. The Anglo-Indian authorities spared no means for financing the Meerut trial. In spite of the chronic adverse balance, the Viceroy of India allocated ten million rupees for this purpose. (*Liberty*, April 23, 1929)

There was nothing surprising in the fact that the Meerut case was prepared by the British authorities in India under Baldwin's Conservative cabinet. The Conservatives were always justifiably considered the most arrant defenders of the interests of British colonial imperialism. But of the Labour leaders who came to power on June 8, 1929, British as well as world progressive opinion expected an entirely different colonial policy, and, in particular, measures to stop the persecution of the Indian trade union leaders and important concessions to the Indian national liberation movement. The Second Labour Government did not, nor could it justify these hopes. It did not take much time to make it clear that the Labourites had taken over and were continuing without any change the Conservative policy with regard to the Meerut prisoners, as well as their general policy with regard to the peoples of India who rose to the struggles against the British colonial yoke.

\* \* \*

The Meerut trial passed through the three stages provided for in the Anglo-Indian system of justice.\*

\* A specific feature of this system is the fact that it does not allow for a preliminary investigation. The degree to which one or another case is subject to trial is determined not by the prosecutor on the basis of the investigation, but by the police court known as the magistrate court. If the magistrate court rules that one or another case is subject to trial, this case is referred to the ordinary sessions court where the defendants may be tried by assessors or by a jury. Unlike the jury, the assessors in the Indian court have not a shred of power; their verdict is not binding on the judge who can completely disregard it. Usually articulated law students

The British colonial authorities in India had no great difficulty in finding a pretext for engineering a judicial provocation.

In the very early hours of March 21, 1929, the Anglo-Indian police made about 200 house-searching expeditions and about 100 arrests in the administrative, industrial and working class centres of Bombay, Calcutta, Dacca, Poona, Lucknow, Allahabad, Jhansi and other cities. Scores of trucks filled with captured literature and papers were unloaded and their contents taken to the premises of the police officers, who under the guidance of a special official of the intelligence bureau of the Indian Department of Interior, R. A. Horton (an Englishman), proceeded at once to prepare incriminating material for the "Communist conspiracy" case in India.

Among the arrested were active leaders of the Indian trade unions, including: S. A. Dange, Assistant Secretary of the All-India Trade Union Congress, General Secretary of the Girni Kamgar Union, the revolutionary union of the Bombay textile workers, and a leading member of the Workers' and Peasants' Party of Bombay; S. S. Mirajkar, Secretary of the British-India Steam Navigation Co. Staff Union, Secretary of the Bombay Workers' and Peasants' Party and candidate of the workers in the recent Municipal Elections in Bombay; Muzaffar Ahmed, Secretary of the Workers' and the Peasants' Party of Bengal and editor of its organ *Jana Vani* (Voice of the People), Vice-President of the Calcutta Scavengers' Union and Vice-president of the All-India Trade Union Congress; P. C. Joshi, a student of Law at the Allahabad University, Secretary of the United Provinces Workers' and Peasants' Party, Executive member of the All-India Workers' and Peasants' Party, editor of *Kranti Kari*, a vernacular newspaper of this party; G. M. Adhikari, a Doctor of Engineering, who wrote for the Bombay Socialist paper, *Spark*; S. S. Josh, President of the first All-India Workers' and Peasants' Party Conference in December, 1928. Among the arrested men was also B. F. Pradley, an English engineer, a member of the Executive Council of the GIP Railwaymen's Union and of the Girni Kamgar Union. Later on June 17, 1929, another Englishman,

are summoned to act as assessors. Trials by jury are practised only in the big cities. The ruling of a session court may be appealed against to the High Court functioning in every province. In the event of any essential disagreement arising between the sessions judge and the jury, the judge may refer the case to the High Court of the province for a consideration or reversal of the sentence. (Banerjee, *The Indian Constitution*, 1927, pp. 404-405).

Lester Hutchinson, a young journalist was added to the prisoners.

Prosecutions were instituted against 32 left-wing leaders of the Indian trade union movement; only 14 of them were Communists and six declared their solidarity with Communist opinions at the trial. As for the remaining twelve they were people of the most diverse political views who were in no way connected with the Communist movement.

The trial of the leading Indian trade unionists brought forth an outburst of anger from the Indian workers, which compelled some of the leaders of the Indian National Congress to undertake the organisation of legal defence for the prisoners. The Central Committee formed for the defence of the Meerut prisoners included prominent representatives of the National Congress: Motilal Nehru, Ansari, K. F. Nariman, the present Prime Minister of Hindustan, Jawaharlal Nehru and others.

The Central Committee announced a drive for a legal defence fund for the benefit of the Meerut prisoners. Local committees for the defence of the Meerut prisoners were soon organised in Bombay, Calcutta, Lahore, Allahabad, Meerut and other cities. In addition to this workers' defence committees were organised in Bombay and Calcutta. The money raised was used for securing the services of defence attorneys for the Meerut prisoners. But there was a shortage of money, for the collections were meagre. It was hard for the workers in a colonial country to make any big contributions from their miserly wages towards the support of their comrades in the struggle. As for the Indian bourgeoisie, it flatly refused and had no intention to assist the Meerut prisoners.

The leader of the Indian bourgeoisie, Jawaharlal Nehru who was a member of the Central Defence Committee, had to recognise in his *Autobiography* the fact that the committee had great difficulties in raising funds for the legal defence of the Meerut prisoners. It was not easy to raise the money, he wrote. The people with money had little sympathy for the Communists, Socialists and other labour agitators. (J. Nehru, *An Autobiography*, London, 1936, p. 188-189)

At the same time Nehru was embarrassed by the avarice of the lawyers who tried to make capital of the defence of the Meerut prisoners. The attorneys, he wrote, wanted a full pound of flesh for their services. He goes on to say that he marvelled at the greed of his colleagues in the profession. The committee had to depend for money on the

copper coins of the poor workers in order to pay the heavy bills of the lawyers.

The Central Committee for defence of the Meerut prisoners was shortlived. It fell apart in 1929, since the leaders of the National Congress very soon subscribed to the lying fables of the prosecution about an "all-India Communist conspiracy" and about the dangerous character of the Meerut prisoners, and refused to defend them.

It is impossible to ignore this treachery of the National Congress leaders. In the well-known Irwin-Gandhi pact signed on March 5, 1931, the Congress leaders, promised to cut short the civil disobedience campaign and agreed to attend the Round Table Conference in London. On his part, Viceroy Irwin announced an amnesty for political prisoners not implicated in violent actions.

Thus, under this agreement, the Congress leaders agreed to have the amnesty extended only to members of the civil disobedience movement headed by Gandhi. And it was clear from the very beginning that the Viceroy's amnesty did not apply to the Meerut prisoners accused of intentions to overthrow the existing system.

Mention should also be made of the reasons for which the "all-India Communist conspiracy" trial was arranged in Meerut, the small provincial town of "officials and apes", although only two of the 32 accused in the Meerut case were residing in Meerut before the trial; 22 of the defendants were permanently employed in Bombay or Calcutta, and the rest — in Poona, Dacca, Allahabad, Jhansi and other cities; therefore, under the criminal code the authorities should have arranged the trial at Bomay or Calcutta. But Meerut was more suitable for the colonial authorities as a place for the trial because it was not an industrial centre, and they could, therefore, have no fear of mass demonstration or protest against the judicial tyranny of the imperialists, as would have been the case if the trial were held in a big working class centre, such as Bombay or Calcutta. Furthermore, the Anglo-Indian authorities chose Meerut as the place for trying the Indian trade union leaders in order to avoid trial by jury (during the anti-Communist trials in 1924-1927, the jury invariably returned a verdict of not guilty).

The first stage of the Meerut trial—the police investigation by a special magistrate, Milner-White, lasted about seven months (June 12, 1929, to January 14, 1930).

After the usual interrogation procedure, the indictment was read on behalf of the crown by J. Langford James, senior counsel for the prosecution and in the past

president of the extremely reactionary European Association at Calcutta. On the basis of Section 121 (a) of the Indian Penal Code, the prosecution charged the 32 prisoners of conspiring for the purpose of overthrowing the Government of His Majesty the King-Emperor and establishing a government of the proletarian dictatorship in India.

In spite of the length of his address (17.5 hours which took up four court meetings), in spite of all his sophistry and stiff logic, James had to recognise that he was unable to prove the main charge of the prosecution. Addressing Magistrate Milner-White, James expressed the belief that he will arrive at the conclusion that they (the accused — N.S.) formed such a party (of conspiracy — N.S.) and that if they had not actually joined the Third International, they were headed in that direction. (*The Bombay Chronicle*, June 25, 1929).

After the address of the prosecution delivered by James, the Magistrate Court heard the statements of 320 witnesses for the prosecution.

Through press reports about the Meerut trial we have become acquainted with the statements of 117 witnesses, of whom more than fifty per cent were police officers (inspectors, officials, police reporters, gendarmes, etc.). Most of the other witnesses were also government employees. There were post office, customs and other officials, i.e., persons dependent upon the authorities by virtue of their office. Among these numerous witnesses for the prosecution there were quite a number of agent-provocateurs and whose evidence was clearly inspired by their chiefs. It is noteworthy that the court session of October 26, 1929, when statements were made by two witnesses from the police force at Pondicherry, French India, revealed the "touching" collaboration between the British and French police. Five Scotland Yard officers summoned specially from London were put up as "witnesses" at the court meeting of October 29, 30 and November 2 and 5, 1929.

But when the question was raised of summoning witnesses for the defence from abroad, the judge rejected the request on the ground that it was allegedly prohibited to summon witnesses from abroad.

In an effort to demoralise the Meerut prisoners, the judicial and prison authorities created unprecedentedly hard conditions for them; they were confined in the Meerut district prison, in filthy barracks poorly adapted to the climatic conditions of India. An idea of the shocking lack of sanitation may be judged by the fact that on May 2, 1929, there were two deaths from cholera. The prisoners were

tormented by hard work and kept on a hunger ration, they were insulted and humiliated. Letters and remittances sent to the prisoners were deliberately delayed by the prison authorities. Letters were subject to a very strict censorship. From a statement made at the trial by the warden of the Meerut prison, Abdul Aziz, it was learned that the reason for the delay of the letters was the strict order to have them photographed. The prisoners were forbidden to write about the prison conditions. Any reference to these conditions found in a prisoner's letter was deleted. In a letter to *The Workers' Life* of October 18, 1929, one of the Englishmen accused in the Meerut case, B. F. Bradley wrote:

"I am not writing about the conditions in the local prison, because I want this letter to reach you."

The humiliating regime established for the prisoners was offensive to their human dignity; for example, the prisoners were searched by the police on entering and leaving court.

The organisers of the Meerut trial did everything within their power to limit the defence possibilities of the prisoners. Thus, the legitimate request of six defendants who did not understand the English language in which the court proceedings were conducted for a hearing in the local languages (Marathi and Bengali) was granted only after a persistent five weeks struggle put up by the prisoners in support of their demand.

Although they were fully entitled by law to receive stenographic reports of the daily proceedings, the court authorities refused to supply copies of these reports to the prisoners. Only after repeated protests had been declared by the defence attorneys did the magistrate agree to supply regularly three copies of the stenographic records of the daily proceedings free of charge. The judicial authorities did everything to hinder the direct work of the defence attorneys during the trial. They were allowed to see their clients in strictly limited hours and were compelled to waste much time in waiting for permits. (L. Hutchinson — *Conspiracy at Meerut*)

In spite of all these obstacles and hindrances, the attorneys exposed the utter fallacy of the prosecution built up on inventions and extremely unscrupulous shuffling of facts. They likewise raised a number of objections on points of procedure.

But the magistrate and the prosecution paid little heed to these fair remarks of the defence. Complying with the will of the Anglo-Indian authorities and aware of the fact

that the second Labour Government gave its full support to the Viceroy of India, the Conservative Lord Irwin, they were pushing headlong towards their object.

On January 14, 1930, Milner-White announced to the Meerut prisoners his Committal Order, referring the cases of 31 prisoners for trial to the Sessions Court; the inquiring magistrate declared that all the prisoners with the exception of one—Choudhori Dharamvir Singhi, a Gandhi follower—were found guilty of complicity in a conspiracy intended to deprive the King of the sovereignty of British India, and that they would, therefore, be brought up on trial under Section 121-a of the Indian Penal Code.

This completed the inquiry of Mr. Milner-White.

On January 31, 1930, the trial of the 31 trade union leaders charged in the "Communist conspiracy" case opened in the Meerut Sessions Court. The judge, Mr. R. L. Yorke, an old English bureaucrat of the Indian civil service heard the case of the Meerut prisoners in the presence of five Indian assessors. (The power of the assessors were limited to the right of advice and the judge was free to disregard all their considerations.)

The composition of the prosecution was the same as in the Magistrate Court.

The position of the Meerut prisoners had grown much worse at that time. The defence fund was completely exhausted. The prisoners lacked the means for defence attorneys. Only two of the attorneys formerly engaged consented to continue their services temporarily on a credit basis. But the prisoners were not found lacking in spirit. In February, 1930, they themselves undertook the legal defence. The Meerut prisoners published an announcement in the press to the effect that they themselves were undertaking their legal defence and asked that all donations be forwarded to the treasurer elected from their midst — B. F. Bradley.

On this occasion, the prosecutor, L. James took up a full ten meetings for his introductory at court. It should be borne in mind that the English prosecutor was personally interested in prolonging the trial as much as possible, for he was receiving a very high fee of 100 Pounds Sterling a day, holidays included.

After the speech of the Prosecutor, L. James (February 11, 1930), the court had for 13 long months (until March 17, 1931) been listening to the witnesses for the prosecution. Neither James, nor the witnesses for the prosecution had anything new to add to what they had already said in Milner-White's Magistrate Court.

On February 14, 1930, the defendants Bradley and Hut-

chinson, through the services of the attorney Singhi, petitioned Justice Yorke to interrupt the proceedings to enable the defendants to organise their legal defence. Justice Yorke rejected the petition but the proceedings had to be interrupted because the Meerut prisoners complained to the local authorities at Yorke's arbitrary rulings.

In their complaint the Meerut prisoners also requested that they be ensured the elementary conditions necessary for preparing for their legal defence. The defendants asked for the right to meet their lawyers, friends and relations, for the right to use books for reading and the right to buy food through the prison and police personnel at any time. The least essential of these requests were subsequently granted. (*The Bombay Chronicle*, February 21, 1930). But throughout the trial the judge and prison chiefs were constantly hindering the normal organisation of the defence of the prisoners.

The legitimate demands of the prisoners and their attorneys for summoning witnesses for the defence invariably met a hostile reception from Judge York. At the end of December, 1931, the Indian newspaper *Liberty* published the list of witnesses for defence whose summons was requested by the attorneys of the Meerut prisoners. There was a total of 236 witnesses, of whom fifty would have to be summoned from abroad. As regards the latter, Judge Yorke repeated the arguments used in the Magistrate Court, saying that neither he, nor the Government of India had any right to summon witnesses from foreign countries. This was an obvious lie, for seven of the witnesses for the prosecution questioned by the judge were summoned from Pondicherry and London. As for the witnesses residing in India, Judge Yorke informed the Meerut prisoners that the question of pay for these witnesses could not even be raised (*Liberty*, December 26, 1931).

And this at a time when the question of paying the 320 witnesses summoned to the Meerut trial by the prosecution was not raised in general. It was understood as a matter of fact that they would be receiving compensation. In view of the difficult financial position of the Meerut prisoners, it meant that they were actually deprived of possibilities for defence.

The British authorities in India did everything to hinder the campaign for funds necessary for preparing the legal defence of the Meerut prisoners. Thus, the Governor of Bombay ordered the return of 500 dollars sent for the defence fund by friends of the Meerut prisoners from the

USA; a protest against this act was declared in court on May 12, 1931 by B. F. Bradley, treasurer of the defence fund.

In connection with this incident, the "left" Labourite Brockway addressed a question in Parliament to the Labour Secretary for Indian Affairs, Wedgewood Benn, on June 29 1930. Replying to this query the Labour Minister did not hesitate to slander the Meerut prisoners, saying that the above five hundred dollars were sent allegedly not for legal defence purposes, but for general revolutionary activities and that the Government of India was allegedly allocating adequate means for the defence of each of the Meerut prisoners (*The Hindu*, June 30, 1931).

The real facts concerning this government "assistance" are as follows: On June 19, 1931, Viceroy's Minister of the Interior requested Judge Yorke for information about the attorneys engaged in the defence of the Meerut prisoners. The Minister thereupon advised that the government had allocated a fee of 50 rupees for every engagement. This negligible sum was of course insufficient for securing the services of an attorney. Suffice it to recall that the senior counsel for the prosecution at the Meerut trial received 100 Pounds Sterling a day (\*) (*Liberty*, June 23, 1931).

In spite of the persecutions and terror of the authorities, most of the Meerut prisoners behaved with courage as befits revolutionaries. They understood the tremendous political significance of the trial for the international labour movement and for exposing the imperialist policy of the Labour Government.

The English engineer, Bradley, placed on trial at Meerut for his participation in the trade union movement in India, wrote to his friends in London :

"Our comrades in England may rest assured that we will keep the banner flying to the very end; we understand that this trial will do as much to help the Indian people as the British workers. . . . in exposing the imperialist policy of the Labour Government."

In their speeches, the Meerut prisoners—the Communists and the sympathising members of the Workers' and Peasants' Party—exposed British imperialism and pointed out to the Indian working people the way to national independence and freedom.

\* For comparison, it should be mentioned that 100 pounds Sterling equalled 1,333 rupees. It is clear that allocation of 50 rupees for a defence attorney was nothing else than sheer mockery of the Meerut prisoners.



One of the accused, G. M. Adhikari, declared in his speech from the dock :

"The so-called conspiracy.....consists of actions which would have been regarded as perfectly normal in other countries. I had Communist literature, I was a member of the Workers' and Peasants' Party and of the Communist Party, I spoke at a Lenin memorial meeting, and lastly, contributed several articles to the *Spark*. These actions are nothing else than the dissemination of political views and affiliations to a political party which stands openly for the achievement of India's independence from British imperialism through revolution. But in India this is regarded as high treason."

The same idea that it was persecution for legal activities and convictions was expressed in his defence speech by the English journalist, Hutchinson:

I am not ashamed of any of my actions and I do not regret anything. You may convict me, but all that you can write without changing the facts is that I have been convicted for my beliefs and activities which are legal and normal in any country of the world free from government terror."

Noting that the charge of conspiracy in the case of the Meerut prisoners was absurd, the accused S. S. Josh said in his speech from the dock :

"All the statements of the witnesses have merely confirmed the fact that we have adhered to certain views and were advocating them. This charge was a charge for definite views and not for any illegitimate actions. The questions in this case were questions of elementary civil rights, of the freedom of speech and the right of association."

The accused Hutchinson and Bradley exposed the methods by which the prosecution obtained "compromising documents" against the defendants and mysterious coded letters. This was in essence a counter-charge of forgery presented by the defendants against the Anglo-Indian authorities and police.

"My speeches were so distorted and confused," declared Hutchinson, "that in many places their meaning was altered. Speeches considered my own are actually half my own, the authorship of the remaining half belongs to the police reporters."

Bradley disclosed how the police had forged the "coded" letters:

"The police intercepted my friendly missives and used them as a basis for the invented mysterious letters."

At the trial, the accused emphasised the bourgeois-class character of the prosecutions started against them. Refuting the trumped-up charges about the organisation of a conspiracy of the government in India, the Communist prisoners at Meerut made extensive use of the court forum for exposing the policy of the British imperialism in India, for propaganda of the Marxist-Leninist teachings about the Socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. They gave a clear appraisal of all the questions of the revolutionary movement in India and the role of the working class in the national liberation struggle. This was the keynote of the speeches of most of the prisoners.

Only a few of the accused (national-reformist of different shades) were concerned solely with their own defence and sought irrelevant justification.

The trial continued under the National Government.

This change did not affect the fate of the Meerut prisoners and the judicial terror machine of the British imperialists in India proceeded with the trial to the very end. Judge Yorke of the Sessions Court announced the judgement in the Meerut case on January 16, 1933. The court found guilty and sentenced: Muzaffar Ahmed to transportation for life; S. A. Dange, K. N. Joglekar, S. V. Ghate, Philip Spratt and R. S. Nimbkar to transportation for 12 years; Shaukat Usmani, S. S. Mirajkar and B. F. Bradley to transportation for 10 years; P. C. Joshi, Abdul Majid and D. Goswami to transportation for 7 years; A. Prasad, G. M. Adhikari, S. S. Josh and M. G. Desai to transportation for 5 years; G. Chakravarty, Gopal Chandra Basak, Lester Hutchinson, R. R. Mitra, S. H. Jhabwalla and K. N. Sehgal to four years' rigorous imprisonment; S. Huda, A. A. Alwe, R. Kasle, Gauri Shankar and L. R. Kadam to three years' rigorous imprisonment, D. R. Thengdi died in September 1932. Only three of the prisoners were acquitted. Koshonlal Ghose, B. N. Mukerjee and S. N. Banerjee. (*Advance*, January 17, 1933). Moreover the four-year period of imprisonment already undergone was not taken into account.

After the sentences were announced the prison conditions of the Meerut prisoners became entirely intolerable. The prisoners were tortured by constant check-ups, they had no right to beds and were forced to sleep on thin straw mats placed right on the floor; they were compelled to do

hard labour; lug loads, pump water, mill corn or grain, press oil, make ropes. The overseers chosen among the most callous felons were mercilessly beating the prisoners, they were starved. They received no medical assistance, and for a long time the Meerut prisoners were denied the right to read books and newspapers. Only once in three months they were allowed to mail and receive letters from their relatives.

The unprecedented harsh sentence passed by Judge Yorke on the Meerut prisoners stirred up deep anger among the world public. The campaign of international solidarity and protest against the Meerut sentences stirred into actions progressive circles in India, as well as in Britain, France, Denmark, Ireland, Germany, Austria and other countries. It had the support of outstanding writers and scientists: Romain Rolland, Herbert G. Wells, Prof. Einstein, D. N. Pritt and others. The campaign assumed such dimensions that the pressure of public opinion compelled the British imperialists to "correct" the very clumsy work of Sessions Judge Yorke. Acting on the appeal of the prisoners the High Court at Allahabad reconsidered and reduced and in some cases annulled the sentences. Thus, nine of the prisoners were acquitted, five prisoners who had undergone more than 4 years of preliminary confinement were released, and the sentences of the other 13 Meerut prisoners were commuted.

The commutation of the sentences and release of some of the Meerut prisoners were a result of the mass movement of protest which compelled the British imperialists to retreat. It was a great victory for organised international public opinion.

The international campaign of solidarity continued after the announcement of the verdict of the High Court of Allahabad.

At this new stage the movement was concentrated on the demand for the unconditional and immediate release of the remaining 13 Meerut prisoners. The imposing scope and vigour of the international solidarity campaign could not but influence the British Government and the Viceroy of India. Moreover, the authorities had to prepare the political ground in India for the adoption of the new Indian "constitution". This prompted the British authorities in India to make a "noble gesture", and nine of the prisoners were released on November 15, 1933, before serving their full terms.

The remaining four Meerut prisoners sentenced to longer terms were released in September, 1934 and in July 1935.

Thus, the judicial provocation engineered by the British imperialists ended in utter failure.

The mitigation and annulment of some of the sentences by the Allahabad High Court and the subsequent release of the Meerut prisoners before the expiration of the terms, furnished convincing evidence of the utter failure of the whole scheme of playing up the "all-India Communist conspiracy" invented by the authorities.

As conceived by the organisers of the Meerut trial it was designated to weaken the anti-imperialist movement, to disclose a "Communist conspiracy" in India and thereby play a major role in preparing the ideological ground for a new anti-Soviet war.

However, the subsequent development of the Indian labour movement showed that the influence of the Communists had grown considerably as a result of the Meerut trial. At hundreds of meetings held in town and country, in hundreds of resolutions adopted in protest against the tyranny of the British colonial authorities in India, the workers and peasants called the Meerut prisoners their comrades and acclaimed them as heroes of the working class and of the Indian people. These facts indicated that the Meerut prisoners were not alone, that they were backed by hundreds of thousands of workers and peasants. And it was for this reason that the voice of the Meerut prisoners brought forth a powerful response from the people of India as well as beyond her confines.

