

**COLONIAL
PEOPLES'
STRUGGLE
FOR
LIBERATION**

**Reports to
Institute of Economics
&
Pacific Institute of the
Academy of Sciences, U.S.S.R.**

1949

PEOPLE'S PUBLISHING HOUSE, LTD.

Scanned/Transcribed by
The Socialist Truth in Cyprus-London Bureaux
<http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk>



&
Direct Democracy (Communist Party)



www.directdemocracy4u.uk

**COLONIAL PEOPLES'
STRUGGLE FOR
LIBERATION**

**Reports to
Institute of Economics
&
Pacific Institute of the Academy of
Sciences, U.S.S.R.**

1949

PEOPLE'S PUBLISHING HOUSE, LTD.

Printed by Jayant Bhatt, at New stage Printing House Press, 190-B, Khetwadi Main Road, Bombay 4, and published by him for the People's Publishing House, Ltd., Khetwadi Main Road, Bombay 4.

Contents

PROBLEMS OF NATIONAL AND COLONIAL STRUGGLE AFTER THE SECOND WORLD WAR . By E. M. ZHUKOV.....	6
ON LEADING ROLE OF WORKING CLASS IN THE NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT OF THE COLONIAL PEOPLES BY V. M. MASLENNIKOV	21
NEW STAGE IN THE NATIONAL LIBERATION STRUGGLE OF THE PEOPLE Of INDIA BY V. V. BALABUSHEVICH	50
PEOPLE'S LIBERATION STRUGGLE IN COLONIAL AND SEMI-COLONIAL COUNTRIES AFTER SECOND WORLD WAR.....	89
PEOPLE'S CHINA.....	143
FOR A LASTING PEACE, FOR A PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY!	144

PROBLEMS OF NATIONAL AND COLONIAL STRUGGLE AFTER THE SECOND WORLD WAR* . By E. M. ZHUKOV

The struggle of the oppressed peoples for emancipation has spread over vast expanses of the earth and over all the continents of the world.

This struggle has already been crowned with great victories in the countries of East Asia.

Before our eyes Mongolia, which was once the most backward among backward countries has avoided the painful path of capitalist development and is laying the foundations of transition to Socialist construction.

The Korean people, who in the course of many decades were subjected to the most savage and bestial exploitation of the Japanese barons, a people who were sedulously 'Japanised' in order that their culture could be stifled and their feeling of national dignity corroded, have become masters of their own fate over a considerable part of the territory of their country.

Finally, the great Chinese people whose wealth for more than, a century attracted the avid glances of foreign capitalists, preachers and colonisers, generals and businessmen, missionaries and bankers, a people who suffered great misfortune and humiliation and whose land was rent and torn to pieces by the British, French, Japanese and other usurpers, a people whom even till yesterday the American interventionists had tried to stifle with their so-called "aid"—this people have

* *Revised stenogram of the report delivered on June 8 1949, at a Joint session of the Scholars' Council of the Institute of Economics and the Pacific Institute of the Academy of Sciences, USSR devoted to the problems of the national and colonial movement after the Second World War.*

already won a great victory of historic significance. A People's Republic of China has been proclaimed and a Central People's Government headed by the renowned leader of the Chinese Communists, Mao Tse-tung has been formed. The banner of People's Democracy flies victoriously over the most important vital centres, over the industrial towns—the cradle of the Chinese working class, which is leading the people.

S.E. Asia, that ancient preserve of colonial oppression and exploitation has been transformed into an arena of a dogged and bloody struggle of the rising peoples against the imperialist slave-owners.

The imperialists and their native servitors are resorting to frenzied terror, imprisonment, the gallows, to the basest provocation in order for the time being to hold in subjugation the peoples of India, of the Near East, Central and South America.

But even the most backward continent, Africa, has already begun seriously to disturb the peace of the colonial masters by the appearance of a popular resistance to the civilised oppressors, a resistance which though weak at present is growing irresistibly. The heroic uprising of the Malagazy people in Madagascar, this immense island situated near the African coast and remote from the centres of the revolutionary struggle, deprived of correct information about the life and struggle of other people and concealed behind the iron curtain of the French colonial empire—this heroic uprising drowned in blood has like a flash of lightning cast light on the tense situation in the most lonely and secluded corners of the dark domain of the imperialist pirates. The peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies do not wish to live as of old. It is not merely that they can no longer endure the chains of colonial slavery, but also that they have recognised the possibility of breaking their chains; and have gained confidence in their strength and faith in the future.

Comrade Stalin has pointed out that the First World War and the victory of the revolution in the USSR

“has shattered the bases of imperialism in the *colonial and dependent* countries, that the authority of imperialism in these countries has already been undermined, and that it is beyond its power any longer to rule as of old in these countries.”

The Second World War and the defeat of the fascist aggressors, the world-historic victory of the USSR and the fact that a number of countries have dropped out of the capitalist system and are taking to the path of Socialist development had undermined the authority of imperialism in the colonial and dependent countries to a greater and hitherto unprecedented extent. This has deepened the crisis of the colonial system which is the most important component part of the general crisis of capitalism.

The peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies have seen with their own eyes the might of the forces that were opposed to imperialism; the downfall of the fascist colonial empires, the weakness and cowardice of the British “race” of the old colonial rulers and the instability of the empire of their oppressors.

For example can the peoples of Burma ever forget how shamelessly the British “masters” conducted themselves the period of the Second World War? Was it not possible for the people of the Philippines to observe a display of all the “qualities” of the belauded General MacArthur—from cowardice to treachery? Were not many peoples of Asia convinced through their own experience that the Japanese and the American, the French or the Italian colonisers “differ from each other only as a blue devil differs from a white devil”?

Inspired by the victories of the USSR, the defeat of fascism, the exposure of the barbarian ideology of racism the

weakening of their former ‘colonial “rulers”,’ whom during, the Second World War, they had learnt to really despise, the peoples of the colonies raised with renewed energy and confidence in their strength the banner of struggle for freedom and independence.

The armed struggle of the peoples of a number of colonial and dependent countries for their national independence and sovereignty, testifies not only to an increase in the sweep of the national liberation struggle but also its rise to a qualitatively new level. The armed struggle for the creation of independent republics in Indonesia and Indo-China, the armed struggle in Malaya and Burma, the peasant uprisings in India and finally the victorious Liberation War of the Chinese people bear clear testimony to the fact that the national liberation movement has entered a new and higher stage of its development after the Second World War.

The leading role of the working class and of its vanguard—the Communist Party is of decisive importance in the national liberation movement of the most important colonial countries. Already today we can affirm with complete truth that in the majority of colonial countries and in the first instance in those countries where the struggle against imperialism has assumed the sharpest form *the working class is emerging in the role of recognised leader of the colonial revolution, and the Communist Parties directly or through broader mass organisations are leading the national liberation movement.*

It is undoubtedly impossible to speak of the development of the national struggle in the colonies and semi-colonies, the character of this struggle, its direction and its tendencies in isolation from the general international situation. It is not difficult to see that the very advance and successes of the national liberation movement after the Second World were wholly the result of the changes in the correlation of class-forces on a world scale in favour of democracy and Socialism

and to the detriment of imperialism—a result of the growth of the might of the USSR. This is confirmed by the whole course of postwar historical development.

The aggressive policy of the USA and the growth of American colonial expansion after the Second World War, the formation of the Anglo-American imperialist bloc, directed against the USSR, against the People's Democracies, and against the national liberation movements on the one hand, and the active support which the Soviet Union is rendering to the peoples fighting for their liberation on the other, have resulted in the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries naturally gravitating more and more towards the anti-imperialist, democratic camp headed by the Soviet Socialist State. The consolidation of the democratic camp is the guarantee of the further successes of the national liberation struggle of the colonial peoples. The formation of and the struggle between the two camps—the camp of democracy and the camp of imperialism has at the same time sharpened the class struggle in all countries, by facilitating a more rapid and clear-cut demarcation of the opposing class forces both in the colonial and dependent countries.

The sweep and the successes of the popular movements in Asia are greatly alarming the imperialist camp, causing special annoyance to the American pretenders for world domination by revealing the adventurism of their plans and calculations. American imperialism which heads the anti-democratic camp and aspires for world domination has become the leader of the colonial powers, the main gendarme that is attempting to rescue the imperialists from the progressive democratic movement all over the world, and is seeking to crush the national liberation struggle in the colonies and semi-colonies. The monopolists of the USA regard the colonial possessions of every imperialist power as their own potential possession and by utilising the various levers of political, economic and

military pressure on the so-called Marshallised countries (Britain, France, Holland, Belgium), are overcoming the resistance of their competitors and compelling them to pursue in the majority of the colonies a policy which corresponds to the interests of American monopoly capital.

This policy is above all dictated by the strategic interests of the aggressive Anglo-American imperialist bloc. It is directed towards the utilisation of the man-power and material resources of the colonies and semi-colonies and in the first instance towards the acquisition of cheap or free labour power, cannon-fodder and military supplies for the purpose of preparing for a new world war. This policy sets as its task the utilisation of the territories of the colonies and semi-colonies as military jumping-off grounds and bases for the Anglo-American armed forces. Finally this policy pre-supposes the ruthless suppression of the national liberation movements in the colonial world.

The Trumans and Bevins are planning to use Africa for combined strategic purposes as a gigantic jumping-off ground for a new world war, and, at the same time, as a source of war raw materials and slave labour.

The democratic victory in China gives rise to an attempt on the part of the Anglo-American imperialists to organise a kind of a "screen" or "barrier" in order to fence off the sphere of their colonial plunder in South East and South Asia. The imperialists are mortally afraid of the perspective or direct contact being established between liberated China and Viet Nam, Indonesia, Malaya and Burma wherein also a ceaseless struggle is being waged by the peoples for their liberation. Wall Street and the City have reason to fear even about India, where the fresh winds from China cannot but reach.

While the aggressive North Atlantic Pact which is directed against the USSR and People's Democracies contains clauses which bind its signatories to carry out joint police measures against the democratic forces and in the first instance against

the working class movement in the countries of Western Europe. The Pacific and Mediterranean Pacts prepared by the imperialists bear a similar anti-Soviet direction and besides this their edge is especially directed against the national liberation movement of the colonial peoples.

But the correlation of forces between democracy and imperialism has of late changed to such an extent in favour of democracy that more and more often the imperialists are meeting with failure when they attempt as of old to apply the method of open armed intervention in the struggle against democracy. The sorry “experience” which the imperialists had in China and Viet Nam is there for all to see. Therefore the colonisers, while not renouncing the policy of war and intervention are attempting in every way to mask this policy more and more often the imperialist intervention is being carried out under the pretext of “aid”, “support” “defence” and with pious references to the United Nations Organisation.

The unprecedented advance of the national liberation struggle of the peoples of the dependent and colonial countries after the Second World War, the high level of that struggle and primarily the revolutionising effect on the colonies of the uninterrupted consolidation of the democratic anti-imperialist camp has compelled the imperialists to manoeuvre and to change the forms of their domination in the colonies. It has forced them to resort to demagogic means in order to dupe the enslaved people and cause a split in their national anti-imperialist front. The imperialists are relying to a greater and greater extent not only on the feudal-landlord elements, but also on the national big bourgeoisie in the colonial and semi-colonial countries.

Alarmed at the national liberation struggle of the peoples, which is rising at the present time to a particularly high level and which is being waged under the hegemony of the working class, confronted with the growing revolutionary activity of the

broad masses, the big bourgeoisie in the colonies and semi-colonies has finally gone over into the camp of imperialist reaction and betrayed the interests of its country and peoples.

Alarmed by the sweep of the national liberation struggle, the growth in the political consciousness of the toiling peoples and the leading role of the working class and Communist Parties in the revolutionary movements in the colonies and semi-colonies, the imperialist colonisers with the help of the big bourgeoisie, by utilising the religious, racial and other prejudices are trying to corrupt the consciousness of the masses with the poison of bourgeois nationalism and are trying to instigate chauvinistic sentiments.

Bourgeois nationalistic propaganda plays a most vital role in the aggressive plans of the imperialists. It is calculated not only to disrupt, disunite the peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies in the interests of imperialism but it also sets itself the task of neutralising the national liberation movement by directing it on to a false, nationalistic path under the leadership of the reactionary bourgeoisie and the national reformists, who are deflecting the masses from revolutionary aims and methods of struggle.

In the colonies and semi-colonies bourgeois nationalism is designed to hold back the masses under the ideological and political leadership of the big bourgeoisie which in the majority of colonial countries has already gone over into the imperialist camp. Bourgeois nationalism is especially directed against the national liberation movements in the colonies and dependent countries joining the anti-imperialist democratic camp. Bourgeois nationalism is the most important ideological weapon utilised by the Anglo-American aggressive bloc for the purpose of strengthening the instable colonial system of imperialism.

That is why a ruthless exposure of the reactionary, bourgeois-nationalistic ideology in all its diverse forms—be it

Kemalism or Gandhism, Sionism or Panarabism—accelerates the process of national and social emancipation of the colonial and dependent countries and razes to the ground the provocative designs of the imperialists and their agents.

Similarly in the developed capitalist countries the Right-wing Socialists, traitors to the working class are attempting to disseminate the rotten notion about the possibility of some kind of a ‘third’ middle path between Communism and capitalism and are in actual fact serving the forces of imperialist reaction, which is planning war against the USSR and the countries of People’s Democracy. The national reformists in the colonial and semi-colonial countries falsely reiterate their desire “to remain aloof from the struggle between the two camps”, their “neutrality” in relation to, as they express it, “the ideological conflict between the USSR and USA”, and in practice they form a bloc with the reactionary bourgeoisie, slander the USSR and actively help the imperialists.

The base role of Sultan Sjhariar in Indonesia, who has sold himself to the American imperialists is known to all. No baser slander is spread against the USSR than by the so-called Indian “Socialists”. The British puppet in Burma Thakin Nu also calls himself a “Socialist”.

The bloc of Anglo-American imperialist colonisers and the national bourgeoisie along with their national-reformist servitors are allowing the imperialists in the majority of the more important colonies to utilise the bourgeois democratic reformist illusions to dupe the masses. They permit the imperialists to substitute for the open and crude forms and methods of colonial domination, more subtle and covert forms (granting of dominion status, “independence” and the establishment of ‘allied’ treaty relations on the foundations of a formal equality of the parties).

In actual practice “equality” between the Philippines and USA or Iraq and Britain is a farce in the same manner as the

attempts of the French bourgeoisie to mask its colonial oppression in its overseas possessions under the sign-board of the “French Union”.

As a result of the “new policy” of the imperialists in the colonies and semi-colonial countries, the national big bourgeoisie is often being allowed by them to come to power along with the landlords and other feudal elements. It utilizes this power for the most violent and ruthless suppression, of the mass liberation movement of the workers, peasants, the progressive intelligentsia. The position in India shows that the national big bourgeoisie do not yield either to feudal or imperialist colonisers in their ruthless and reactionary nature. This contributes to the fact that the new bourgeois-democratic reformist forms and methods of administration which were designed to mask the retention of imperialist domination in the colonies are being rapidly exposed and rendered less effective. At the same time the masses in the colonies and semi-colonies are at an accelerated pace coming to realise the falsity and hypocrisy of bourgeois pseudo-democracy. On the other hand the growing mass national liberation movement, led by the proletariat calls forth the full fury of the reactionary forces, who are casting aside the fig-leaf of bourgeois democracy and are resorting ever more and more to openly fascist and terroristic means.

