2 copy
stock

JPRS: 3427

23 June 1960

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

- USSR -

By M. D. Kammari

RETURN TO MAIN FILE

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

19991008 142

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

Photocopies of this report may be purchased from:

PHOTODUPLICATION SERVICE
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

U. S. JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE
205 EAST 42nd STREET, SUITE 300
NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

F O R E W O R D

This publication was prepared under contract by the UNITED STATES JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE, a federal government organization established to service the translation and research needs of the various government departments.

JPRS: 3427

CSO: 3803-D

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

- USSR -

[The following is a translation of an article by M. D. Kammari, Corresponding Member of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, in Voprosy Filosofii (Problems of Philosophy), Vol. XIV, No. 4, Moscow 1960, pages 30-45.]

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

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

I. The Marxist Theory of Nations Developed by V.I. Lenin

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

In one of his prominent early theoretical works, which was entitled "Who Are These 'Friends of the People', and How Do They Combat the Social Democrats?" (spring-summer 1894), Lenin criticized the idealistic-populistic theory of nations, setting up in opposition to it the materialistic Marxist theory. According to populist N. Mikhaylovskiy, nations and national relationships constitute a "continuation and summarization of

clan relationships." This theory, which is current with bourgeois sociologists and historiographers, who believe in evolution from the family through the clan, tribe and nation to the state, is gainsaid by the actual history of the appearance of nations. Analyzing the process by which the Russian national state developed, Lenin showed that the formation of nations and national relationships had no link with tribal development nor was it a 'continuation or summarization' of the tribal system. Rather, the increased exchange among various parts of Russia, the gradually larger volume of goods turnover, the concentration of small local markets in an all-Russian market - the appearance of capitalist production relations - were the important factors.

"Since the leaders and managers of this process were the capitalist merchants, the creation of national relationships was none other than the establishment of bourgeois relationships" (V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. I, pages 137-138). Prior to the existence of the Moscow state, there were various areas and principalities with traces of fuedalism; there were autonomous sectors with special forms of administration, their own armies, customs frontiers, etc. At that time national relations in the proper and strictly scientific sense of the term did not exist in Russia. "It was only with the new era in Russian history (as of the seventeenth century, approximately)," according to Lenin, "That there was a real merger of all these lands, areas and principalities into a whole." (Ibid, page 137).

These conclusions of Lenin's constitute a further development and expansion of the theories of Marx and Engels on the "merger into one nation with a single government, legal code, national class interest, and customs frontier of various independent areas with separate interests, laws, governments and customs levies" as capitalism developed in the feudal states." (K. Marx and F. Engels, Works, Vol. 4, page 428).

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

About the process of formation and the nature of these nations, Lenin wrote: "Nations are the inevitable product and form deriving from the bourgeois epoch of social development." (Works, Vol. XXI, page 56).

Lenin developed the only correct and specific scientific approach to the study of nations, which appear in connection with the evolution of capitalism. The revisionists (O. Bauer and K. Renner) have opposed to Marxist theory their won nationalistic and idealistic concept of nations. In their view, a

"nation is a union of individuals thinking and speaking similarly", or a community of persons unrelated "to the land" but with a communal territory. (K. Renner). "The nation is a community of relatively common character," or a "totality of persons by a common nature on the basis of a common fate." (O. Bauer). This theory ignores the class contradictions within bourgeois nations, picturing these as "unions of likethinking people". It fails to relate nations and their psychic mentalities with the true grounds on which nations are based, exist, and develop, including a community of language. The logical result of such a theory would be a nationalist program to promote "cultural-national autonomy." Each citizen of a state would identify with one "nation" or another or with an extraterritorial "national union" guiding the cultural affairs of the nation (schools, etc.), constituting a juridical entity with the right to tax its citizens for cultural undertakings, and having its own parliament and ministers. General international working organizations, trade unions, cooperatives, and even the Social Democratic Party would have been broken down on the basis of the extraterritorial-national principle. Not only in the state but also in individual factories would this theory call for a breakdown into many national trade unions, cooperatives, workers' parties, etc.

"The essential basic error in this program," wrote Lenin, "Is that it attempts to put into practice the most acute and absolute nationalism carried to the extreme." (Works, Vol. XX, page 17). This bourgeois-nationalistic program distorted the workers' movement, and undermined its international solidarity and class unity.