The speeches of the Communists at the Meerut trial dealt a shattering blow to the national-reformist illusions in the Indian labour movement and assisted in bringing the crystallisation of the Communist Party of India to its consummation.

In September, 1933, when most of the Communists convicted at Meerut were released, energetic activities were launched for the purpose of building up a united Communist Party of India. A provisional Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party was formed already in 1933. Since then the Communist Party of India has been acting as the Party of the Indian proletariat which has firmly taken its place in the vanguard of the fighters for India's national independence, in spite of the government persecutions. Year after year the Communist Party has been bringing increasing sections of the Indian working class under its influence. The Communists have been conducting a successful struggle against the national-reformists in the Indian trade unions.

The Meerut trial was a glaring example of imperialist

justice in a colonial country. By sanctioning the Meerut trial, the British authorities in India and the British Government merely discredited their judicial apparatus in the colonies. The trial also demonstrated the complete unanimity of aim and methods of the Conservatives and Labourites. It helped to expose the fact that from the standpoint of its colonial policy, the British Labour Party is as much of an imperialist party as the party of the diehard Conservatives.

The second Labour Government was also a one hundred per cent "respectable" bourgeois government from the standpoint of its colonial policy. Consistently true to the example of the Conservatives, it continued the policy of splitting the Indian national movement. Thus, in accordance with MacDonald's instructions, the British representatives at the first and second "Round Table Conferences" (1930-31) insisted on a representation in India based on the religious community principle. In vain were the Hindu and Sikh representatives at these conference objecting against the religious community principle of representation as a compulsory practice.

At the same time the Labourite rulers were conscious of the fact that an unduly frank imperialist colonial policy might stir up protest and indignation among the progressive public in Britain and among the rank and file party and trade union followers of the Labourites.

Under pressure of the rank and file, the "left"-wing Labour leaders (Brockway, Maxton and Kirkwood) feigned an opposition to the second Labour cabinet. They repeatedly asked questions in parliament about the fate of the Meerut prisoners. But neither Brockway nor Kirkwood have done anything to lighten the lot of the victims of the frame-up trial. As for the Labourite trade union leaders, Cook and Purcell, they did not even hesitate to resort to foul villification of the Meerut prisoners, accusing the latter of the appropriation of some mythical funds allegedly forwarded by the British trade unions to the Indian trade unions.

At the beginning of the Meerut trial, the Labourite *Daily Herald* wrote that once it has opened, the trial must go on and the machinery of justice must continue its work. (*The Daily Herald*, June 26, 1929).

Thus, under the hypocritical mask of "non-intervention", the second Labour government was actively pursuing a policy designed to crush the revolutionary labour movement in India, regarding the terrorist Meerut trial as one of the means for the achievement of this object. The

following is a very characteristic fact. At the June 12, 1929, meeting of Milner-White's Magistrate Court, the defendants asked the judge for permission to send a telegram to Prime Minister MacDonald. The telegram petitioned for the restoration of the unlawfully abrogated rights of the defendants and for referring the trial to a jury court in Britain.

"Now that British Labour has returned to power," wrote the Meerut prisoners in their telegram, "will Indian labour be restored to its rights? Will the anti-labour legislation be repealed and will the Meerut case in view of its significance for the Indian and international movement be withdrawn from this backward part of the country and referred for trial by jury in the mother country?"

This telegram was never answered.

Petitions for referring the Meerut case for trial by jury were filed again and again, moreover appeals to this effect were sent to the judicial council of the Viceroy of India, to the India Office as well as to the judicial authorities directly concerned with the trial. Objections were also raised to the effect that a case of a "national Communist conspiracy" was not within the competence of the Meerut Magistrate Court, and later, the Sessions Court, (*The Bengali*, May 7, 1929). The justified demand was advanced on the basis of Sections 275 and 443 of the Indian Penal Code, for referring the Meerut case to trial by jury. But all the petitions and demands of the Meerut prisoners were not heeded. The second Labour Government of MacDonald while ostensibly pursuing a policy of "non-interference" with "justice" in India, in reality left the fate of the Meerut prisoners entirely to the discretion of the Conservative Viceroy Irwin. This standpoint of the Labour Government was not fortuitous. Already before the second Labour Government came to power, MacDonald was seeking the political confidence of the British imperialist bourgeoisie; in his speech at a meeting in 1929, he said:

"Let us come to power, I will cut short the criminal work of this organisation (the Comintern) not only in India, but in the whole colonial East."

The second Labour Government was obviously eager to "please" the British bourgeoisie by pursuing its imperialist colonial policy in India.

Furthermore, the second Labour Government did not wish to intervene in the Meerut trial owing to its servile

considerations with regard to its bosses among the British bourgeois oligarchy.

The case of the Communist John Campbell in connection with which the first Labour Government had to resign in 1924, was still fresh in the memory of MacDonald and the other Labour leaders in the second "labour" government.\*

In this connection the liberal *Manchester Guardian* wrote in its leading article on December 9, 1929 that it was quite clear why the Labour Government did not dare to intervene in the Meerut trial. The trial was opened under the Baldwin Cabinet, and MacDonald, who was already once licked as a result of the case of the Communist Campbell (1924), does not want the Communists to cause him more trouble in connection with the Meerut trial. (*The Manchester Guardian*, December 9, 1929).

That this was really the case, was subsequently confirmed in the conversation of N. Hutchinson (the mother of one of the Englishmen accused in the Meerut case) with Drummond Shields, Assistant Secretary for India in the Labour Government. N. Hutchinson asked Mr. Shields to intervene in the Meerut case and stop the prosecution of the innocent Meerut prisoners, and, in particular, secure the release of her son, a young journalist, Lester Hutchinson. Reproached for the complete indifference of the Labour Government towards the fate of the unlawfully prosecuted Indian trade union leaders, Shields replied :

"You can see the position we are in. So what can we do under the circumstances? You know that we have lost our former cabinet owing to the intervention in the

\* The circumstances attending the fall of the first Labour Government are frankly described by Phillip Snowden, a member of the first two Labour cabinets, in his *Autobiography*. In brief the gist of the matter was as follows. In 1924, under the first Labour Government of MacDonald, a Communist by name Campbell was arrested for having written an article urging British soldiers and sailors to refrain from using arms against strikers, and a charge of sedition was alleged against him. The prosecution of Campbell aroused a storm of indignation among the workers. Since there were no grounds for substantiating the charge in the "Campbell case", the prosecution was withdrawn by the Attorney General on direct instructions from MacDonald. This put the Conservatives on the war path. The upshot was a motion for a vote of no-confidence and a decision to hold new elections to parliament. During the election campaign the Conservatives produced the notorious piece of forgery known as the "Comintern letter". Instead of exposing the Conservatives as the authors of this forgery, MacDonald declared a protest to the Soviet Government. As a result of all this the Labour Government had to resign. (Phillip Snowden—*An Autobiography*)

Campbell case, and now we do not want to lose this cabinet owing to the Meerut trial. (*The Bombay Chronicle*, Feb 18, 1930).

The Labour Secretary for India, Wedgewood Benn could of course have stopped the absurd Meerut trial; he could at least have obtained some relaxation of the prison regime and secured more favourable conditions for the legal defence of the Meerut prisoners, but Mr. Benn did nothing of this kind, preferring as a real imperialist to go on with the provocative judicial farce.

This attitude of the Labour leaders to the Meerut trial was correctly qualified by the London Defence Committee as the continuation of the policy of the diehard Conservatives who were in the government before the second Labour cabinet. In one of its appeals to the English workers, the London Defence Committee wrote

"Ever since the Labour Government came to power, all the efforts to secure their release (of the Meerut prisoners—N.S.) or even to guarantee them better conditions for defence, have been fruitless." (*The Daily Worker*, April 1, 1930).

Nor did the attitude of the Labour leaders towards the Meerut prisoners change after the second Labour Government ceased to exist. True, the Labour leaders resorted to increasing manoeuvring. The annual conference of the Labour Party at Scarborough (1931) adopted a resolution on the Meerut trial, denouncing the attitude of the Labour Government towards the Meerut prisoners and demanding their release. Matters were carried so far, that even Mr. Benn himself undertook the role of interpellator with regard to the Meerut prisoners. (*The Bombay Chronicle*, April 11, 1933).

In May 1933, the Labour leaders issued a pamphlet with a pretentious title *Meerut—Release the Prisoners!* In the introduction to this pamphlet Walter Citrine wrote that it was published in the hope that this account of the true facts will awaken the public spirit of the citizens to support the demand for the release of the persecuted men. (*The Daily Worker*, May 31, 1933).

In connection with the publication of the above-mentioned pamphlet, the Communist *Daily Worker* of London commented as follows on the hypocrisy of the Labour Party leadership :

"On reading the pamphlet the workers will wonder why it has been published... Had the second Labour Government wished to do so, it could have stopped the Meerut trial

and released our comrades several years ago. The pamphlet in itself is a complete condemnation of the policy of the Labour Government." (*The Daily Worker*, May 31, 1933)

Speaking in the House of Commons debate on the Indian policy of the National Government, on July 17, 1933, George Lansbury, formerly a member in MacDonald's Labour Government, called the Meerut sentences "very cruel". This former Labour Minister had to explain why a political trial of such significance was arranged by the authorities in so small a provincial town as Meerut. Lansbury recognized that Meerut was selected as the place for the trial precisely in order to avoid a trial of the Meerut prisoners by jury. They were tried in Meerut, he said, in order to avoid complications of a jury trial. No evidence has been presented against them that would prove the organization of a criminal conspiracy. (*The Daily Worker*, December 19, 1933)

This standpoint taken up by Lansbury under pressure of public opinion was not of course, nor could have been a consistent stand. His criticism was not extended to the glaring manifestations of colonial imperialism on the part of MacDonald's "National" Government. The Labour leaders glossed over such facts as the use of armed forces against demonstrations, the proclamation of martial law in India, the sanguinary suppression of Negro uprisings in Nigeria, Gambia, Kenya and in the Union of South Africa, the imperialist terror in the colonies—facts for which Ramsay MacDonald was fully responsible.

It will be remembered that in August, 1931, MacDonald, Snowden and Thomas were expelled from the Labour Party. The expulsion of MacDonald, Snowden and Thomas was to a certain extent intended to show that the Labour leadership had disassociated itself from MacDonald and Co., since their resort to an open alliance with the Conservatives and the Liberals for pursuing the policy of the British imperialist bourgeoisie aroused violent indignation among the rank and file. The expulsion of the former leaders from the Labour Party pursued one object—to rehabilitate the prestige of Labourism in the working class in order to continue in the future the criminal imperialist policy.

The Labour leadership tried to persuade the working class of Great Britain that there was allegedly a definite distinction between the policy of the Conservatives and the policy of the Labourites. In reality, they were pursuing an entirely different course, as is shown above.

The Labourites, as represented by the right-wing leaders—MacDonald, Snowden, Thomas and Benn—who were members of the second Labour Government, and in particular its policy with respect to India and the Meerut prisoners, was vivid evidence of the imperialist essence of this government.

Baldwin's Conservative Government was pursuing far-reaching imperialist aims when it schemed the Meerut frame-up. Baldwin and his colleagues wanted to show that the Communist movement was a menace not only to the British rule in India but to the entire capitalist world. The brazen reactionaries hoped to use the Meerut trial for preparing the ideological ground for an anti-Soviet war. Baldwin furthermore wanted to strike a crushing blow at the successfully developing revolutionary labour movement in India and primarily, at the Communists. In pursuance of these schemes, the British colonial authorities wanted to leave the revolutionary trade union movement without leadership and to intimidate the people in India by the arrests and trial. Along with this, the British authorities wanted to frighten the Indian national bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie which have stirred into a movement since 1927, as well as the peasantry, with the "Communist revolution" bogey. They believed that they would thus be able to make these classes in India more tractable, more inclined to compromise with the British imperialists.

Moreover, the colonial authorities wanted to cut short the assistance of the European and particularly of the British Communists to the Indian revolutionary movement. As conceived by its organisers, the trial engineered at Meerut was to provide a pretext for intensifying the colonial terror in India. The trial was furthermore designated to play the role of an effective election trick in favour of the Conservatives, since parliamentary elections were scheduled to take place in Britain in May, 1929. But these schemes of the Conservatives were not destined to materialise. The people of Britain did not allow the Conservatives to mislead them in May, 1929. They placed faith in the Labour leaders whose election platform contained demagogic promises of far-reaching social reforms. But after the elections, the second Labour Government, composed of the right-wing leaders headed by J. Ramsay MacDonald "forgot" about the election promises of their party. More than this, MacDonald and Co. tried their best to persuade the British bourgeoisie that the Labour leaders are as capable of pursuing an imperialist home and foreign policy, as any "respectable" 100% bourgeois government.

In the two odd years that the second Yabour government was in power, MacDonald, Snowden, Benn and other members of the government pretended that they were not interfering with "justice", letting the terroristic colonial court take care of Meerut prisoners and doing their best to crush the revolutionary movement in India. The Meerut judicial provocation—the unfair frame-up trial of the 31 left-wing trade union leaders in India was carried to the very end. People known to be innocent were convicted on the basis of an "all-India Communist conspiracy" charge trumped up by the police officials. But the net result of this sinister judicial provocation was utter failure. Under pressure of world progressive opinion, the authorities were compelled to commute and subsequently annul the sentences and release the prisoners before their terms had expired.

Thus, the results of the Meerut trial were directly contrary to the expectations of its inspirers and organisers—the British imperialists.

Far from abating the mass popular movement and, in particular, the trade union and strike movement continued with greater vigour after the Meerut trial.

Nor did they succeed in arresting the progress of the Communist movement in India. The year 1933, the very year when the Meerut trial was adjourned, witnessed the foundation of the All-India Communist Party. Thus, the Meerut trial was an important preparatory stage in the formation of the Communist Party of India.

At the Meerut trial the Indian Communists outlined their viewpoint on all the problems of the revolutionary movement in India and the leading role of the working class in the national liberation struggle. In the course of the trial, India's revolutionary proletariat drew a still more distinctive dividing line between itself and the national reformist bourgeoisie. This fact subsequently became a most important prerequisite for the successful achievement of working class unity and of a united national anti-imperialist front built up with the aid and closest cooperation of the Communist Party of India.

As for the Labourites, whose right-wing leaders formed the second Labour Government, they had completely exposed themselves for what they are in the course of the Meerut trial. Their colonial policy in India has shown that the labour leaders are as much of the inveterate imperialists as the diehard Conservatives.

The Meerut trial was of great political significance which has not been lost to date. The Meerut trial belongs

to the class of cases that had stirred the world—such as the Dreyfus trial in France, the Reichstag Fire trial of Dimitrov in Germany, the Sacco and Vanzetti trial and the Mooney trial in the United States.

The international fascist-mongering bourgeoisie is now trying to resort to the reactionary methods employed by the British bourgeoisie in the case of the Meerut prisoners. Suffice it to recall the racket raised around the protocol provocation in Western Germany in 1948, which was played up with truly servile zeal by the right-wing leaders of the German Social Democrats led by Schumacher and the reactionary British Labour leaders, Bevin and McNeil. The same may be said of the provocative judicial persecution of the 12 U. S. Communist Party leaders started by the Wall Street fascist clique in New York, in January, 1949.

The police and security bodies of the reactionary bourgeoisie have obviously not succeeded in inventing anything new since the Meerut trial. Just as at that time, they are making extensive resort to methods of foul inventions, provocations and perjury in an effort to undermine and weaken the democratic and liberation movement of the working people against imperialism. And just as at that time the provocation schemes of the fascist-mongering bourgeoisie are imminently doomed to failure.

## LENINIST-STALINIST TEACHING ON NATIONS AND THE NATIONAL AND COLONIAL REVOLUTION

by V. V. VASSILIEVA

**T**HE activity of the great leaders of the world proletarian revolution, V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin, is linked closely with the theoretical elaboration of the national and colonial question and with the solution of the problem of the national and colonial revolution. The foundations of Leninist-Stalinist national policy are internationalism, international proletarian solidarity, free and equal existence and development of nations, the liberation of peoples oppressed by imperialism. The working out of these very important questions by Lenin and Stalin is a model of creative Marxism. Leninist-Stalinist teachings on the national and colonial revolution represent a vast ideological treasure and an invaluable contribution to Marxist theory and the strategy and tactics of the national and colonial movement. It was an effective and powerful instrument of Bolshevism in the struggle for liberation of the peoples of Russia from national oppression. This powerful weapon was forged in the struggle against Great Russian chauvinism and bourgeois nationalism, against Russian and international opportunists and above all against the Austrian Social-Democrats who were divorcing the solution of the national question from the proletarian revolution.

The works of Lenin and Stalin on the national and colonial question possess a world historic significance. It is already more than forty years since some of these works have been published but they continue to remain vitally important and living even today. They bear a colossal significance for the peoples of those countries where imperialist oppression has not been overthrown, for the peoples of those countries which are dropping out or have already dropped out of the capitalist system through the path of revolution and for the peoples of those countries where the national question has still not been solved. The national policy of the Soviet State which ensures the brotherly friend-

ship of the peoples of the multi-national Soviet Union has been based and is based upon the Leninist-Stalinist teachings on the national question. Comrade Stalin has also brilliantly worked out the theory of the national question in conformity with the conditions of the country of victorious Socialism and the transition from Socialism to Communism.

The Leninist-Stalinist theory of the national and colonial question has dealt and is dealing a devastating blow to the ideology of bourgeois nationalism. The bourgeoisie and its Right Socialist lackeys not only do not seek for a solution of the national question but foment still more discord between nations in order to intensify the national and colonial oppression of imperialism. Founded on the principles of proletarian internationalism, Leninist-Stalinist theory has armed the Communist Parties, all revolutionary fighters, all the toilers of the capitalist, colonial and semi-colonial countries for the struggle for the abolition of imperialist oppression, for the freedom of peoples, for their equality and self-sufficient, independent existence and development.

\* \* \*

The national and colonial question is a constituent part of the general question of the struggle of the working class for the overthrow of imperialism, for the proletarian revolution, for the dictatorship of the proletariat and Socialism. Comrade Stalin said:-

"Formerly, the national problem was regarded from a reformist point of view, as an independent problem having no connection with the general problems of the rule of capital, of the overthrow of imperialism, of the proletarian revolution. It was tacitly assumed that the victory of the proletariat in Europe was possible without a direct alliance with the liberation movement in the colonies, that the national colonial problem could be solved on the quiet, 'of its own accord', off the high road of the proletarian revolution, without a revolutionary struggle against imperialism. Now, we can say that this anti-revolutionary point of view has been exposed. Leninism has proved, and the imperialist war and the revolution in Russia have confirmed that the national problem can be solved only in connection with and on the basis of the proletarian revolution, and that the road to victory of the revolution in the West lies through the revolutionary alliance with the liberation movement of the colonies and dependent countries against imperialism. The national problem is a part of the general problem of the proletarian

revolution, a part of the problem of the dictatorship of the proletariat." (J. V. Stalin: *Problems of Leninism*, Moscow, 1947, p. 61)

The close dependence and inter-relation of the struggle of the proletariat of capitalist countries and the national liberation movement in the colonies lends force and power to the revolutionary movement as a whole. The oppressed peoples of the colonies, the semi-colonies and dependent countries as well as the oppressed national minorities in the capitalist countries are a powerful inexhaustible reserve and an ally of the revolutionary proletariat. The interests of the international revolutionary movement demand that the advanced revolutionary proletariat of the capitalist countries that is steeled in battles should render support and assistance to the national liberation movement of the colonial peoples by trying to utilise most completely this—its most important reserve.

Internationalism is the basis of the international proletarian movement and of its constituent part—the national liberation struggle. The ties of brotherly solidarity cement the fighting peoples of the colonies with the proletariat of the metropolitan countries, with the entire international working class movement in the struggle against capitalist exploitation, for the overthrow of the rule of imperialism which is necessarily linked with the strengthening and extension of the most barbaric forms of social, racial and national oppression. The Bolshevik Party has always trained the working class in a spirit of international class solidarity. The international Marxist-Leninist workers' organisations are a school of class solidarity; they train the workers and draw them in the single channel of the mighty revolutionary movement.

Comrade Stálin wrote:

"The workers are interested in the complete amalgamation of all their comrades into a single international army, in their speedy and final liberation from intellectual subjection to the bourgeoisie and in the full and free development of the intellectual forces of their brothers, whatever the nation to which they belong.

"The workers, therefore, combat and will continue to combat the policy of national oppression in all its forms, subtle or crude, as also the policy of inciting nations against each other in all its forms.

"Social-Democratic parties in all countries, therefore, proclaim the right of nations to self-determination." (J. V.

Stalin: *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, Lawrence and Wishart, 1947, p. 18)

Lenin and Stalin have always pointed out the revolutionary forces and possibilities of the peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies, who are awakening to political life. At the Second All-Russian Congress of the Communist Organisations of the Peoples of the East, which took place in Moscow in November, 1919, Lenin in characterising the advance of the struggle of the workers of the countries of the West against the imperialists and exploiters, said:

"Similar will be the case in the East. We know that here the popular masses of the East will rise as independent participants, as creators of a new life, because hundreds of millions of this population belong to dependent and not completely equal nations, who to this day have been the object of international politics and who have existed for capitalist culture and civilisation only as manure." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Russ. Ed., Moscow, Vol. XXIV, p. 549)

Lenin's brilliant foresight has been completely confirmed. After the Second World War, a powerful national liberation movement of an unprecedented force and sweep is embracing the majority of the peoples oppressed by imperialism. The colonial system of imperialism is undergoing a sharp crisis. Colonial empires, created through decades, are collapsing. A new world of the free peoples of the East is being born. Following the peoples who were liberated by the Russian working class in the course of the Great October Socialist Revolution and who joined the Soviet Union, the Mongolian people, relying on the support of the first state of the victorious proletariat in the world, created a People's Republic, avoided the capitalist path of development and embarked on the high road of building the basis of Socialism. As a result of the world-historic victory of the Soviet Union in the Second World War, thanks to the defeat of imperialist Japan by the Soviet armed forces and the support of the USSR, the great Chinese people won freedom and independence and created the state of People's Democracy. The Korean people liberated from Japanese imperialism by the Soviet Army created the People's Democratic Republic of Korea. All these countries are entering the mighty camp of peace, democracy and Socialism, led by the great Soviet Union. They have taken to the path of a Socialist transformation of their life. The peoples of the East who have been liberated or are being liberated from the oppression of imperialism are advancing on the path of proletarian internationalism.



The peoples of Viet Nam, Indonesia, Malaya, Burma and other countries are fighting with arms in hand for their national liberation. The Soviet Union is the powerful support and reliable ally of the workers of the colonial countries in their struggle for the abolition of colonial slavery and a mighty bulwark of the national independence of all peoples, both big and small. The oppressed peoples see the guarantee of their own liberation in the victories of the Soviet Union. Amir Sharifuddin, the former Prime Minister of the Indonesian Republic who was treacherously murdered by the clique of Indonesian bourgeois nationalists, in expressing the true sentiments of the peoples of his country said: "The USSR is our hope." Louis Taruc, the leader of the organisation of Philippine partisans, the Hukbalahap, affirmed: "We saw what the Soviet policy was in relation to the peoples of Asia. The USSR is the only country which consistently fights for the interests of the Indonesian People's Republic, Viet Nam and other colonial peoples... The Soviet Union is friend of the Filipinos."

The agents of imperialism, the bourgeois nationalists and other reactionaries and traitors of all kinds in the capitalist and colonial and dependent countries, want to lead the liberation struggle of the peoples on to the path of compromise with imperialism, on to the path of national betrayal and treachery. Social-imperialism of the present-day so-called "Socialist" Governments of the West European countries is based on a system of feeding the workers' aristocracy, the top strata of the "Socialist" parties and trade unions with colonial super-profits. The Right Socialists of France, the British Labourites, the "Socialists" of other West European countries who have joined hands in the domination of and act as partners in the exploitation of colonial peoples are at present the watchdogs of imperialism and come forward as gendarmes and stranglers of freedom not only of their "own" but also of other peoples.