In this respect the example of India is particularly convincing. The Indian bourgeoisie now rivals the most reactionary forces in stifling the mass popular movement, in the terror against the progressive elements of the working class and peasant movement. The metamorphosis of Nehru, from a Left-Congressite and an accuser of imperialism into a shrewd servant of the two masters—both Britain and USA—into an ally of the Indian princes and landlords, into a bloody strangler of the progressive forces in India is a clear demonstration of

this. But this is the logic of the class struggle—there can be no “middle position” between imperialism and democracy”.

Bourgeois democratic institutions in the colonial countries as a rule brought into play as a result of the postwar policy of the imperialists in order to camouflage their rule, are revealing their bankruptcy. They guarantee neither the democratisation of the country nor the weakening of imperialist oppression. Bourgeois democracy everywhere including in the colonies is incapable of carrying out even the limited bourgeois reforms.

The demarcation of the opposing class forces on a world scale, the formation of two camps and the struggle between them, the world-historic role of the Soviet Union as a bulwark of all the progressive forces has contributed in a tremendous degree to the working class assuming the hegemony in the national liberation movement in the colonial and dependent countries. The leading role of the proletariat in the anti-imperialist struggle as also the earlier experience and the new postwar historical experience contributing to the further exposure of bourgeois democracy, which is incapable of guaranteeing the attainment of genuine independence and not even directed towards the carrying out of effective democratic transformations, have lent the national liberation movement the character of a struggle not for bourgeois democracy but for People's Democracy.

People's Democracy as a special form of power which corresponds to the transitional period from capitalism to Socialism, which has been possible thanks to the victory of Socialism in the USSR and the consolidation of the democratic forces all over the world not only fully corresponds to the interests of the broadest masses of toilers of the colonies and semi-colonies but also is easily understood by them and realisable in practice. People's Democracy is in a position to guarantee both emancipation from imperialist oppression and the carrying out of genuinely democratic transformations,

creating the necessary prerequisites for a transition to Socialist construction.

In the struggle for People's Democracy in the colonies and semi-colonies are united not only the workers, the peasantry, the urban petty-bourgeoisie, the intelligentsia, but even certain sections of the middle bourgeoisie which is interested in saving itself from cut-throat foreign competition and imperialist oppression.

Thus, the struggle for People's Democracy can unify the overwhelming majority of the people under the leadership of the working class. This signifies that the people's democratic revolution can easily become a form of national liberation struggle, a form of colonial revolution.

The successful experience of building People's Democracy in North Korea and over the liberated territory of China, the popularity of the slogan of struggle for people's democracy in the overwhelming majority of the colonial and dependent countries fighting for their freedom, clearly confirms the correctness and the practicability of the people's democratic path of national and social emancipation, the path of progress towards Socialism for the former colonial and backward countries.

The entire postwar events in the colonial world developing as an exposure and weakening of reaction and the growth of revolutionary forces in the shape of the consolidation and further strengthening of the mighty camp of democracy and Socialism has resulted in the national liberation struggle of the peoples of many countries growing over naturally into the struggle for People's Democracy.

Nevertheless it would be incorrect to ignore the essentially distinctive features which distinguish people's democracy in the colonial and dependent countries who are liberating themselves from imperialist yoke from people's democracy in the countries of Central and South Eastern Europe. The first

and the main difference consists in the fact that insofar as in the colonies and dependent countries the cultural and economic development has been partially hampered and artificially stifled by imperialism, the extent of the bourgeois-democratic tasks confronting people's democracy in these countries will be considerably greater than in the other less backward and more developed countries, to whom colonial oppression has been unknown or almost unknown.

It is perfectly clear that the people's democratic revolution in the colonial and semi-colonial countries cannot but bear in the first place an anti-imperialist and anti-feudal character. Hence it follows that the people's democratic revolution in the colonies must in its development go through a number of consecutive stages and the period of the transition to the solution of Socialist tasks, to the construction of Socialist economy in these countries may be more prolonged than in the other countries of people's democracy, which were not colonies.

The stages of development of the people's democratic revolution in the colonies and semi-colonies, representing in essence the process of its growing over into Socialist revolution will be determined in every country by the concrete distinctive features of its historical path and by the correlation of class forces inside the country and on an international scale.

The general programme adopted by the Chinese People's Consultative Council indicates that the People's Republic of China is carrying out in practice the dictatorship or people's democracy, which is headed by the working class based on alliance of the workers and peasants and unifies all the democratic classes and all the national-minorities of China.

The People's Republic is waging a struggle against imperialism, feudalism and bureaucratic capital and sets as its task "to abolish all the privileges of the imperialist countries in China, to confiscate bureaucratic capital, to transfer it to the

ownership of a People's State; systematically to carry out the transformation of the feudal and semi-feudal system of landownership, to protect the common property of the State and the property of the co-operatives, to guard the economic interests and private ownership of the workers, peasants, the petty-bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie, to develop the people's economy of the new democracy and steadily transfer the country from an agricultural into an industrial one."

The Chairman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, Mao Tse-tung, has written in his article "On the Dictatorship of People's Democracy" published in *Pravda* of July 6, 1949,

"the experience acquired by the Chinese people over many decades shows us the need to establish a dictatorship" of the people's democracy. This means that the reactionaries must be deprived of the right to express their opinion and that only the people shall have the right to vote and to express their opinion. The democratic system must be realized among the people, granting them freedom of speech, assembly and organisation. The right to vote is granted only to the people and not to the reactionaries. These two aspects, namely, democracy for the people and dictatorship over the reactionaries, represent the dictatorship of the people's democracy." (Mao Tse-tung, "The Dictatorship of People's democracy",—"For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy" July 15, 1949)

The political and economic programme of the People's Democracy of China is designed for a systematic increase in the specific weight of social, State ownership which is the foundation of further progressive development.

The general laws of social development are uniform both for the countries of the East and for the West. It is possible to

speak of a difference only in the tempo or the concrete forms of this development. In that sense in its basic features People's Democracy in the East does not differ from People's Democracy in the West.

Lenin and Stalin teach us that taking into account the local distinctive features, the national—specific concrete approach of “solving the single international task” in every country is the indispensable condition for an appraisal of the revolutionary movement. Since the very task is one and international, the question is of how best to apply the general, the identical, the international principles, to the particular concrete national conditions.

The development of the national liberation struggle in the colonies and semi-colonies, the development of the struggle against imperialism has already been crowned with the biggest successes which testifies to the increasing aggravation of the general crisis of the capitalist system. The growing liberation movement of the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries is emerging as a reliable ally and a mighty reserve of the camp of democracy and Socialism, opposed to the forces of imperialism and reaction. The People's Republic of China is already an inseparable and integral part of the anti-imperialist camp headed by the Soviet Union, fighting for peace and democracy. The whole course of the national and colonial struggle, the greatest victories won by the forces of democracy in East Asia are clear confirmation of the correctness of the Leninist-Stalinist teaching on the national and colonial question and a demonstration of the triumph of the all-conquering ideas of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin.

Problems of Economics No. 9, 1949.

ON LEADING ROLE OF WORKING CLASS IN THE NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT OF THE COLONIAL PEOPLES* BY V. M. MASLENNIKOV

LENIN and Stalin elaborated a complete teaching on the Socialist and the national and colonial revolutions. One of its cornerstones is the teaching on the leading role of the proletariat in these revolutions.

Lenin wrote:

“Only the proletariat can be a consistent fighter for democracy. It may become a victorious fighter for democracy only if the peasant masses join its revolutionary struggles.” (*Lenin, Selected Works, Eng. Ed., Moscow, 1947, Vol. I, P. 376*)

The Great October Socialist Revolution was victorious because at its head stood the revolutionary working class of Russia with its vanguard, the Bolshevik Party, tempered in political battles. It was victorious because the working class of Russia possessed such an important ally in the revolution as the poor peasantry, comprising the vast majority of the peasant population in the country. The experience of the revolutionary struggle in Russia was and still is of tremendous significance

* *Revised stenogram of a report delivered on June 8, 1949 at a joint meeting of the Scholars' Council of the Institute of Economics and the Pacific Institute of the Academy of Sciences, USSR, devoted to the problems of the national-colonial movement after the Second World War.*

for the national liberation movement, of the peoples of the colonies, the semi-colonies and the dependent countries.

The successes of the national liberation movement in the postwar period and above all the historic victory of the Chinese people, who have smashed the Kuomintang clique and created the People's Republic of China, are the most striking demonstrations of the triumph of the Leninist-Stalinist teachings on the national-colonial revolution and on the leading role of the proletariat in this revolution.

* * *

Comrade Stalin has pointed out that after the Great October Revolution the era of undisturbed exploitation and oppression of the colonies and dependent countries has passed away and the era of revolutions for emancipation in the colonies and dependent countries, the era of the awakening of the proletariat in these countries, the era of its hegemony in the revolution has begun.

“The October Revolution has ushered in a new era, the era of *colonial* revolutions which are being conducted in the *oppressed countries* of the world in alliance with the proletariat and *under the leadership* of the proletariat.”
(*Stalin, Problems of Leninism, Moscow, 1947, p. 201*)

The Great October Socialist Revolution has broken the chains of national and colonial oppression in Tsarist Russia and freed from it, without exception, all the oppressed nations of our State.

“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 for the oppressed nations of the whole world”. (*Stalin, Problems of Leninism, Moscow, 1947; pp. 200-201*)

The oppressed peoples of the colonial and semi-colonial countries found in the Soviet Union a support, a loyal friend in the struggle against imperialism.

After the Great October Socialist Revolution the national liberation movement of the oppressed peoples grew more and more intense, constantly undermining the rear of imperialism. In giving his classical definition of the general crisis of capitalism, Comrade Stalin pointed out as one of its basic symptoms the fact

“that the imperialist war and the victory of the revolution in the USSR had undermined the basis of imperialism in colonial and dependent countries, that the authority of imperialism in these countries was already shattered and that it was not able to rule as of old through force in these countries”. (*Lenin and Stalin, Collection of Writings for the Study of the History of the CPSU (B), Russ Ed., Party Publishing Press, 1936, Vol. Ill, p. 428*)

The struggle of the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries of East and South-East Asia, of the Middle East and Africa for freedom and independence and against the imperialist oppressors is characterised by a diversity of forms and of sweep in various countries. This difference is determined by the correlation of class forces in these countries, by the extent of their industrial development, by the level of the revolutionary consciousness and organisation of the proletariat;

the successes of its struggle for hegemony in the national liberation movement, for allies, and, in the first instance, for the peasantry which comprises the majority of the population of the colonies and semi-colonies.

China occupied the leading position in the revolutionary movement of the oppressed peoples in the period between the First and Second World Wars.

Comrade Stalin paid great attention to the problems of the Chinese revolution. He pointed out that the characteristic features of the Chinese revolution is the struggle between two paths—the path of the national bourgeoisie which wants to crush the proletariat, enter into a compact with imperialism and, with it, launch a campaign against the revolution in order to suppress it and establish the rule of capitalism, and the other path—the path of the proletariat which pursues the aim of pushing aside the national bourgeoisie and consolidating its hegemony and winning the following of the toiling millions in the town and countryside in order to overcome the resistance of the national bourgeoisie, secure the complete victory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution and then gradually switch it to the path of Socialist revolution. (*As quoted by E. Zhukov, "The Great October Socialist Revolution and China", New Times, No. 46, November 7, 1949*)

The accomplishment of the tasks through the conquest and the consolidation of the hegemony of the proletariat, through the carrying out of the democratic revolution and through the creation of conditions for Socialist construction necessitates a prolonged and stubborn struggle.

In this struggle the Communist Party of China based itself on the great teachings of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin, on the great historical experience of the CPSU (B). In his article, *On the Dictatorship of People's Democracy*, written on July 1, 1949, the occasion of the twenty-eighth anniversary of the

Chinese Communist Party, the Chairman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, 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 machinegun but Marxism-Leninism.... The Chinese acquired Marxism as a result of its application by the Russians. Before the October Revolution the Chinese did not know who Lenin and Stalin were; neither did they know Marx and Engels. The salvoes 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 problem. The conclusion reached was that we must advance along the path taken by the Russians.” (*Mao Tse-tung, “Dictatorship of People’s Democracy”, For A Lasting Peace, For A People’s Democracy, July 15, 1949*)

The feudal-militarist groups were the main support of foreign imperialism in China. The foreign imperialists waged a struggle for the extension of their spheres of influence in China by utilising one or another set of militarist cliques. Feudal survivals were predominant inside the country and they were aggravated by the oppression of militarism and arbitrary rule of the bureaucracy. In order to gratify foreign capital the reactionary Government stifled national industry.

The Chinese industrial bourgeoisie which had multiplied its capital considerably and increased its production in the years of the First World War found itself in opposition to the

foreign “imperialists, who at that time preferred to utilise the compradore trading bourgeoisie for its operations. Under these circumstances, the national bourgeoisie stood in the ranks of the united front for a struggle for *its own interests* against imperialism and the feudal-militarist cliques.

In China the revolutionary fight of the workers and peasants against the feudal-bureaucratic oppression, against militarism and imperialism began immediately after the October Revolution in Russia and after the termination of the First World War. In 1921, the Communist Party was formed in China and already in the following year it led the strike struggle of the workers. This struggle was of tremendous political importance. The hegemony of the proletariat in the Chinese revolution would have been impossible if the Communist Party of China had not from the very beginning of its activities created powerful mass proletarian organisations, if these organisations, and above all the trade unions, had not been under the leadership of the Communist Party and if the Communist Party had not succeeded in leading the working class movement and leading it along the revolutionary path, the path of uniting it with Socialism. In June 1923, at the Third Congress of the Communist Party the decision to join the Kuomintang was taken. By this time the Communist Party already had the solid experience of revolutionary leadership of the working class movement. After the Kuomintang Congress had adopted in 1924 the resolution proposed by Sun Yat-sen to accept peasants and workers as members of the Kuomintang a base was created in China for the formation of a united front against foreign imperialism and the reactionary militarists.

Comrade Stalin points out that. a united front with the national bourgeoisie in the first-stages of the colonial-revolution does not at all mean that the Communists must not intensify the struggle of the workers and peasants against the landlords and the national bourgeoisie, that the proletariat must sacrifice its

independence in the slightest degree or for a single moment.

“A united front can have revolutionary significance only if and when it does not hinder the Communist Party from conducting its independent political and organisational work, only if it does not prevent it from organising the proletariat into an independent political force, rousing the peasantry against the landlords, openly organising a revolution of workers and peasants and thus preparing the conditions. necessary for the hegemony of the proletariat.” (*Stalin, Marxism and the National and Colonial Question, London, Lawrence and Wishart, p. 237*)

The Chinese proletariat by consolidating its ranks and by being tempered in the strike struggle against foreign capital at the same time fought to extend its influence among the broad working masses. The Party of the proletariat, its foremost and organised detachment, grew and strengthened. While in 1925 the Communist Party of China had only two thousand members, in 1927 the membership of the Communist Party had already risen to sixty thousand. In these years the Communist Party led the biggest strike battles and it succeeded in increasing considerably the membership of the trade unions. While at the First Congress. of the Trade Unions of China which was called in 1925 on the initiative of the Communist Party, representatives of 230,000 organised workers were present, in 1927 the number of workers organised in trade unions were already three million. The revolutionary movement embraced tens of millions of toiling peasants of China. Finally the Communist Party succeeded in drawing to its side whole regiments and divisions of the nationalist troops.