Opposing the idealistic theory on nations set forth by O. Bauer and K. Renner, as well as the nationalist socalled "cultural-national autonomy" program, Lenin demonstrated the importance of a common language to the unity of a population living in a common territory as well as that of a common economic existence in the larger modern nations. (see Works, Vol. VII, page 83). Unity within the national structure of a population, including a common language, Lenin said, is an important factor in the complete command of the domestic market and total freedom in economic turnover. (see Works, Vol. XIX, page 317, and Vol. XX, page 32). On the other hand, the development of economic relationships, trade, and the bourgeois distribution of labor determine the concentration of similar dialects in a general national language and the development and spread of that tongue.

On this basis, Lenin exposed the chauvinist policy of compulsory assimilation and Russification effected under the czars. He criticized the nationalistic concepts and the programs for cultural-national autonomy. He adamantly opposed the

introduction of a single "state language" in Russia, because it would promote the chauvinist policy of Russification. According to Lenin, this would mean the compulsory study of the Russian language, which would immediately alienate the peoples of Russia from it. The study of the great, powerful and free Russian tongue, the language of Lomonosov, Pushkin, Gogol, Turgenev, Tolstoy, and Gorki should not require compulsion. In his letter to Lenin, S. G. Shaunyan spoke of his idea of making Russian the state tongue of Russia because of its great cultural significance. Lenin determinedly opposed this measure, although he never in any way denied its cultural importance for all the peoples in the nation. ".....can you not see," he wrote, "That it (the Russian language - M. K.) would have even greater progressive influence if it were not compulsory? If a state language implies hickory sticks, it will be repellant. How can you fail to understand the psychology which is of such great importance in the nationality question? Given the slightest degree of compulsion the indisputably progressive significance of a united language in the centralization of a large state will be defiled, damaged and brought to naught. However, the economy is of even greater importance than psychology. In Russia, there is still is a capitalist economy, which makes the Russian language essential. But you do not trust the influence of the economy and would like to 'strengthen' it with the billysticks of the police riffraff? Will the abolition of the wretched police methods not multiply ten times (a thousand times) voluntary unity for the preservation and spread of the Russian language?" (Works, Vol. XIX, pages 452-453).

In the light of Lenin's statements, the Marxist view on the language problem is entirely clear: full equality of nations and their languages is necessary. No state privileges should be accorded to a given nation or language. No state compulsion should be connected with the study of a language. The free development and use of all languages should be permitted. Economic requirements and political and cultural communications between persons in a multinational state naturally lead gradually to the voluntary study of the language of the majority of the population insofar as it serves as the means of international communications and the mutual enrichment of the cultures of all nations. This occurs along with the study by citizens of each nation of their own tongue. This means of international communication will strengthen naturally and systematically, but cannot be enforced. The masses themselves will determine which languages they must know and therefore must study. For example, if the Soviet national republics have introduced Russian language study in the schools, it has been entirely a voluntary

matter with no pressure from the Russians, a measure taken because the knowledge of Russian opens wider the doors to the rich treasuries of Russian and world culture, and facilitates communication and cultural development. Such decisions, adopted voluntarily, have nothing in common with the compulsory study of an official state language.

Thus, from Lenin's analysis of the process of the emergence of nations based on community of language, territory, economic life and culture, stems the well-known Marxist concept of the nation as set forth in "Marxism and the National Problem" written by J. Stalin in 1913. His definition contains another aspect of nationality - a community of mind evidenced in the special peculiarities of national cultures. This is undoubtedly a product of communal economic life and the common history of development and emergence of the nation as well as its interrelationships with other nations. Neither in theory nor in practical politics can this factor be ignored, as Lenin stressed more than once.

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

pletely consistent with the actual facts. It is here that the bourgeois-nationalistic nature of the theories of these "critics" of Marxism becomes apparent. In this instance they overlook the fact that bourgeois nations are composed of opposing and antagonistic classes, and that the bourgeoisie leads these nations, implementing bourgeois policies in the name of the nations and educating them in a nationalist spirit.

II. Two Capitalist Trends As Regards the National Question and the Struggle for Proletarian Internationalism

Lenin laid a firm basis for the proletarian policy in regard to the national question and worked out the objective law governing the development of capitalism in the field of national relationships. In his article "Critical Notes on the National Question" (1913) he wrote: "In the development of capitalism there are two historical trends as regards the question of nations. The first is an awakening of national life and national movements - the struggle against nation-oppression and the creation of a national state. The second is the development and intensification of all relationships between nations, the elimination of national boundaries, the creation of an international union of capital, and, in general, of international economy, politics, science, etc. The two trends comprise the essence of the global law governing capitalism. The former is dominant during the early stage of development, and the latter characterizes the mature phase - capitalism changing into a socialist society. The Marxist national program takes both trends into account." (Works, Vol. XX, page 11).