Just as in his time the "Socialist" MacDonald who twice headed a Labourite Government ruthlessly suppressed the national liberation movement in the colonies, in the same way today the blood of colonial peoples is being shed at the orders of the "Socialists" Bevin and Attlee. The Labourite leaders come forth as the most active protagonists of the imperialist policy of suppressing the national liberation movement, the policy of colonial exploitation of the peoples of dependent and colonial countries. The criminal activities of the British Labourite Government in Indonesia and in Viet Nam will always go down as one of the blackest and most shameful pages in British Labour history. The French

Minister of Colonies, "Socialist" Moutet, and the former French Premier, "Socialist" Ramadier, instigated the colonial war against the Republic of Viet Nam. It is these French social-traitors who sent troops to suppress the Malagasy insurgents and to annihilate the peaceful inhabitants in Madagascar. Such is the present-day openly imperialist colonial policy of the social-traitors.

The national-reformists of the colonies and semi-colonies, representing the interests of the national big bourgeoisie, have gone over into the camp of imperialism. They are the protagonists of the policy of the most powerful imperialism at the present stage, American imperialism which is trying to establish its world domination, as well as of British imperialism.

Now, more than ever before, it has become evident that the question of the progressive character of this or that movement, the question of the devotion of this or that party to the cause of the liberation of its country is determined by its attitude towards the USSR. The path of fighting colonial peoples lies only alongside the USSR, alongside the international working class movement, in the camp of democracy and Socialism, headed by the Soviet Union.

\* \* \*

The Great October Socialist Revolution has ushered in a new era in the history of all mankind, the era of proletarian revolutions in imperialist countries, 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 creation and the consolidation of the USSR bore testimony to the great force and vitality of the Leninist-Stalinist teachings on the Socialist revolution. Having overthrown the landlords and the capitalists the October Revolution has broken the chains of national and colonial oppression and freed from it, without exception, all the oppressed nations of a vast state.

Comrade Stalin pointed out:

"It is a characteristic feature of the October Revolution that it accomplished these national colonial revolutions in the USSR not under the flag of national enmity and conflicts among nations, but under the flag of mutual confidence and fraternal rapprochement of the workers and peasants of the various nationalities in the USSR; not in the name of nationalism but in the name of internationalism." (J. V. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, Moscow, 1947, p. 200)

The embodiment in life of the Leninist-Stalinist theory on the national and colonial question was of tremendous significance for the victory of the October Revolution. It won the participation of many millions of peoples of various nationalities in the struggle on the side of the revolution. The Russian working class, led by the Bolshevik Party, rallied round itself all the peoples oppressed by tsarism and made them into an effective revolutionary force in the struggle against autocracy and imperialism, and for the creation of a firm multi-national Socialist state based on the unbreakable friendship of peoples united into a single brotherly family.

The victory of the proletarian revolution and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia guaranteed all the necessary prerequisites for a revolutionary solution of the national question and at the same time put forward new tasks in the sphere of the national and colonial question. The *Declaration of the Peoples of Russia* which was drafted by Comrade Stalin and published on November 16, 1917, under the signatures of Lenin and Stalin, proclaimed the equality and sovereignty of the peoples of Russia and also their right to free self-determination to the point of secession and the formation of separate states. This historic document was, above all, aimed at drawing in all the numerous peoples inhabiting our country in the struggle for the retention and consolidation of the power of the proletariat, for the building of Socialism and the liquidation of the virtual inequality of the different nationalities which resulted from their historic development and tsarist oppression. The work of the Party and of Comrade Stalin, its leader on the national policy who headed the People's Commissariat till 1923, was directed towards the fulfilment of these tasks. Comrade Stalin put forward a broad programme of measures, whose aim was the liquidation of the economic and cultural backwardness of the peoples oppressed by tsarism. At the Tenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party (B) in March 1921, Comrade Stalin in his report on the immediate tasks of the Party on the national question said that

"the essence of the national question in the USSR consists in the abolition of the virtual backwardness (economic, political, cultural) of certain nations which they had inherited from the past, and in giving the backward peoples the possibility of catching up with Central Russia both in state, cultural and economic relations." (J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Russ. Ed., Moscow, Vol. V, p. 39)

Avoiding the stage of capitalism, the extremely backward national republics are taking to the path of Socialist construction. The October Revolution created the prerequisites for their successful economic development. Socialist people's economy, the conversion of the means of production into public property made it possible to go over to the planning of national economy both of the entire country as a whole as well as of every individual republic and region that had joined the Soviet Union. In his brilliant works Comrade Stalin pointed out the paths of the construction of Socialism in the Soviet national republics, the path of their inclusion in the general plan of joint construction, taking into account the distinctive features of the economy, culture, way of life and historical development of these republics.

By transmuting the Lenin-Stalin national policy into life, the Bolshevik Party solved the national problem over the vast multi-national country and transformed tsarist Russia—the prison-house of nations—into a fraternal Socialist family of free peoples. In the Soviet Union in this voluntary federation of the republics, national and racial discrimination has been abolished. The Stalin Constitution ensured and guaranteed to all the peoples of the land of the Soviets the possibility of rapid advance towards Communism. Under the leadership and with the assistance of the great Russian people, the formerly oppressed peoples of the borderlands of tsarist Russia passed over from incredible backwardness and ignorance towards Socialist economy, towards an unprecedented advance in the economy, towards the flowering of a culture, Socialist in content and national in form. Year by year, the number of mills and factories is increasing, and the material well-being and cultural level of the toilers inhabiting the numerous Soviet national republics is rising.

In his brilliant work, *Marxism and the National Question* written towards the end of 1912 and the beginning of 1913, which to this day constitutes a programme and guide to action both for the peoples fighting for their liberation from the yoke of capital as well as for the peoples building Socialism and Communism, and also in his other works, Comrade Stalin has pointed out that the rule of the dictatorship of the proletariat is the only rule capable of solving the national question, *i. e.*, a rule capable of creating the conditions that would ensure the peaceful coexistence and brotherly cooperation of various nationalities and tribes. The solution of the national question in the USSR is one of the greatest achievements of our epoch.

The national oppression existing through centuries has been replaced by the great friendship of equal, sovereign peoples—a friendship that has been steered more strongly in the years of the Great Patriotic War.

Comrade Stalin created the only scientific, Marxist-Leninist theory of nations and unmasked the opportunism and insipidity of the scheme of the Austrian Social-Democrats. The Austrian Social-Democrats, the Bundists and the Mensheviks put forward a false conception of nations as an aggregation of individuals united by a community of character without any relation to territory and they propagated the platform of "national cultural autonomy". This platform of "national cultural autonomy", i.e., the right of nations to decide only those questions relating to cultural life, was an opportunist one and exceedingly dangerous for the working class. It separated the question of the class struggle and was directed towards tearing away the proletariat from the struggle against capital. It talked about "the harmony of class interests" and proposed to bring about "freedom of nationalities" without relation to specific territories. This rotten presentation disunited the proletariat of different nations and bound the working class and the toilers of different nationalities to the "native" bourgeoisie and was in practice an expression of extreme bourgeois nationalism.

Comrade Stalin pointed out:

"Bauer's point of view, which identifies a nation with its national character, divorces the nation from its soil and converts it into an invisible, self-contained force. The result is not a living and active nation, but something mystical, intangible and supernatural." (J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, Lawrence and Wishart, 1947, p. 11)

The Leninist-Stalinist teachings on nations which were created already in the pre-October period and which defeated the idealist "theory of nations" propagated by the Austrian Marxists acquired exceedingly great importance in the post-October period and in particular during the years of the Second World War and after its termination when the ideologists of the imperialist bourgeoisie which was going towards its doom began disseminating most sedulously all possible corrupt racial and misanthropic conceptions. The racial ravings of fascism and the misanthropy of the new edition of racism, now being propagated by the Anglo-American imperialists is incomparably more reactionary and aggressive in its essence than the notorious "theory of nations" of the Austrian "Marxists"; they too

are based on anthropological elements of "racial blood" and "racial soul" and set themselves the aim of "justifying" the domination of the imperialists, of "specially chosen nations" over weak nations which are backward in their development.

The imperialists of the USA and Britain pursue a policy of oppressing the peoples of the entire capitalist world. Their henchmen in attempting to "prove" every kind of racial and national inequality in every way have developed under the flag of cosmopolitanism, a campaign against national sovereignty. In order to "justify" the preparations for a new war, which are being made by the American and British imperialists, the worst enemies of mankind, they are preaching the old, worn-out, fascist "ideas" of the contradiction among nations and the domination of one nation over the other, the subservience of peoples to the new pretender for world domination—American imperialism.

Comrade Stalin exposed the misanthropic racial theory of the German fascist obscurantists. After the Second World War, he smashed the racial ravings of the Anglo-American imperialists. With exhaustive completeness Comrade Stalin pointed out that Churchill and his friends in Britain and USA had started the work of instigating a new war with proclamation of a racial theory, i.e., they were following in the footsteps of the Hitlerites.

"The German race theory led Hitler and his friends to the conclusion that the Germans as the only superior nation must dominate other nations. The English race theory leads Mr. Churchill and his friends to the conclusion that the English-speaking nations, as the only superior nations, must dominate the other nations of the world.

"As a matter of fact, Mr. Churchill and his friends in England and the USA are presenting something in the nature of an ultimatum to nations which do not speak English: Recognise our domination voluntarily and then everything will be in order — otherwise war is inevitable!

"But the nations shed their blood during the five years of fierce war for the sake of the freedom and independence of their countries and not for the sake of replacing the domination of the Hitlerites by the domination of the Churchills. Therefore, it is quite probable that the nations which do not speak English and at the same time constitute the vast majority of the world's population, will not agree to submit to the new slavery." (Stalin's interview to *Pravda* correspondent concerning Churchill's speech, March 13, 1946.)

Comrade Stalin gave a clear and classical definition of nations.

"A nation is a historically evolved, stable community of language, territory, economic life and psychological make-up, manifested in a community of culture." (J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, Lawrence and Wishart, 1947, p. 8)

Besides Comrade Stalin emphasised that none of the above characteristics is by itself sufficient to define a nation. On the other hand, it is sufficient for a single one of these characteristics to be absent and the nation ceases to be a nation.

Comrade Stalin pointed to the process of the formation of nations as a historical category belonging to a definite epoch.

Comrade Stalin writes:

"A nation like every other historical phenomenon is subject to the law of change, has its history, its beginning and end." (J. V. Stalin, *Ibid*, p. 8)

Nations were formed in the period of the development of capitalism and there was a time when nations did not exist just as a time will come when there will be absolutely no nations and mankind will be integrated into one international whole.

Comrade Stalin pointed out further that as a result of the development of capitalism there takes place the process of the formation of national and multi-national states, the birth of national oppression which is intensified in particular in the epoch of imperialism, when "capitalism grows over into a world system of colonial oppression and financial strangulation of the vast majority of the world's population by a handful of 'advanced nations'" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Russ. Ed., Moscow, Vol. XXII, p. 179). Colonial oppression and colonial exploitation are inherent in the very nature of capitalism. Imperialism intensified and increased the scale of this oppression and exploitation to an unprecedented degree. Out of the two-and-a-quarter million population of the world, the majority was doomed to terrible colonial and semi-colonial oppression and to semi-starved, miserable existence, deprived of all rights. Besides this, within the bounds of almost every capitalist country, there exist numerous small and big nationalities who are undergoing incredible economic and political oppression by the ruling nations.

It is precisely because of this that the national question, or the question of the struggle against national inequality, against the domination of one nation over others, for equal and independent existence, grows over into the national and colonial question, into the question of the struggle of the oppressed peoples of the world, the peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies for freedom and independence. The epoch of imperialism brought forth the national and colonial question to the forefront of the national liberation struggle in so far as the contradiction "between the handful of ruling 'civilised' nations and hundreds of millions of colonial and dependent peoples of the world" was more and more disclosed and aggravated and became one of the most important contradictions of the epoch of imperialism.

Comrade Stalin revealed the class essence of the bourgeois national movements in the oppressed countries. He exposed the attempts of the bourgeoisie to mask its class interests under the slogans of "national unity", "national traditions" and similar slogans and to make the proletariat and all toilers subservient to it.

To the "theory" of rank bourgeois nationalism which was expressed in the programme of "national cultural autonomy", Comrade Stalin put in opposition the Bolshevik principle of the right of nations to self-determination to the point of state secession. This means that every nation decides the question of its existence as a separate state in conformity with its own tasks and interests and has the right of state secession and the formation of an independent state. But the question of secession, according to Stalinist teaching, must be decided by proceeding from the concrete historical conditions and the practical requirements and expediency of the development of each country. Secession may or may not take place while self-determination of nations is the necessary condition for a Bolshevik solution of the national question.

"Inasmuch as Soviet states are amalgamated into a federation on voluntary foundations, the right to secession remains unused by the will of these very peoples who have joined the RSFSR." (J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Russ. Ed., Vol. V, p. 43)

Moreover, as the friendship and solidarity of the Soviet national republics become more firmly strengthened, these republics do not raise the question of going out of the single fraternal family of peoples forming the Soviet Union but strengthen it all the more as it corresponds to their basic and vital interests. At the same time the number of equal

partners of this voluntary union is growing. New republics are joining the Soviet peoples, the unification of the formerly dismembered Ukrainian and Byelorussian peoples has taken place and the might of the Land of the Soviets grows with every year.

In his work, *The National Question and Leninism*, written in 1929, Comrade Stalin raised the Marxist-Leninist theory of nations to new heights. While only bourgeois nations existed till the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, in the Soviet State are amalgamated new Soviet nations. Comrade Stalin called them Socialist nations. Comrade Stalin wrote:

"The working class and its internationalist Party constitute the force that cements these new nations and directs them, the alliance of the working class and the labouring peasantry within the nation with the purpose of eliminating the relics of capitalism for the sake of the equality and free development of nations and national minorities; abolition of the relics of nationalism for the sake of the promotion of friendship among nations and the affirmation of internationalism; a united front with all oppressed and unequal nations in the struggle against the policy of conquest and wars of conquest, in the struggle against imperialism—such is the spiritual and socio-political aspect of these nations. Such nations should be defined as Socialist nations." (J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Russ. Ed., Vol. II, p. 339)

On the basis of the Leninist-Stalinist national policy, the Bolshevik Party unified in practice the principle of the self-determination of nations, of a complete and all-sided development of every nationality and appraisal of all its national attributes and distinctive features with the principle of proletarian internationalism — the brotherly cooperation of nations. In the Soviet Union the formerly backward nations rose to the level of advanced nations. As opposed to bourgeois nationalism and baneful imperialist cosmopolitanism, which denies national distinctions, national culture, language and national sovereignty, the Leninist-Stalinist theory on the national question proceeds from the necessity of a complete and all-sided development of the culture of peoples, a culture which is Socialist in content and national in form and from the international solidarity equality and friendly cooperation of peoples.

In the Soviet Union all the conditions have been created for an all-sided and full-scale development of new, Socialist nations. These nations are characterised firstly, by profound internationalism and secondly, by a solidarity and friendship

moral and political unity and mutual assistance, which has been brilliantly confirmed by the entire history of the existence of the Soviet Union.

Alongside the rallying together and consolidation of Socialist nations there is going on a process of disintegration of bourgeois nations of the capitalist countries and the subservience of a whole number of nations and peoples to American imperialism. National contradictions and national differences within every capitalist and colonial country are growing; the imperialists are setting one nation against another; bloody national conflicts are becoming more and more frequent. The clearest example of this is India where national and religious conflicts bear an exceedingly sharp character.

Comrade Stalin's teachings on nations bear a world-historic significance. The majority of the countries of the East comprise of multi-national states where the process of the formation of nations stands at different stages of development and where there have always existed sharp national differences, artificially fomented by the imperialist rulers there. The experience of the solution of the national question in the Soviet Union is really invaluable both for the formerly colonial peoples who have been liberated from imperialist oppression as well as for the peoples, still fighting for their liberation.

The Great October Socialist Revolution had a tremendous revolutionising effect on the peoples of the colonies and of the dependent countries. In actual fact, there is not a single country in the world in which the October Revolution did not give rise to growth in the political activity and the awakening to political life of the broad popular masses. It gave faith in the hearts of millions of workers in the possibility of victory over imperialism. The liberation movement that had developed even earlier in many countries of the East increased considerably and rose to a new level. The Soviet Union became the guiding star for peoples fighting for their liberation, it became an inspiring example for them.

From the very first days of its existence and in the course of its entire history, the Soviet Union constantly and consistently supported and supports the struggle for freedom and independence of all colonial and dependent peoples, oppressed by imperialism. Across a number of barriers and cordons, the truth about the Soviet Union—the Soviet Power which has liberated the peoples oppressed by tsarism and which in its home and foreign policy implements the principles of equality of races and nations, respect for the

sovereignty and independence of peoples, recognition of the principle of self-determination to the point of secession and the policy of democracy, peace and international cooperation — has reached and reaches the oppressed peoples.

The Leninist-Stalinist policy of the Soviet State was a powerful revolutionising factor in the struggle of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples.

Comrade Stalin wrote in 1923:

"The call to fight for the emancipation of the nationalities, a call backed by such facts as the liberation of Finland, the evacuation of troops from Persia and China, the formation of the Union of Republics, the moral support openly given to the peoples of Turkey, China, Hindustan, Egypt—this call was first sounded by the people who were the victors in the October Revolution. The fact that Russia which formerly served as a symbol of oppression in the eyes of the oppressed nationalities has now, after it has become Socialist, been transformed into a symbol of emancipation cannot be said to be a mere chance." (J. V. Stalin: *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, Lawrence and Wishart, 1947, p. 188)

Nor is it a mere chance that the names of the great leaders of the October Socialist Revolution and the Soviet State, V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin, are now the names most cherished by the peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies as well as by the peoples of all the countries of the world.

In the measure of the growth of the might of the Soviet State grew also its role in the international arena and the importance of the moral support rendered by it to the small and oppressed nations.

In the years of the Second World War when the armies of the fascist assassins and cut-throats came down upon mankind and attempted to establish their predatory regime of enslavement and misanthropy everywhere, the Soviet Union came forth as the liberator of peoples. Before the eyes of the peoples of the whole world and including those of the colonies and dependent countries, the heroic Soviet people and its army smashed German fascism and Japanese imperialism. This very great victory of the Soviet Union over fascism contributed to the rapid growth of national consciousness of the peoples, oppressed by imperialism and indicated to them their place in the common liberation struggle. These peoples interlinked closely their struggle against fascism with the anti-imperialist struggle for their liberation. In the colonies, the fall in the prestige of the imperialist metropolitan powers — Britain, France, Holland

—who beat a retreat in face of the fascist aggressors without any fight also contributed to the growth in the consciousness of the colonial peoples and to an intensification of their liberation movement.

In the war years the Governments of colonial powers came forth with demagogic promises about the granting of freedom and self-government to the oppressed peoples in order to ensure for themselves the support of the colonies. The USA promised independence to the Philippines, Britain to India, Burma, Transjordan; Holland to Indonesia, etc. However, these promises were soon forgotten after the termination of the war. With respect to the peoples of India, Transjordan or the Philippines, the "independence" they received turned out to be fictitious and only screened the same imperialist oppression and exploitation.

In the postwar period, the basic contradiction between the policy of the Socialist power and the imperialist powers in relation to the oppressed peoples manifested itself more and more sharply. Reality rapidly destroyed the illusions, which the colonial peoples had associated with the creation of the United Nations Organisation. They had hoped that this organ would be able to cut short the attempts of the colonial powers to establish the old regime of oppression in the colonies and to defend them from the aggressive policy of the imperialist states and all the more since, the Charter of the United Nations Organisation included the demand for the equality of rights and sovereignty of big and small nations. However, the bloc of the colonial powers, headed by the USA and Britain, relying on the voting machine subservient to them are managing to solve colonial problems within the bounds of their own narrow interests and are attempting to utilise UNO as a screen for the creation of unions and blocs, directed against the peoples fighting for their freedom.

In opposition to this aggressive policy is the policy of the Soviet Union which is heading the camp of democracy and Socialism, which defends the interests of the whole world and the security, sovereignty and freedom of all oppressed peoples. The Soviet Government ceaselessly and consistently exposes the policy of the imperialist bloc and comes forth in defence of the Indonesian, Egyptian, Syrian, Lebanese and other colonial and dependent peoples. Thanks to the support of the Soviet Union, whose international importance has increased exceedingly as a result of its victory in the Second World War, thanks to its consistent and deeply principled policy in UNO a number of colonial countries have been rendered direct assistance.

The colonial peoples are more and more convinced of the fact that

"the existence of capitalism without national oppression is inconceivable in the same way as the existence of Socialism is inconceivable without the liberation of the oppressed peoples, without national freedom." (J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Russ. Ed., Vol. V, p. 19)

They know of the speeches of the representatives of the USSR in UNO. These speeches reach the most remote corners of the world and meet the earnest gratitude of the oppressed peoples for the determined support to the liberation struggle. The enemies of the Soviet Union, the enemies of peace and democracy, are attempting to undermine the growing sympathy of the colonial peoples for the USSR, are raising heart-rending howls by falsely representing the growing people's liberation struggles as "Communist conspiracies", "machinations of Moscow", etc.

However, contrary to the policy of the imperialists, the very fact of the existence of a mighty power of victorious Socialism, its constant and consistent defence of the oppressed peoples and the support for their struggle for independence and freedom inspires the colonial peoples and raises them in struggle.

"While shaking imperialism, the October Revolution has at the same time created in the first proletarian dictatorship a powerful and open base for the world revolutionary movement, a base such as the world revolutionary movement never possessed before and on which it can rely. It has created a powerful and open centre of the world revolutionary movement such as the world revolutionary movement never possessed before and around which it can now rally and organise a united revolutionary front of the proletarians and of the oppressed nations of all countries against imperialism." (J. V. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, Moscow 1947, p. 202)

The existence of this revolutionary centre facilitates the struggle of the colonial peoples for freedom and independence. They see and know for what they must fight and alongside whom they must march in the struggle.

\* \* \*

The end of the Second World War saw a further aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism, the deepening of the crisis of the colonial system. The national liberation movement of the colonial and dependent countries rose to a new and higher level.

The basic paths and perspectives of the national and colonial revolution have been pointed out and a brilliant analysis of the conditions of its victory is given in the works of Lenin and Stalin. The guiding directives of Lenin and Stalin on these questions are now being embodied in life. In his works, devoted to the development of the revolution in China, Comrade Stalin pointed to two paths of struggle—the path of the national bourgeoisie which at a definite stage in the movement betrays the united revolutionary front and the interests of its people, comes to a compromise with imperialism and along with it fights against the revolution, in order to complete the establishment of the domination of capitalism, and secondly, the path of the proletariat, which pursues the aim of consolidating its hegemony and bringing behind it millions of toilers in order to overcome the resistance of the national bourgeoisie and achieve victory in the anti-feudal revolution and gradually lead it on to the path of the Socialist revolution.