“.... the Chinese Communist Party has succeeded during this period in converting the idea of the hegemony

of the proletariat from a wish into a fact,” wrote Stalin. (*Stalin, Ibid.*, p. 252)

The successes attained by the Communist Party in the struggle for the hegemony of the proletariat in the national liberation movement was to a considerable extent facilitated by the fact that in China: the bourgeoisie was weak and unorganised. The big national bourgeoisie, apprehending the sweep of the revolutionary movement of the working people crossed over to the camp of counter-revolution. Relying on the support of the foreign imperialists the bourgeoisie attempted to halt the revolution at the “first step” in order to stifle it later. However, the bourgeois nationalists who had usurped State power in China with the help of foreign imperialists did not succeed in halting the Chinese revolution.

“While the first stage was distinguished by the fact that the edge of revolution was directed mainly against foreign imperialism, the distinguishing feature of the second stage is that the edge of revolution is now directed mainly against the internal enemies and primarily against the feudal lords and the feudal regime.” (*Stalin, Ibid.*, p. 244)

The exposure of the big compradore national bourgeoisie as an agent of British and American imperialism and a relentless struggle against it were the most important tasks of the working class of China during the second stage of the revolution. The Chinese revolution now entered into a higher phase of its development—the phase of the agrarian revolution. The agrarian revolution assumed broad dimensions and seriously frightened even the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia which in the person of the Wuhan leadership of the Kuomintang also went over to the camp of counter-revolution. This meant that the revolution suffered a temporary defeat.

“But,” as Comrade Stalin pointed out, “it rallied the broad masses of the peasantry and the urban poor more closely around the proletariat, preparing soil for the proletarian hegemony.” (*Stalin, Collected Works, Russ. Ed. Vol. X, p. 25*)

Basing on the peasant partisan movement led by the Communist Party of China the thousand-strong Red Army was created and the first seats of democratic power arose in the country. In November 1931, at the First All-China Congress of Soviets representing sixty million members, the new democratic power in China—Soviet Power—was created. The new organs of revolutionary power were organs of uprising against the existing Kuomintang power, organs of struggle for a new democratic power. At the same time they were organs for the carrying out in China of the agrarian bourgeois-democratic revolution, which was far from being completed. The new democratic power was a powerful revolutionary centre attracting all the progressive elements inside the country in their struggle against the counter-revolutionary Kuomintang. After the Japanese invasion of China, with the aim of creating and strengthening the united national front, the Chinese Red Army was reorganised into a People’s Liberation Army and became the principal force in the struggle against the Japanese usurpers.

The democratic power, created in the regions liberated from the Japanese invaders by the People’s Liberation Army and the partisan detachments of China during the Sino-Japanese war (1937-45) was an all-people’s power. It enjoyed the confidence and the support of not only the population of the democratic regions but of the whole of China. The industrial enterprises in the liberated regions passed into the ownership of the entire people, the peasants received land; the power of

the capitalists, the landlords and foreign capital was liquidated, the bloc of toiling strata of the population beaded by the working class under the leadership of the Communist Party, became the principal leading force. For the first time, the Chinese people had the possibility of being convinced through their own experience of what a genuinely People's Democratic power means.

At the end of the Second World War the influence of the Communist Party of China as a leading force had spread to eighteen liberated areas with a population of 140 million people. The Communist Party won tremendous authority and the respect of the majority of the population of the entire country. The hegemony of the entire working class of China, its leading influence on the peasantry was thus not only won but passed the test of historical experience.

In the course of the agrarian revolution that was unfolding under the leadership of the Communist Party over a considerable part of the territory of China the leading role of the proletariat in the national liberation struggle increased and its influence grew among the peasant masses. At this stage of the Chinese revolution the Communist Party won over in the struggle for democratisation of the country not only the proletariat and the peasantry but also democratic sections of the national bourgeoisie.

In the period between the First and Second World Wars China occupied the position of the vanguard in the revolutionary movement of the peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies. But in this period in the colonial front many other weak links in the imperialist chain had been formed creating a serious threat to imperialist rule. In this period the national liberation movement of the Indian people rose to great heights.

India occupies one of the first places among colonial countries in the numerical strength of its proletariat. While

according to the figures of the Chinese census, the total number of factory workers in China in 1927 did not exceed one-and-a-half million, in India in that very same year the urban proletariat exceeded three-and-a-half million. In India as in China it was not only the factory proletariat which participated in the revolutionary national liberation struggle. Tens of millions of peasants, millions of artisans workers in small manufacturing enterprises, port workers, coolies, rickshaw drivers and other urban poor were active participants in the mass revolutionary struggle, whose leaders undoubtedly were the more organised and disciplined factory workers.

The Indian proletariat by the end of the nineteenth century, i.e., considerably earlier than the Chinese proletariat had already begun to participate actively in the strike struggle, which often passed over into political struggle. In 1905, the Indian textile workers conducted a strike directed against the attempts of capitalists to lengthen the working day. In 1906, a general political strike of the Bengal railway workers broke out. In May 1907 the railway workers of the Punjab refused to transport troops sent by the British imperialists to crush a peasant uprising. In 1908, Lenin wrote in connection with the general political strike of the Indian textile workers:

“In India the proletariat has already matured sufficiently to wage a class conscious and political mass struggle.” (*Lenin, Selected Works, Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1936, Vol. IV, P. 300*)

The working class movement in India assumed abroad sweep in 1918-22. Along with powerful strikes unprecedented till then in the history of India, there took place mass demonstrations and meetings of workers. After the bloody shootings of the workers' demonstrations in Amritsar in 1919 the national liberation movement embraced the whole country.

In the period of revolutionary advance of 1930-32 and also on the eve of the Second World War the Indian proletariat for the first time emerged as an independent political force. In India the peasant movement too assumed a broad sweep both in 1919-22 as well as in 1930-32 and in a number of places it passed over into armed uprisings, into burning of landlords' estates, confiscation of landlords' grain. The Indian people dealt forceful blows at the rear of the capitalist system and by shattering the positions of imperialism their fight helped the international proletariat.

Nevertheless in its scope and results the revolutionary movement in India greatly lagged behind the revolutionary movement in China. The struggle of the Indian working class for hegemony in the national liberation movement was not crowned with such successes as in China. The Indian working class in its struggle for hegemony in the revolutionary movement met such an exceedingly powerful opponent in the person of British imperialism, who with all the means at its disposal crushed and disrupted the national liberation movement.

British imperialism employed ruthless and bloody terror and all kinds of repressive measures against the national liberation movement of the peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies, and at the same time it extensively utilised bourgeois national reformism. National reformism, whose leader in the colonies and semi-colonies is the national bourgeoisie, like all reformism rejects the revolutionary path of emancipating the country from imperialist oppression. The national reformists, while duping the workers, affirm that its possible to achieve freedom and independence through the path of gradual attainment of reforms.

The Chinese Communist Party succeeded in the course of many years' struggle in smashing national reformism and isolating its bearers, the national bourgeoisie and the petty-

bourgeoisie in the towns from the masses of the working-class and the peasantry. Mao Tse-tung wrote in the article quoted above:

“The national bourgeoisie cannot be the leader of the revolution nor for that matter can it occupy a leading position in the State for its social and economic position determines its weakness, its lack of foresight, courage and the fear of the masses displayed by many of its representatives. Sun Yat-sen called for ‘awakening the masses’ or for ‘rendering assistance to the peasants and workers’. Who intends to awaken them and help them? According to Sun Yat-sen it was to be the petty-bourgeoisie and national bourgeoisie, But this cannot be realised in practice. Sun Yat-sen’s revolutionary work of 40 years ended in failure. Why? Because in the epoch of imperialism the petty-bourgeoisie cannot successfully lead any real revolution. Our experience of 28 years is quite different. We have acquired invaluable experience and the essence of this experience consists in 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.

“This makes us different from our predecessors. Basing ourselves on these three factors we won the main victory, traversed a difficult path and waged a struggle against the Right and Left opportunist tendencies in the Party.” (Mao Tse-tung, *“Dictatorship of People’s Democracy”*, from *For a Lasting Peace, For a People’s Democracy*, July 15, 1949)

In China national reformism never had such a strong

influence as in India. The influence of the Chinese big bourgeoisie increased in the period of the Northern Expedition and of the collaboration between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party of China. But it swiftly lost this influence after it betrayed the national revolution and openly became a counter-revolutionary agent of the Anglo-American imperialists. At the same time considerable sections of the petty and middle bourgeoisie oppressed by foreign imperialism and big bureaucratic capital became more and more closely linked: with the united revolutionary front led by the Communist Party of China.

National reformism began to consolidate and extend its influence in India after the founding of the Indian National Congress in 1885. The Indian bourgeoisie, formed a bloc with the liberal section of the landlords and attempted by gradual reforms within the framework of the regime of colonial oppression to consolidate its economic positions and persuade the masses about 'the unsuitability' of the revolutionary struggle. By spreading illusions about the possibility of a reformist path of achieving independence and about "the decolonisation at the hands of the imperialists", the national bourgeoisie of India retained its influence on the masses of Indian workers.

Already in 1925 Comrade Stalin had pointed out that the Indian national bourgeoisie had split into a revolutionary Party and a compromising party and that the compromising section of this bourgeoisie had already managed in the main to come to an agreement with imperialism. Comrade Stalin emphasised in this connection that the compromising section of the Indian bourgeoisie and entered into a bloc with imperialism against the workers and peasants of its own country.

"The victory of the revolution cannot be achieved unless this bloc is smashed. But in order to break this bloc

fire must be concentrated on the compromising national bourgeoisie; its treachery must be exposed, the toiling masses must be emancipated from its influence and the conditions necessary for the hegemony of the proletariat must be systematically prepared. In other words, it is a question of preparing the proletariat of such colonies as India for the role of leader in the liberation movement and of dislodging, step by step, the bourgeoisie and its spokesmen from this honourable position. The task is to create a revolutionary anti-Imperialist bloc and to ensure the hegemony of the proletariat within this bloc.” (*Stalin, Marxism and the National and Colonial Question, p. 217*)

Comrade Stalin teaches that the independence of the Communist Party “must be the basic slogan of the advanced elements of Communism, for the way for the hegemony of the proletariat can be prepared and the latter can be achieved only by the Communist Party” (*Stalin, Ibid., p. 218*). Till that time no Communist Party had been organised in India. The Workers’ and Peasants’ Party, formed in November 1925, was the first organisation unifying the scattered Communist groups inside the country, but in its composition it included even representatives of the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia, among whom there were also Left social-reformists. Social-reformists penetrated into the working class as agents of the national bourgeoisie and by indulging in democratic and Socialist phraseology they attempted to subordinate the working class to the influence of the national bourgeoisie. The influence of social-reformism made itself felt in the activities of the Communist organisations of India in the formation of trade unions and in the policy of their leadership. A factional struggle went on in the different groups who had joined the Workers’ and Peasants’ Party. In 1928 the expulsion of the renegade Roy, who was instigating factional struggle within

the Party, improved the situation. But the survivals of social-reformism made themselves felt even further. Immediately after their foundation in 1918-20 the leadership of the trade union organisations in India was in the hands of bourgeois elements which included the social-reformists who pursued a compromising policy. In 1929 a split took place within the Indian trade union movement and by 1931 three leading trade union centres were formed inside the country-the All-India Federation of Trade Unions, led by Right reformists, the All India Trade Union Congress under the leadership of the "Lefts" and the Red Trade Union Congress which united the revolutionary organisations of the Indian proletariat. The split within the working class movement in India had a negative influence on the further development of the antiimperialist struggle of the Indian toilers, which bore an insufficiently organised character.

At the end of 1933 there took place the organisational unification into a single Communist Party of the Communist groups that were scattered till then. From this time the Indian working class under the leadership of the Communist Party began to emerge in the political arena of the country as an independent force and for the first time waged a struggle against the bourgeoisie and for hegemony in the national liberation movement.

In 1935 a united Trade Union Congress of India was formed by merging the Red Trade Union Congress and the All-India Trade Union Congress, and the force and the sweep of the trade union movement inside the country increased sharply. The growth in the influence of the Communist Party among the masses alarmed the British imperialists and their protégés, from amidst the Indian bourgeoisie. In 1934 the Communist Party of India was declared illegal.

The revolutionary struggle in India grew again in strength on the eve of the Second World War. The strike movement

embraced the vast masses of workers and the capitalists were often forced to give concessions. The workers of the jute industry in Bengal, the textile workers of Kanpur, the railway workers, etc., all went on strike. The working class that was steeled in struggle became the most organised and powerful detachment of the anti-imperialist forces of India. The Communist conception of the formation of a united antiimperialist front found a broad response and the approval of the overwhelming majority of the toilers. In 1936 new peasant unions (kisan sabhas) emerged, which were in the main led by the Communists.

In 1942 after eight years of illegal existence, the Communist Party was legalised. The emergence of the Party from underground and the strengthening of its ties with the masses led to the growth and the organisational consolidation of the Party. The membership rose from four thousand members in 1942 to sixteen thousand in 1943. In June 1943 the First Congress of the Communist Party of India was held and it noted that the influence of the Party had increased considerably not only among the workers but also among the peasants and the intelligentsia.

The old leadership of the Communist Party was nevertheless not free from the reformist influence which left its mark on the policy of the Party in the period of the Second World War. "The Mountbatten Plan" for the partitioning of India and the granting of Dominion status to India and Pakistan which was nothing but a deal between British imperialism and the Indian bourgeois top strata, a new form of the economic and political dependence of these Dominions on British imperialism, was evaluated by the former leadership of the Communist Party of India as some kind of 'step forward' and not as a new form of attack of British imperialism on the Indian people. After the partition of India into two Dominions the leadership of the Communist Party took the decision to support

the bourgeois Nehru Government and decided on the “expediency” of forming a united national front from Gandhi to the Communists. This reformist line was strongly criticised and condemned at the Second Congress of the Communist Party of India which took place in February-March 1948.

It was thus that in the two biggest countries of the East the struggle of the working class for the leading role in the national liberation struggle developed in the period between the First World War and the termination of the Second World War.

Guided by the teachings of Lenin and Stalin on the national colonial revolution the working class led by the Communist Parties has become in China and in India the leading force in the struggle for national independence and the freedom of the many millions of peoples of these countries.

* * *

The might and the international authority of the Soviet Union grew immeasurably after the Second World War. The great victory of the Soviet people in the patriotic war demonstrated with new force to the whole world the superiority of Socialism over capitalism. As a result of the war and the victory of the Soviet Army, the breach in the world system of imperialism was widened, a number of countries of Central and South-East Europe—the countries of People’s Democracy—dropped out of this system and today stand on the path of building the foundations of Socialism. The revolutionary anti-imperialist front of the oppressed masses acquired an even more powerful support than before.

The support and assistance of the Soviet Union which exposes before the whole world the aggressive policy and the criminal designs of the Anglo-American bloc is of inestimable importance for the successful development of the national

liberation movement in the colonies and dependent countries. The Soviet army by vanquishing the Japanese occupiers of Manchuria and North Korea averted imperialist intervention in these regions and prevented the counter-revolutionary forces from seizing power there. Thus the Soviet people not only liberated the peoples of China and Korea from the yoke of Japanese usurpers but also created in China and North Korea conditions favourable for the organisation and consolidation of the People's Democratic regime.