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

As early as 1914 Lenin wrote: "National movements did not first develop in Russia nor were they especially typical of it. All over the world the epoch of the complete victory of capitalism over feudalism was linked with national movements. The economic basis for these movements was the fact that total success in goods production demanded that the bourgeoisie find a domestic market, have a state with a united territory and a population speaking a single language, eliminate all hindrances to the development of that language, and promote its literary reinforcement.....

".....the establishment of national states which are best able to meet these requirements of modern capitalism therefore constitutes a trend pursued by each and every national movement. All major economic factors lead in that direction, and for the whole Western Europe - as a matter of fact for the entire civilized world - the national state is typical of and normal in the capitalist period." (Ibid, pages 368-369). Recognizing this phenomenon, Lenin's program, apart from demanding full equality for every citizen regardless of language or nationality, called for the right of selfdetermination and the right to separate and form its own state for each nation.

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

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

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

cratic state. Separation is not our plan. We do not advocate it at all. In general, we oppose it. However, we stand for the right to separate thinking. This applied to the reactionary believers in Great Russian nationalism, for example, although it damaged the cause of national coexistence. Sometimes closer relationships may result after a free separation!" (Works, Vol. 19, pages 453-454).

On this basis, Lenin adamantly opposed the project of federation in terms of the conditions pervailing in the bourgeois-landowners' Russia. However, as is generally known, he did accept it as a transitional form during the establishment of the multinational socialists state. In the letter to Shaumyan quoted above he also wrote: "In principle, we oppose federation - it weakens economic relations, and is an unsuitable form for a single state. You wish to separate? Be damned, then, if you will forsake economic relationships, or rather, if oppression and friction within the "cohabitation" system are such that they harm those relationships." (Ibid, page 453).

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

Marxism favors a type of state, national or multinational, in which the maximum freedom, democracy and equality have been guaranteed for all nationalities, since only on such a basis can friendly cooperation and progress come about. Lenin frequently pointed out the fact that in principle Marxism opposes separatism, and that it cannot support a movement, including national reactionary movements, when they conflict with the interests of the working people and the international revolutionary workers' movement, or the will of the working people of the nation.

The program and policies implemented by the party of the proletariat in the field of national relationships on the basis of Lenin's theories proved excellent. This was because they embody the two trends in capitalism on the national question in their contradictory unity.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The division of the old India into the new India and Pakistan on the basis of religion was, naturally, a reactionary one, as it inflamed religious passions, dulled the class con-

sciousness of the working people, and hindered the struggle they were waging against imperialism and feudalism.

Because of bourgeois ideology and politics, the two capitalist trends on the national question are oriented toward an irreconcilable contradiction which finds its distorted expression in state chauvinism, cosmopolitanism, racism, notions of world domination on the one hand and the promotion of nationalism for oppressed nations on the other.

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

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

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

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

"The nationalist principle, historically speaking, is inevitable in a bourgeois society," wrote Lenin, "And in analyzing such a society, Marxism acknowledges the historical necessity for such a movement. However, so that this recognition will not be confused with an apology for nationalism, it should be strictly limited to approval of the progressive aspects of such movements. It should not result in the clouding of the proletarian mind with bourgeois ideology." (Works, Vol. XX, page 18).

The struggle of the masses against national oppression, against colonialism and against imperialism is without a doubt a progressive phenomenon. It is the duty of the proletariat to aid the people in ridding themselves of all national oppression in the interests of its own class struggle. This latter battle is hindered and clouded by national bickering resulting from national oppression and inequality. Hence it is the absolute duty of Marxists to promote systematic and strict democracy in dealing with all aspects of the national question. But the support of nation-

ist prejudices, division or a lack of faith among the working people of various nations would constitute taking a nationalist stand.