The question of the hegemony of the proletariat in the national liberation movement is the cornerstone of the Leninist-Stalinist teachings on the national and colonial revolution and a decisive question both for its sweep as well as for the direction and the content of the movement as a whole and also it goes without saying for its results. Already in 1920 Lenin pointed out that

"in the initial stages, the revolution in the colonies will not be Communist, but if from the very beginning a Communist vanguard stands at its head, then the revolutionary masses will be brought on the correct path towards the achievement of the set aim by the gradual acquisition of revolutionary experiences." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Russ. Ed., Moscow, Vol. XXV, p. 575)

Historical experience, the experience of the Great October Socialist Revolution showed that the only genuinely revolutionary class, the class which is revolutionary to the end—the working class and its vanguard—the Communist Party alone can give a correct direction to the masses. Comrade Stalin teaches that "the proletariat cannot liberate itself without liberating the oppressed peoples." And further, Comrade Stalin points out:

"It is precisely because the national-colonial revolutions took place in our country under the leadership of the proletariat and under the banner of internationalism that pariah nations, slave nations, have for the first time in the history of mankind risen to the position of nations which are

really free and really equal, thereby setting a contagious example to the oppressed peoples of the whole world." (J. V. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, Moscow 1947, pp. 200-201)

In the liberation movements of the peoples of many colonial and dependent countries leadership in the first stages belonged to the national bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie headed the united anti-imperialist front where it was formed in order to direct the movement in the channel it required, to behead it in the final instance and to utilise this movement for its own narrow, class interests. The history of the national liberation movement of the oppressed peoples is a history of the betrayal of the liberation movement by the national bourgeoisie, it is a chain of betrayals and compromises with the imperialists of the metropolitan country. In the first stage, the working class found itself in the general mass of the fighting people; only gradually it began playing an independent political role and began advancing more and more to leading positions in this struggle. Till the Second World War, almost nowhere with the exception of China, did the colonial proletariat as yet occupy a leading position in the movement, its hegemony did not exist. After the Second World War, the most important and ultimately determining fact of the national liberation movement, the decisive guarantee of its success is that the working class is emerging as the leading force in the liberation movement in the majority of the colonial countries. While formerly the young colonial working class led only individual battles, now it has become in the majority of colonies, semi-colonies and dependent countries the leader (hegemon) in the common national struggle against imperialism, the standard-bearer of the struggle for the freedom and independence of its people. Led by Communist Parties, the working class is the most powerful and the only consistently revolutionary and militant force in the anti-imperialist movement in the colonial world. In many colonial and semi-colonial countries, the Communist Parties, the vanguard of the working class, have become the leading political force in the national-liberation movement. They have been able to unite and organise the fighting peoples on a nationwide scale, to make their struggle more organised and to set before them new aims and to lead them towards the realisation of these aims.

In the years of the advance of the national liberation movement brought about by the victory of the October Revolution in Russia, the Communist Parties in the colonies and dependent countries were still weak and had little

experience; in many countries they had only then been formed. The creation of the Communist Party was closely linked with the formation of a working-class in the colonies, to which, as is well known, the First World War had given a powerful impetus. In the years between the two world wars, the Communist Parties of the colonies grew considerably both numerically as well as organisationally and politically. They became more unified, the ideological and theoretical level of their cadres rose, their political role in the leadership of the national liberation movement became strengthened. The Communist Parties imbibed the teachings of Lenin and Stalin, learnt from the experiences of the Great Communist Party, the Party of Bolsheviks, and they became transformed into fighting parties, traversing the difficult path of revolutionary tempering by acquiring the experience of the struggles and leadership of mass battles, the experience of defeats and of victories. Under their leadership the national liberation movement of the colonial peoples rose to a higher level.

In his scientific works and in practical activities, Comrade Stalin has paid and is paying tremendous attention to the formation of Communist Parties in the countries of the East, to the working out of their strategy and tactics at different stages of the national liberation movement. Comrade Stalin emphasises in particular the necessity of an all-sided study of the concrete and distinctive features of every colonial country for the working out of the tactical line of Communist Parties. He points out that without a study of the definite tactical principles of Leninism, leadership of the revolution in colonial countries is impossible.

- "I have in mind such tactical principles of Leninism as—
- (a) the principle of the necessity of taking into account of the national peculiarities and the national characteristics of each country;
  - (b) the principle of the necessity for the Communist Party in every country of utilising the smallest possibilities of securing mass allies for the proletariat, even if they are temporary, vacillating, wavering or unreliable;
  - (c) the principle of the necessity of taking into account the truth that propaganda and agitation alone are not enough for the political education of millions of the masses but that this demands the political experience of the masses themselves." (J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Russ. Ed., Moscow, Vol. IX, p. 331)

Basing themselves on the principles of Leninist-Stalinist teachings, the Communist Parties of the countries of the



East worked out their tactical line, assumed leadership of the mass movement; they have led and are leading the working class in its struggle for consolidating its hegemony in the liberation movement and dislodging the national bourgeoisie from leading positions. It was precisely this path which has been successfully traversed by the glorious Communist Party of China under whose leadership the world-historic victory of the Chinese People's Democratic Revolution was achieved. The struggle of the peoples of Indonesia, Indo-China for freedom and a whole number of other actions of the popular masses in the colonial countries are also proceeding under the direct leadership of the working class and of the Communist Parties.

The Leninist-Stalinist theory of the national and colonial revolution teaches that the principal problems of the possibility of realising working class hegemony in the liberation movement of the colonies is the problem of an ally—the peasantry. Colonies are agrarian countries with an absolute predominance of the peasant population. The distinctive feature of the colonial peasantry is the fact that its overwhelming majority possesses no land or almost no land. The central figure in the countryside in the colonies is the share-cropper or the peasant-proprietor of a tiny parcelled-out plot, which is not able to provide for the peasant and his family, crushed by want and living from hand to mouth; the multi-million peasantry is the natural ally of the proletariat in the liberation struggle. The numerous agricultural proletariat—the farm labourers—is its ally to an even still greater extent. All these toiling strata, enmeshed in pre-capitalist survivals and ground down by the bondage of usury are deeply interested in radical transformation of the existing order and in the agrarian revolution. They understand all the more that the fulfilment of these tasks, the realisation of their aspirations is possible only in the struggle under the leadership of the proletariat. The peasantry sees its leader and its liberator in the working class.

The national bourgeoisie on its part also fights for the peasantry and hopes to utilise it for its own class interests. But here is the weakest point of the colonial bourgeoisie. The unbearable exploitation of the colonial peasantry can only be abolished through the path of agrarian revolution. The bourgeoisie of China, India and Egypt alike is, through its direct interests, so closely linked with landlordism, with usurious capital, with the exploitation of the peasant masses in general that it comes forth not only against the agrarian revolution but also against any kind of resolute agrarian reform. It fears and not without foundation that even the

open raising of the agrarian question will give an impetus to the revolutionary process of ferment among the peasant masses and accelerate its tempo. Thus, the reformist bourgeoisie wellnigh cannot resolve to approach in practice this fundamentally burning question. The struggle of the toilers in the countryside for land, for human conditions of life and labour, for democratic liberties merges into the single common stream of the anti-imperialist liberation struggle of the colonial peoples, their struggle for national liberation headed by the working class and its Communist vanguard.

Comrade Stalin points to the possibility and necessity during definite stages of the revolution of creating a united national anti-imperialist front in the colonies. Comrade Stalin teaches that it is necessary

“to make a strict difference between revolution in imperialist countries, countries that oppress other peoples, and revolution in colonial and dependent countries, countries that suffer from the imperialist oppression of other states. Revolution in imperialist countries is one thing; in those countries, the bourgeoisie is the oppressor of other peoples; it is counter-revolutionary in all stages of the revolution; the national element, as an element in the struggle for emancipation, is absent in these countries. Revolution in colonial and dependent countries is another thing; in these countries the oppression exercised by the imperialism of other states cannot but affect the national bourgeoisie also; the national bourgeoisie at a certain stage and for a certain period, may support the revolutionary movement of its country against imperialism, and the national element, as an element in the struggle for emancipation, is a revolutionary factor.”

(J. V. Stalin: *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, Lawrence & Wishart, 1947, p. 232-233)

The positions of the national bourgeoisie of the colonies and semi-colonies in relation to imperialism even at the first stages of the development of the liberation movement are not uniform. A section of this bourgeoisie, the so-called compradore or intermediary bourgeoisie, directly serves the interests of imperialism. As regards the national, industrial and in particular the big bourgeoisie, it cannot but express its dissatisfaction with the policy of the imperialists who in every way hinder the development of the productive forces in the colonies. In the measure that its role and importance in the process of industrial production grows and in the measure that it obtains a bigger share in the exploitation of the colonial working class, its appetite increases. It would itself prefer to exploit completely the working class

East worked out their tactical line, assumed leadership of the mass movement; they have led and are leading the working class in its struggle for consolidating its hegemony in the liberation movement and dislodging the national bourgeoisie from leading positions. It was precisely this path which has been successfully traversed by the glorious Communist Party of China under whose leadership the world-historic victory of the Chinese People's Democratic Revolution was achieved. The struggle of the peoples of Indonesia, Indo-China for freedom and a whole number of other actions of the popular masses in the colonial countries are also proceeding under the direct leadership of the working class and of the Communist Parties.

The Leninist-Stalinist theory of the national and colonial revolution teaches that the principal problems of the possibility of realising working class hegemony in the liberation movement of the colonies is the problem of an ally—the peasantry. Colonies are agrarian countries with an absolute predominance of the peasant population. The distinctive feature of the colonial peasantry is the fact that its overwhelming majority possesses no land or almost no land. The central figure in the countryside in the colonies is the share-cropper or the peasant-proprietor of a tiny parcelled-out plot, which is not able to provide for the peasant and his family, crushed by want and living from hand to mouth; the multi-million peasantry is the natural ally of the proletariat in the liberation struggle. The numerous agricultural proletariat—the farm labourers—is its ally to an even still greater extent. All these toiling strata, enmeshed in pre-capitalist survivals and ground down by the bondage of usury are deeply interested in radical transformation of the existing order and in the agrarian revolution. They understand all the more that the fulfilment of these tasks, the realisation of their aspirations is possible only in the struggle under the leadership of the proletariat. The peasantry sees its leader and its liberator in the working class.

The national bourgeoisie on its part also fights for the peasantry and hopes to utilise it for its own class interests. But here is the weakest point of the colonial bourgeoisie. The unbearable exploitation of the colonial peasantry can only be abolished through the path of agrarian revolution. The bourgeoisie of China, India and Egypt alike is, through its direct interests, so closely linked with landlordism, with usurious capital, with the exploitation of the peasant masses in general that it comes forth not only against the agrarian revolution but also against any kind of resolute agrarian reform. It fears and not without foundation that even the

open raising of the agrarian question will give an impetus to the revolutionary process of ferment among the peasant masses and accelerate its tempo. Thus, the reformist bourgeoisie wellnigh cannot resolve to approach in practice this fundamentally burning question. The struggle of the toilers in the countryside for land, for human conditions of life and labour, for democratic liberties merges into the single common stream of the anti-imperialist liberation struggle of the colonial peoples, their struggle for national liberation headed by the working class and its Communist vanguard.

Comrade Stalin points to the possibility and necessity during definite stages of the revolution of creating a united national anti-imperialist front in the colonies. Comrade Stalin teaches that it is necessary

“to make a strict difference between revolution in imperialist countries, countries that oppress other peoples, and revolution in colonial and dependent countries, countries that suffer from the imperialist oppression of other states. Revolution in imperialist countries is one thing; in those countries, the bourgeoisie is the oppressor of other peoples; it is counter-revolutionary in all stages of the revolution; the national element, as an element in the struggle for emancipation, is absent in these countries. Revolution in colonial and dependent countries is another thing; in these countries the oppression exercised by the imperialism of other states cannot but affect the national bourgeoisie also; the national bourgeoisie at a certain stage and for a certain period, may support the revolutionary movement of its country against imperialism, and the national element, as an element in the struggle for emancipation, is a revolutionary factor.”

(J. V. Stalin: *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, Lawrence & Wishart, 1947, p. 232-233)

The positions of the national bourgeoisie of the colonies and semi-colonies in relation to imperialism even at the first stages of the development of the liberation movement are not uniform. A section of this bourgeoisie, the so-called compradore or intermediary bourgeoisie, directly serves the interests of imperialism. As regards the national, industrial and in particular the big bourgeoisie, it cannot but express its dissatisfaction with the policy of the imperialists who in every way hinder the development of the productive forces in the colonies. In the measure that its role and importance in the process of industrial production grows and in the measure that it obtains a bigger share in the exploitation of the colonial working class, its appetite increases. It would itself prefer to exploit completely the working class

and the toiling peasantry. But in the first place, the industrial bourgeoisie of the colonies is as yet weak, and secondly, it is beginning to essay more and more a great fear in face of the growing working class movement and in face of the liberation struggle of the peoples in general. In so far as it sees and knows that the anti-imperialist struggle is intimately linked with the class struggle, which menaces it directly, it slides down more and more to the position of both economic and political collaboration with imperialism and betrayal of the national interests of its people.

As a direct consequence of the Second World War, the victory of the Soviet Union over the fascist aggressors, the postwar international political events and above all the sharp strengthening of the camp of democracy and Socialism, in the colonies and dependent countries the national big bourgeoisie—the upper strata of the military, various financiers and businessmen—all these strata following the feudalists, the landlords and the compradore bourgeoisie have jointly and finally gone over into the camp of reaction and imperialism and represent the bulwark of imperialism in the colonies and semi-colonies. Fear of the loss of their class privileges compels them to yield a considerable part of the surplus value created by the workers and be satisfied with the crumbs which imperialism throws at them, pursuing the aim of disrupting the national front which had been formed during the war years in many colonial countries.

Now we see the open betrayal and treachery not only of the big bourgeoisie of India and of the Kuomintang bourgeois reactionaries, but also of the bourgeoisie of the Philippines, Indonesia, Burma and a number of other colonies and semi-colonies. The national big bourgeoisie of many countries has rapidly taken to the path of betrayal and treachery of the national liberation movement. In many countries, as for example, in India, in Indonesia, it has already become an enemy of its people and is not less, if not more, cruel than the imperialist colonisers.

Marxism-Leninism teaches that the weak development of productive forces, the foreign national oppression and also the existence of powerful survivals of feudalism and pre-capitalist relationships determine the character of the national and colonial revolution as an anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution which gradually grows over into the Socialist revolution. Under conditions of the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism, which is characterised by a sharp aggravation of all imperialist contradictions, including the contradiction between the metropolitan countries

and colonial countries, by a mighty sweep of the national liberation struggle and by the victory of the national and colonial revolution in a number of countries, this revolutionary process develops with a still more rapid tempo.

The national liberation movement which is rising to new heights as a result of the victories achieved by the Soviet Union in the Second World War and on the road to building a Communist society is developing as a struggle for the People's Democratic revolution in the colonies. The successful experience of People's Democratic construction in the Mongolian People's Republic, in North Korea and in China contributes to this. The slogan of struggle for a new, People's Democracy is the most popular slogan of the national liberation movement in the colonies. Under present conditions when there exist the great Soviet Union and the mighty camp of democracy and Socialism, People's Democracy as a form of power fulfilling the functions of the dictatorship of the proletariat corresponds most to the transitional period to Socialism.

It is precisely this form of power which fully corresponds to the interests of the broadest masses of workers of the colonies. The anti-imperialist struggle, the struggle for People's Democracy unites under the leadership of the working class the overwhelming majority of the people including the petty bourgeoisie and certain sections of the middle bourgeoisie. The People's Democratic power is waging a successful struggle for liberation from imperialist oppression and is carrying out genuinely democratic transformations in the economic life and social and political construction and is creating all the conditions for a transition to Socialist construction. Thus, the People's Democratic revolution in the colonies bears above all an anti-imperialist and anti-feudal character. But later on it undoubtedly grows over into the Socialist revolution. The tempo of this growing over depends upon the concrete peculiarities of each colonial country. The stages and the paths of this transition were in the main formulated by Comrade Stalin in his famous theses on the development and perspectives of the Chinese Revolution.

The transitional period in the colonial and semi-colonial countries from complete economic and political bondage and enslavement to economic and political independence and freedom, to Socialist construction will certainly be difficult and different in every one of these countries. It is determined by a combination of many political and economic factors, by the level of the development of industry, the level of the consciousness and organisation of the proletariat and its

Communist vanguard. A decisive and favourable factor, facilitating the transition to Socialist construction in the People's Democracies both in the East and the West is the existence, the assistance and support of the great Socialist State — the USSR — and the further consolidation of the democratic camp over the entire world. The experience of the Mongolian People's Republic and the Korean People's Democratic Republic shows that the direct assistance of the Soviet Union plays a decisive role in the solution of the most acute problems which arise in the process of the development of the states of the People's Democracy.

The brilliant teachings of Lenin and Stalin on the national and colonial revolution arm the Communist Parties, the international proletariat, the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries in the struggle against imperialism for national and social liberation, for independence.

Mao Tse-tung wrote:

"We had to fight internal enemies and enemies from without, enemies inside the Party and outside its ranks. We are indebted to Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin for giving us a weapon to fight with. This weapon is not the machine-gun but Marxism-Leninism. . . . The salvos of the October Revolution brought us Marxism-Leninism. The October Revolution helped the progressive elements of the world, and of China as well, to apply the proletarian world outlook in determining the fate of the country and in reviewing their own problems. The conclusion reached was that we must advance along the path taken by the Russians." (Mao Tse-tung, "The Dictatorship of People's Democracy", **For a Lasting Peace, For A People's Democracy**, July 15, 1949)

The revolutionary events which are unfolding in the colonies and semi-colonies after the Second World War indicate irrefutably that the struggle of the oppressed peoples is being waged under the banner of the great teachings of Lenin and Stalin.

## LESSONS OF STRUGGLE AGAINST THE KOSTOV GANG

Report by Comrade VYLKO CHERVENKOV  
Secretary, Central Committee,  
Communist Party of Bulgaria.

[The newspaper *Rabotnichesko Delo* has published a report given by Vylko Chervenkov, Secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party, at the January plenary session of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party, on "Basic Lessons from the Discovery of the Traicho Kostov Band and the Struggle to Rout It and on Shortcomings in Party Work and Our Tasks."]

IN his report Chervenkov declared that the discovery and rout of the Traicho Kostov spy group was a great success for the Communist Party and the Bulgarian people. A most dangerous enemy agency, skilfully concealed by a Party ticket, had been routed. "Our country," said Chervenkov, has been saved from the terrible danger of sharing the fate of present-day Yugoslavia, of being isolated from the camp of peace, democracy and Socialism, from our great liberator — the Soviet Union — and being thrown to the rapacious claws of the Anglo-American colonisers and their Titoist mercenaries.

"The imperialist plan, the existence of which was established by documents already at the Budapest trial of Rajk and company, viz., with the aid of the treacherous Tito clique to prepare for and bring about the separation of the countries of People's Democracy from the Soviet Union, to establish capitalism in them and make these countries bases for Anglo-American aggression against the Soviet Union, has completely collapsed both in Hungary and in our country. Once more there has been revealed the foul role of the Tito fascist clique as a tool of Anglo-American imperialist aggression.

"The expansionist intentions of the Titoites in respect of Bulgarian territory have been exposed. Without doubt the rout of the Traicho Kostov band is evidence of the strength of our People's Democracy, of the strength of the Commu-

nist Party and of its determination to preserve the loyalty and devotion of our working people to the camp of peace, democracy and Socialism, to the Soviet Union, to defend our national independence and the Socialist road of development of our country.

"The struggle against Traicho-Kostovism still further steels the Communist Party, increases its vigilance, makes it stronger and wiser. The working people of our country are rallying still more closely around the Communist Party. Their political consciousness is growing, their vigilance is increasing. State discipline in the country is strengthening. Evidence of this is to be seen in the vast enthusiasm for labour, the results of Socialist emulation, the new successes in production. Evidence of this is the brilliant victory of the Fatherland Front in the elections of December 18 last year.

"The discovery and rout of the Traicho Kostov band is a fresh defeat for the imperialists, the instigators of a new war, the violators of order and tranquillity in the Balkans and in Europe.

"It would be an impermissible mistake, however," said Chervenkov, "for us, as a Party, to restrict ourselves merely to noting this correct fact. We were able to smash the treacherous Traicho Kostov group. In this respect the Party leadership was fully equal to the situation.

"But it has to be recognised," Chervenkov stressed, "that for us Traicho-Kostovism was a surprise. How did it come about that the Bulgarian Communist Party, which smashed its overt enemies, beginning with the American spy Gameto and ending with the espionage group of evangelical pastors, was unable for a long time to expose Traicho Kostov and his accomplices camouflaged inside the Party?"

"Ours is an old Party. It has had no little experience of struggle against anti-Party tendencies and groups. Our Party had—and should always bear in mind—the wealth of world historic experience of struggle of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks) against hostile tendencies and groupings. It knew of the experience of the struggle of the CPSU (B) against the Trotskyist-Bukharinist spies and wreckers. We have studied and are still studying Lenin and Stalin.

"Lenin and Stalin teach, and the experience of the CPSU (B) the experience of the international working class movement, fully confirms their teaching, that the enemy resorts to diabolical efforts and every kind of cunning, in order to penetrate into the ranks of the Communist Party, in order to corrupt it from inside, to strike blows at it from

inside; that the enemy is particularly ferocious after the Communist Party comes to power, that it then begins to make particular efforts to mask itself, to engage in double-dealing, to lie, to twist and turn in order to climb into and consolidate itself in the most responsible posts, to wreck as skilfully as possible, to strike its blows at moments most difficult and dangerous for the Party.

"We knew this. We knew also that the enemy strives to make use first and foremost of unstable elements in the Party, of those elements who in any degree have deviated from the Party line, taken part in anti-Party groups adopted Trotskyist, Left-sectarian and other anti-Party stands.

"How is it to be explained that the Central Committee of the Party was unable for so long to recognise the true nature of Traicho Kostov and his adherents?"

Chervenkov pointed out that "there existed warning signs and alarm signals that all was not well with regard to Traicho Kostov. In the Central Committee of the Party they were known. This cannot and should not be denied. But for a long time attention was not paid to them, they did not serve as a reason for raising the question of Traicho Kostov's true features.

"Our political sense, our revolutionary vigilance, were not up to the mark. We should fully recognise these weaknesses, these mistakes of ours. We should see them and recognise them to the full. We did not take clearly into account the inevitability of a sharpening of the class struggle as our offensive against capitalist elements continue, and we did not opportunely adopt all measures to prepare the Central Committee and the Party as a whole for the new forms of struggle our enemies were using against our Party and the People's Democratic Government.

"It has to be admitted that after September 9, 1944, there existed among us for a long time, and weighed heavily on the whole of our practical work, the idea for a special, almost original, road of development for our country which, one fine day, would lead us to Socialism. This idea originated in the supposition that after September 9 the class struggle would die down more and more that unlike the Soviet Union we would be able to pass to Socialism without proletarian dictatorship, painlessly, as it were organically, by virtue of a simple quantitative and gradual growth of our successes. Hence the necessity of collaborating with representatives of the bourgeois class who, after September 9, has allegedly become tamed to Socialist construction,

their peaceful transition, so to speak, to Socialism had begun.

"At the 16th plenary session of the Central Committee of our Party, Comrade Georgi Dimitrov condemned and criticised this idea as harmful and dangerous. The existence of the idea of a sort of special road to Socialism in Bulgaria, differing from the road to Socialism of the Soviet workers and peasants, could naturally not promote a real and full preparation by the Party for an intensifying class struggle, for an increase in revolutionary vigilance and the ability to recognise enemies no matter behind what mask they operated. On the contrary such a situation helped to dull the vigilance of our people. It gave enemies an opportunity of digging in and using new forms of struggle against us.

"We considered that our Party was, in substance, insured against such an infection as nationalism. We were unable earlier to recognise that after the rout of bourgeois opposition, after nationalisation, the chief danger for us was not our overt, but our covert enemy, the enemy with the Party card.

"We had no idea previously of this danger and, therefore, were caught unawares by Traicho-Kostovism, failed to notice it. We did not draw all the conclusions from the circumstance that after September 9, the doors of the Party were thrown wide open to everyone. Traicho Kostov was an ardent defender of wide-scale acceptance into the Party of new members, acceptance without any restrictions. We know that people were accepted as members of the Party without any demands being put on them, and sometimes simply at public meetings. Therefore, side by side with honest and devoted people, casual, unstable, rotten and careerist elements joined the Party. Enemies, too, joined the Party. It is now perfectly clear that internal and external enemies from imperialist intelligence staffs did not fail to take advantage of our hospitality and sent their people into the ranks of our Party.

"Our appeals for vigilance, for struggle against enemies, could not be sufficient and always effective, since we regarded as enemies only those who openly, at the time, raised their hands against us. We sought enemies primarily and chiefly outside the Party. We did not persistently and daily with the necessary consistency, educate our Party and people to understand that the farther we progressed, the more ferociously the enemy would seize upon the foulest ways and means, and resort to all kinds of manoeuvres and cunning, to the most subtle forms of camouflage.