“Had there been no Soviet Union, had there been no victory in the anti-fascist Second World War, had Japanese imperialism not been defeated (which is particularly important for us), had there been no growing struggle of the oppressed countries of the East, had there been no struggle of the masses in the United States, Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, and other capitalist countries against the ruling reactionary cliques—had none of these factors existed then the pressure of the international reactionary forces would of course, have been much stronger than it is today. Would we have been able to achieve victory in these circumstances? Of course not. So it would have been impossible to consolidate victory after it had been achieved.” (*Mao Tse-tung, Ibid.*)

After the Second World War the sharp intensification of the uneven development of the imperialist States, the inevitable emergence of new sharp contradictions, differences and conflicts between them is of tremendous importance for the national liberation movement in the colonies and semi-colonies. American imperialism, which has fattened on the war and on the blood of the people is attempting to re-divide the world after the Second World War in conformity with the changed correlation of imperialist forces. In its struggle for the

establishment of world domination American monopoly capital is constantly coming into conflict with the interests of the imperialist robbers who have been weakened after the war. The main contradiction in the imperialist camp—the Anglo-American contradiction—has been sharply aggravated.

During the war Britain's ties with her colonies were weakened. She found herself militarily and economically dependent on the supply of American foodstuffs and manufactured goods. In spite of the fact that the British imperialists recovered their colonies after the war they met with the increasing influence of the USA there. American capital is more and more extending its penetration into the countries of the British empire; at present it occupies almost the same place as Britain in their trade. The USA is not releasing Britain from the clutches of financial and economic dependence and is gradually taking away its control over the colonies. It is dislodging Britain from the former spheres of influence and subordinating it to the position of its vassal. The positions of France, Belgium, and Holland are being more and more undermined in their colonial empires. The Marshallisation of the main European imperialist metropolitan countries is converting them more and more into satellites of the USA. In spite of this the British, the French, the Dutch and the Belgian imperialists are opposed to the growing penetration of American capital in their colonies and are attempting to consolidate their own positions there. All this gives rise to extraordinary instability and extreme weakening on the general front of imperialism in the colonies. Nevertheless, the imperialists of different countries under the aegis of the American imperialists join together when it is a question of crushing the national liberation movement of the oppressed peoples.

The Second World War gave an impetus to the development of national industry in the colonies, the semi-

colonies and dependent countries. During the war the extension of industrial production in the colonial world was conditioned on the one hand by the stoppage in the imports from the metropolitan countries of essential foodstuffs and goods for wide consumption and on the other hand by an increase in the requirements of the metropolis of the military strategic raw materials and various other materials necessary for the conduct of war operations. In the colonies this facilitated the development of the mining and raw material industry, the building of war factories and plants owned by the imperialists on an indigenous raw material base and also to an increase in the number of small industrial enterprises of a manufacturing type, the growth of domestic industry and trade. However, in spite of a certain industrial development in a number of colonies and dependent countries they have maintained their former colonial status.

“It is imperialism’s special method to develop industry in the colonies in such a way that it is chained to the imperialist metropolis.” (*J. V. Stalin, Collected Works, Vol. VIII, page 128*)

The development of industry in the colonies and’ semi-colonies assumed distorted forms and a one-sided character. Moreover, it led to the growth of a national proletariat. The Indian proletariat increased almost by one million. In the colonies there took place simultaneously an intensified differentiation amongst the peasantry and the number of the agricultural proletariat increased.

In the war period the imperialists drained the wealth from colonies and semi-colonies in great quantities; the colonial population was doomed to hunger and slow death.

The intensification of the plunder and exploitation of the colonies by the imperialist metropolitan powers extremely

aggravated the contradiction in the colonies and semi-colonies themselves. The imperialists attempted to extend their social base in the colonial countries and increasingly drew over to their side the national big bourgeoisie which served them as a weapon for pumping out the wealth of the colonial countries and for the still greater enslavement of the colonial peoples. With the assistance of the imperialists the ruling groups of the local bourgeoisie became centres of the 'antidemocratic struggle in the colonies and semi-colonies. In certain countries, as for example India and China, these groups of the national bourgeoisie have become converted through imperialist support into big monopolist compradore amalgamations.

The "Four Families" in China—Chiang Kai-shek, Chen Li-fu, Sun and Kun-Syan-Si—were a clear example of such monopolist associations. All political and economic power in Kuomintang China belonged to them. With the help of the American imperialists they concentrated in their hands tremendous capital and the natural riches of the country.

They employed not only capitalist but pre-capitalist methods of exploitation and emerged as the most typical representatives of big finance capital which merged both with the State apparatus and foreign capital.

In exactly the same manner as the Chinese, the Indian monopolist amalgamations made tremendous profits during the war period and this substantially increased their economic strength. The Directors of the Birla, Tata, Dalmia and other companies had no objection to the passing of anti-British resolutions by the Congress. But they in essence were and continue to remain agents and allies of British capital in India. The rule of foreign imperialists in India is advantageous to the Indian big bourgeoisie. It is interested in the assistance of British imperialism for a struggle against the people's movement. It betrayed the national liberation movement for the sake of its class interests. The Indian big bourgeoisie has

assisted the British imperialists to establish in India after the war a regime which under the outer form of 'independence' has preserved intact the colonial exploitation of the population by British monopoly capital.

A close merging of the national big bourgeoisie with foreign imperialism was also taking place in other colonial and dependent countries. The groups of compromising bourgeoisie are the enemies and stranglers of the national liberation movement of the oppressed peoples and along with the imperialists they are organising civil war against the progressive democratic forces of their own countries.

After the Second World War the proletariat of many colonies and semi-colonies became the *acknowledged leader of the national liberation movement*. The emancipation of the labouring peasantry and the urban petty-bourgeoisie from the influence of the big bourgeoisie has been and is proceeding at a very rapid pace in the colonies and dependent countries. At present the Communist Parties in many semi-colonial and colonial countries—Viet Nam, Burma, Malaya, Indonesia, etc.,—have unified broad sections of the people under their leadership in the democratic anti-imperialist front.

In the first ranks of the revolutionary national liberation movement in the East are the millions of Chinese people—a victorious people. Immediately after the termination of the Second World War the reactionary feudal-bourgeois clique of Chiang Kai-shek supported by the American imperialists subjected China to a sanguinary civil war. The Kuomintang Government rejected the popular demands for a democratisation of China, that were put forth by the Chinese Communist Party and other democratic organisations, representing the interests of the proletariat, the toiling peasantry and the patriotic groups of the petty and middle national bourgeoisie. It launched an attack on the working class, on its leader the Communist Party and on the defenders of its

interests, the People's Liberation Army of China.

In 1946 the Kuomintang troops that were equipped by the Americans exceeded twice the number of the People's Liberation Army. But even before two years had passed, the main forces of Chiang Kai-shek were smashed and by June 1949 the Kuomintang troops lost more than four-and-a-half million men and almost 60 per cent of the population of China was freed from the rule of the feudal-bourgeois-reactionary Kuomintang Government. By October 1949, the overwhelming majority of the Chinese population was liberated and on October 1, the formation of the People's Republic of China was proclaimed and a Central People's Government was elected with Mao Tse-tung, the leader of the Communist Party, at its head. The prolonged struggle of the Chinese peoples under the leadership of the working class culminated in a great historical victory. Four hundred and seventy-five million people of the world's population, liberated from imperialist oppression, stood on the path of development towards Socialism.

A decisive factor in these victories of the Chinese people is the leading role of the Communist Party of China which is steered in battles, which is following the great teachings of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin, which had succeeded in rallying the Chinese people around the working class, around the revolutionary People's liberation Army and which has exposed the anti-popular, anti-national, treacherous policy of the Kuomintang clique.

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.*

“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, on 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 and 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. No other class in any country in the epoch of imperialism can lead a real revolution to victory. This has been clearly proved by the fact that the Chinese petty bourgeoisie and national bourgeoisie led the revolution on many occasions—but always they met with failure.” (Mao Tse-tung, “*The Dictatorship of People’s Democracy.*” *For A Lasting Peace, For A People’s Democracy*, July 15, 1949)

The victory of the Chinese Revolution has once again confirmed the brilliance of the teachings of Lenin and Stalin on

the national and colonial revolution and on the necessity of the hegemony of the proletariat in this revolution.

The advance of the national liberation movement in India in the postwar period is also proceeding on the basis of the proletariat attaining a more and more leading role in the national liberation movement.

After the Second World War the influence of the national bourgeoisie among the masses in India decreased decisively and the strength and influence of the working class increased considerably. The membership of the Communist Party of India rose to ninety thousand; the Communists strengthened their position and authority among the workers, the peasants and the urban petty bourgeoisie- The All-India Trade Union Congress comprising nearly 800,000 members, the All-India Kisan Sabha with also a membership of nearly 800,000 members, the All-India Students' Federation and many other progressive unions and organisations in the country are under the influence of the Communists.

In the course of 1948 more than 1,600 strikes took place in India and a considerable number of these strikes bore a political character. The strikes and mass actions of the workers were directed against the attacks of the bourgeoisie on the living standard and political rights of the working class, anti-working class legislations, against the lifting of price-control, and against the assumption of extraordinary powers by the Government against the persecution of the Communist Party of India, etc.

Thanks to the leading role of the working class and its leaders—the Communist Parties—successes have also been achieved in the national liberation movement in Viet Nam whose people are waging a heroic struggle against French imperialism which is egged on and supported by the ruling circles in USA. A partisan army is also operating in Burma, a partisan war is being waged against the American colonisers in

the Philippines and an armed struggle for independence of the peoples is on in Indonesia and Malaya. All these are not accidental, spontaneous outbursts but an organised and conscious struggle of the popular masses led by the working class and the Communist Parties against the imperialists and internal reaction.

The national liberation movement in Indonesia is taking place under complicated conditions. Under the leadership of the Communist Party the Indonesian partisans are waging a dogged armed struggle against the Dutch troops not only in Java and Sumatra but also in the other islands of Indonesia.

* * *

The consolidation of the leading role of the proletariat in the national liberation movement of the peoples of the colonies and the semi-colonies during the war and after its termination was the factor which determined the gigantic sweep of this movement and its decisive victories.

In all the countries of the colonial world the peasantry, the intelligentsia, the urban petty bourgeoisie, and that section of the national bourgeoisie which is coming forth against imperialism are rallying around the proletariat for emancipation from colonial oppression, for national freedom and independence. Moreover, the Communist Parties are waging a determined and irreconcilable struggle against the national reformist agents of the imperialists who are trying to drive a wedge between the various detachments of the national liberation movement in the different countries and also between the national liberation movement of the colonies and semi-colonies on the one hand, and the international camp of democracy and Socialism as a whole on the other. The servitors of American imperialism—the Bevins and Blums—

are trying to poison the consciousness of the fighting peoples of the colonies by dissemination of the treacherous slogan of the “third path”, for the sake of rescuing the colonial empires from final destruction. Mao Tse-tung writes, “Not only in China, but throughout the world without exception, it is either support for imperialism or Socialism. Neutrality is a camouflage and no third path exists.” The Communist Parties of the colonial and semi-colonial countries are exposing these attempts and are carrying on an irreconcilable struggle against them.

In the course of a prolonged struggle the Chinese people came to the conclusion that the most important condition of success is

“unity in the common struggle with the countries of the world which regard us as an equal nation and with the peoples of all countries. This means alliance with the USSR and the People’s Democracies in Europe and alliance with the proletariat and the masses of the peoples of the other countries to form an international united front.” (*Mao Tse-tung, Ibid.*)

True to the traditions of internationalism, the Communist Party of China and Communist Parties of other colonial and semi-colonial and dependent countries branded with shame the Tito fascist clique, that gang of provocateurs and paid spies of foreign imperialist secret services, which has established a regime of terror, espionage and diversion inside the country.

The Soviet people see in the tremendous victories of Chinese democracy the triumph of the all-conquering power of Marxism-Leninism. They welcome the formation of the People’s Republic of China as a historical culmination of the great and prolonged struggle of the Chinese people under the leadership of the working class. The Soviet Government was

the first to grant recognition to the new Government of Democratic China.

The further rallying of the peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies around the working class led by the Communist Parties under the banner of Lenin and Stalin is the guarantee of success of the struggle for the liquidation of the imperialist system of colonial slavery and oppression.

—*From Problems of Economics, No. 9, 1949*

NEW STAGE IN THE NATIONAL LIBERATION STRUGGLE OF THE PEOPLE Of INDIA BY V. V. BALABUSHEVICH

MARXISM-LENINISM teaches that the hegemony of the proletariat is the decisive condition for the success of the national liberation struggle of the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries. It is only under the leadership of the working class, the only consistently revolutionary class, that the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries can free themselves from imperialist yoke and win real independence. Under conditions of the extreme accentuation of the general crisis of capitalism, the further deepening of the crisis of the colonial system and the unprecedented advance of the national liberation movement of the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries, the principal trend of this movement towards a further widening and intensification of the struggle of the oppressed peoples against the imperialist oppressors and internal reaction and towards the consistent strengthening of the leading role of the working class in the national liberation movement, manifests itself all the more clearly. In the majority of the colonial countries, the working class has today become the acknowledged leader of the general peoples' struggle against imperialist oppression, which testifies to the transition of the struggle to a new and higher phase of its development.

* * *

In dimensions and in the number of its population, India occupies one of the first places among the colonial countries. Its territory exceeds four million square kilometres and its 400 million population comprises more than three-fourths of the population of the British empire and more than half the population of the whole colonial world. It is natural that the

struggle of the peoples of India for their independence has great importance for the entire democratic camp.

India is a typical agrarian country. Britain after her conquest of India converted it into her agrarian and raw material appendage. The overwhelming majority of the Indian population is engaged in agriculture. According to the figures of the last census (1941), 339.3 million people or more than 87 per cent of the entire population of the country live in villages and only 49.7 million people (nearly 13 per cent of the population) in the towns.

In spite of extremely favourable natural and climatic conditions, agriculture in India is deteriorating and is characterised by an exceedingly low level of development of productive forces. In spite of being a very large agricultural country, India cannot feed her own population. Not only has she stopped exporting foodstuffs but is even forced to import them. India represents the classical land of famine—famine that regularly carries off the lives of millions of toilers.

The reason for the degradation of Indian agriculture lies in the prolonged rule of British imperialism and in the system of agrarian relationships based on feudal landownership that have been implanted and nurtured by the British colonisers. More than two-thirds of the total land under cultivation in the country is concentrated in the hands of the British and Indian landowners.

A great majority of Indian landlords hire out their land on lease to big tenants who divide this land into still smaller plots and in their turn also hire it out on lease. In India this “pyramid” of sub-tenants sometimes extends to the twentieth degree and even more. Between the owner of the land and the peasants who cultivate it, there exists a numerous strata of parasitic middlemen sitting on the necks of the peasants. The landlords serve as one of the main props of British imperialism in India. The Indian countryside is enmeshed in all kinds of

feudal survivals, which are hampering the economic development of the country and intensifying the degradation of its agriculture.

In spite of the fact that India is one of the most industrially-developed colonies, her industry is not very great. The cotton and jute industry had already arisen during the second half of the last century and are the most developed branches of Indian industry. Following on them, during the period between the two world wars and particularly on the eve of the Second World War, there developed a metallurgical industry. But it is a fact that the production of the iron and steel industry is altogether insignificant. In 1948 it consisted of only 1,470,000 tons of pig iron and 854,000 tons of steel. The Second World War gave an impetus to the development of the chemical industry which till this time had been practically non-existent in the country. The sugar, foodstuff and leather industries saw a significant development between the two world wars.