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

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

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

Lenin, in his article "The National Pride of the Great Russians," written in 1914, demonstrated that "The interests, not to be confused with the indomitable pride, of the Great Russians, coincide with the socialist interests of the Great Russian (and all others) proletariat," and that it is the landowners and capitalists who deride and sell out the true interests of the nation and the motherland, while their social-chauvinist supporters and flunkeys not only are traitors to the motherland but to the proletarian brotherhood of nations as well, i.e. the cause of socialism the world over. Stressing the progressive, and even revolutionary role played by the bourgeoisie and capitalism in establishing large, progressive nations free of the oppression of feudal monarchy, during the period of bourgeois-democratic revolutions and national liberation movements in Europe and later in Asia, Lenin also showed that the monopolistic bourgeoisie in the principal capitalist countries and in the powerful states became the greatest oppressor of colonial peoples and the world as a whole.

During the imperialist epoch, as Lenin stated, there is a typical and characteristic division of the world in general into a handful of imperialist states and dominant nations on the one hand, and a majority of oppressed and dependent nations and countries on the other. This aspect of imperialism, as regards the national question, is carefully overlooked by all the supporters of colonialism, social chauvinism, reformism and revisionism. They depict colonial empires which are centers of cruel racial and national oppression and exploitation as free societies of nations. They continue to attack the concept of nation-

al independence, sovereignty, and free selfdetermination for the peoples of dependent countries and colonies. They regard national sovereignty as an outdated concept contradictory to the "forward march of history"; the patriotic strivings of the peoples for freedom and independence they identify with nationalism. They demand the establishment of "national federations" and "world government", to be effected, naturally, under the aegis of the imperialist states. Such are the beliefs of the leaders of the right wing socialists in France, the laborites in England, the reformists in Austria, and other parties of the "Socialist International".

The tremendous significance of Lenin's program is made even more obvious under current conditions. This program calls for the total equality of nations, with the right of free selfdetermination, separation, and the establishment of separate states. He who opposes this program is an enemy of free nations, and a deliberate or unwitting defender of imperialism. The communists support all national liberation movements, including those which are bourgeois, insofar as they propound these ideas. The communists oppose revisionism and "national communism", whose advocates deny the need for battling to promote the leading role of the proletariat in national liberation movements. Taking into account the lessons of history and the present situation, they give warning to the working people of the fact that a national bourgeoisie is most unsystematic and unstable in defending the freedom and independence of nations, and that it will compromise with imperialist and domestic reactionary forces which oppose the interests of the working people. For this reason the creation and strengthening of a united national and people's anti-imperialist front does not hinder, but on the contrary directly embodies, the promotion of the proletariat's leading role and hegemony. Such is the general and objective law which leads all nations from capitalism and precapitalist relationships to socialism.

It is only the workers' class which is capable of continuing systematic battle against oppression and exploitation, including national oppression, which can serve as the liberator of all nations from the stifling rule of imperialism and capitalism, and can create a society within which there will be neither social nor national oppression. This Marxist-Leninist assertion is not only a theoretical view, but a reality as well. It has become fact for the more than 30% of humanity which is constructing a new society.

From the Marxist point of view, therefore, the national question must always be regarded in a specific historical-dialectical light, i.e. all the dialectical aspects of social development in the various opochs and countries must be taken into account in terms of the various relationships between classes within a country and on an international level, inter-relationships between nations, the development of class contradictions within nations, the level of the

organization and consciousness of the working masses in various nations, etc., etc.

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

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

In 1916, forecasting the advance of the epoch of world socialist revolution, Lenin described the national liberation movement as a part of the international socialist movement. It was also very clear to him that such movements were bourgeois-democratic in nature, particularly in the colonies, economically backward countries, and peasant areas in the Orient with semi-feudal, semi-patriarchal and semi-colonial structures. He stated that socialist revolution in the imperialist epoch constitutes an era in itself which combines proletarian revolutionary movements for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie in developed capitalist countries, and an entire series of democratic and revolutionary movements - including those which are national - liberational - in nondeveloped, backward and oppressed countries. This results from the law of inequality of economic and political development under capitalism, especially during the imperialist epoch.

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

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

In this regard, the possibilities for the transition of peoples to socialism by skipping the difficult stage of capitalism, as set forth by Lenin, are of extreme importance to the peoples of economically underdeveloped countries, who comprise

more than half of the population of the globe. Lenin enlarged on this matter in his address to the Second Congress of the Communist International in 1920. He stressed that "With the help of the proletariat of advanced countries, others may advance to socialism and communism while bypassing the capitalist stage of development." (Works, Vol. XXX 31, page 219). Lenin developed this idea even prior to the October Revolution, in 1916.