"We knew that this is how it was in the Soviet Union. We knew about this, but considered that our country would be an exception, that it would not follow the same road, that here this would not be repeated. Despite the fact that, from the experience of the entire international working class movement, we knew of the undeviating endeavour of the bourgeoisie to corrupt the Communist Party by sending provocateurs into it, by recruiting, when the situation was difficult, unstable elements as spies, we failed, after September 9, 1944, when after two decades of fascist dictatorship our Party emerged from underground conditions and stood at the head of the State, to subject our Party cadres to a serious check-up, from bottom to top and from top to bottom.

"In the light of the lessons of the struggle against Traicho-Kostovism, we particularly clearly see our weaknesses, shortcomings and mistakes. First and foremost one should mention that, for a long time after September 9, incorrect and unsuitable methods of work existed in the Central Committee of the Party and its Executive and permanently operating organ—the Political Bureau—a point to which Comrade Georgi Dimitrov had drawn the Party's serious attention at the Plenum of the Central Committee.

The Party leadership lacked the essential collegiate system of work, and, as a consequence, the Central Committee and its Political Bureau were not all-round, wholly authoritative leaders of the political, social, economic and cultural life of the country.

"Our Central Committee hardly possessed, and still does not fully possess, the necessary apparatus. Thus is by no means accidental! It is the direct consequence of a definite underestimation of the role of the Central Committee.

"Until recently the Central Committee hardly occupied itself seriously with questions of Party building, of regulating the social composition of the Party, of the work of the separate Party organisations. It is clear that in such a situation the experience of the Party organisations is by no means sufficiently taken into account and the connection between the Central Committee and the Party organisations is not what it should be, while internal Party democracy is not observed in proper measure and criticism and self-criticism, despite our appeals, remain at a low level.

"On the other hand not enough attention was always paid to the Central Committee and its decisions. For many of our public, State and even Party organisations, the Central Committee of our Party is, in effect, only one of many existing leading bodies. It is a frequent phenomenon with us

that a member of the Central Committee — a member or other responsible official—decides certain questions himself without asking the opinion of the Central Committee. Such a practice is foreign to Bolshevism, foreign to Leninist-Stalinist methods of work, but there were cases of it in our country and there still are.

“As a result of the practice of not observing collegiate methods in the work of the Political Bureau and the Central Committee, such harmful facts proved possible as the arbitrary reduction by two-thirds of State deliveries on the part of the Minister of Trade, as against the figure stipulated in the Government plan for the year 1949, as the arbitrary permission given by the Chairman of the Planning Commission in 1947-49 for building work costing thousands of millions.

“In the face of such practice it is not surprising that Traicho Kostov cunningly weaved his counter-revolutionary net, collected together his band, secretly harmed us and demoralised our ranks, and even succeeded in getting some of his wrecking plans and intentions put into official decisions. In the face of such a practice it is not surprising that the notorious Committee on Economic and Financial Questions constituted under the Council of Ministers actually became a second Government, that many questions were decided not only without the Political Bureau, but without Comrade Dimitrov, behind the back of Comrade Dimitrov, our teacher and leader. In the face of such a practice it is not surprising that we were unable quickly to find the ends of the threads of the plot, to recognise earlier the true nature of Traicho Kostov, to discover and liquidate his band, the wrecking activities of the Ivan Stefanovs, Petko Kunins, and their like.

“What follows from this? It follows that we, members of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee, bear before the entire Party responsibility for the fact that for a long time harmful, non-Bolshevik methods of work existed and were tolerated in the Party leadership and facilitated the activities of the enemy, and made it impossible earlier to discover and eliminate these activities. It follows that we must once and for all recognise the harmfulness of every violation of collective work in the Party leadership, of every underestimation of the Central Committee. Not a single decision important for our country must be adopted, not a single action of importance for our Motherland and our working people must be undertaken without the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party, without its agreement and confirmation.

“This should become the iron rule for everyone. In the work of the Central Committee of the Party, apart from violations of the principle of collegiate methods, certain elements of liberalism, mutual condonation, complacency have still not been completely overcome. We are frequently guided by rotten non-Party considerations: the comrade should not be hurt, he must not be let down, the man, after all, has rendered good service in the past and so on and so forth. But this practice is not Bolshevik and it is dangerous. It is all the more dangerous if one bears in mind that we are the Party in power in the country, that our example is followed and should be followed by all other organisations, all working people, and that for every one of our mistakes, for every one of our omissions, the working people pay and bear on their shoulders the consequences of our mistakes and omissions.

“The attitude of the Political Bureau, for example, towards the frequent mistakes and weaknesses of Dobri Terpeshev as a leader, was impermissibly lenient. The Political Bureau limited itself to reprimands, warnings and persuasions in its own close circle. In his work as Chairman of the State Planning Commission, Dobri Terpeshev made many serious mistakes. Immediately before the Fifth Party Congress, after the anti-Soviet activities of Traicho Kostov had become known, Dobri Terpeshev declared in the Political Bureau that he knew about Traicho Kostov's directives to conceal from the Soviet Union the prices obtaining in our trade with capitalist countries. Before that he had never come to the Political Bureau and told us about this directive.

“Did we bring Dobri Terpeshev to book? Did we punish him? Was he criticised anywhere? Did we get him to make any self-criticism, to account for the reasons why he has acted in that way? No, we did not. And the Party does not know to this day why he acted in this way. In this case, too, we tolerated and forgave Dobri Terpeshev—at the expense of the Party and the State, at the expense of the correct training of cadres. How many times was Dobri Terpeshev found guilty of not keeping a secret, of talking about affairs which should not have been talked about? Did we punish him, did we kick him for it? No, we tolerated and forgave him; we spared him. But is it not clear that such a practice is rotten and harmful, that we must once and for all put an end to such harmful liberalism and cauterise it with red-hot iron? Is it not clear that such a practice can only serve the enemies of our Party?

“Such liberalism was shown not only towards Dobri Terpeshev. We have to admit that there existed, and still

exist, big shortcomings in the work with cadres, and this, it is perfectly obvious, provided a favourable atmosphere for the activities of well-camouflaged enemies.

"First and foremost note should be taken that over a prolonged period there existed indecision on the question of promoting new people to the leadership of the Party and the State, new cadres from the ranks of the working class — just as though our new leading cadres ought to drop from the sky ready-made and with a knowledge of their business! Certainly we should have used, and still use in our national economy the old experts, educated in the bourgeois spirit, and help them to educate themselves anew and join in the common cause of Socialism. But in this, I think, we made a serious mistake; we had an uncritical approach to using certain old specialists and made it appear that they were "one of us", and we trusted them too much; not only did we trust them too much, but we allowed them to be all-powerful leaders in a number of decisive branches of our national economy; we were not everywhere able to put alongside these experts our own loyal workers who, although they had not as yet become specialists, could, on the one hand, have exercised control over them and, on the other, have rolled up their sleeves, gone in for study and in a short space of time have themselves become experts.

"We were behindhand with raising and solving the problem of training specialists of working class origin for the various branches of our economy, for the economic and State leadership. It is sufficient to recall that only last year the law on higher education established that only sons and daughters of the working people have the right to be educated in higher educational institutions. As yet we have not solved the task of training specialists of our national economy, for the State administration, from among people of working class origin. The verification of Party cadres, attentive study of Party workers, care for their growth, their correct development and timely criticism of their shortcomings, for timely assistance to them — this very important part of the work of the Party's leadership is still on a low level in our country.

"The work of the cadres department of the Central Committee and the cadres departments in the Party is in general unsatisfactory. It proceeds formally. That is why the Central Committee was unable to expose in good time all those who were concealing from the Party their previous actual behaviour before the police, their connections with the police and their undertakings to serve the fascist organs of 'public security' and foreign intelligence.

"The trials in Budapest and Sofia demonstrated that in his activities the enemy is relying in particular on former Trotskyites, members of factions, Right-wing opportunists, Left-sectarians as well as on people who for many years lived in Western capitalist countries. These people ought always to be studied attentively. People of whom it is not known, or not quite definitely known, whether they have broken with their anti-Party past should not be put forward for responsible work. Had there been a correct studying of cadres by our Central Committee, we could have exposed the presence of provocateurs and bandits earlier.

"The conclusion must be: decisive reorganisation and improvement of the cadres' work in the Party and the Central Committee.

"We had another weakness comrades, which enabled enemies to remain disguised for a long time. I have in mind the attitude towards alarm signals, towards various warnings received by the Central Committee. Not always did we treat the incoming signals with sufficient attention. Lack of regard for warning signals is a great mistake. It bars our way and deprives us of the opportunity to liquidate serious dangers and failures. We must learn the lesson and radically change our attitude towards warning signals received from Party organisations, from Party members, from the working people.

"The main weakness, emphasised in particular by Comrade Georgi Dimitrov at the 5th Congress of our Party, which has not yet been overcome is our theoretical weakness. Of course, the main thing is the correctness of the Party's general line, its policy. The general line of our Party, its policy, are correct. But the realisation of that policy must be strengthened by a profound Marxist-Leninist analysis of the changing circumstances, of the ways and means of our advance towards Socialism. Theoretical knowledge and theoretical maturity of Party leaders are a vital necessity for enabling them successfully to implement the correct policy.

"Comrade Dimitrov noted that our theoretical generalisations are in many respects of an incidental character, that our theoretical thought considerably lags behind practice, that we were unable sufficiently to apply Marxist-Leninist teaching to our conditions, that in many important cases we failed to do everything necessary to secure its correct application.

"The reason for this lies in the absence of systematic collective discussion and solution of problems in the Political



Bureau and in the Central Committee, and in an underestimation of the necessity of a collective theoretical Marxist-Leninist elaboration of fundamental problems of our policy.

"We, members of the Political Bureau and of the Central Committee, are responsible for the weaknesses and shortcomings I have mentioned, which explains our failure to expose Traicho-Kostovism earlier.

"We, members of the Central Committee, Ministers, all of us, are personally responsible for the sectors of the national economy, and of state construction which are under our direct administration. The Central Committee, the Party and the working people of our country must demand from everyone of us an account of how we have worked and are working. None of us can hide behind the Central Committee, behind the Political Bureau.

"There are, however, two spheres where, in view of Traicho-Kostovism it is essential to demand particular exactitude, where it is essential to demand the greatest responsibility. I have in mind the work of guaranteeing state security and of the administration of the national economy.

"We have a right to ask: How did the Ministry of the Interior work before? Why was a Traicho Kostovite anti-Soviet directive disseminated in economic ministries and their organs? And why had there not been any alarm signal from the Ministry of Interior? How did it happen that foreign spies infiltrated into the organs of State security and into responsible posts? How did they get there? Comrade Yugov has been Minister of the Interior for over four years. Consequently he is personally responsible for this state of affairs.

"Traicho-Kostovites inflicted the greatest damage in the economic field. Comrade Dobri Terpeshev was Chairman of the Supreme Economic Council. Why did Comrade Dobri Terpeshev not sound the alarm? How did it happen that he, a member of the Political Bureau, knowing about Traicho Kostov's instructions, failed to come to the Political Bureau and give information about that instruction?

"Dobri Terpeshev must account to the Central Committee of the Party for his work in the State Planning Commission, must explain to what degree he is responsible for the damage inflicted upon the national economy as a result of the absence of real leadership of the Planning Commission. Comrade Dobri Terpeshev must say whether he guarded the country's state interests as a Bolshevik, as a member of the Political Bureau entrusted with the leadership of the Planning Commission ought to have done. Is it

not a fact that under his Chairmanship the Planning Commission — without asking anybody — obviously gave its blessing to the lowering of plans, and on the other hand sanctioned the expenditure of thousands of millions without the existence of any drafts and estimates, ratified by the Political Bureau and the Government? Who then is the main culprit of squandering and embezzling materials and means and in their freezing?

"Why was money circulation not planned in our country? Why did the Planning Commission not even raise this question? Who is responsible in the first place for distortions in the plan for the turnover of goods? for wages' funds? for those ugly things exposed at stock-taking? Who is responsible first and foremost? Who has the account first and foremost for the absence of real statistics, without which we are as without eyes and without hands?

"These are vital questions, questions of life and death for our economy. Certain people want to seize on the considerable successes, achieved beyond doubt despite the wrecking acts, and which testify to the viability of the People's Democratic system, to the great selflessness of our working people. Certain people want to seize on the successes and gloss over the enormous damage inflicted on the economy intentionally and unintentionally. This cannot be tolerated. We can liquidate the disruption and secure the economic advance of the country only if we resolutely crush the wreckers, unhesitatingly remove complacent leaders who are not standing, but 'lying' on the positions of Marxism, who are not leading, but enjoying their leading posts, and if we put in their places businesslike people who are conscious of their responsibility. There should not be any hesitations in this respect!

"The Political Bureau of the Central Committee, overcoming the weaknesses and shortcomings mentioned, gradually freeing itself of incorrect methods of work and having unmasked the true face of Traicho Kostov, has exposed his vile spying gang and organised its rout. The staff of Traicho Kostov's gang has been utterly routed and all measures taken to complete the exposure of Traicho Kostov's conspiracy. The blows upon that conspiracy will not cease until its complete liquidation throughout the country, wherever its traces might appear. The rout of Traicho-Kostovism means and must mean the merciless, shattering rout of the foreign capitalist agencies in our country.

"We must cleanse, and will complete the cleansing, of the Party, the State apparatus, public organisations and the entire country, of any enemy nests. The working people of

our country welcome with relief the resolute struggle against the enemies of the people. They are relieved to see that our Central Committee holds the banner of Comrade Georgi Dimitrov firmly in their hands.

In a further section of his speech, Vylko Chervenkov outlined the tasks of the Bulgarian Communist Party and stressed the need to strengthen the Central Committee of the Party, to assure the collegiate character of its work.

"It is essential," he said, "to strengthen firm adherence to principle, without toleration of compromises and concessions, never to be content with achievements, to be irreconcilable towards shortcomings, never to forget the responsibility before the people and the Fatherland.

"In the present circumstances, when we are responsible for the State, for the people's struggle, when we are laying the foundations for Socialism, one cannot lead without knowledge, without mastering the teachings of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin. To build successfully, it is essential to master science. It is necessary for us, members of the Central Committee, to learn from books, from life, from the people and first and foremost to learn from the world-historic experience of the great Soviet Union.

"To strengthening the collegiate work of the Political Bureau and the Central Committee, it is necessary simultaneously to augment personal responsibility. The Central Committee must be monolithic. It is essential to put an end to every kind of disharmony, to put an end to arbitrary actions. The Central Committee is responsible for everything in our country. It holds in its hands the destiny of the people and of the State. It must take all measures to work in an exemplary way.

"One of the main tasks is the consolidation of the Party, the development of inner-Party democracy, the launching of criticism and self-criticism, the heightening of revolutionary vigilance.

"We must radically change the methods of the Central Committee's leadership of Party organisations. It is necessary to eliminate the last vestige of any kind of leadership by command. Collegiate work must be inculcated in all our leading Party organs, not only in the Central Committee.

"Elements of leadership by command are doubtless more substantial in district and local leading organs of the Party. These elements of leadership by command must be entirely eliminated.

"To consolidate the Party means to observe inner-Party democracy with still greater persistence. It is necessary to develop criticism and self-criticism within the Party,

without respect for persons. Without the widest criticism and self-criticism it is impossible completely to eradicate Traicho-Kostovism from the Party. Without criticism and self-criticism it is impossible to strengthen the revolutionary vigilance of the Party. It is necessary to act firmly and mercilessly against everyone who to any degree hampers criticism, who strangles criticism within the Party."

Comrade Chervenkov dealt on the important role of the Party press in developing criticism and self-criticism, and spoke of the significance of worker and peasant correspondents. "Comrade Stalin teaches", he said "that in order that leaders should not forget themselves, they should not cut themselves off from the masses and the masses from them, criticism and self-criticism are essential....

"Comrade Stalin teaches that criticism and self-criticism from below must be launched, that leaders must listen to it with attention.

'It is one thing,' says Comrade Stalin, 'when a dozen or two leading comrades are looking out for and noticing shortcomings in our work, while the mass of the workers do not want or are unable either to look out for or notice shortcomings. There is every chance then that there will certainly be oversights and not everything noticed.

"It is a different story when, together with a dozen or two leading comrades, hundreds of thousands and millions of workers are looking out for and noticing shortcomings, exposing our mistakes, drawing themselves into the cause of construction and outlining the ways for improving the work. There will then be more guarantee that no surprises will occur, that negative phenomena will be noticed in time and measures for the elimination of such phenomena will be taken in good time,' (Stalin, *Collected Works*, Russ. Ed., Vol. II, pages 35-36)

"With the help of criticism and self-criticism the working class is learning to administer the country, economy and industry. In order for it to learn how to administer, it is necessary to give scope to the forces and capacities of the working class, to criticise our mistakes and shortcomings.

"And what does it mean to criticise mistakes in order to remove them, to improve the work, and advance it? This calls for the active participation of the working class in construction work, in the administration of the country, and the growth of its consciousness that it is the master.

"This is a very important condition, comrades, one must fight ruthlessly against bureaucracy, against that bourgeois-aristocratic, obtuse and soulless attitude towards human

beings — in the Party, trade unions, in the State apparatus and economy—everywhere.”

Speaking of the need for struggle against bureaucracy, Chervenkov recalled Stalin's words that

“In arousing the fury of the masses of toilers against bureaucratic distortions in our organisations, it is sometimes necessary to hurt some of our comrades, who rendered services in the past, but are suffering at present from bureaucratic diseases.” (Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. II, p. 73)

“It is necessary to organise and develop mass criticism from below”, Chervenkov said.

“We must tell our workers and all working people of our country: Criticise! Criticise courageously and openly the ulcers and shortcomings in our work! Don't be afraid to criticise! Don't hesitate to criticise on the grounds that you are unable to express yourself with refinement and precision! It is sufficient to speak honestly and conscientiously and to have the desire to help—criticise the weaknesses, don't become reconciled to them, don't ignore them! Nobody will suffer for making such criticism! Anybody who hampers criticism, anyone who stifles criticism, can and must suffer!

“Criticism from above—the criticism which we leaders ourselves carry out—is not enough. It is essential, but it is not enough. Criticism from below is essential. Criticism from below is the most important matter for us at present.

“Criticism and self-criticism constitute the specific Bolshevik method for the education of cadres. In our popular-democratic setting criticism and self-criticism are one of the fundamental driving forces. Hence our main task is: To develop the widest possible, healthy and nationwide criticism and self-criticism. This is called for by the radical interests of the working people, by the interests of Socialism. That is what Comrade Stalin teaches.

“A most important task in the struggle for the consolidation of the Party,” Chervenkov noted, “is to raise the ideological-political Marxist-Leninist level of Party workers and rank and file Party members.

“It is particularly important to organise work for self-education among members of district and local committees, our leading cadres must master Bolshevism in the process of practical work and become not only well versed in Marxism, but also highly-cultured, politically-tempered and mature leaders, capable of orientating themselves independently in international and internal conditions. The future of our Party and of our country depends on it, comrades.

“We must purge our Party of enemies and doubtful elements who infiltrated into it and have taken root. We have not yet finished with Traicho-Kostov within our Party. It is essential to check up on the Party cadres, beginning with the Central Committee and ending with the leadership of the primary organisations. During the checking, we must be particularly exacting and severe towards those who in the past took part in factional anti-Party groupings within the Party. But the check-up should not be indiscriminating or general, but strictly individual. There must be very sharp revolutionary vigilance towards our enemies in the Party at the present time.

“The building of Socialism is being carried out in conditions of sharpened class struggle. The class struggle will not die down but will become more acute. Capitalist elements, sinking to the depths, resist frenziedly. They enjoy the support of Anglo-American imperialism. Unceasing vigilance within the Party is as essential as air. One must fight mercilessly against any kind of self-complacency, against any underestimation of the necessity for the most intense vigilance towards the enemies of people's power and of our Party.

“It is necessary to declare war on complacency, on a conciliatory attitude towards shortcomings. It is necessary to struggle mercilessly against petty bourgeois philistine vestiges, lack of principle, and sycophancy.

“The enemy is alive, he has not been finally destroyed in our country. The conditions which encourage our enemies have not yet been liquidated. The enemy is active. By destroying the Traicho Kostov conspiracy we inflicted a shattering blow on the enemy. Now it is a question of depriving him of the opportunity of rearing his head again. It is necessary to destroy him permanently.

“Nationalism and nationalist manifestations must be eradicated as a hostile, fascist ideology, wherever they may appear. Nationalism manifest itself in hostility towards the Soviet Union, in belittling its successes, in non-recognition and denial of the world-historic experience of the Great October Socialist Revolution as a model and example for workers and working people throughout the world, in over-estimation of one's own strength and successes, in under-estimation of the strength and success of others, in denial of international proletarian solidarity.

“Nationalism is an ideology of treason towards the camp of peace, democracy and Socialism. Nationalism means a Party's degeneration into a bourgeois counter-revolutionary Party.

"Nationalism is betrayal of the Motherland, Traichokostovism is Bulgarian nationalism, betrayal of Socialism, betrayal of Bulgaria."

Chervenkov emphasised that this band of traitors was exposed in good time and routed thanks to the assistance of Comrade Stalin and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), for which the Bulgarian Communist Party is boundlessly grateful to Comrade Stalin and the Bolshevik Party.

He also noted the great importance of the resolution adopted by the Conference of the Communist Information Bureau in June, 1948.

"We must", Chervenkov went on to say, "strengthen, expand and guard as the apple of our eye, Bulgarian-Soviet friendship, educate the Party in the spirit of proletarian internationalism which today finds its most striking expression in friendship with the Soviet Union, the mighty stronghold of victorious Socialism, in loyalty and devotion to the Soviet Union, and to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks) and Comrade Stalin.

"We must educate and train the Party with more energy, by deeds, not words. To the very end and under all circumstances, the Party must be loyal and devoted to proletarian internationalism, to the Soviet Union, to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), to our great and beloved teacher and leader—Comrade Stalin.

"We must remain true to the behests of Comrade Georgi Dimitrov. In his report at the 16th plenary session of the Central Committee Georgi Dimitrov said:

"We frequently overlook the fact in our country that, although the Communist International no longer exists, the Communist Parties constitute a united international Communist front under the leadership of the Party of Lenin and Stalin, the Party which is the most powerful and steered in the struggle against capitalism and in the building of Socialism; and that all Communist Parties have the one and only scientific theory as a guide to action—Marxism-Leninism—and that all of them have a common leader and teacher, recognised by all, Comrade Stalin—the leader of the glorious Bolshevik Party and of the great country of Socialism."

"To strengthen the Party means to regulate correctly its social composition. We must now admit new members into the Party mainly from among the workers, from among shock-workers who have distinguished themselves in production or who make suggestions for rationalisation, as well as from among the ranks of toiling peasants.

"To strengthen the Party means to solve in Stalinist fashion the task of a correct selection of cadres and check-up of the fulfilment of decisions adopted. Cadres decide the success of the cause. After a correct line has been given, success depends on organisational work, on the correct distribution of cadres, on timely checking of the fulfilment.

"This is what Comrade Stalin teaches.

"We must select cadres in the Stalinist way—organise by business-like and political methods checking up on the fulfilment of decisions adopted and raise our organisational work to the necessary level. By so doing we shall strengthen our Party.

"Our Party" said Chervenkov, "must take into its hands entirely and along all lines the leadership of national economy and its reconstruction on a Socialist basis. We must learn to administer national economy well, to lead Socialist construction in industry and agriculture, in transport and in the sphere of finance and credit. Our Party cadres must acquire first-class knowledge and become experts in economic questions.

"We must put an end to our political illiteracy and learn correctly to coordinate the leadership of economic work with Party organisational and Party-political work.

"Decisive for us now is the task of creating a new Socialist intelligentsia in production, agriculture, industry, State administration, preferably out of the ranks of the working class, out of initiators and organisers of Socialist emulation.