However, in spite of the growth of certain branches of Indian industry, the general level of industrial development in India is extremely low even today. Industrial production comprises only 20 per cent of the total value of the entire production of India and is less than two per cent of the industrial production of capitalist countries, in spite of the fact that approximately one-sixth of the whole world's population lives in India. This fact alone eloquently testifies to India's extreme backwardness, which is the direct result of the predatory rule of British imperialism.

India's industry bears a typically colonial character. It is exclusively dependent on British capital.

Even today, it is the branches of light industry—cotton, jute, foodstuffs, etc.—which occupy a predominant place. As before, the specific weight of the branches of heavy industry and above all, of metallurgy, still remains insignificant, in the total industrial production of the country. Thus, in 1947, the

workers employed in the cotton and jute industry comprised more than 44 per cent of all the factory workers of India and the workers in the metallurgical and in the so-called machine-building industry (in which Indian bourgeois statistics include all kinds of machine and other workshops) comprise 14 per cent in all. The specific weight of the workers in metallurgy and machine-building industry in the total number of Indian factory workers rose all told by three per cent during the five war years (1939-44). These indices refute the fabrications of the British colonisers about the rapid pace at which the industrialisation of India proceeded during the war years. A machine-building industry which is the foundation of real industrialisation and the basis of the economic independence of the country is practically non-existent in India. The British imperialists adopted every measure to prevent the rise and development of this branch of industry even during the Second World War.

Two centuries of colonial slavery under the heel of British imperialism and the very strong feudal survivals, have fettered the productive forces of India, and have converted this country, so rich in natural resources, into one of the poorest countries in the world and made millions of Indian toilers into paupers dragging out a starving existence.

The partition of India into two parts—India and Pakistan—effected by British imperialism in August 1947 and the granting of fictitious independence to both these parts in the form of Dominion Status has not changed the colonial character of the economy of these Dominions. One of the most important aims of, partition was precisely to strengthen the backwardness of the economy of India and Pakistan, to create difficulties in the path of their independent development and to ensure their utmost dependence on British capital. The partition of India destroyed the economic ties between different parts of the country and placed both the Dominions in an even more

difficult economic position than before.

Pakistan is a backward agricultural country, with quite considerable resources of foodstuffs and certain types of agricultural raw materials (jute, long-fibred cotton), but it is completely devoid of a large manufacturing industry. Apart from railway workshops, the whole industry of this Dominion consists of one woollen and 14 cotton mills, and nine sugar, five cement, four glass and two oil-refining factories. The average yearly consumption of coal is 3.4 million tons but Pakistan can produce only 300,000 tons annually and that too, of an extremely bad quality. In Pakistan, a metallurgical industry is completely absent.

The Indian Dominion consists of regions that are relatively more industrially developed. Till the partition, approximately 90 per cent of the entire large-scale manufacturing industry of the country was to be found here. Moreover, the Indian Dominion is experiencing great difficulties in respect of food produce and certain types of agricultural raw materials, since the important agrarian regions of the country have gone to Pakistan. Jute, which is the biggest branch of Indian industry, is almost completely concentrated in the territory which has gone to the Indian Dominion.

As a result of the partition of the country, the jute industry has been deprived of indigenous raw materials since more than 73 per cent of the jute grown is concentrated on the territory of Pakistan. The textile mills of Bombay and Ahmedabad have been cut off from the regions where long-staple cotton is grown from the districts of the Punjab, which have gone to Pakistan. The dismemberment of India has increased the economic dependence of both the Dominions and has sharply worsened their economic position and still more hampered the development of their productive forces.

All this creates favourable conditions for the British imperialists to retain Pakistan and India as agrarian and raw

material appendages of Britain. The economy of India and Pakistan is in a state of decline. Both the Dominions continue to remain an object of the predatory exploitation and robbery by the British—and now also by the American imperialists. The industrial production in both the Dominions is at present at a lower level than that which was attained during the war. Production in the jute industry fell lower than even the prewar level. In 1946-47, the output of cotton textiles was 3.4 milliard yards or 79 per cent of the war maximum and 90 per cent of the production in 1938-39; in 1947-48, the smelting of pig iron was 74.5 per cent of the highest war level and lower than the 1938-39 level. The production of steel and rolling-steel although rather higher than the prewar level is lower than the war maximum and for the last three years it has been systematically falling.

After the partition of India, both the Dominions continue to remain in fact economically, politically and militarily, dependent on Great Britain. And even after the partition of the country, British capital has retained and is increasing its dominating position in the economy of India and Pakistan. This is proved, for example, by the fact that many British-Indian joint stock companies in which the leading position of British capital is guaranteed, have been created in various branches of industry in both the Dominions. The British capitalists are not in the least attempting to utilise their position in these companies in the interests of industrialising India. It is well-known that many joint companies are offering in India under their own stamp articles that have been mainly manufactured in Britain.

The ruling circles of India and Pakistan have betrayed the interests of the people and are applying all their energies to creating the most favourable conditions in these Dominions for the domination of foreign capital. In speaking not long ago, before the annual meeting of the Indian Associated Chambers

of Commerce, the Indian Government's Finance Minister, Matthai, assured the British capitalists with the statement:

“We have no intention of taking any step which might, to the smallest degree, be detrimental to British interests in India. On the contrary, we shall be glad if the interests you represent are retained in the country and continue to prosper.” (*People's Age*, December 19, 1948)

The representatives of the ruling circles of Pakistan are no less frank about their aspirations to make the country subservient to the interests of foreign monopolies.

In the postwar years American capital is penetrating the economy of India still more actively. The specific weight of the USA in the imports of India rose from 7.4 per cent in 1938 to 30.3 per cent in 1947 and equalled Britain's share, which in that year was 30.2 per cent of the total Indian imports (in 1938, it was 31.4 per cent). In 1948, the specific weight of the USA in Indian imports declined a little while there was an increase in the share of Britain. The American monopolies are attempting in every way to consolidate their position in India. This is what explains in the first place, the creation in both India and Pakistan of Indo-American joint stock companies and enterprises. This also explains the granting of loans to India by the International Bank of Reconstruction and Development, loans which are, of course, reserved not for effecting the industrialisation of the country but only for developing agriculture and transport. The organ of the Indian capitalists, *The Eastern Economist*, wrote in its issue of January 14, 1949:

“For many years India will be in need of foreign capital and foreign technical experience. And all this must come mainly from the USA and Britain.”

Both the British and American imperialists in spite of the aggravation of the contradictions and the competitive struggle between them in all parts of the world and particularly in India and Pakistan, are both interested in crushing the national liberation struggle and creating difficulties in the way of independent economic development of both the Dominions. At the basis of the American and British policy in India and Pakistan as well as in other countries of the Asiatic continent there lies as before the aim of strengthening the imperialist rule and hindering in every way their industrialisation, retaining these countries as colonial agricultural raw material appendages and markets for the goods of the imperialist metropolitan State.

At the behest of Anglo-American finance-capital, the reactionary Press in England and in the USA has lately intensified its propaganda of a false thesis to the effect that in the countries of the East, the development of heavy industry does not correspond to the demands of the economic development of these countries, that they ought to concentrate their efforts mainly on agricultural production. With idle talk of this type, the British and American imperialists are attempting to conceal the real colonising essence of their policy and to guarantee the retention and extension of the former economic base of their domination in the countries of Asia.

The USA and Britain continue to obstruct in every way the importation of industrial equipment into India and Pakistan. Their trade with these Dominions bears even at present a clearly expressed colonial character.

In spite of these facts, the leaders of the ruling parties of India and Pakistan, the National Congress and the Muslim League, talk as though a “bloodless revolution” had taken place in their country, as though they had attained “independence” and as though the prerequisites for the “rapid industrialisation” of both the Dominions had been created. The facts quoted

above decisively refute such false fabrications. It is absolutely clear that it is impossible to achieve any economic advance under conditions of the domination of the monopolies of imperialist countries and under conditions when the ruling circles in India and Pakistan pursue a policy dictated by the interests of the exploiting classes. It is only complete freedom from imperialist oppression and from the feudal survivals, nurtured by the colonisers, and the fundamentally democratic reconstruction of India and Pakistan which can create the lasting prerequisites for overcoming their economic backwardness and for a rapid development of their productive forces.

* * *

The mass anti-imperialist movement which developed in India with unprecedented force after the Second World War was an integral part of the general revolutionary advance of the national liberation struggle of the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries, and it assumed new features, which distinguished it in essence from all preceding stages of the revolutionary struggle of the popular masses of India. After the war, the national liberation movement of the peoples of India entered a new stage. This stage is determined above all, by the fact that it was the working class, led by the Communist Party, that stood at the head of the popular masses and their struggle for freedom from imperialist yoke, for real independence and democratic reconstruction of the country and by the fact that the Indian big bourgeoisie had openly gone over into the camp of reaction and imperialism.

The tasks of the national liberation movement have also extended. At present, the struggle of the peoples of India is directed both against foreign imperialism and also for the carrying out of decisive democratic transformations inside the

country, and above all, the agrarian revolution without which it is impossible to lead the country out of the economic impasse and to win over the wide masses of the peasantry to the side of the working class.

The re-grouping of class forces that has taken place inside the country and the emergence of the proletariat as the leader of . the mass movement of the Indian peoples and also the wider content of the tasks of the struggle demonstrates the fact that the national liberation movement in India has entered a new and a higher phase of its development and that it will develop at an even more quickening pace.

The assumption of the leadership of the national liberation movement in India by the working class was conditioned by the entire course of the historical and socio-economic development of the country.

Along with the development of capitalist industry which the British colonisers, despite their attempts, were not able to stop completely, there arose, developed and consolidated within the country a working class called upon to assume leadership of the struggle of the Indian toiling masses for national and social liberation and to carry it to a victorious conclusion.

Already in 1925, in his historic speech to the University of the Toilers of the East, Comrade Stalin in speaking of the characteristic features of the development of colonial and dependent countries of the East, pointed out that in certain of these countries, India, for instance there had arisen a more or less numerous class of native proletarians and that

“the question of the hegemony of the proletariat in such countries and the emancipation of the masses from the influence of the compromising national bourgeoisie is assuming an increasingly urgent character.” (*Stalin, Address to the University of the Toilers of the East, May 18,*

1925, Lenin, Stalin, Zhukov, On the Colonial Question, PPH Ltd., p. 16)

Since that time, the number of the Indian industrial proletariat has increased considerably. In 1947, nearly 3.5 million people were employed in the manufacturing industry, in the mines and in railway transport in India. Of course, for a country with a 400 million population, this is an extremely small figure, and it bears witness to India's colonial backwardness. It is a fact that there are also a considerable number of workers in plantations, in irrigation works, etc. Finally, even according to the official statistics, the agricultural workers in India number a few tens of millions.

However, the role and the importance of the proletariat in revolutions, in national liberation movements is determined not so much by its number as above all, by its organisation, the firmness of its ties with all the toilers. The proletariat is the only class which is revolutionary to the end and as such called upon to be the leader, the hegemon, in the struggle of all the toilers and exploited against the oppressors and the exploiters. In the colonies where the exploitation of the peasantry which represents the greater mass of the population bears monstrous forms, there is a broad basis for creating a stable alliance by the proletariat with the peasant masses, for consolidating in every way the ideological and organisational leadership of the peasantry by the proletariat, for the successful conquest by the working class of hegemony in the people's struggle against imperialism and internal reaction.

The struggle of the working class of India against feudal-capitalist exploiters, and for the improvement of its conditions was from the very beginning closely bound up with the struggle against imperialism. Under colonial conditions, as a result of the inter-weaving of capitalist and pre-capitalist forms of exploitation, the growth in the impoverishment of the

masses, which is the inevitable accompaniment of the capitalist method of production is proceeding with particular sharpness and at a particularly rapid pace. In pursuit of their super-profits, the imperialists are employing the most inhuman and predatory methods of exploitation of the working class of the colonies. In consequence of this, the struggle of the workers in the colonies for the realisation of their immediate demands, for relieving their economic conditions cannot be separated from the struggle against imperialist oppression, from the struggle for freedom and independence. In the measure of the strengthening of their class organisations, the Indian workers have emerged all the more resolutely as the leading force in the national revolutionary movement in the country. It is precisely owing to the activity of the working class and its influence on the broad masses of peasantry that the national liberation movement in India became increasingly mass and revolutionary in character. In India, already in the beginning of the twentieth century, there appeared on the political arena in the person of the rising proletariat, a force capable of unifying and leading the broad toiling masses in the struggle for overthrowing the domination of British imperialism. In connection with the first mass political action of the working class of India—the general strike of the Bombay textile workers as a mark of protest against the sentence on the Indian democrat, Tilak—Lenin had pointed out in 1908 that

“the Indian proletariat has already matured sufficiently to wage a class-conscious and political mass struggle, and that being the case, Anglo- Russian methods in India are played out.” (*V. I. Lenin Collected Works, Russ. Ed., Vol. XV, p. 161*)

Since that time, the Indian working class has gone through the stern school of the class and the anti-imperialist struggle

and it has immeasurably grown politically and organisationally. It has learnt much from the Russian workers, who had destroyed the capitalist order in their country in October 1917.

Even the first mass advance of the working class movement in India was organisationally linked with the advance of the national liberation struggle embracing the country in 1918-22 under the influence of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia. Already in these years the working class played a most active role in the people's struggle against imperialist oppression and colonial exploitation, in suite of the fact that there was no Communist Party within the country and trade unions had only begun to be formed.

During the new advance of the national liberation movement in India, beginning in 1930, the working class in the country in the person of its foremost detachment had already emerged as an independent political force and from the very beginning conducted a fight for the leadership of the national liberation movement. This was a new and exceedingly important feature of the movement. However, even at that time revolutionary trade unions existed only in a few larger towns, an all-India Communist Party had not yet been created though Communist groups were active in a number of Provinces and in some industrial centres.

The role of the working class increased still more in the years preceding the Second World War when the mass antiimperialist movement flamed up once again in India. This was possible, in the first instance, because of the fact that in 1933, as a result of the unification of different Communist groups an all-India Communist Party had been created. The formation of an all-India Communist Party was of tremendous significance for the further development of the working class and the general mass anti-imperialist movement. The Communist Party began extending its influence in the course of the anti-imperialist struggle and by attempting to wean away

the peasantry from the influence of the bourgeois leadership of the National Congress, was winning it over to its side.

During the Second World War, the Indian working class was considerably strengthened both politically and organisationally. From 1937-38 to 1942-43, the number of workers organised in trade unions rose from 390,000 to 685,000, i.e., by 75 per cent. Towards the end of the war, the number of trade union members exceeded one million. Communists were elected to the leading organs of the majority of the trade unions that were formed. The Communist Party became the leading force in the working class movement in the country. In the war years, the working class under Communist leadership came forth with a detailed programme of struggle for improving the conditions of the toilers, for carrying out the demands of the national liberation movement. This to a considerable extent, facilitated the growth of the influence of the working class and its Party among the broad masses of the Indian people. The toilers of India are more and more convinced that it is precisely the working class led by the Communist Party which represents that force capable of rallying all the toilers and leading them in a resolute struggle against the imperialist oppressors of the country and against the “native” exploiters and capable of carrying out the tasks of the national liberation movement.

At present the Indian working class has won considerable success in the fight for hegemony of the national liberation movement. This is confirmed by the whole course of events in India, especially after the Second World War.