On behalf of the Russian workers' class and people, he stated: "We will try to render to other peoples selfless cultural assistance, in the expressive phrase of the Polish Social Democrats, i.e. to help them initiate the use of machinery, to facilitate their work, to promote democracy and the achievement of socialism." (Works, Vol. XXIII, page 55).

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

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

The national liberation movements in dependent countries and colonies which are not yet free of the yoke of imperialism are intensifying along with the breakdown of imperialist colonial systems. The contradictions and national antagonisms within the camp of the principal imperialist colonialist states are becoming more and more acute. The establishment of the so-

called "common European market" has as its purpose the rallying of imperialists against socialism, the workers' movement in Europe, and the liberation movements of the peoples in Asia and Africa. However, it will inevitably intensify the national contradictions among the imperialists themselves, and will make necessary a resurgence of national propaganda, chauvinism and racism. These are already evidenced in the ragings of the fascist revenge-seekers in Western Germany and the reestablishment of Nazi antiSemitism there. Also, the beastly forms taken by the ideology and practices of the advocates of racial oppression and discrimination, which are being implemented by the ruling classes in the Union of South Africa and the Southwestern African Territory mandate, the Belgian Congo and the British colonies in Africa, and the racial discrimination in the attitude towards the millions of Negroes in the USA are well-known. All of these make it necessary for us to intensify our efforts to lay bare colonial, racist, chauvinist and nationalistic ideology, and to propagandize the ideology of proletarian internationalism and friendship among peoples, as called for in the decisions adopted by the CC of the CPSU on Party propaganda.

III. The Basic Trend of Socialism in the Field of National Relations

Leninist principles and the program for a national Party policy have been fully implemented in the USSR. The right of free selfdetermination, including separation and the formation of an independent national state; full equality and freedom of development for all nations, national and ethnographic groups and national minorities in all sectors of public life; and the abolishment of all national and national-religious favoritism have all been brought about. In the process of constructing socialism, actual economic and cultural equality among nations has been achieved; in place of the old bourgeois nations divided into antagonistic classes and headed by the bourgeoisie and its nationalist parties, new, socialist nations have developed and flourished and have united in a monolithic moral-political unity within the socialist regime, led by the workers' class and its internationalist Party, which educates all working people in a spirit of proletarian internationalism, friendship among peoples, and Soviet patriotism.

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

The extreme, almost total, illiteracy of the population

of national areas in the northern and eastern parts of czarist Russia has been eliminated in the course of the development of the cultural revolution. A system including all levels of education was established with unheard of speed, the national cultures of formerly oppressed nations were encouraged, and numbers of national cadres constituting a socialist intelligentsia were established. The socialist nations of the USSR became the most educated and cultured nations in the world. For example, in January 1959, there were 18 university graduates and 263 graduates of secondary and junior secondary schools per 1000 population in the USSR; 19 and 263 respectively in the RSFSR: 17 and 286 in the Ukraine; 21 and 261 in Azerbaijan; 21 and 344 in Latvia; 21 and 304 in Estonia; 28 and 289 in Armenia; and 38 and 315 in Georgia. The Byelorussian, Cossack, Uzbeck, Lithuanian, Moldavian, Kirghiz, Tadzhik and Turkmen SSR's lag somewhat behind in secondary and higher education, but even here, the level exceeds that in foreign countries, not only in the Orient, but in Europe as well. Furthermore, the speed of the educational upsurge is amazing. Between 1939 and 1959, the number of secondary school graduates per 1000 population in the USSR and the RSFSR increased to a total of 340% of the number in the former year. That in the Ukrainian SSR increased to 310% of the earlier figure; that in Byelorussia to 330%; in Moldavia - 460%; the Tadzhik SSR - 800%; the UZbeck SSR - 600%; and the Kirghiz - more than 700%.

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

In the cultural sector, the USSR is implementing a law on the systematic and proportionate development and gradual equalization of the general cultural level and standard in all nations on the basis of aid to backward nations such that they may attain the level of those better developed and more advanced. This law is being conscientiously applied. This process is also being carried out throughout the socialist camp in connection with the gradual equalization of their economic development. For example, industrial production had increased by 1958 to more than 250% of the prewar output in the German Democratic Republic, 330% in Czechoslovakia, almost 400% in Rumania, more than 400% in Hungary, more than 550% in Poland, approximately 900% in Bulgaria, 1,800% in Albania, 1,000% (in eight years) in China, and 350% in the Korean People's Democratic Republic, despite the serious destruction due to war and foreign intervention. (See Extraordinary Twenty-first Congress of the CPSU, Stenographic Report, Vol. I, page 67). Such an equalization in economics (and later