"The working class', Comrade Stalin teaches 'cannot become a true master of its country if it is unable to rid itself of the lack of culture, if it is unable to create its own intelligentsia, if it does not master science and is unable to administer economy on a scientific basis.' (Stalin Collected Works, Vol. II, p. 76)

"In order to raise the cultural level of the working class as the ruling class, our secondary and higher schools must be opened wide for the working youth.

"These are the main tasks," said Chervenkov, "which we must and can solve. We shall solve them, we should strengthen our Party, we shall secure the country's economic upsurge along the road of Socialism.

Chervenkov in conclusion, said, "allow me to express our deep gratitude, devotion and affection to our great teacher and leader, Comrade Stalin, and to express also our firm will to learn constantly and indefatigably ever more assiduously and better, from Comrade Stalin, from the matchless Bolshevik Party."

## OUTSTANDING CONTRIBUTION ON THE NATIONAL QUESTION

By I. VERKHOVTSEV

*25th Anniversary of the Publication of J. V. Stalin's Speech on the Political Tasks of the University of the Peoples of the East*

**T**WENTY-five years have passed since the publication of J. V. Stalin's speech at the meeting of students of the Communist University of the Working People of the East on "The Political Tasks of the University of the Peoples of the East."

In this historic speech, J. V. Stalin outlined a programme for Socialist transformations in the Soviet Republics of the East and defined the tasks of the Communist Parties in the colonial and dependent countries.

J. V. Stalin delivered his speech at a time when the titanic national economic restoration effort of the USSR was nearing completion and the building of Socialism in the Soviet Union became the immediate practical task. The Fourteenth Party Conference, which met in April 1925, endorsed the Lenin-Stalin line directed towards the victory of Socialism in the USSR as a Party law binding for all the members of the Party. In fulfilment of the resolutions of the Fourteenth Conference, the Party launched extensive political and organisational activities designated to strengthen the alliance between the working class and the peasantry, to enlist the cooperation of the working masses in the practical struggle for the building of the Socialist society.

It was one of the main tasks of the Party at the period to secure the active participation of the popular masses of the Soviet Republics of the East in the building of Socialism.

"The fundamental task," pointed out J. V. Stalin, "is to help the workers and peasants of these Republics to become fellow-builders of Socialism in our country; to create and develop conditions, in accordance with the specific circumstances of the life of each of these Republics, that will promote and accelerate this fellowship." (Stalin, "The Political Tasks of the University of the Peoples of the East", *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, London, 1947, pp. 207-8)

J. V. Stalin showed that the Soviet Republics of the East, freed from the colonial yoke, protected by the dictatorship of the proletariat, and being equal members of the Soviet Union, could and should become fellow-builders of Socialism because the peoples of these Republics were developing and consolidating as nations not under the aegis of the bourgeois system, but under the aegis of Soviet Government.

In his later works, J. V. Stalin established that, under the leadership of the Communist Party, new, Socialist nations originated and developed on the ruins of the old, bourgeois nations. These nations could originate and develop only on the basis of the Soviet system and thanks to the consistent pursuance of the Lenin-Stalin national policy. The crux of the national problem in the USSR, as J. V. Stalin pointed out at the Tenth Congress of the Party, lay in the obligation to put an end to the actual backwardness inherited by some nations from the old exploiting system and thus enable them to overtake Central Russia in the political, cultural and economic respect.

In his speech, J. V. Stalin outlined a concrete programme of action designated to enlist the efforts of the working people of the East for the building of Socialism. To achieve this, it was necessary to create industrial centres in the Republics of the East as bases for rallying the peasants around the working class; to advance agriculture and above all irrigation; to facilitate and advance cooperative organisation among the broad masses of the peasants, as the most important way of bringing the Soviet Republics of the East into the general system of Soviet economic development; to bring the Soviet closer to the masses, to make them national in composition and in this way to implement a national Soviet State organisation that will be close and comprehensible to the working people; to develop national culture, to organising the training of Party, government, economic and trade union cadres from among the local people.

Extremely important was J. V. Stalin's precept about the nature of Soviet culture. J. V. Stalin showed the unbreakable unity of its content and form and gave a classical definition of Soviet culture, as culture which is Socialist in content and national in form.

"We are building a proletarian culture," pointed out J. V. Stalin. "That is absolutely true. But it is also true that proletarian culture, which is Socialist in content, assumes different forms and methods of expression among the various peoples that have been drawn into the work of Socialist

construction, depending on differences of language, customs such as forth. Proletarian in content and national in form—such is the universal human culture towards which Socialism is marching. Proletarian culture does not cancel national culture, but lends it content. National culture, on the other hand, does not cancel proletarian culture, but lends it form." (Ibid, p. 210)

This precept of J. V. Stalin is of tremendous significance for the development of Soviet culture, the most advanced in the world; unlike the reactionary bourgeois culture which poisons the minds of the working people with the venom of nationalism, Soviet culture educates the people in the spirit of Socialism, in the spirit of internationalism.

In his speech, J. V. Stalin revealed the existence of two deviations in the practice of the Party and government workers in the East and called for a determined struggle against the tendency to underestimate the local national conditions and against nationalism.

Guided by the wise precepts of J. V. Stalin, the Communist Party educated in all the Soviet Republics numerous Bolshevik cadres who are successfully coping with the responsible tasks of Socialist construction.

As a result of the consistent implementation of the Lenin-Stalin national policy, of the industrialisation of the country and collectivisation of agriculture, the peoples of the Soviet East have, with the unselfish fraternal aid of the great Russian people, eliminated their old backwardness and developed into advanced Republics with a modern industry and collectivised farming. Thus, already in 1940, industrial output in the Kazakh SSR increased to a point which was 22 times the 1913 level; a 160-fold increase in industrial production was achieved in the Kirghiz Republic and a 242-fold increase in the Tadjik Republic as compared with 1913. The world's most advanced, Socialist agriculture is being successfully advanced in all the Soviet Republics of the East.

Along with the Socialist reorganisation of economy, all the Republics of the East effected a cultural revolution. The peoples of the Soviet East have advanced from total illiteracy and cultural backwardness to the summits of Socialist culture. As compared with the pre-Soviet period, the school attendance in Kirghizia increased 44 times over, in Tadjikistan 660 times. The Uzbek, Kazakh, Tadjik and other Republics of the East, where not a single college existed before the Soviet period, now have scores of institutions of higher learning, their own academies of science or branches of the

Academy of Sciences of the USSR, and scientific research institutions; they have educated a numerous Soviet national intelligentsia. Outstanding achievements have been made by the peoples of the Soviet Republics of the East in the advancement of science, literature and the arts.

Liberated by the October Revolution, the peoples in the former colonies of tsarist Russia skipped the painful stage of capitalist development and set out firmly along the course of a free Socialist life.

\* \* \*

Of exceptional significance have been and still are J. V. Stalin's precepts about the tasks of the Communists in the colonial and dependent countries of the East.

Lenin and Stalin teach us to view the national-colonial question not as a local and internal question, but as the general question of the liberation of the oppressed peoples from the yoke of imperialism, as part and parcel of the general question of the Socialist Revolution, of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In his speech, J. V. Stalin gave a profound analysis of the new developments in the national liberation movement in the colonial and dependent countries. J. V. Stalin showed that the working people in the colonial East are burdened with a double yoke of oppression — the internal yoke (of their own bourgeoisie) and the external yoke (of the foreign imperialist bourgeoisie), and emphasised that the national liberation movement must not be regarded as a solid front of national forces. The national bourgeoisie had split into two sections, and its reactionary section composed of the big bourgeoisie compromises with imperialism and betrays the interests of its own country.

The liberation of the colonial and dependent countries is impossible without a victorious revolution against imperialism, without a determined struggle against the compromising national bourgeoisie.

J. V. Stalin pointed out that in order to secure the victory of the national liberation movement it is necessary to organise the advanced elements of the working class in independent Communist Parties, to strengthen these Parties, to build up a national-revolutionary bloc of the workers, peasants and revolutionary intelligentsia under the hegemony of the proletariat, to establish a bond between the liberation movement in the colonies and semi-colonies and the proletarian movement in the advanced countries of the West.

The questions of the strategy and tactics of the revolutionary national liberation movement masterfully elaborated by Stalin have been and still are of enormous significance for the Communist Patries in the colonial East. This is especially evident in the example of the Communist Party of China. In his speech on "The Political Tasks of the University of the Peoples of the East" and in other pronouncements, J. V. Stalin indicated to the Communist Party of China, a young party at that time, the only correct course for its struggle, the course of transition from the policy of a united national front to the policy of a bloc of the workers and the revolutionary petty bourgeoisie.

Stalin's precept became the guiding star for the heroic Chinese Communist Party which led the Chinese people to the victory of the great people's revolution and opened to China the way to Socialism.

The camp of imperialism in general was considerably weakened, whereas the camp of democracy and Socialism headed by the Soviet Union became immeasurably stronger as a result of the defeat of German fascism and Japanese imperialism in the Second World War. The result has been a new and unprecedented surge of the national liberation movement in the colonies and dependent countries. The question of the complete eradication of the colonial system of imperialism is now on the order of the day.

The victory won by the Chinese people under the leadership of their glorious Communist Party dealt another hard blow to the world system of imperialism, substantially reinforced the general front of peace and democracy in the whole world and inspired the peoples of Viet Nam, Burma, Malaya, South Korea, Indonesia and other countries to a still more determined struggle against the imperialist enslavers.

The national liberation struggle of the peoples in the colonies and dependent countries is headed by the working class, led by the Communist Parties. The new surge in the national liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples is a victory for the Lenin-Stalin theory of the national and colonial question.

\* \* \*

Twenty-five years ago, appraising in his speech on "The Political Tasks of the University of the Peoples of the East", the experience accumulated in the first years of the building of the Soviet multinational State, J. V. Stalin drew the conclusion that "the Bolshevik national policy is the only

right policy" (*Ibid*, p. 209). Eloquent evidence of the correctness of this conclusion is contained in the entire history of development of the world's first Socialist State of the workers and peasants.

The Soviet Union constitutes a great friendly commonwealth of new nations which originated and developed under the Soviet system. The Soviet Socialist multinational State, which rests upon the moral and political unity of Soviet Society, upon the fraternal friendship of the peoples of the USSR and the invigorating patriotism of the Soviet people, revealed its strength and titanic power in the trying years of the Great Patriotic War, and it is now successfully solving the problems connected with the building of the Communist society.

The Soviet multinational State, which is a living embodiment of the immortal ideas of Marxism-Leninism, is regarded by the oppressed peoples of the world fighting for their freedom as the standard-bearer of peace, democracy and Socialism.

Armed with the ever-conquering ideas of Lenin and Stalin, the fraternal Communist and Workers' Parties of all countries are fighting for the victory of Communism.

—PRAVDA, May 22, 1950.

# THE STRATEGY AND TACTICS OF LENINISM — A MILITANT WEAPON IN THE HANDS OF FRATERNAL COMMUNIST PARTIES \*

By V. GRIGORYAN

30th Anniversary of V. I. Lenin's book "Left-Wing Communism, An Infantile Disorder".

V. I. LENIN'S book, "Left-Wing Communism—an Infantile Disorder", written thirty years ago is a classic work of creative Marxism. In this work, Lenin, on the basis of the very rich experience of the Russian revolutions of 1905 and 1917 and the entire international working class movement elaborated the foundations of the strategy and tactics of a Marxist Party of a new type and outlined a thorough system of guiding rules on the leadership of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat.

Marx and Engels constantly paid great attention to questions of the tactics of the class struggle of the proletariat by determining the tasks of these tactics in strict conformity with all the premises of their dialectical and materialist world outlook. In his article, *Karl Marx*, Lenin emphasises that only an objective estimate of the whole totality of the inter-relations of all classes, without any exceptions, of a given society and consequently also an objective estimate of the standard of development of this society can serve as the basis of a correct strategy and tactics of the proletariat, as an advanced class. Besides, all classes and all countries must be regarded not from a static but from a dynamic point of view, that is, not in their immutable state but in motion, whose laws emerge from the economic conditions of the existence of every class.

The opportunists of the Second International attempted to bury the ideas of Marx and Engels on the strategy and tactics of the class struggle of the proletariat. Lenin revealed the whole wealth of the theoretical labours of Marx and

\* To mark the completion of 30 years since the publication of V. I. Lenin's "Left-Wing Communism — an Infantile Disorder".

Engels and developed their teachings in a new historical period, in the period of the open actions of the proletariat, in the period of the proletarian revolution.

"... Lenin did not confine himself to restoring certain tactical propositions of Marx and Engels. He developed them further and supplemented them with new ideas and propositions, combining them all into a system of rules and guiding principles for the leadership of the class struggle of the proletariat. Lenin's pamphlets, such as *What is to be Done?*; *Two Tactics*; *Imperialism*; *State and Revolution*; *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*; *Left-Wing Communism*, etc., will undoubtedly always be treasured as priceless contributions to the general store of Marxism, to its revolutionary arsenal. The strategy and tactics of Leninism constitute the science of leadership of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat." (J. V. Stalin: *Problems of Leninism*. Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1947, p. 68)

Leninist teachings on the strategy and tactics of a revolutionary party of the working class were developed further in the works of Comrade Stalin. In developing Leninist teaching Comrade Stalin gave a classical definition of the essence of strategy and tactics, the essence of strategic and tactical leadership. Mastery of the strategy and tactics of Leninism is inconceivable without a study of all that Comrade Stalin contributed to this teaching. Such works as *Problems of Leninism*; *Short Course of the History of the CPSU (B)*; *The Question of the Strategy and Tactics of the Russian Communists*; *The October Revolution and the Tactics of the Russian Communists*; the outline of the pamphlet *On the Political Strategy and Tactics of the Russian Communists* and other works of Comrade Stalin, which give a masterly analysis of the main guiding foundations and rules on the strategy and tactics of Bolshevism have enriched Marxist-Leninist teaching with new conclusions and propositions applicable to the new conditions of the class struggle of the proletariat in the epoch of the sharpening of the general crisis of capitalism and the division of the world into two camps.

Lenin's book "Left-Wing Communism — an Infantile Disorder", was written in April-May, 1920. By that time, the Soviet power had consolidated its positions in the country. The war waged by Soviet Russia against the united forces of the foreign imperialists and internal reaction was drawing to a victorious culmination in favour of Soviet power. After the Red Army had defeated Kolchak, Yudenich, Denikin and Krasnov and other proteges of the imperialist entente



one after another, the latter was compelled to lift the blockade of Soviet Russia.

"But we know," said Lenin in his report to the Central Committee at the Ninth Congress of the Party, "that our forces are growing vastly every month, and will grow even more in future. The result is that our international position is more stable than ever before." (V. I. Lenin: *Selected Works*, Moscow, 1947, Vol. II, p. 561)

The parties of the Socialist Revolutionaries, the Mensheviks, the Anarchists and the Nationalists, after having suffered a defeat in the revolution openly passed over to the side of the foreign interventionists, were the centre of White Guard revolts and during the civil war years finally lost their influence amongst the people.

Guided by Lenin and Stalin, the Bolshevik Party consolidated and extended still more its ties with the masses; its authority rose immeasurably not only amongst the peoples of Soviet Russia but amongst the toilers of the entire capitalist world. For the international working class movement, the Soviet Republic became a bulwark on which it could always rely and around which it could always unite and multiply its forces into a single revolutionary, anti-imperialist front.

The establishment of the Soviet power in Russia as a result of the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution had a gigantic revolutionising influence upon the peoples of all lands. Millions of toiling peoples of Europe and Asia entered the movement under the direct influence of events in Russia. A profound revolutionary crisis enveloped the capitalist world.

The working masses of capitalist Europe organised a broad movement of solidarity with the peoples of Soviet Russia by declaring strikes and sabotaging production and despatch of arms for the armies of the interventionists and the White Guards. In the countries of the entente, the strike struggle of the workers for the cessation of war assumed a broad sweep. One of the first results of the October Revolution was the revolution in Germany and the overthrow of Wilhelm in November 1918.

After the October Revolution the working class movement in the capitalist countries rose to a new, higher level. Lenin wrote:

"Now the idea of Soviet power has arisen all over the world and is spreading among the proletariat of all countries with extraordinary rapidity." (V. I. Lenin: *Ibid*, p. 579)

In Hungary and Bavaria there arose Soviet republics. The Italian workers seized enterprises and created Soviets under the slogan of "Do as Russians Did!" The workers in Germany acted in the same way by defeating the attack of the German Kornilovites. A revolt flared up amongst the sailors of the French Navy in the Black Sea. Not merely the countries of capitalist Europe but also the colonial and dependent countries were drawn into the revolutionary vortex, whose foundation was laid by the October Revolution.

The decisive left trend of the toiling masses, their revolutionary aspirations created favourable conditions for the emergence and development of a Communist movement.

The parties of the Second International, which had already become politically bankrupt in the years of the First World War, were on the other side of the barricade in the days of the revolutionary actions of the working class. They openly disavowed Marxism and the demand of the dictatorship of the proletariat and emerged everywhere in the role of traitors and strangulators of the revolutionary movement. Within these parties the struggle between the revolutionaries and the internationalists on the one hand and the compromisers and the chauvinists on the other, was aggravated. The majority of the Social-Democratic parties underwent a sharp political crisis which in many countries culminated in a split and in the creation of revolutionary Communist Parties. Already, in 1918, Communist Parties had arisen in a number of countries. The existence of the Soviet Republic was a firm base for the international alliance of parties, heading the struggle for an overthrow of the yoke of capital. In March 1919, under Lenin's guidance such an alliance was created in the form of the Communist International.

Lenin considered it a very important task to pass over to the young fraternal Communist Parties the very rich experience of the Bolshevik Party accumulated in the process of struggle against tsarism and capitalism, in the course of three Russian revolutions. Lenin described his book "*Left-Wing Communism — an Infantile Disorder*" as the "experience of a popular talk in Marxist strategy and tactics". In this book Lenin devoted special attention to a criticism of the various leftist, sectarian tendencies, which manifested themselves in the ranks of several Communist Parties.

"*Left-Wing Communism — an Infantile Disorder*" became the guide on the strategy and tactics of Leninism, in which the science of the leadership of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat was analysed. Now, as thirty years ago, this Leninist work of genius retains in full its signifi-

cance; it is a sharp weapon of the brother Communist Parties in their struggle for the organisational, ideological and political consolidation of their ranks.

\* \* \*

In his book *"Left"-Wing Communism — an Infantile Disorder*, V. I. Lenin showed what is universally applicable, universally important and universally essential in the history and contemporary tactics of Bolshevism for the entire international revolutionary movement.

"The Russian model reveals to all countries something, and something very essential, of their near and inevitable future. The advanced workers of every land have long understood this; most often they have not so much understood it as grasped it, sensed it, by revolutionary class instinct. Herein lies the international 'significance' (in the narrow sense of the term) of the Soviet power, and of the fundamentals of Bolshevik theory and tactics." (V. I. Lenin: *Selected Works*, Moscow, 1947, Vol. II, p. 572)

The Great October Socialist Revolution, which was carried out under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin, by indictating a model of the strategy and tactics of the revolutionary party of the proletariat, signified a radical change in the world history of mankind. It was a revolution, not merely "in national boundaries", it gave rise to a radical turn in the movement for emancipation of the world proletariat, in the methods of struggle and forms of organisation, in the culture and ideology of the exploited masses of the entire world.

The October Revolution exposed the falsity of the Social-Democratic servitors of imperialism on the possibility of a peaceful transition to Socialism through bourgeois parliamentarism. Now the toilers in all countries see clearly that the sole bearer and stronghold of revolutionary Marxism is Leninism, which proves that it is impossible to end capitalism without ending Social-Democratism which is the ideological prop of capitalism.

One of the distinctive features of the October Revolution consists in that this revolution was the classic model of the practical embodiment into life of the Leninist theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat which is not a purely 'Russian' theory, but a theory essential for all lands. Bolshevism is not a merely Russian phenomenon.

"Leninism is the international doctrine of the proletariat of all lands, suitable and essential for all countries without exception, including the developed capitalist countries." (J. V. Stalin: *Problems of Leninism*, Moscow, 1945, p. 127)

The October Revolution dealt a shattering blow to the rear of imperialism, undermined its rule in the colonies and dependent countries. It also opened a new chapter in the history of dependent and semi-colonial countries. Lenin and Stalin prophesied the inevitability of a revolutionary upsurge in China, the inevitability of the great historic victory of the Chinese people. The teachings of Lenin and Stalin on the national and colonial revolution in the epoch of imperialism under the leadership of the working class and under the banner of internationalism has become a part of the theoretical treasury of Marxism-Leninism.

The historic victory of the great Chinese people, which was achieved under the leadership of the Communist Party of China, headed by Mao Tse-tung, is a new defeat for the imperialist and anti-democratic camp and a fresh blow to the instigators of war, who are unable to halt the course of the social development and growing consolidation of the camp of democracy and Socialism.

The defeat of Hitlerite Germany and militarist Japan in the Second World War, which was effected because of the decisive role of the Soviet Union, was the most important prerequisite for the victories of the Chinese people and the rise in the revolutionary movement of the oppressed peoples of Asia.

Lenin wrote that day by day it is becoming clearer to the workers of the whole world that

"Bolshevism has indicated the right road of escape from the horrors of war and imperialism, that Bolshevism can serve as a model of tactics for all", that "on some very important questions of the proletarian revolution, all countries will inevitably will to go through what Russia has gone through." (V. I. Lenin: *Selected Works*, Moscow, 1947, Vol. II, p. 409 and p. 578)

The unity of the international tactics of the Communist working-class movement of all countries demands not the elimination of diversities but such an application of the basic principles of Communism as would correctly alter these principles in their particularities and correctly apply these principles to the national and national-State divergencies.

As a result of the defeat of fascism and the historic victories of the Soviet Army in the Second World War, there

emerged the countries of People's Democracy where the regime of People's Democracy is implementing the functions of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In an article, *Victorious Leader of a New Epoch*, written on the occasion of the seventieth birthday of J. V. Stalin, the President of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party, Beirut, wrote:

"Due to the victory of the proletarian revolution and dictatorship of the proletariat in the USSR, due to the help of Stalin and the Soviet people, Poland and the other countries liberated by the Soviet Army from the violence of the imperialist Hitler invaders, can today carry out the functions of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of People's Democracy.

"People's Democracy is a tremendous historic achievement for which our people and the peoples of the countries liberated by the Soviet Army are indebted to the victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the USSR, a victory won under the guidance of the Party of Lenin and Stalin. Strengthening the leading role of the Polish working class, People's Democracy firmly guarantees to the Polish people the victory of Socialism in Poland.

"We can speak about this victory with such profound confidence and faith precisely because we have before us the historic experience of the example of the path and struggle which guided by Lenin and Stalin resulted in the triumph of Socialism in the USSR." (From *Nove Drogi*, Organ of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party, No. 6, November-December, 1949)

On the basis of an appraisal of the Russian and the entire international working-class movement, Lenin showed that one of the fundamental conditions of victory over the bourgeoisie is absolute centralism, the strictest discipline of the proletariat. Lenin said that without the iron discipline inside the Party, without the fullest and unreserved support rendered to the Party by the whole mass of the working class, the Bolsheviks could not have maintained themselves in power for two and a half months, let alone two and a half years.

Lenin teaches us that the discipline of a revolutionary Party of the proletariat is maintained, tested and reinforced by the consciousness of the proletarian vanguard, its ability to link itself with, to keep in close touch with primarily the proletariat and also with the non-proletarian toiling masses, the correctness of the political leadership exercised by this vanguard, the correctness of its political strategy and

tactics, provided that the broadest masses have been convinced by their own experience that they are correct. Such are the main conditions which have been worked out by prolonged effort, hard-won experience and a correct revolutionary theory, in the absence of which discipline in a revolutionary Party is unthinkable.

Lenin points out that Bolshevism was able to build up and successfully maintain the strictest centralisation and discipline due to a number of historical peculiarities of Russia. On the one hand, Bolshevism arose on the very firm foundation of the theory of Marxism, which Russia achieved as the only correct revolutionary theory

"veritably through suffering, by half a century of unprecedented torment and sacrifice, of unprecedented revolutionary heroism, incredible energy, devoted searching study, testing in practice, disappointment, verification and comparison with European experience." (V. I. Lenin: *Selected Works* Moscow, Vol. II, p. 579)

On the other hand, Bolshevism passed through practical history that was very rich in experience. Lenin points out that in no other country was there concentrated during so short a time (1903-17) such a wealth of forms and methods of struggle involving all classes of modern society, as in Russia.