* * *

The successes of the Indian working class in the struggle for hegemony in the national liberation movement are above all expressed in the organisational and in the ideological growth of the vanguard of the proletariat—the Communist Party of India.

This is of great significance since, as Comrade Stalin teaches us:

“The hegemony of the proletariat can be prepared only by the Communist Party.” (*Stalin, Address to the University of the Toilers of the East, May 18, 1925, Lenin, Stalin, Zhukov, On the Colonial Question, PPH Ltd., 1948, p. 19*)

The Second Congress of the Communist Party which took place during the end of February and beginning of March 1948, was an important step in the life of the Communist Party of India and a big political event inside the country. The Congress demonstrated a big increase in the influence of the Communist Party.

The Congress advanced as the most important task in the new stage, the struggle for the consolidation by all means of the People’s Democratic Front, which must be the embodiment of the alliance of the working class, the peasantry and the urban petty bourgeoisie under the leadership of the working class. The Congress proclaimed the following demands as the central slogans of the People’s Democratic Front at the present stage of the national liberation movement in India:

(1) Complete national independence, severance from the British empire and the Angle-American reactionary bloc, and the establishment of close economic, political and cultural ties with the genuinely democratic countries and above all, with the Soviet Union.

(2) Abolition of landlordism without compensation and distribution of land to the tillers of the soil.

(3) A determined democratisation of India and its conversion into a union of national, People’s Democratic republics on the basis of the principle of national self-determination; the abolition of Princely States.

(4) Nationalisation of the key branches of industry and the confiscation of foreign and above all, of British enterprises; a radical improvement in the position of the working class.

The Communist Party set itself as a specially important task, the building of unity of the democratic movements in the Indian Union and Pakistan and emphasised that this unity is the indispensable condition for the liberation of both these Dominions from imperialist oppression and the most important pre-requisite for a successful struggle for real democratisation of both these parts of India.

The influence of the Communist Party amongst the workers in both the Dominions has increased considerably and above all, because on the fundamental question of the struggle against imperialism and colonial oppression, and for the improvement of the conditions of the workers, it has come forward with its own platform which expresses the aspirations and the hopes of the broadest masses of the Indian people.

The conditions of the Indian working class who even before used to drag out a starving existence has worsened sharply during the Second World War and after its termination. The partition of India has aggravated even more the process of the absolute and relative impoverishment of the working class. The Indian capitalists and the Anglo-American monopolists along with the Governments of India and Pakistan have intensified their attack on the living standards of the workers and on all the toilers of both the Dominions.

The rise in the prices of foodstuffs and manufactured articles or wide consumption has brought new riches to the Indian and foreign capitalists and also to the merchants and speculators and led to a further lowering of the living standard of the workers. Even according to the official falsified figures, the index of the cost of living for the working class is steadily rising. In Bombay, which is one of the biggest industrial centres of the country, it rose from 103 in 1939 to 265 in 1947

and up to 296 in March 1949; in Nagpur, it was 104, 320 and 374 respectively; in Kanpur 105, 378 and 468 (The Eastern Economist, July 1, 1949 p. 36). Even at present, as a result of the continuous rise in prices, the real wages of the workers are steadily falling. Everywhere, under the guise of “rationalisation” of production, the exploitation of the workers is increasing and the intensification of their labour is becoming greater. The army of unemployed is growing. In 1948, those of the unemployed registered with the urban employment exchanges alone numbered more than two million people.

After the war, the struggle of the working class in India assumed tremendous proportions. The strike movement reached an unprecedented level. In 1947, in the Indian Dominion alone, nearly two million workers and employees participated in economic strikes; as a result of these strikes nearly 16,000,000 working days were lost. In India, the strikes of the postwar years are distinguished by their mass character, their solidarity and the active role of the workers and by the inclusion on a wide scale of new strata of the proletariat and the toilers, the workers in small enterprises, workers in States, those employed in Government and private enterprises, etc., etc. It is characteristic that the specific weight of general strikes embracing broad strata of the workers and employees in the strike movement is increasing in both the different industrial centres (the number of general strikes in Bombay, Calcutta and other cities) as well as in entire provinces (the general strike of the textile workers of the Central Provinces and Berar, the general strike of teachers in the Bombay Province, in the Punjab and in the United Provinces, etc.). The workers of different branches of industry also went on strike on a nationwide scale (the general strike of the Post and Telegraph workers). The very broad sweep of the strike struggle of the Indian working class played a big role in the growth of the revolutionary consciousness of the popular masses and in

rallying them around the proletariat.

The Indian working class, fighting for the satisfaction of its economic demands is at the same time, the pioneer and the leader of mass anti-imperialist actions directed against the British rule. During the mass anti-British disturbances in Calcutta in November 1945 and in February 1946 and in other towns during the bloody clashes and the barricade battles in Bombay in January-February 1946, the working class drew the broad masses behind it and as a result of its active role, these actions assumed a militant and revolutionary character.

The uprising of the sailors in the navy in Bombay and other places in February 1946 would have been impossible without the active support of the working class. The general strike of the Bombay textile workers as a mark of solidarity with the sailors, running into three-day long barricade battles as well as the solidarity strikes in other centres of the country, brought out clearly the leading and guiding role of the working class in the anti-imperialist movement' of the Indian toilers. The vanguard role of the working class was to be seen also in the mass movements that flared up after the termination of the war in a number of feudal Princely States (Travancore, Hyderabad, Indore, etc.)-these bulwarks of reaction. The workers' struggle was the signal for the unfolding of a mass movement against the feudal Princes and the British rule, for the liquidation of the feudal order in the States, for their democratisation.

After the partitioning of India into two Dominions, the strike struggle against the attack of the capitalists and of the ruling circles on the living standard of the workers and all the toilers has not ceased. In the Indian Dominion 1,634 economic strikes involving more than 1.3 million workers took place in 1948.

After the partitioning of the country, the political strikes and the mass actions of the workers against the anti-popular policies of the Congress Government in India and of the

Muslim League Government in Pakistan, against the persecution of the Communist Parties, the All-India Trade Union Congress and other progressive democratic organisations by the Governments of both the Dominions, have assumed a wide sweep.

The most important events in the life of India were such political actions of the proletariat as the one-day general strike of 700,000 workers of Bombay as a mark of protest against the lifting of price control by the Congress Government (December 1947), the one-day general strike of 100,000 workers in Calcutta against the adoption of the law by the Bengal Provincial Legislative Assembly giving the Bengal Government extraordinary plenary powers (January 1948), the one-day general strike of 200,000 workers of Central Provinces and Berar against the anti-working class policies of the Government (March 1948), the one-day strike of 50,000 Calcutta workers as a mark of protest against the introduction of anti-working-class legislation (July 1948) and a whole number of other big political actions as well as a large number of protest strikes against the persecution of the Communist Party.

The brilliant successes of the national liberation army in China evoke a broad response in India and Pakistan. In a number of towns in both the Dominions meetings and demonstrations of solidarity with the Chinese people are taking place under the leadership of the Communist Party and other progressive organisations. The heroic struggle of the Chinese people for freedom and democracy cannot but have a big influence on the further widening and deepening of the national liberation movement in India and Pakistan.

The growing political struggle of the Indian proletariat clearly proves that it is resolutely emerging in defence not only of its own economic interests but is leading the struggle for the defence of the interests of the broad toiling masses and against

the reactionary bloc of the imperialists, the big bourgeoisie and the landlords. Thus, in practice it rises to the level of the leader of the general struggle.

The Indian working class and its Party in its fight for the masses will have to overcome serious difficulties and above all, it must fight to establish unity within its own ranks. In the Indian Union, the reactionary leadership of the National Congress and the Socialist Party are trying to split the trade union movement. Apart from the All-India Trade Union Congress which is led by progressive leaders, including Communists; since the time of partition three new parallel trade union centres have arisen inside the country—the National Trade Union Congress, which is a Government-owners' organisation and is the creation of the leaders of the National Congress and the Patel-Nehru. Government; the Hind Mazdoor Sabha which was formed at the initiative of the leadership of the Socialist Party and the United Congress of Trade Unions which has recently been formed in Calcutta. And notwithstanding the fact that these latter three organisations are considerably weaker than the All-India Trade Union Congress, the disruptive and splitting activities of their leaders constitute an obstacle in the way of the struggle of the working class. A clear example of this is the disruption by the Socialist leaders of the general strike of the eight-hundred thousand railway workers, scheduled to take place in March 1949, and for which 95 per cent of the members of all the trade unions of the railway workers had cast their vote. The trade union movement in Pakistan is also split.

The lack of unity in the Indian working class is to a great extent a consequence of the fact that certain of its sections have still not shaken off the influence of bourgeois national reformism. National reformism appears both in the reactionary form of Gandhism which continues to remain the most important ideological weapon of the bourgeoisie as well as in

the “Left” garb of the Socialist and other “Left” parties. At the present time, “Left” national reformism, which is attempting to conceal its subservience to the interests of foreign and national capital, its fawning before them by demagogic and pseudo-revolutionary slogans, represents a big danger to the working class movement. The attempt to retain inside the country imperialist-colonial slavery and capitalist oppression runs through all the activities of the leadership of the Socialist Party. The Socialist Party is intensifying its disruptive activity amongst the workers, peasants, youth and other organisations.

* * *

One of the decisive conditions for the realisation of the hegemony by the Indian proletariat in the national liberation movement is the strengthening of its ideological and organisational influence among the peasantry—constituting, in this typically agrarian country, the overwhelming majority of the population. The peasantry is the most important driving force in the colonial revolution and the main ally of the working class in its struggle against imperialism, for national liberation, and for democratic reorganisation. The success of this struggle depends on the extent to which the greater masses of the Indian peasantry, along with the working class and under its leadership are drawn into the revolutionary struggle against colonial oppression, against the remnants of feudalism and for a democratic reorganisation.

The domination of British imperialism and the retention of strong remnants of feudalism doomed the millions and millions of peasant masses to dire want, terrible privations and subjected agriculture to degradation. The pauperisation of the peasantry in India has reached such dimensions that the main figure in the countryside at the present time is the poor, landless or the almost landless peasant. The impoverishment of the peasant is clearly illustrated by the systematic growth of the

number of agricultural workers. In India, the number of the agricultural proletariat rose from 7.5 million in 1882 to 21 million in 1921 and to approximately 33 million in 1931. At present, the number of agricultural labourers has increased still more and according to even the Indian bourgeois economists represents in some districts of the country approximately one half of the entire population engaged in agriculture.

The big army of the agricultural proletariat is a clear indication of the relative agrarian over-population in India. Indian agricultural workers are essentially different from the agricultural workers of the advanced capitalist countries. Side by side with the workers employed in kulak and landowners' farms (as a rule on a daily basis and for not more than three or four months in the year), the great masses of agricultural workers also comprise of those enslaved, the so-called agricultural servants, debt-slaves and others amongst the dispossessed strata of the rural population crushed down by feudal exploitation. To the same category belong the impoverished and proletarianised rural artisans (the potters, the tanners, the blacksmiths etc.). The position of the small proprietors and the small tenants working on very tiny plots of land is very little different from the position of the agricultural workers. It is absolutely self-evident that only fundamental changes in social relationships, only an agrarian revolution, can abolish the feudal remnants and ameliorate the conditions of the Indian peasantry and the agricultural proletariat.

The many millions of the Indian working peasantry, crushed by untold want and driven off *en masse* from the land, cannot but become the most important ally of the proletariat. The peasants can win their emancipation only under the leadership of the proletariat, just as the proletariat can lead the colonial revolution to victory only in alliance with the peasantry and by leading it.

The struggle of the peasant masses of India against feudal-

landlord exploitation, against the yoke of the British colonisers had assumed quite considerable dimensions, even in the second half of the nineteenth century. However, it was only in 1918-22 that a broad peasant movement began in India. But at that time the peasant movement in spite of the fact that it was developing under the influence of the strike movement of the working class, bore a spontaneous isolated character and often proceeded under religious slogans. The struggle of the peasants assumed a still broader sweep during the mass anti-imperialist movement from 1930-32. But even at that time, the peasant movement to a great extent developed spontaneously. The peasant masses continued to remain under the bourgeois leadership of the National Congress and, in particular, under the influence of Gandhism. Nevertheless, in a number of places, peasant actions bore a militant, revolutionary character. Independent peasant organisations began to spring up in some places.

The influence of the working class and the Communist Party among the peasant masses showed a marked increase on the eve of the Second World War. There arose in the country a considerable number of peasant unions (kisan sabhas) led by revolutionary elements. Many mass actions of the peasants were already being conducted under revolutionary slogans under Communist leadership. During the war years and in particular, in the postwar period, the peasant unions united in the All-India Kisan Sabha strengthened considerably and are at present at the head of the mass peasant movement. At present all over the country as well as in the Princely States, there exist kisan sabhas led by revolutionary elements. They enjoy a particularly strong influence in the south of India.

The postwar peasant movement in India is developing under the slogan of the consolidation of the alliance of the working class and the peasantry and it is closely interwoven with the general democratic movement, which is developing

under the leadership of the working class and the Communist Party. It must, however, be noted that in spite of the fact that the peasant movement has in certain districts attained a high level, it is still distinguished by great unevenness and does not bear an all-India character. In Pakistan in particular, the peasant movement is at a weaker stage of development.

In the East and North Bengal as well as in certain districts of Orissa, the tenants are waging a struggle for a reduction of the landlords' share of the crop. Immediately after the war, this movement assumed the widest dimensions and a militant character in Bengal. The tenants of twenty districts of the province stopped taking the grain gathered in the fields to the barns of the landlords and refused to give up the one-half of the crop which the landlords were demanding. They kept the harvest to themselves and delivered up to the landlords not more than one-third of the crop. This movement of the Bengal peasants widely known as "Tebhaga" (which means one-third, i.e., the struggle for reduction of the rent To one-third of the crop) has in fact been going on for nearly the past three years, sometimes dying down and then flaring up again.

In a number of districts in Bihar and Orissa (India) as well as in West Punjab and the N.W.F Province (Pakistan), the struggle of the peasants against mass evictions by the landlords from tenanted land is spreading. Often the peasants refuse to leave the plots tenanted by them and enter into an open fight with the police.

In the Madras province, where the bad harvest and famine have specially worsened the conditions of the peasantry in recent years, the peasant movement has assumed an extremely acute form. In this province not only entire villages but whole districts are rallying behind the revolutionary kisan sabhas. Here the peasant struggle mainly assumes the form of confiscation of the landlord's grain which the kisan sabhas then

distribute among the particularly needy peasants. Quite often the peasants distribute a portion of the confiscated grain among the workers and in particular, at the time of strikes (it was thus in Chirakkal and in other districts). The movement for the confiscation of grain-stocks from the landlords developed particularly widely in North Malabar and very often passed over into an open fight of the peasant masses against police and military detachments. Peasant partisan detachments are active in certain districts of the Madras Province (Krishna, Godavari, Guntur).