in cultural development) is impossible under the conditions in a capitalist system, where the law of uneven economic and political development, the law of maximum exploitation of superprofits from colonies, the law of bourgeois competition, colonial and national domination and oppression, subjection and exploitation of some countries by others are operative. The peoples of the USSR, previously oppressed, deprived of their rights, existing like animals under patriarchal precapitalist relationships, and fated by the bourgeois landowners' regime to poverty, hunger, disease, ignorance, illiteracy and oblivion, have experienced rebirth into a new and happy life. They rapidly created a national state, a socialist economy and industry, a socialist intelligentsia and a socialist culture. On this basis, the great and brotherly Leninist friendship between the peoples of the USSR has flourished. It was in the USSR that the Leninist principles of proletarian internationalism practically embodied in the Leninist program for resolving the national question first emerged victorious.

In connection with the victory of socialism in the USSR and the creation of a world socialist system, the problem of the basic policy to be pursued under socialism as regards national relations of course arises. It naturally requires profound, specific and thorough research. Here we can only set forth the general outline as propounded by Lenin. In his works he many times emphasized the fact that the purpose of socialism is not only the liberation, voluntary union and rapprochement, but also the merger, of all nations into a united communist society. As the abolishment of classes and class differences may lead humanity, through a transitional period, to achieve the dictatorship of the proletariat, "the transitional period too, through the total liberation of oppressed nations, i.e. their free separation, will lead to an inevitable merger among all nations." (Works, Vol. XXII, page 136).

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

The tendency toward the internationalization of economic life dominant in the imperialist epoch in fact means the oppression and exploitation of one country by another, colonial plundering and seizure, the striving of "civilized" nations to dominate "uncivilized" countries, the suppression of freedom, sovereignty and peoples' independence, and of their efforts toward

national consolidation and the establishment of national states. Hence the development of contradictory trends toward the elimination of compulsory forms of imperialist "unification" of peoples is inevitable. This trend has been on the increase since the victory of the socialist revolution in the USSR and the establishment of a world socialist system. The struggle between these two contradictory and irreconcilable trends is inherent in the history of establishment and existence of all colonial empires. It is precisely this which leads to the breakdown of these empires and the entire colonial imperialist system. In its place separate and independent nations and national states arise.

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

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

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

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

It is these very vestiges and their "carriers" who are out of step with the general systematic and progressive processes of rapprochement between socialist nations and the partial processes of voluntary merging between small nations, tribes, ethnographic and national groups, into large, progressive socialist nations. By idealizing all of the past, including its backward aspects, by

defending all national peculiarities including presocialist forms and social relationships, the supporters of these vestiges of nationalism not only hinder the rapprochement between their nations and others, but also their internal development and prosperity. Those who display remnants of state chauvinism fan to a flame the remnants of local nationalism.

Hence the necessity for combatting all capitalist remnants in the field of national relationships as well as remnants of nationalism, and the need for educating the working people of all nations in a spirit of socialist patriotism and internationalism.

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

The process of partial voluntary mergers among small ethnographic groups, tribes and nations with larger socialist nations will intensify even further. There is no doubt that the tendency toward a rapprochement between closely related languages, and even their combination and standardization, as a result of expanded communications between the users and developers of these languages, will progress. The great progressive importance of the Russian language as a means of international communications among the peoples of the USSR and in the promotion of their cultural development will become even greater.

Data in the 1959 all-union census indicates the nature of these processes which are occurring under our very eyes. For example, Russian is considered their native language by 10.2 million people of ther than the 114.4 million of Russian nationality (of which 99.8% considered it their native tongue). This means that the Russian language is not for them merely a means of international communication, but a basic tool, the means for their cultural and creative development. The partial process of the merger of nations in terms of language is especially intensive among small ethnographic groups and nationalities which do not inhabit a given territory in a compact group, but are scattered over other larger nations. For example, only 16.5% of the

Karaimi, 20.8% of the Jews, 22.3% of the Aleutians, and 34.7% of the Izhortsy consider the original tongue of their nations as their native language. About 40% of the gypsies and Finns, 39% of the Bashkirs, 30% of the Saams, 28% of the Karelians, 22% of the Mordovians and 18% of the Evenians consider the language of their nations as their native tongue. The mastery of the tongue of another nation as their native language is practiced by national groups as large as the Belorussians, of whom 16% do so; the Ukrainians - 13%; the Tartars - about 8%; the Letts - about 5%; the Uzbecks, Azerbaijani, Cossacks, Armenians, Georgians, and Lithuanians - 2.3 to 1.3%; and the Russians- 0.2%. These processes of partial merger in terms of language are indications of the deeper and more extensive processes of rapprochement between nations within the fields of economics, politics, and culture, and of the socialist community of their psychological backgrounds, which reflects the common socialist nature of their lives.