Bolshevism grew up, consolidated and became steeled in the main in the struggle against opportunism, which in 1914 grew into social chauvinism and definitely sided with the bourgeoisie. This was the principal enemy of Bolshevism in the working-class movement. The Bolsheviks exposed ruthlessly the baseness, loathsomeness and vileness of social chauvinism and "Kautskyism". This was one of the main reasons why Bolshevism was able to attain victory in 1917.

"The victory of the revolutionary proletariat is impossible unless this evil is combated, unless the social-traitor leaders are exposed, discredited and expelled. And this is the policy pursued by the Third International." (V. I. Lenin, *Ibid*, p. 588)

Bolshevism also struggled relentlessly against another enemy within the working-class movement—petty-bourgeois semi-anarchist "revolutionism".

The entire social content of petty-bourgeois "revolutionism" is opposed to the principles of enduring class struggle. The small proprietor, who under capitalism always suffers oppression, an acute and rapid deterioration in his conditions of life ending in ruin, easily goes to "revolutionary" ex-

tremes but is incapable of perseverance, steadfastness and discipline.

In their work, the brother Communist Parties are daily being guided by Leninist directives on the peculiarities of the circumstances that give rise to small-scale economy and small-scale production, which has still not disappeared, to proprietary habits and traditions that have not been eliminated and make themselves felt in all spheres of social, cultural and political activity.

The typical representatives of petty-bourgeois "revolutionism" were the "Left" Communists. Thus, for example, after the revolutionary crisis of 1923, when the German Communist Party passed over to the tactics of circuitous movement, the only correct tactics in the struggle for winning over the broad masses of the German proletariat, the 'ultra-Leftist' group repeated old slogans and came out against the new forms of work. They adopted a sceptical attitude to trade union activities, ignored the slogans calling for unity and for winning over the trade unions, and they defended the slogan of "leave the trade unions". At the same time, the 'ultra-Leftists' barred the path of the Communist Party to the broad masses of the German working class.

In Russia, the Otzovists constituted such 'ultra-Leftists' after the 1905 Revolution. After the 1917 October Revolution, the 'Left-Communists' group which was opposed to the Bolshevik Party came out against the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty.

"It must not be forgotten" said Comrade Stalin at a session of the Presidium of the ECCI on January 22, 1926, "that the Rights and the ultra-Lefts are in actual fact twin-brothers and consequently take up an opportunistic position with the one difference, however, that the Rights do not always conceal their opportunism, while the Lefts always conceal their opportunism behind 'revolutionary' phrases." (J. V. Stalin: *Collected Works*, Russ. Ed., Moscow, Vol. VIII, p. 8)

A consistent struggle against the Right opportunists and the Left doctrinaires acquired still greater importance for the Communist Parties of the countries of the West because as is well known, these Communist Parties arose and developed under peculiar conditions. The absence of homogeneity in the composition of the Communist Party, the presence in it of persons who had come from other parties and who had not succeeded in making a break with Social Democratic survivals, the existence of such an opponent as

Social-Democracy, and an enemy like the European bourgeoisie with its State apparatus and press—such were the conditions in which the brother Communist Parties developed their struggle for the rearing of revolutionary cadres, for the winning over of broad masses of the working class to their side and emancipating them from the influence of the corrupt Right-Socialist leaders—the true agents of imperialism.

Of enormous importance for the organisational, ideological and political consolidation of the brother Communist Parties was the relentless and irreconcilable struggle waged by Lenin and Stalin against anti-Party groupings which were later on exposed as counter-revolutionary agents of the imperialist intelligence service, against the Trotskyite-Zinovievite, Bukharinite counter-revolutionary groupings which tried to bring about a split in the ranks of the CPSU (B) and to infect the Party with a lack of faith in the victory of Socialism.

"Leninism was born, grew up and became strong in its ruthless struggle against opportunism of every brand, including centrism in the West (Kautsky) and centrism in our country (Trotsky, etc.)," said Comrade Stalin. (J. V. Stalin: *Problems of Leninism*, Moscow, 1947, p. 379)

Twenty-five years ago, Comrade Stalin in his talk on *The Prospects of the Communist Party of Germany and Bolshevisation*, gave a classic definition of all the conditions without which the Bolshevisation of the Communist Parties in general is impossible. These conditions, formulated by Comrade Stalin, even today represent for brother Communist Parties an extensive and fighting programme of struggle for the organisation and ideological and political consolidation of Communist Parties for a correct implementation of the strategy and tactics of Leninism.

"It is necessary," said Comrade Stalin in this talk, "that the entire work of the Party, and in particular if Social-Democratic traditions have not been overcome in it, should be reorganised in a new and revolutionary way reckoned in such a manner that every step of the Party and every one of its actions would naturally lead to the revolutionising of the masses, to preparing and educating the broad mass of the working class in the spirit of revolution.

"It is necessary for the Party to be able to combine in its work an irreconcilable revolutionary spirit (not to be confused with revolutionary adventurism) with the maximum of flexibility and manoeuvring capacity (not to be confused

with opportunism), without which it is impossible for the Party to master all forms of struggle and organisation and to link the day-to-day interests of the proletariat with the basic interests of the proletarian revolution and to combine in its work the legal and the illegal struggle." (J. V. Stalin: *Collected Works*, Russ. Ed., Moscow, Vol. VII, p. 38-39)

Comrade Stalin points out that Communist Parties must not be regarded as appendages of the parliamentary election mechanism, but as the highest form of the class association of the proletariat; the Party must master the revolutionary theory of Marxism and link it indissolubly with revolutionary practice. The Party must work out its slogans not on the basis of formulae learnt by rote but as a result of a careful analysis of the concrete conditions of the revolutionary movement by necessarily taking into account the experience of the revolutions of all countries; it must verify the correctness of these slogans in the fire of the revolutionary struggle of the masses; not merely teach the masses but also learn from the masses; not conceal its mistakes, not fear criticism but train cadres to learn from their own mistakes. The Party must be able to select a main leading group of the best, most devoted amongst the foremost fighters capable of applying the strategy and tactics of Leninism. The social composition of Party organisations must be improved, they must be purged of opportunist elements and must work out and observe the strictest iron discipline of the Party and check up the fulfilment of their own decisions and directives.

\* \* \*

Lenin, in laying bare in his book *"Left-Wing" Communism—An Infantile Disorder*, the essence of the tactics of the Bolsheviks during the various stages of the revolutionary movement in Russia, shows that the political activity of the Bolshevik Party relies upon a profound scientific basis. Lenin remarks that "politics is a science and an art that has not fallen from the skies and is not given free as a gift", and that the Communists can only be successful when they scientifically set about working out their tactical slogans.

Lenin draws sharply the attention of Communists to the fact that they, in defining their tactical line should proceed not from abstract theoretical considerations but from a study of the actual reality. The strategy and tactics of Marxism depends upon the conclusions of theory, but theory can never give ready-made recipes for the activity of the

Party in this or that situation. The Party, while being guided by the Marxist theory of social development, must grope for, grasp and divine the essential and the peculiar in this situation, which must determine the tactical line of the Party for a definite interval of time. As in a number of his other works, Lenin in his book *"Left-Wing" Communism—An Infantile Disorder* once again recalls the words of Marx and Engels that their theory is not a dogma but a guide to action. This book of Lenin is permeated with a struggle against the doctrinairism and scholasticism in politics, which was characteristic of the "Left" Communists.

In laying bare the roots of the mistakes of the "Left" Communists, Lenin showed that the "Left" Communists do not understand the role of the Party in the class struggle of the proletariat, that their tactics are practically the tactics of a circle of intellectuals and not of a Party of the working class, conscious of its obligation to the working class. Speaking of the "Lefts" in Germany, Lenin several times emphasised that

"they have proved that they are not a party of the class, but a circle, not a party of the masses—but a group of intellectuals and of a few workers who imitate the worst features of intellectualism." (V.I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Moscow, 1947, Vol. II, p. 599)

Lenin and Stalin teach us that the Party is the foremost section of the working class, which together with the class constitutes a complete whole—and does not possess its own special aims as distinct from the aims and tasks of the working class as a whole. The Party is the conscious and organised detachment of the proletariat a detachment which leads the revolutionary struggle and is intimately linked by innumerable threads with the entire class. But to lead the class does not mean to take into account the Party alone and not to pay attention to the mass that is led. The Party must thoughtfully listen for the mood of the masses and constantly take into account the level of their consciousness, their readiness to support the one or the other slogans, the one or the other actions of the Party. It is insufficient if the Party alone understood the necessity of overthrowing the old social orders and substituting them by new ones. A revolution is made, above all, by the masses and not only by the Party; therefore, the consciousness, the preparedness of the masses themselves for resolute action must be of constant interest to the Party if it does not wish to be in the position of a vanguard that has run too far ahead and lost contact with its class.

Lenin said: "Victory cannot be won with the vanguard alone. To throw the vanguard alone into the decisive battle before the whole class, before the broad masses have taken up a position either of direct support of the vanguard, or at least of benevolent neutrality towards it, and one in which they cannot possibly support the enemy, would be not merely folly but a crime. And in order that actually the whole class, that actually the broad masses of toilers and those oppressed by capital may take up such a position, propaganda and agitation alone are not enough. For this, the masses must have their own political experience. Such is the fundamental law of all great revolutions, now confirmed with astonishing force and vividness not only in Russia but also in Germany." (V. I. Lenin, *Ibid*, p. 627)

The consciousness of the broad masses is formed under the influence of the conditions of their life, in the course of the struggle of the masses for an improvement in these conditions. Therefore, the appeal of the Party to the masses, its agitation amongst the masses for the overthrow of the reactionary political systems, only then attains success when this agitation combines with the demands which are emerging from below, from the masses themselves, and consciously express that which the masses themselves have already felt after having experienced the unsuitability of the old forms of life.

The Communist Party must by its tactics, by its practical actions, help the masses to understand its slogans and the final aim of its struggle. The Party must have in view such practical actions—apart from such forms of struggle—which would lead up the masses to the positions of the Party by convincing the masses in practice of its correctness. It is only under such circumstances that the Party in actual practice justifies its role as leader of the working class and comes forward as a Party of the class, a Party of the masses and not as a circle of propagandists.

While laying the basis of the strategy of Bolshevism, Lenin in his book "*Left-Wing Communism—An Infantile Disorder*" also considers the concrete problems of tactics, which were agitating the Communists abroad. These are the questions about the work of the Communists in trade unions, on their participation in bourgeois parliaments, on the permissibility of compromises, etc.

Lenin emphasised that the trade unions in a majority of capitalist countries unite millions and millions of workers and the refusal of the "Left" Communists to work in trade unions signifies that these millions of working masses will

completely be handed over to the control of the opportunists. It is clear that the Marxist Party sets before itself the task of winning over the majority of the working class and the leadership of its struggle cannot consign itself to such inactivity.

Lenin said:

"You must not fear difficulties, you must not fear the pinpricks, chicanery, insults and persecution of the 'leaders' (who, being opportunists and social-chauvinists, are in most cases directly or indirectly connected with the bourgeoisie and the police), but must imperatively work wherever the masses are to be found." (V. I. Lenin, *Ibid*, p. 596)

Lenin showed from the examples of the work of the Bolsheviks in Zubatov societies under tsarism that one must work in any society and trade unions—even the most "reactionary" — in which proletarian and semi-proletarian masses are to be found.

"To fear this 'reactionariness', to try to avoid it, to skip it, would be the greatest folly, for it would be fearing that function of the proletarian vanguard which consists in training, educating, enlightening and drawing into the new life the most backward strata and masses of the working class and the peasantry." (V. I. Lenin, *Ibid*, p. 594)

In a number of his works Comrade Stalin in developing the directives of Lenin, discloses the tremendous harm wrought by the "Left" Communists and by their theory of "non-participation" in the trade unions which were under the influence of the opportunist groups and parties. Comrade Stalin said:

"In the West, there are still at present some individual 'Communists' who continue to propagate the anti-proletarian and anti-revolutionary slogan of 'leave the trade unions'. It must be said that no one could harm the Communist movement in the West more than these people and 'Communists' similar to them. These people think of "attacking" the trade unions from outside, considering them to be the camp of the enemy. They do not understand that with such a policy the workers will consider just these people as the enemies. They do not understand whether the trade unions are good or bad, but the mass of workers still consider them as their strongholds which help them to preserve their wages, the working-day, etc. They do not understand that such a policy does not facilitate but undermines the cause of the penetration of the Communists amongst the

millions of masses of the working class." (J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Russ. Ed., Moscow, Vol. VII, p. 104-5)

No less harm was wrought also by the theory of the "Lefts" on the impermissibility of the Communists participating in bourgeois parliaments. In exposing the sham revolutionariness of the "Left" Communists who affirmed that bourgeois parliamentarism had been overcome, Lenin wrote that a strict differentiation must be made between the fact of bourgeois parliamentarism being overcome historically and its being overcome politically. The fact that in a world-historical sense, the epoch of bourgeois parliamentarism has ended does not signify that bourgeois parliamentarism has also been overcome in practice in the consciousness of the mass of people. It is easier to overcome the parliamentary illusions of the masses, the more graphically it is demonstrated to them in practice that parliaments do not reflect the universal will of the people but serve the interests of the bourgeoisie.

The Communists must enter bourgeois parliaments not in the least for "organised" work in them as the one-time Mensheviks said but in order to utilise the parliamentary platform in the interests of the political enlightenment of the masses.

The Communist Parties of Western Europe and America were confronted with the task of utilising bourgeois parliamentarism in a new way not like the parties of the Second International, who transformed parliamentary forms of struggle into the only forms of struggle and did not want to combine parliamentary forms with non-parliamentary ones. The Communist Parties had to master all forms of struggle —illegal and legal. Lenin writes:

"Unless we master all means of warfare, we may suffer grave and even decisive defeat if changes in the position of the other classes that do not depend on us bring to the forefront forms of activity in which we are particularly weak." (Lenin: *Selected Works*, Moscow 1947, Vol. II, p. 629)

Comrade Stalin also points out forcefully to this very same aspect of the question. In his work on *The Foundations of Leninism*, Comrade Stalin writes:

"The task of tactical leadership is to master all forms of struggle and organisation of the proletariat and to ensure that they are used properly so as to achieve, with the given relation of forces, the maximum results necessary to prepare for strategic success." (J. V. Stalin: *Problems of Leninism*, Moscow, 1947, p. 75)

The "Left" Communists thought it was sufficient to admit the permissibility of compromises in general to obliterate the boundary between opportunism and revolutionary Marxism. Lenin explained this mistake and on the basis of the experience of the Bolshevik Party, proved the permissibility in principle of the tactics of compromises for a revolutionary party. Moreover, Lenin considered that he who does not prove in practice during quite a considerable period of time and in quite diverse political conditions his ability to have recourse to a compromise which is in the interests of the revolution and of the proletarian party, has not still learnt how to help the revolutionary class in its struggle for the emancipation of toiling mankind from the exploiters.

The expediency of the tactics of such compromises which would strengthen the Communists and weaken their opponent, ensues out of the interests of the proletariat. Under capitalism the working class is surrounded by a mass of variegated, different strata and sections of the population, is itself divided into more developed and less developed strata, divided according to profession, religion and territorial origin, etc. This makes it absolutely necessary for the Communist Party to resort to manoeuvres, to compromises with the various groups of the proletariat, with the various parties of the petty-bourgeoisie.

Lenin wrote that the whole history of Bolshevism, both before and after the October Revolution, knows many instances of temporary agreements and compromises with other parties, bourgeois parties included. Besides, he cites the cases of the actual compromises of the Bolsheviks with the "Legal" Marxists in the nineties, with the Socialist Revolutionaries, with the "Left" Mensheviks, etc. Lenin emphasised:

"The whole point lies in knowing how to apply these tactics in such a way as to raise, and not lower, the general level of proletarian class consciousness, revolutionary spirit, and ability to fight and to conquer." (V. I. Lenin: *Selected Works*, Moscow, 1947, Vol. II, p. 612)

The importance of Lenin's directions on the tactics of compromises is particularly clear to the proletariat which, having accomplished a Socialist Revolution in one country, is surrounded by capitalist countries. Under these circumstances Lenin emphasised that

"the more powerful enemy can be conquered only by exerting the utmost effort, and by necessarily, thoroughly, carefully, attentively and skilfully taking advantage of every,

even the smallest 'rift' among the enemies, of every antagonism of interest among the bourgeoisie of the various countries and among the various groups or types of bourgeoisie within the various countries, and also by taking advantage of every, even the smallest, opportunity of gaining a mass ally, even though this ally be temporary, vacillating, unstable, unreliable and conditional. Those who do not understand this do not understand even a particle of Marxism or of scientific modern Socialism in general." (V. I. Lenin, *Ibid*, p. 609-10)

Lenin's tactical directions on the participation of Communists in bourgeois parliaments, on working in trade unions, in concluding compromises, helped in a vast measure in raising the fighting capacity of the Communist Parties abroad and helped them skilfully to adapt themselves to different conditions and to find the most appropriate means of struggle.

\* \* \*

During the thirty years that have passed since the publication of V. I. Lenin's book "*Left-Wing" Communism—An Infantile Disorder*, the Communist Parties in the whole world have traversed the glorious and difficult path of struggle for the cause of the working class.

While in 1920, when Lenin wrote his book, the victorious banner of the proletarian revolution only flew over one country, where the working class had just accomplished the October Socialist Revolution and taken the path of Socialist construction, now a number of countries with a population of more than 800 million peoples have thrown off the yoke of capitalism forever.

The historical course of events from the time of the Great October Socialist Revolution, which opened a new era—the era of Socialism—bears irrefutable testimony to the correctness of Communist teachings, the correctness of Marxism-Leninism, which proves scientifically the inevitability of the doom of capitalism and the inevitability of the victory of Socialism.

Side by side with the growth of the working class movement over the entire world, there grew and matured Communist Parties. A great role in their growth was played by the Third Communist International formed by Lenin and Stalin on the granite foundation of Leninism and which did a great deal to spread the experience of Bolshevism among the Communists abroad. The Comintern was created after

the First World War when the Communist Parties were still weak, the links between the toiling masses of the different countries were almost absent and the Communist Parties did not still possess their generally acknowledged leaders of the working class movement. The services of the Comintern consist in that it restored and strengthened the ties between the toilers of different countries, elaborated the theoretical problems of the working class movement in the new postwar conditions of development and established the general norms of propaganda and agitation of the ideas of Communism and facilitated the task of education and steeling of the leaders of the working class movement. Thereby the conditions were created for transforming the young Communist Parties into mass working class parties.

The Second World War was a serious test for the Communist Parties. In this war the Communist Parties occupied the only correct position, ensuing from their very existence as parties of the working class, parties of the toiling masses.

The Communist Parties of Eastern Europe, where the fascist occupation raged, particularly of Western Europe which fell under the yoke of Hitlerism, of China and other countries of Asia, came forward as organisers and leaders of the general popular resistance to fascism. They made innumerable sacrifices, heroically and self-sacrificingly fought for the freedom and national independence of peoples. The Communists rallied round themselves all the freedom-loving patriotic elements of the nations, by effecting the unity of actions of the various strata of the people.

This heroic struggle of the Communist Parties earned for them deserved authority amongst the broad masses and the sacrifice made by them in the struggle forever fixed in the consciousness of the masses the image of the Communists as true patriots and fighters for people's happiness, they had known in the war years.

The Communist Parties emerged from the Second World War still more consolidated and with an extraordinary growth in their influence amongst all strata of the population.

Revealing the essence of this historical process of the extension of the influence of the Communist Parties, Comrade Stalin said:

"The growth of the influence of the Communists cannot be regarded as fortuitous. It is a perfectly legitimate phenomenon. The influence of the Communists has grown because in the hard years of fascist domination in Europe, the Communists proved reliable, courageous, self-sacrificing fighters



against the fascist regime for the freedom of the peoples... It is they, the millions of these 'simple people' who tested the Communists in the fire of struggle and resistance to fascism and decided that the Communists fully deserved the people's trust. That is how the influence of the Communists has grown in Europe. Such is the law of historic development." (J. V. Stalin: Interview to *Pravda* Correspondent Concerning Churchill's Speech, March 13, 1946)

The steadily growing and spreading influence of the Communist Parties reflects the objective laws of social development, which are irresistibly paving a path for themselves overcoming each and every obstacle. By their activity, the Communists accelerate the course of historical development leading to a new social order.

In particular, the figures of the growth of the membership of the Communist Parties speak eloquently of the strengthening of their influence: on the eve of the war the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia consisted of 80,000 members while at present it is 2,300,000 in number; the Polish United Workers' Party now comprises of 1,360,000, while before the war it had only 20,000 members in its ranks; in Rumania, the Workers' Party had 1,000 members, at the present time, it has a million; in Hungary, the Workers' Party numbered 30,000 on the eve of the war, at the present time it numbers 950,000; in the Bulgarian Communist Party there were 8,000 members before the war, at present there are 460,000. The Albanian Workers' Party consisted of 1,000 members before the war, now it has 70,000 members and candidate members.

A world-historic victory has been attained by the Communist Party of China. In the conditions of a semi-feudal, semi-colonial country, where the most diverse economic and political contradictions were interlaced, the Communist Party of China proved itself capable of applying creatively the principles of Leninism and skilfully utilising the experience of the Bolshevik Party. It advanced such strategic and tactical slogans, which guaranteed to it the support of the overwhelming majority of the Chinese people. The Communist Party of China which in 1921 commenced the struggle with a small but united group is at present a party consisting of four million members.

The Great October Socialist Revolution awakened the peoples of the colonial East. The victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War contributed to the further strengthening of the national liberation movement. The formation of the People's Republic of China as well as of the

Korean People's Democratic Republic and of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam signifies that the colonial rule of the imperialist powers is coming to an end.

The Communist Parties of a number of capitalist countries, in the years that have passed since Lenin's book saw the light of day, have taken serious steps forward in the task of solving the main task noted by Lenin: the task of winning over the majority of the working class to their side.

The Communist Party of France has been transformed into a militant mass Party. While till the war it comprised of 340,000 members now more than 800,000 members are fighting in its ranks. The Communist Party covered itself with fighting glory in the years of resistance to fascism and acquired tremendous authority in the eyes of the French people. A considerable section of the working class of France is under the influence of the Communist Party and is self-sacrificingly supporting it under the present difficult conditions of struggle.

In Italy the Communists had been subjected to the most savage persecution for more than 20 years by the Mussolini Government. Immediately after the fall of the fascist regime as a result of the Second World War, the Communist Party emerged from underground and was able swiftly to build and consolidate close ties with the broadest masses. The self-sacrificing struggle of the Communist Party during the underground years, the successes of the partisan movement it organised in the war years guaranteed it unshakable authority amongst the toilers of Italy. In a short time, the numerical strength of the Party increased many times over; while on the eve of the war it comprised of 58,000 members, now it comprises of 2,300,000 members.

The Communist Parties of France and Italy have won their influence in the working class through resolute struggle against the Right-Socialist traitors, who, according to Lenin's evaluation, are the main enemies of the Communists within the working class movement.

From 1920, the influence of the Right-wing Socialists on the proletarian masses was undermined to its foundations by the unconcealed betrayal of the interests of the working class with which the entire path of the venal Right-wing Socialist leaders is marked.

The striving towards unity among the working masses developed strongly during the Second World War. The unity of action effected during the war years between the Communist Parties and the rank-and-file of the Socialist Parties in Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, successfully terminated in the further unification of these parties—

in every one of these countries there arose one united party of the working class, accepting Marxism-Leninism as its ideological teaching. The words of Lenin, permeated with a profound faith in the working class have completely come true:

"Certain individuals, especially among the unsuccessful claimants to leadership, may...persist in their mistakes for a long time; but when the time is ripe the masses of the workers will easily and quickly unite themselves and unite all sincere Communists to form a single party...." (Lenin, *Ibid*, p. 637)

The emergence of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany in 1946 was a serious blow to the splitters of the working class. The Socialist Unity Party of Germany fights in actual practice for the real national interests of the German people, for the creation of a single, peace-loving democratic Germany. The German working class headed by the Socialist Unity Party, is fulfilling a historic task in fighting for the extension and consolidation of the National Front of Democratic Germany.