The agricultural workers who cannot but be a very important force in the developing agrarian revolution are playing a very big role in the peasant movement in many districts of the country. The strikes of the farm labourers in Bihar had a decisive influence on the growth of the peasant movement. In Bengal, the districts where the "Tebhaga" movement is developing, the agricultural workers are participating side by side with the peasants in conducting strikes and they are taking an active part in the meetings and in the demonstrations of the peasants. In the province of Madras, those organised in the unions of agricultural workers are taking part alongside with the peasants in the confiscation of grain from the landlords. The struggle of the agricultural workers is also intensifying in the U.P. and in other provinces. In the district of Gorakhpur, 1,500 farm labourers of one locality in reply to an attempt to deprive them of their rights to till their plots of land for themselves, proclaimed this land as their own and planted the Red Flag in this locality. In Bombay province (India) and in East Bengal (Pakistan), the struggle of the agricultural labourers for their emancipation and for the payment of wages in cash assumed considerable proportions (Warlis and Halis in the Bombay province, Nankari in Bengal).

In India and in Pakistan, the peasants are beginning to put forward more and more frequently the demand for the

confiscation of the land of landlords, without compensation and transferring it to the peasants. The numerous peasant meetings and conferences in the provinces of Madras and Bombay, in Bihar, in West and East Bengal, in the N.W.P. province and in other places have put forward this demand. The total inability of the Congress Government in, India and the League Government in Pakistan to introduce even the most modest democratic agrarian reforms and their open support to feudal-landlord reaction cannot but lead to the strengthening or the peasant movement and to its transition to a higher phase.

The numerous peasant meetings and demonstrations which took place all over the country as a mark of protest against the persecution of the Communist Party and against the mass arrests of Communists, testify to the growing influence of the working class and the Communist Party among the peasantry and a growth in the political activity of the latter.

In the district of Guntur in the province of Madras many thousands of peasants held a demonstration with the slogan: "We demand an end to repression against the Communist Party"! The demonstration received a warm welcome from the peasant population and it terminated, in a meeting attended by ten thousand people.

In Betuak (Bihar) seven thousand peasants attended a meeting called by the kisan sabha where they demanded the immediate confiscation without compensation of the landlords' land, release of arrested Communists and the withdrawal of the ban on the Communist Party in West Bengal.

In Darbhanga (Bihar), where a meeting of the Provincial Committee of the National Congress was being convened, a 15,000 strong peasant demonstration took place with the slogan: "We demand an end to repression against the peasants! Long Live the Communist Party!" The peasants would not allow a Government Minister attending the conference to make a speech and he was compelled to leave the platform. Similar

meetings and demonstrations of the peasants are taking place everywhere. In the postwar period, the peasant movement attained its highest peak in the territory of Telengana in the Princely State of Hyderabad. The peasants, who in the main belong to the Telugu (or Andhra) nationality, rose in battle against the feudal exploitation and simultaneously put forward the demand for incorporating their national territory which was included in Hyderabad with the respective national territory of the Indian Union. It was the combination of the anti-feudal and the national struggle which conditioned the particular acuteness of the peasant struggle in Telengana. In Telengana the peasant movement against the landlords and against the despotic power of the Nizam assumed the character of an armed revolt and an agrarian revolution. As a result of this, the rule of the Nizam and the landlords was overthrown on one-sixth of the territory of the Princely State with a population of four million people. In 2,500 villages of Telengana, the land of the landlords was distributed amongst those peasants who had no or very little land and amongst the agricultural labourers, the indebtedness of the labourers to the landlords and the money-lenders was abolished, people's elected organs and courts were created and a people's militia was formed. In September 1948 the Government of the Indian Dominion sent its armed forces into Telengana in order to suppress the revolutionary struggle of the peasants. It is already one year since the punitive detachments began to run amok in Telengana but they have not succeeded in breaking the fighting spirit of the peasants and in crushing their heroic struggle. The peasant struggle is continuing-it is very often assuming the character of partisan warfare and is extending to the neighbouring districts and in particular to those districts of the Madras Province where the Andhras live.

The peasant movement in Telengana is closely bound up with the struggle of the workers of Hyderabad and is being waged under the leadership of the working class and Left

organisations. The events in Telengana are the most striking instance of the revolutionary struggle for land and democracy and represent the first attempt at creating People's Democracy in India. And although this attempt is limited in its scale and in its character, it has indisputably tremendous importance for the further development and intensification of the general democratic movement in India and Pakistan. The struggle in Telengana is the harbinger of the agrarian revolution and constitutes the most important content of the present stage of the national liberation struggle in India.

In different parts of both India and Pakistan, the peasants have already begun to follow to one or another degree the example of Telengana. In a number of rural districts of the United Provinces, the Central Provinces and of other provinces, peasant revolts against landlord oppression . are taking place more and more often. According to the information of the agency of the *Press Trust of India*, 2,057 peasant revolts and disturbances took place in, the United Provinces alone in the first six months of 1949.

The working class and the Communist Party of India have to overcome serious difficulties in the fight for the peasantry. The influence of reactionary Gandhism is still strong amongst the peasants. In spite of the treachery and the betrayal of leading top sections of the National Congress, the Congress still continues to retain considerable influence amongst the peasant masses and the fact that the disruptive All-India Kisan Congress led by the protégés of Patel and Nehru (Ranga and others) finds soil for its treacherous activity amongst the peasants can be explained by the illusions with regard to the National Congress which have not yet been dispelled. The Socialist leaders are also trying to carry out their disruptive activity amongst the peasant masses. Not long ago they formed a parallel peasants' organisation aimed at undermining the developing revolutionary struggle of the peasantry and the

growth of the influence of the Communist Party.

An important ally of the Indian proletariat in its fight for freedom, independence and democracy is also a considerable section of the urban petty-bourgeoisie. Their difficult conditions and their exploitation by foreign and native capital are more and more forcing the broad strata of the petty-bourgeoisie on to the path of common struggle with the proletariat. In recent years the authority of the working class has been considerably strengthened amongst the lower strata of the urban petty-bourgeoisie. Their active participation in the mass militant political actions taking place under the leadership of the Communist Party is a testimony to this. In recent years, the influence of the Communists has increased in a number of mass democratic, student, youth and other progressive organisations. In spite of this the influence of national reformism is still strong among a considerable section of the urban petty-bourgeoisie. This is especially manifested in the fact that in some provinces there exist not a small number of petty-bourgeois parties and groups who frequently screen themselves behind "Left" labels and are in actual practice utilised by reaction in the struggle against the democratic movement.

* * *

The dislodging of the national bourgeoisie from the leadership of the movement and its isolation constitute one of the most important conditions for the hegemony of the working class in the national liberation movement.

The Indian bourgeoisie, not only the mercantile but even considerable sections of the big industrial bourgeoisie, was from its very inception closely bound up through diverse threads with the British imperialists. These connections were established and strengthened through the credit system, since all the principal banks in India belong to British capital, and

through the so-called “Managing Agencies” which represent one of the special forms of the subservience of Indian industry to the British financial oligarchy; these connections have also been established in other ways. The financial magnates of Britain have always occupied a dominating position in the Indo-British capitalist alliance.

A considerable strata of the Indian industrial bourgeoisie is closely linked with feudal landlords and quite often with usurious capital. To a great extent the British policy of hampering the industrial development of the country contributed to this.

Finally, one more characteristic peculiar to the Indian big bourgeoisie must be noted. As is well-known, India is a multinational country and the process of the formation of nationalities is proceeding in a uneven fashion inside the country. Alongside regions which are more capitalistically developed and in which nationalities have already been constituted, there also exist in the country a considerable number of regions that are economically extremely backward and in which the process of formation of nationalities is still far from complete. The process of the formation and growth of the bourgeoisie of the different nationalities of India is intimately bound up with the process of capitalist development and the formation of nationalities. At present in India there exist not merely large enterprises owned by native capital but national monopolist combinations have also been formed (the joint companies of Birla, Tata and Dalmia, etc.) which play a big role in the country's economy. Of course, these monopolies have a special colonial character; they are closely linked with foreign capital and directly dependent on it. The Gujerati and Marwari groupings of the bourgeoisie occupy a dominant position in these monopolist combinations and it is in the first instance, these monopolist combinations that the Right-wing leadership of the National Congress and the Indian Dominion

Government represent.

The fight of these already constituted monopoly groups for domination over the internal market inevitably meets with the resistance of the rising bourgeoisie of those national territories of India which are more backward in the level of their capitalist development.

In Pakistan where the industrial development and capitalist relations are still characterised by their extreme backwardness the big industrial bourgeoisie is relatively weak. In both the Government of Pakistan and in the top strata of the Muslim League, the leading positions are mainly occupied by feudal-landlord elements.

The characteristic features of the Indian big bourgeoisie which have been noted above and which are determined by the distinctive features of India's colonial development, are of important significance for an understanding of the position of the Indian bourgeoisie in relation to British imperialism, and in relation to the struggle of the popular masses.

The policy of British imperialism which invariably aimed at holding back the industrial development of India could not, of course, provoke anything but the dissatisfaction of the Indian big bourgeoisie. There existed serious differences between the Indian bourgeoisie and British imperialism. Nevertheless, the Indian big bourgeoisie which from its very birth was closely linked with British capital and feudal reaction inside the country, was not capable of or inclined towards any kind of active struggle against imperialism.

True, the Indian bourgeoisie through the leadership of the National Congress attempted to utilise the mass movement in order to bargain for some concessions for its own benefit from British imperialism. The decisive and constant endeavour of the Indian bourgeoisie has, however, always been one of not allowing the struggle of the broad toiling masses for their independence and for freedom to assume an active, extensive

character, since in the epoch of imperialism, real freedom implies freedom not only from the oppression of the colonisers but also from the oppression of one's "own" national bourgeoisie. The Indian big bourgeoisie has always come to a compromise with British imperialism and has reckoned on its support in the struggle against the proletariat and the toiling masses of India.

Even in 1920, V. I. Lenin had emphasised that

"a certain rapprochement has been brought about between the bourgeoisie of the exploiting countries and those of the colonial countries so that very often, even in the majority of cases, perhaps, where the bourgeoisie of the oppressed countries does support the national movement, it simultaneously works in harmony with the imperialist bourgeoisie, i.e., it joins the latter in fighting against all revolutionary movements and revolutionary classes." (*Lenin, The Report of the Commission on the National and Colonial Questions at the Second Congress of the Communist International, July 26, 1920, Selected Works, Lawrence & Wishart, London, Vol. X, p. 241*)

The position of the Indian bourgeoisie is an example which clearly confirms this Leninist observation. The Indian big bourgeoisie took to the path of treachery, to the path of national betrayal and compromise with imperialism even during the very first stages of the national liberation movement, when the direction of the movement was mainly against foreign oppression and when the Indian proletariat had still not yet become an independent political force.

Even the mass movement of 1918-22 pointed out that the big industrial bourgeoisie of India represented by the leadership of the National Congress is a compromising bourgeoisie and that it cannot be considered as a revolutionary

force in the struggle against imperialism. Comrade Stalin pointed out:

“Dreading revolution more than imperialism, concerned more about its moneybags than about the interests of its own country, this section of the bourgeoisie, the wealthiest and the most influential section, is completely going over to the camp of the irreconcilable enemies of the revolution, having entered into a bloc with imperialism against the workers and peasants of its own country.” (*Stalin, Address to the University .of the Toilers of the East, May 18, 1925, Lenin, Stalin, Zhukov, On the Colonial Question, PPH Ltd., 1948, p. 19*)

Even in 1930-32 at the time of the advance of the national liberation movement of the Indian toilers, the big bourgeoisie betrayed the masses and came to a compromise with British imperialism.

After the Second World War and in connection therewith the national liberation movement assumed an unprecedented sweep, its leadership passing more and more into the hands of the working class. The Indian big bourgeoisie openly went over into the camp of reaction and of imperialism and began savagely to suppress the democratic movement in the country. Its fear of its own working masses is intensifying as a result of the growth and the solidarity of the democratic forces of the whole world led by the Soviet Union and as a result of the unprecedented advance of the revolutionary movement in the countries of South-East Asia and the brilliant victories of the national liberation armies in China.

If earlier the Indian big bourgeoisie, in spite of a whole chain of betrayals and capitulation before imperialism represented some opposition to imperialism, then at the present time it has completely and openly gone over to the camp of

imperialism.

The fact that not only the landlord-bourgeois top strata of the Muslim League but the bourgeois-landlord leadership of the National Congress completely accepted the “Mount-batten Plan” testifies to the open passing over of the Indian big bourgeoisie into the camp of reaction. As a result of the carrying out of this plan into practice, both the Dominions continue to remain dependent on Great Britain although the forms of this dependence have changed and although the British imperialists have allowed the native exploiting classes to be in power in both the Dominions. The whole domestic and foreign policy of the ruling circles of both the Dominions also proves that the big bourgeoisie of India and Pakistan has betrayed the national interests.

The internal policy of the leading circles of India and Pakistan is wholly at the service of the interests of the reactionary bloc of the Indian big bourgeoisie, the landlords and the feudal princes. After coming into power, the Indian big bourgeoisie took all steps to retain such a survival of medievalism and bulwark of reaction as the feudal princes—the bases of British imperialism in India. It is bending all its energies to preserve landlordism which represents the main basis of feudal survivals and is at present the predominant form of the oppression over the Indian peasantry. The bills for agrarian reforms which are being elaborated in a number of provinces of the Indian Dominion clearly testify to this. These reforms retain the survivals of feudalism and landlordism everywhere. But the implementation of even these reforms is being prevented by the ruling circles in India. Regardless of the former demagogic statements made by the leadership of the National Congress, the rulers of India are refusing to nationalise large-scale industry. Like the ruling circles of Pakistan, they are opening wide their doors to foreign capital and are now increasing the economic and political dependence

of both the Dominions on British and American monopolies.

The ruling circles of both the Dominions are resorting to brutal repression against the working class and its organisations and against all democratic elements. They are employing essentially fascist methods in their struggle against the progressive forces and in particular against the Communist Party. Trade unions and peasant organisations led by democratic elements are savagely persecuted. Thousands of democratic leaders have been thrown into jails. In India, in February 1949, more than three thousand people were arrested solely in connection with the threat of a general strike of railwaymen. News about brutal firing on striking workers, on peasant meetings and on student demonstrations is coming in from different parts of India. At present, laws are being prepared which will in fact completely ban strikes. At a session of the Constituent Assembly, Nehru threatened to ban the Communist Party, which as it is, is working under semi-illegal conditions. In their foreign policy, the ruling circles of India are following the dictates of the bosses of the Anglo-American imperialist bloc. Ignoring the demands of the people, they have obediently expressed their readiness to remain as a Dominion and further, within the system of the British empire. They are taking an active part in the formation of a bloc of the countries of South-East Asia and the Pacific Pact.

The Indian bourgeoisie and its agents in the trade union movement are carrying out the plans of Anglo-American reaction and have taken the initiative in splitting the working class movement of the countries of South-East Asia. The formation of the Asiatic Federation of Trade Unions was brought about through the direct and active participation of the reactionary Indian National Trade Union Congress organised by the National Congress.

Facts irrefutably prove that the Indian big bourgeoisie has willingly taken upon itself the role of a steward of Anglo-

American imperialism by rallying all the reactionary elements in the countries of East Asia for the struggle against the national liberation movement of the oppressed peoples, against those forces that stand for lasting democratic peace.

Therefore, the statements of certain leading statesmen of the Indian Dominion about India following an “independent” or “neutral” foreign policy, about her adhering to a “third” path in the sphere of international relations in particular sounds altogether unconvincing. All this talk is designed at duping the popular masses and deceiving public opinion both inside the country and outside. In actual practice, the reactionary circles both of India and Pakistan are adopting a course of consolidating the position of their countries in the role of satellites of the Anglo-American imperialist bloc. Even some Indian bourgeois journalists were compelled to admit that “the middle path” followed by India in its international policy is very little different from the policy of the Western Powers and their satellites.