These are progressive processes which demand concrete study.

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

The establishment of a world socialist system has led to the emergence and increasing development of the international socialist distribution of labor and cooperation between industry in the various countries within the system. This links the peoples, their countries, and the peoples' economies in a cohesive unit. Rather than damage to any one of them, mutual benefits for each of them and for the system as a whole are derived.

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

creates the "national egotism" upon which the "national communist" ideologists dwell.

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

In place of bourgeois competition with its principle of "strangling the weaker in order to emerge the victor", socialism promotes competition based on a humanitarian principle: "aid the backward to achieve common progress." This is wholly consistent with the principle of proletarian internationalism in the relationships between socialist countries. Thus the public ownership of production tools unites entire peoples, and leaves no room for "national egotism". The international socialist distribution of labor and cooperation in industry, science and technology, and mutual aid between socialist countries, and the ever-developing and strengthening cultural relations between them indicate a process of rapprochement and prospering of the various nations, and the establishment of the conditions necessary for their complete merger in the higher stage of communism following the total triumph of communism the world over. Lenin linked the process of the merging of nations with that of the withering away of the state, and thus with the elimination of state borders between nations. This is possible only on the basis of the victory of socialism, at least in the majority of the principal capitalist countries.

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

Without such action the struggle for the victory of communism cannot succeed. In complete accordance with these Leninist teachings, the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU included the following in its resolution on the report of the CC:

"The national policy of the Party was and is based on the Leninist teaching to the effect that not only does socialism not eliminate national differences and peculiarities, but on the contrary guarantees the many-sided development and prosperity of the economies and cultures of all nations and peoples. The Party must in the future as has been done in the past consider carefully these various peculiarities in the practical work it does." (Twentieth Congress of the CPSU, Stenographic Report, Vol. II, page 422.).

These concepts were thoroughly analyzed in the reports presented by N. S. Khrushchev at the Twentieth and Twenty-first Congresses, and in many of his other statements.

Calling to mind the legacy left by V. I. Lenin in the field of national relationships, Khrushchev stated at the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU: "Our Party has succeeded in eliminating the mutual mistrust which existed between peoples in czarist Russia, and uniting all the peoples in the Soviet Union in ties of brotherly friendship. This was possible specifically because The Party always has devoted profound attention to their interests and their national peculiarities and aspirations, combining this concern with the education of the working people of all nationalities in a spirit of socialist community and concern for overall state interests." (Ibid, Vol. I, page 87). On the initiative of the Party, the CC, and of N. S. Khrushchev himself, the Soviet state in recent years has expanded the rights of the union republics, giving their administrations the majority of the industrial, state, legal, administrative, social and cultural functions which were previously under Union supervision. This has provided tremendous scope for the initiative of all the nations within the USSR. The improvement of planned guidance of the economy requires that the economic potential and needs of all republics and their prospective economic and cultural development be carefully taken into account, and that prompt note be taken of new developments in the lives of the people, their new potentialities and needs. It must always be borne in mind in this connection that the primary prerequisite for successful development of the country and all the republics therein is the rallying of every effort of the peoples in the Union; a strengthening, rather than a weakening, of the principle of democratic centralism in the administration of the economy; and the combination of the centralization required in a large, planned socialist economy and broad initiative on the part of the people's masses of all nations. This is the most important law governing the development of national relationships on the basis of a socialist economy. The ideological foundation for the strengthening of the brotherly friendship between peoples under socialism is an organic combination of socialist patriotism and internationalism.

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

The experience of the USSR in resolving the question of nationalities, in organizing brotherly collaboration among nations, in rallying friendship among various peoples, and in educating

them in a spirit of proletarian internationalism embodying the great and lifegiving ideas of Leninism, is being studied all over the world. This experience arms the brotherly communist parties and peoples of other countries for their struggle toward freedom and independence, peace and friendship with other peoples.

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

5003 - END -