A serious step in the direction of the unity of the working class was taken in Italy when an agreement on unity of action was concluded between the Communists and the Left-Socialists, and workers of different political convictions were united in the ranks of the Italian General Confederation of Labour.

In France unity between the Communist Party and the mass of rank and file members of the Socialist Party already took place in the years of struggle against fascist occupation. Questions relating to the struggle for the consolidation of the unity of the working class occupied a big place in the labours of the recently-held Twelfth Congress of the French Communist Party. The Congress resolutely condemned the manifestation of sectarianism in the activities of various local organisations of the Party and set the task of intensifying the work of the Party organisations in the different strata of the working class and toilers.

"In our struggle for unity," said Maurice Thorez in his report, "we must devote special attention to work among Socialist workers. On many questions the view of the Socialist worker and of his comrade, the Communist worker, coincide. We must speak to him in a brotherly way, convincingly, and never resort to unjustified shouting or use of offensive expressions.

"This, however, does not mean that we must forsake our determination resolutely to expose the treacherous policy of

the Right-Socialist leaders, the defenders of bourgeois interests and the agents of foreign imperialism, the most zealous promoters of the 'Marshall Plan' and the Atlantic Pact, the initiators of the foul war in Viet Nam — men like Moutet and strikebreakers like Jules Moch...

"Great efforts are also necessary to extend and consolidate the alliance with Catholic toilers."

The 12th Congress of the French Communist Party revealed the mistakes of certain Party organisations—the main being an underestimation of the danger of war and at the same time an underestimation of the strength of the working class, the strength of the camp of peace. Another shortcoming, notes the Congress,

"is sectarianism which, like opportunism, does not believe in the masses and prevents the Party from moving forward. It is necessary to wage a relentless struggle against it."

The Right-wing Socialist leaders are resorting to every kind of measure in order to suppress the striving of the rank and file members of their party for joint actions with the Communists. The Right-wing Socialist leaders in different countries are serving one master—American imperialism which regards the Right Socialists as true agents, more reliable than the openly bourgeois parties. The Right-wing Socialists are trying to conceal their subservience to Wall Street with the concoctions that they represent a so-called "Third Force" which ostensibly stands between the camp of Socialism and the camp of imperialism and can prevent a conflict between them. It is not very difficult to understand on what the Right-wing Socialists are counting. They would like to instill in the minds of the toiling masses of the capitalist countries the idea of the possibility of some kind of a Third Path, which is supposed to be unconnected with struggle and sacrifice, which forces the masses to be imbued with the philosophy of passivity and a refusal to wage an active struggle against imperialism. There is no need to add that nothing corresponds better to the interests of American imperialism than this philosophy.

Side by side with this preaching on the 'Third Force' position, the Right-wing Socialists adapted all their old opportunist trash to the needs of the new imperialist market. The decrepit Social-Democratic theories on the growing over of "national" capitalism into a "super-capitalist" organisation, was called upon this time to substantiate the pretensions of American imperialism for world domination. The old Kautskian songs about the "peaceful growing-over of

capitalism into Socialism" through bourgeois democracy are revived once again in the perorations of "Democratic Socialism," "extinction of class struggle at the present-day stage of capitalism", etc.

As Lenin indicated, as long as capitalism exists there exists a social base for opportunism within the working class movement. The Communist Parties of a number of countries are still faced with great painstaking labour in order to remove the bourgeois ideology preached by the Right Socialists and other anti-proletarian parties from the consciousness of the masses.

The Communist Parties of the capitalist countries are confronted with the most important task—the winning over of the majority of the proletarian masses to their side. In this connection, the tactical directives of Lenin on work in trade unions, on participation in parliaments, etc., developed in the book *"Left-Wing" Communism—An Infantile Disorder* still retain all their importance for Communist Parties.

The trade unions that are under the influence of the Right reformists have seriously compromised themselves in the eyes of the masses by their deals with the employers and by refusing to wage an active struggle for the economic interests of the working class.

It is, therefore, not accidental that in the last few years in a number of capitalist countries the main mass of organised workers left the trade unions led by the reactionary leaders and formed united class trade union federations, under the influence of the Communist Parties. Thus, for example, in France, the biggest and most influential trade union federation is the General Confederation of Labour, comprising more than 2.5 million members. In actual fact, the influence of the CGT is extending over much broader masses of the workers, including also those sections which are in other trade union organisations. In Italy in 1944, the powerful Italian General Confederation of Labour was created, comprising of more than 5 million members. The Communists play a leading role in these confederations in both France and Italy. As a rule they receive a majority of votes in the elections to the leading organs.

The formation of the World Federation of Trade Unions was an important success of the world working-class movement. The WFTU elaborated a democratic programme for the defence of the economic demands of the toiling masses, for the defence and winning of the political and trade union liberties, for a co-ordination of the activities of the working class of all countries in the struggle against the danger of a new war.

However, along with these trade union centres there exist trade union federations which are still under the influence of the Right-wing Socialist Parties as well as the Catholic parties, which were revived after the war. In 1947, the French Right-wing Socialists, at the instructions of their American masters, effected a split in the trade union movement by creating a so-called trade union organisation of the "Force Ouvriere". However, the reactionary "Force Ouvriere" was able to draw behind itself only an insignificant part of the membership of the CGT (approximately 300,000) and the task set by the State Department of the USA remained unfulfilled. In Italy in 1942, the representatives of the Christian Democratic trend and the Saragatists undertook the attempt of splitting the Italian General Confederation of Labour. But their attempts led to nought—the trade union centres for disruption created by them — the Free Confederation of Italian Toilers and the Italian Federation of Labour—are organisations numerically weak and isolated from the working class.

The Right-Socialists still wield considerable influence in the trade unions of Britain, Belgium and certain other countries.

At the direct behest of the State Department of the USA the leaders of the British General Council of Trade Unions and the American Congress of Industrial Organisations effected a split in the World Federation of Trade Unions. This was done with the aim of facilitating the fulfilment of the expansionist plans of American imperialism. But the agents of the State Department did not succeed in splitting the World Federation of Trade Unions. The majority of the organised workers of the world—78 million—are united in its ranks as before. And in order to create the so-called International Confederation of 'Free' Trade Unions, its leaders were compelled to include in this disruptive confederation many organisations which had ceased to exist including the Kuomintang "All Chinese Federation of Labour", 'free' trade unions in exile, composed of traitors, who had run away from the People's Democracies from a just retribution for their crimes, and every other kind of rabble.

The Communists of France, Italy take into account the fact that still considerable working masses are under the influence of the Right-wing leaders who had duped the working class and betrayed its interests. This applies all the more to such countries as Britain, USA, Belgium and others. The Communist Parties of these countries are carrying on a determined struggle against the manifestations of sectarianism in their midst and are trying to win

under their influence all the workers who had joined the trade unions led by the reactionary leaders.

The Communists are not confusing the reactionary leaders of these trade unions with their rank and file mass, who in the majority of cases have not refused joint action. With respect to the masses, the Communists pursue the tactics of "open door", not closing to them admission into democratic trade union organisations and are also appealing to them for united actions in the struggle for rise in wages, preservation of trade union liberties, right to strike, etc. These tactics very often yield positive results. The characteristic example of the implementation of unity of action of the workers was the warning one-day general strike on 25th November of last year in France. The strike embraced the big branches of industry of almost all the workers (from 90-98 per cent). A proof of such a unity was last year's strike of the miners and the broad strike movement which is developing in France at the present time.

The enemies of the working class know what danger the work of the Communists inside the trade unions constitutes for them. The Communists are exposing before the trade union masses the attempt of the Labourite Government, the policy of "freezing" wages, the policy of enormous military costs at the cost of the reduction in the sums assigned for housing construction and care of public health. That is why the Labourites are trying with all measures to fight against the influence of the Communists in the trade unions. Only recently, one of the pillars of Labourism, Herbert Morrison, speaking at a meeting turned to the British trade unions with the appeal "to drive out the Communists as soon as possible." However, the mass of the rank and file members of the British trade unions are beginning to understand the real background of the policy of the Labourite Government and the corrupt trade union bureaucrats supporting it.

Lenin's direction on the participation of Communists in the parliaments in capitalist countries fully retains its significance in the present-day condition. Lenin wrote in 1920 that the epoch of bourgeois parliamentarism had ended, that in a world historic sense, parliamentarism had been overcome. The thirty years which have passed have brought new and numerous testimonies to this.

Bourgeois democracy is undergoing a serious crisis at the present time and has to a considerable degree lost in the eyes of the masses the halo of serving "general national interests" with which it surrounded bourgeois ideology. The fact that bourgeois democracy was not able to prevent but

on the contrary facilitated the development of fascism and its advent to power in Germany and in Italy revealed still more to masses the class content of bourgeois democracy. The stern realities of the bourgeois State dispelled forcibly the illusions of parliamentarism of which Lenin wrote in his book.

The authority won by the Communists in the war years, the successes of the struggle for the unity of the working class achieved in several countries ensured the formation of large Communist fractions in parliaments. By utilising the parliamentary platform the Communists are exposing the policy of the ruling parties which at the present time have betrayed the national independence of their countries to American imperialism. Thus, the sessions of the French National Assembly and the Italian Parliament which discussed the war budgets and the laws which were introduced by the Governments and directed against the progressive organisations were utilised by the Communists in order to demonstrate vividly to the mass of people how the pro-American ruling parties are betraying the national interests of their countries and are pursuing a policy of preparation for a new war and of the armaments race, dooming the people to starvation and misery.

\* \* \*

Under the present conditions, when a fierce struggle is being waged between two camps, the democratic and anti-imperialist camp headed by the Soviet Union and the anti-democratic imperialist camp with the USA at its head, the Communist Parties of the capitalist countries are confronted with tasks of historic importance.

The importance of the political and organisational work of the Communist Parties, their skill in building the closest ties with the masses and in leading the struggle not only of the working class but also of the broad mass of people has increased as never before. Lenin emphasised in particular this task in his book "*Left-Wing Communism—An Infantile Disorder*".

American monopoly capital is openly pursuing a policy of preparing for a new world war, a war for the seizure of new markets and territories, for world domination. The openly expansionist course adopted by the USA creates a menace for all freedom-loving and independent peoples of the world. The national independence and freedom of many nations and States is in danger.

The aggressive policy of American imperialism, which has found support only among the ruling bourgeois classes of the capitalist countries and their Right-wing Socialist agents is meeting with a rebuff among the broad mass of people. The course taken by American imperialism for the economic and political subjugation of States in Europe and Asia gives rise to a growth of democratic tendencies in the masses in these States and to a striving of the peoples for unity and for an active resistance to the new pretenders for world domination.

In these conditions, the responsible and historic task of uniting and organising the mass of people, rising to wage a struggle against the imperialist policy of the USA into a single camp falls upon the Communist Parties of the capitalist countries. The resolution passed at the November meeting of the Information Bureau of Communist and Workers' Parties says:

"The struggle for a stable and lasting peace, for the organisation and consolidation of the forces of peace against the forces of war should now become the pivot of the entire activity of the Communist Parties and democratic organisations." (**For A Lasting Peace, For A People's Democracy**, November 29, 1949)

It is not the working class alone which is interested in the struggle for Peace, against the instigation of a new war; there can be no neutral people in the struggle for Peace, for cessation of the armaments' race and above all, for the prohibition of the atomic weapon which threatens the lives of the broadest mass of the population. Neither religious convictions nor differences in political views nor party affiliations can be an obstacle for those who in practice want to fight actively against the threat of a new war, for a long and lasting peace. Today no one can stand aloof on the question of war and Peace. These are the fundamental questions of the present time. Even those abroad who do not think it necessary to take interest in politics and who mistakenly think that they can stand aside in the eventuality of war have to define their attitude to these questions.

The Communist Parties are striving to unite for the struggle for Peace all those who feel anxious for the fate of Peace and seriously desire the consolidation of peaceful relations between peoples.

The decisions of the recently-held Stockholm Session of the Permanent Committee of the World Congress of the Partisans of Peace signified a new stage in the powerfully developing movement of the partisans of Peace. The col-

lection of millions of signatures to the appeal of the Permanent Committee with the demand for the prohibition of the atomic weapon and the declaration of the Government which first employs the atomic weapon as a war-criminal, will mean a vast extension of the mass base of the movement and the drawing in of newer and newer forces in the struggle for Peace.

The peoples of the whole world are deeply conscious of the exceptionally great role of Comrade Stalin in the struggle for the guaranteeing of lasting Peace and reliable security in the future. The wise words of Comrade Stalin on the necessity of making the outbreak of new aggression and new wars an impossibility are meeting with a warm response from the hearts of millions — nay tens of millions of people of the entire world, who are actively fighting for the cause of Peace.

The Communist Parties of the bourgeois countries are at present forced to work under the conditions of a developing frantic anti-Communist campaign, inspired by Anglo-American imperialist reaction. The Communist Party of USA which has been declared a "subversive" organisation and which the U.S. Congress is getting ready to ban is being subjected to savage persecutions.

The Communist Party of USA has courageously condemned the foreign policy of the Truman Government and demanded an end to the war hysteria fomented for the purpose of unleashing a new war. Hence, it can be understood why the American monopolies strive to reek vengeance on the Communist Party and why Craig, the fascist head of the "American Legion", declared recently, "Every single member of the Communist Party must be imprisoned."

The 'trial' organised by the ruling circles of the USA of the leaders of the Communist Party pursued the aim of removing from the path those who came forward courageously against the preparations for a new world war, and of destroying the political party of the American working class, a party in whom all progressive and honest men in the country rightly perceive "the conscience of America." Besides this, the trial was organised with the aim of sounding a new signal for an attack on the camp of Socialism and democracy in the whole world, for organising fresh persecutions of the Communist Parties.

In exposing the organisers of these base proceedings, Foster, the Chairman of the National Committee of the Communist Party of USA, wrote that the proceedings were necessary "for the insane foreign policy of the Truman Government" and were an indication to the servitors of

American imperialism in other countries "to suppress the democratic rights of the peoples with the aim of facilitating the fulfilment of the war programme and of the conquest of the whole world, which is being effected by the monopolies." But the forces of war cannot and will not succeed in intimidating the Communist Party of USA.

The Plenum of the National Committee of the Communist Party of USA, which took place in 1949, discussed the question of the further struggle of the people for Peace and adopted the decision on the strengthening of the Party, in raising its vigilance and in the struggle for unity in the trade union movement against the reactionary trade union leaders of the type of Green, Murray, Carey — the rabid enemies of working class unity and the accomplices of the instigators of war.

The steady growth of the forces of the democratic and anti-imperialist camp, headed by the Soviet Union, evokes the fury of the forces of reaction and war. The imperialist camp resorts to new methods and means in order to arrest the growth of the forces of democracy and Socialism.

In their plans for the preparation for a new war and for world domination, the American imperialists are now, after their defeat in China, assigning a special role to Japan, whilst striving to convert her into a base for the unleashing of a struggle against the growing democratic movement in Asia and into a springboard for their military adventures against the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic.

Relying on Japanese reaction, American imperialism is striving to prevent the unity of the democratic forces of the people. The so-called "Tokuda Case" represents a manoeuvre of the American imperialists and Japanese reaction intended to crush the Communist Party of Japan and to suppress the democratic movements.

Under these conditions, the Communist Party of Japan sees that its most important task is to rally the toilers and all democratic forces for a struggle for national independence of the country, to create a national democratic front, to expose daily the colonising plans of foreign imperialists in Japan and the anti-popular treacherous role of Japanese reaction. The Communist Party of Japan is striving to implement the unity of action of the working class and the unification under its leadership of the activities of the different strata of the the people directed against the imperialists.

The Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Japan which was held recently set itself the task of overcoming the tendencies prevailing in the Party

of underestimating the mass organisations, and to do its utmost for the consolidation of trade unions and mass organisations and an extension of its influence amongst them. Special attention was paid to the necessity of intensifying the activity of the Communists in non-party organisations which are under the treacherous leadership of the Social-Democrats. The Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Japan emphasised the importance of Party work in the peasant unions, amongst the agricultural workers, the poor peasants and the fishermen.

Speaking of the base methods of the bourgeoisie in the struggle against the growing Communist movement, Lenin wrote:

"In many countries, including the most advanced, the bourgeoisie is undoubtedly now sending agents-provocateurs into the Communist Parties and will continue to do so." (V. I. Lenin: *Selected Works*, Moscow, 1947, Vol. II, p. 591)

The Tito band — that clique of spies and murderers, long ago recruited by the foreign intelligence service—is a gang of such provocateurs. The imperialist reaction entrusted to this band the fulfilment of the special task of undermining the unity of the international Communist movement with the aim of making it easier for itself to unleash a new war. Tito is a most commonplace spy and a purveyor of new agents for American espionage.

Demagogic perorations about "building Socialism in Yugoslavia with one's own forces" will not rescue the clique of Tito-traitors.

The peoples of Yugoslavia are more and more beginning to recognise that the traitors who had sold themselves to the imperialists captured power by deceptive means. They will not escape the judgement of the peoples and the deserved retribution for betrayal of the interests of the working class and the toilers of Yugoslavia, for betrayal of national independence. By shackling the country in the chains of police and fascist terror, the traitors placed it at the feet of the imperialists.

One of the notes of the Soviet Government to the Yugoslav Government emphasises:

"An examination of what is happening in Yugoslavia today leaves no doubt whatever that it is quite out of the question to speak of popular rule there, or of the present government system in Yugoslavia being democratic or socialist.

"For, what talk can there be of a socialist system in

Yugoslavia when that country has been placed under the control of foreign capital and the leadership of the Yugoslav Communist Party is at war with the Communist Parties of the whole world?" (The Soviet Government's Reply to the Yugoslav Government's Note, concerning the Unlawful Arrests of Soviet Citizens: Supplement to *New Times*, No. 35, August 24, 1949)

"The Communist Party of Yugoslavia" as it is constituted today has forfeited the right to call itself a Communist Party since it has fallen into the hands of the enemies of the people—the murderers and spies—since the doors of the Party have been opened wide for bourgeois-kulak elements while the Tito-Rankovic gang expels the Communists who are true to proletarian internationalism out of the ranks of the Party and shoots them down.

The so-called "Communist Party of Yugoslavia" is at present only an apparatus fulfilling the espionage instructions of the Tito-Rankovic gang.

The capital of Yugoslavia has been converted into an American centre of espionage where plans are being worked out for the effecting of counter-revolutionary coups in the People's Democracies, and their separation from the Soviet Union, from the entire Socialist Camp and their subjection to the imperialist camp.

The Communist and Workers' Parties see as one of their most important tasks that there should be an all-sided raising of revolutionary vigilance in their ranks and that bourgeois-nationalist elements who had wormed themselves into the ranks of the Parties should be exposed and eradicated, whatever be the label under which they screen themselves.

One of the main tasks of the brother Communist Parties is the intensification of the ideological work, the education of Communists in the spirit of loyalty to proletarian internationalism, in the spirit of irreconcilability to any departure from the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

Communists must perceive calmly the frenzy of the bourgeoisie, doomed by history to inevitable destruction. They recall the prophetic words of Lenin expressed by him in the book "*Left-wing Communism — An Infantile Disorder*:"

"When the American bourgeoisie having completely lost its head, seizes thousands and thousands of people on suspicion of Bolshevism, creates an atmosphere of panic and broadcasts stories of Bolshevik plots; when the British bourgeoisie—the most "solid" in the world—despite all its wisdom

and experience, commits incredible follies, founds richly endowed "anti-Bolshevik societies", creates a special literature on Bolshevism, and hires an extra number of scientists, agitators and priests to combat it—we must bow and thank the capitalist gentry. They are working for us. They are helping us to get the masses interested in the nature and significance of Bolshevism. And they cannot do otherwise; for they have already failed to stifle Bolshevism by 'silence'." (V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Moscow, 1947, Vol. II, pp. 632-33)

In concluding his book, "*Left-Wing Communism—An Infantile Disorder*", V. I. Lenin writes:

"Communists should know that the future in any case belongs to them; therefore, we can (and must) combine the most intense passion in the great revolutionary struggle with the coolest and most sober estimation of the bourgeoisie." (V. I. Lenin, *Ibid*, p. 633)

These flaming words, permeated with the most profound faith in the ultimate victory of the great cause of the working class, inspire the Communists in all countries in the struggle for Peace, Democracy and Socialism.

The Leninist-Stalinist teachings on the strategy and tactics of Bolshevism help the brother Communist Parties which in the course of thirty years have grown into militant mass parties of the working class, to increase their vigilance against the intrigues of imperialist reaction and the most varied types of its agents; to implant and consolidate discipline in Party ranks; to develop criticism and self-criticism of shortcomings in work; to learn the art of the struggle to win over the majority of the working class and the toiling masses to its sides.

In the works of Lenin and Stalin the brother Communist Parties have found and are finding the most valuable directions as to how one must utilise the most reactionary trade unions and parliaments, combine legal and illegal work, conclude compromises, how to lend to the strategy and tactics of the Communist Parties those forms which are flexible to the maximum and justified by reality, how to utilise every discord, conflict and difference in the camp of the enemy.

The Leninist-Stalinist strategy and tactics of Bolshevism is a sharp weapon in the hands of brother Communist Parties in their struggle for the cause of Peace, Democracy and Socialism.

## REAL FACE OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF INDIA

Pages: 48

Price: As. 6

Every reader of the **COMMUNIST** had been asking for an analysis of the theory and practice of the Socialist Party of India for quite a long time. We are very glad to announce that a booklet on the Indian Socialists is ready for sale.

In this booklet, the author analyses the statements of policy, the reports and resolutions of the Socialist Party Conferences as also the speeches of the top-ranking socialist leaders and contrasts them with the policy of the Congress Government. The socialist leaders clamour very much about "Democratic Socialism". This booklet analyses their claim to be real socialists and democrats. This booklet analyses the foreign policy of the Socialist Party—"positive neutrality"—as well as their attitude towards the Soviet Union, their stand on the Korean issue, on the American atomaniacs, the fight for Peace and such other burning issues of the present international situation.

This is a factual analysis and the conclusions the author draws may not at all be palatable to the Socialist Party leaders.

The readers of the **COMMUNIST** will find in this booklet an effective weapon to combat the reformist illusions fostered by the Socialist leaders.

Sell this booklet in thousands.

*Book Your Orders Immediately*

PEOPLE'S PUBLISHING HOUSE, LTD.,  
190-B, Khetwadi Main Road, Bombay 4.



# **ANARCHISM OR SOCIALISM ?**

*by J. V. STALIN*

Pages: 108

Price: As. 3

This outstanding work in Marxist-Leninist theory by J. V. Stalin was published first in 1906-7. It is for the first time available in English.

The author examines with his usual clarity and precision the doctrine of Anarchism as enunciated by Kropotkin and his followers, V. Cherkhezishvili and others, which then claimed to represent true socialism.

J. V. Stalin, the author, by juxtaposing and comparing the fundamental principles of Marxism and Anarchism in theory and practice, conclusively proves that the claim of Anarchism to represent genuine socialism is baseless and devoid of any reality. He shows beyond dispute that Marxism alone represents true socialism.

The author shows that Marxism and Anarchism are based on fundamentally opposite principles, that Anarchism is the enemy of socialism, of Marxism, of the working-class movement.

At the same time, this great work of Stalin is a creative development of Marxism, its dialectical method and materialist theory.

This book is an indispensable weapon in the struggle against bourgeois ideology, which unfortunately even today is influencing to a very great extent the Indian people, including the working class.

All fighters for true socialism must make it incumbent on themselves to organise the sale of this great work of Stalin as widely as possible.

*Book Your Orders Immediately*

PEOPLE'S PUBLISHING HOUSE, LTD.,  
190-B, Khetwadi Main Road, Bombay 4