The Communist Party of India is resolutely exposing the bourgeois machinations directed towards keeping India tied to the Anglo-American bloc. The Communist Party has come forth against the so-called London Agreement. for retaining India within the British empire and has characterised this agreement as one step further in the path of ‘Converting India into a satellite of the Anglo-American imperialist bloc. The Communist Party notes that the South-East Asia bloc and the Pacific Pact created by the imperialists is a complement to the aggressive North Atlantic Pact and an instrument for the struggle against the rising national liberation movement in the countries of South-East Asia and a preparation in the East for abase of attack against the USSR. The Communist Party emphasises that the working masses of India look upon the Soviet Union as a leading force in the struggle against world reaction and are resolutely taking their place in the camp - of

democracy led by the USSR.

Both in India and Pakistan, the popular movement for lasting peace and democracy, and against the Anglo-American instigators of war and their myrmidons is assuming a broader and broader sweep. At a crowded meeting in defence of peace which was recently held in Firozabad, the following resolution was adopted:

“Under no Circumstances will the Indian workers ever take up arms against the Soviet Union, the greatest defender of peace and democracy. If the imperialists attempt to convert our country into a war base for an attack against the Soviet Union, they will meet with a shattering rebuff from the Indian people. The working class of India alongside the working class of the whole world will fight for peace, democracy and Socialism.” (*Pravda*, August 19, 1949)

The final going over of the Indian big bourgeoisie into the camp of reaction and imperialism does not exclude the fact that individual groupings in the national bourgeoisie can still at one or another time, during one or another period, become fellow-travellers with the democratic forces in their struggle against imperialism and its allies in India. In the first instance, they comprise those elements of the bourgeoisie whose interests in particular run counter to those of the foreign capital that is flowing increasingly into the country. It also comprises the rising bourgeoisie of those national regions of India, which are more backward in their development. This bourgeoisie is dissatisfied with the predominance of the already constituted monopolist groups. At the same time, one must bear in mind that under the present conditions of the extreme accentuation of the general crisis of capitalism, when a specially sharp polarisation of class forces is taking place both on an

international scale and within the bounds of every capitalist country taken individually, these oppositional strata of the Indian bourgeoisie ought not to be regarded in any way as reliable or stable members of the anti-imperialist camp.

Closely connected with the final passing over of the Indian big bourgeoisie into the service of the Anglo-American imperialists, it is necessary to consider also the policy of the Indian National Congress whose leadership had always remained in the hands of the bourgeoisie and the liberal landlords. At the present time, the National Congress has been finally converted into a party of the reactionary bloc of the Indian big bourgeoisie, the landlords and the feudal princes, with the bourgeoisie retaining its leading position in this bloc.

It is impossible not to take into account the fact that the National Congress still enjoys a certain influence among the masses. This can partly be explained by tradition since in the course of a long period of time, the Congress was considered to have been in considerable opposition to the policy of British imperialism in India. This can also partly be explained by the nationalist demagoguery of the Congress leaders, by which they are trying to screen their compromise with British imperialism. But the reactionary policy of the National Congress is beginning to arouse greater and greater dissatisfaction and indignation amongst the Indian workers. With the exposure of the reactionary and treacherous role of the bourgeois-landlord leadership of the National Congress and of reactionary Gandhism, the influence among the masses of the National Congress is being more and more rapidly dispelled.

It is becoming more and more evident to the broad masses of Indian workers that it is the working class alone which is called upon to be the leader in the national liberation movement and that it is only under its leadership that the victory of the working people can be ensured.

—From “*Problems of Economics*” No. 8, Moscow

PEOPLE'S LIBERATION STRUGGLE IN COLONIAL AND SEMI-COLONIAL COUNTRIES AFTER SECOND WORLD WAR

A JOINT session of the Academic Councils of the Institute of Economics and of the Pacific Institute of the Academy of Sciences, USSR, devoted to the problems of the national liberation struggles of the peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies and dependent countries after the Second World War was held in June 1949.

In opening the session, the Director of the Institute of Economics, K. V. Ostrovityanov noted that the unprecedented advance of the national liberation movement of the oppressed peoples after the Second World War is a clear indication of the deepening of the crisis of the colonial system which in its turn is one of the most important manifestations of the accentuation of the general crisis of capitalism.

The world is divided into two camps—the camp of reaction, of imperialism and of war led by the USA and the camp of peace, democracy and Socialism headed by the USSR. The imperialist camp is attempting to crush the powerful national liberation movement in the colonies and dependent countries. The Anglo-American imperialist bloc which is preparing for an aggressive war against the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies is attempting to utilise the colonies as a source of military-strategic raw material and cheap labour power, as a supplier of cannon-fodder, and their territory as a strategic jumping-off ground and base. The policy of imperialist aggression is opposed by the camp of peace, democracy and Socialism, which is fighting for the freedom and independence of colonial peoples and actively supports their national liberation struggle.

The path traversed by the Soviet State, the historic experience of the Party of Lenin and Stalin in the solution of the national question, which is now being followed by the People's Democracies where also the great principles of the Leninist-Stalinist national policy, the principles of complete equality and friendship of all nationalities are being embodied in life—all this is a beacon-light for the oppressed peoples fighting for freedom and against imperialist slavery. The national liberation movement of the colonial peoples is assuming more and more the character of a struggle for People's Democracy, conducted under the hegemony of the working class and under the leadership of the Communist Parties.

Fourteen reports were discussed at the session. The introductory report, "*Problems of the National and Colonial Struggle After the Second World War*", was made by the Director of the Pacific Institute, E. M. Zhukov. Comrade V. A. Maslennikov delivered the report on "*Hegemony of the Working Class in the National Liberation Movement*". (Revised reports of E. M. Zhukov and V. A. Maslennikov published in *Problems of Economics*, No. 9, 1949)

Further reports were heard from Comrade V. Y. Averin on "*The National Liberation Movement in China*", Comrade V. V. Balabushevich on "*The New Stage in the National Liberation Movement of the Peoples of India*" (Revised report of V. V. Balabushevich published in *Problems of Economics*, No. 8, 1949); Comrade V. Y. Vasileva on "*The Struggle of the Peoples of Indo-China*"; Comrade A. A. Guber on "*The National Liberation Struggle in Indonesia*"; Comrade A. M. Dyakov on "*The National Liberation Movement in Burma*"; Comrade M. V. Danilevich on "*The Working Class of Latin America in the Struggle for Independence and Democracy*"; Comrade V. I. Zabozaeva on "*The National Liberation Movement in the Philippines*"; Comrade O. L. Bondarevsky on

“The Struggle of the Peoples of Malaya for their Liberation”; Comrade V. B. Lutsky on *“The National Liberation Movement in the Near and Middle East”*; Comrade L. N. Vatolina on the same; Comrade F. I. Shabshina on *“The Struggle of the Peoples of Korea for Independence and Democracy”*; and Comrade A. T. Yakimov on *“The Mongolian People’s Republic.”*

Comrades A. I. Kogan, Yau-Khin-Shum, G. V. Astafev, N. L. Shvetsov, S. M. Melman, F. D. Gapchenko, N. D. Grodtko, G. G. Kocharyants, A. M. Dyakov and Dr. V. M. Fedonenko spoke in the discussion of the reports. A short summary of a number of reports and speeches is inserted below.

* * *

II

Comrade V. Y. Vasileva (Institute of Economics) in her report on the struggle of the peoples of Indo-China pointed out that in the postwar period, Indo-China, like other countries of South-East Asia has become the seat of a powerful national liberation movement. The peoples of South-East Asia inspired by the successes or the building of Communism in the USSR, the heroic struggle and victories or the Chinese people, are rising, arms in hand, for the attainment of their freedom and independence. Having been steeled in the struggle against the Japanese invaders, the peoples of Indo-China, Indonesia, Burma, Malaya and the Philippines have turned their weapons against their age-old oppressors, the French, the Dutch, the British and American imperialists.

The Republic of Viet Nam, bordering on China, is marching in the front ranks of the fighting peoples of South-East Asia. The three years of the Republic’s existence were for it years of difficult ordeals and at the same time also years of

great victories in the path to liberation from the imperialist yoke.

The independent democratic Republic of Viet Nam emerged as a result of the defeat of imperialist Japan at the hands of the Soviet Army. It was proclaimed on August 17, 1945. It comprised of Tonkin, Annam and Cochin China. At the time of its formation the territory of the Republic was equal to 328,000 sq. km. (the territory of the whole of French Indo-China being 750,000 sq. km.), its population being twenty two million (out of the twenty-six million population of the whole of Indo-China). The French imperialists did not recognise the Republic of Viet Nam and opened military operations against it. Already, in the period of the war against the Japanese occupiers, an army of resistance had begun to be formed in the Republic.

The regular army of Viet Nam numbers 150,000 soldiers and officers; besides this, there are 300,000 combatants fighting in the ranks of the partisans. The Republican Army is armed with modern fire-arms, captured in the battle against the enemy. Viet Nam organised its own production of armaments and munitions. The regular army of the Viet Nameese Republic relies on the support of the absolute majority of the country's population.

The basis of the new State structure in Viet N am is the People's Committees which have been formed in all the villages, districts, regions and provinces. The members of the committees fulfil their duties without any remuneration. The activities of the People's Committees are subordinated in the first place to the tasks of the defence of the Republic. They also render tremendous help to the Government in the carrying out of all social and economic and cultural measures.

The foundations of a new democratic State are being laid in Viet Nam. The liberation struggle and democratic construction are being carried out by a united anti-imperialist

National Front, in Which the majority of the people of Viet Nam are unified under the leadership of the working class. The political organisation, the Viet Minh, which unites all the progressive political parties including the Communist Party, was founded during the years of resistance to the Japanese occupiers. The Communists became the leading force in the Viet Minh; they also lead the trade unions and other mass organisations of workers.

The President of Viet Nam is the oldest and most popular leader of the Indo-Chinese people, the founder of the Indo-Chinese Communist Party, Ho Chi-Minh, who heads the Republican Government and the Viet Minh. Many other well-known Communists are also included in the Government of the Republic. In the general elections for the National Assembly which were held in January 1946 eighty per cent of all the voters of the Republic participated. These elections resulted in a complete victory for the Viet Minh, which won 230 out of the 300 seats.

The Government of Ho Chi Minh has as its aim a resolute struggle for the complete independence and the territorial integrity of the Republic, for the strengthening of national unity, the extension of democratic liberties, the improvement in the material and cultural conditions of life for the workers and in the conditions of labour and for the development of all the branches of national economy. This programme of action unifies the widest strata of the population of Viet Nam.

The National Front of Viet Nam embraces the workers, the peasants, the urban poor, the artisans, the intelligentsia, the petty and middle urban bourgeoisie. The leading force in the National Front is the working class which has rich revolutionary traditions and is led by Communists.

At its present stage, the struggle of the peoples of Viet Nam is directed in the first instance against the French interventionists. The Indo-Chinese big bourgeoisie has broken

off from the general National Front and taken to the path of collaboration with imperialism, to the path of the betrayal of the interests of the peoples. During the years of the Japanese occupation, these exploiting, anti-popular classes and strata cooperated with the Japanese. At present they are actively collaborating with the French interventionists; by utilising the difficult economic position of the Republic, they, by all possible adventures and speculations continue to increase their profits. These groups of the compradore bourgeoisie, which even earlier were closely linked with French imperialism as well as the sections of the national big industrial bourgeoisie and the all-powerful financiers and businessmen, which were grouped around the Indo-Chinese Bank are at one with the French occupiers. The indigenous landlords who are most powerful in Indo-China also take up a hostile position vis-a-vis the freedom struggle of the people.

In their policy which is directed towards the crushing of the Republic of Viet Nam, the French colonisers rely on the bourgeois-landlord top strata, which is the prop of the puppet "Governments" in the territory of Viet Nam. With their help they are attempting to deceive the people. By utilising the Right-wing leaders, the nationalist parties and groupings, the French imperialists want to split the United National Front of Viet Nam. The reactionary leadership of the Kuok Zan Dang Party, which has remained outside the Viet Minh and likewise the pro-Chiang Kai-shek leadership of the Party of Dong Min Khoi, which was formed in 1942 on the territory of South China out of Annamite emigrants assist alike the French colonisers in carrying out their provocative policy. Though the leaders of both these parties came forth in words against French imperialists, in practice, they along with the former Emperor Bao Dai formed in Nanking in January 1947 the so-called United Front of Viet Nam, around which were grouped all the treacherous anti-popular elements. It was precisely from

here that all activities hostile to the Republic of Viet Nam and directed towards its liquidation and the splitting of the unity of the people of Viet Nam were organised. With the help of this centre, the Americans dispatched their agents into the Republic.

The French imperialists are fanning national enmity between the peoples of Indo-China. Through their old established agency; the monarchist and feudal elements of Laos and Cambodia they have succeeded in tearing away these regions from the Republic and preserving them as realms subservient to French imperialism. French imperialism which operates through the most diverse methods—diplomatic machinations, the utilisation of puppets of the type of the Emperor Bao Dai or the traitor General Nygen Ksu An and the use of armed force—is attempting to deprive the people of Viet Nam of their independence and to doom them to colonial slavery. However, the broad and stable front of national unity which exists inside the country guarantees the firmness of the Ho Chi Minh Government, which is supported by the majority of the people.

The building of the Vietnamese Republic is now proceeding under conditions of imperialist intervention and uninterrupted colonial war. This is hampering the construction work of the People's Government and is restricting the scope and depth of the democratic transformation in the Republic. The economic situation inside the country continues as before to remain difficult.

The Vietnamese Government has set about reorganising transport and strengthening the financial system; it has reorganised the tax system and abolished the poll-tax. It pays great attention to the advance in agriculture. The agrarian question is one of the most acute problems in Indo-China. The Government of the Vietnamese Republic has begun to carry out agrarian reform. The division of common land among the toiling peasants has been effected. Rent which, earlier in many

regions of the country was two-thirds of the harvest has been lowered to 50 per cent and usury has been prohibited.

The Labour Code adopted by the National Assembly of Viet Nam has introduced a forty-hour week, leave with pay, sickness benefit, protection of female and juvenile labour and social insurance. The trade unions control the carrying out of labour laws through the workers' committees which exist in every factory and the employees' committees in establishments. The General Confederation of Labour in Viet Nam unites 250,000 organised workers. Patriotic emulation of the toilers for the raising of production is developing inside the Republic.

Democratic public opinion in France strongly supports the struggle of the people of Viet Nam for freedom. It demands the immediate cessation of the colonial war against Viet Nam and the peaceful settlement of Franco-Annamite relations with the lawful Government of Ho Chi Minh that has been elected by the people. The people of Viet Nam have faith in their victory, they are full of determination to continue the struggle for freedom and independence.

III

Comrade A. A. Guber (Pacific Institute) made the report on "*The National Liberation Struggle in Indonesia.*"

By the time of the collapse of Japanese imperialism; the objective prerequisites for the creation of a broad anti-imperialist front on democratic principles had been laid down in Indonesia. These objectively favourable circumstances were predetermined by the entire social and economic structure of Indonesia, by the entire historical development of this colony under Dutch rule. The relative weakness of the Indonesian big bourgeoisie and the comparative numerical strength of the proletariat and its concentration in the working class centres of Java had already, after the First World War, told favourably on

the development of the national liberation movement of Indonesia. However, till the time of the collapse of Japan, until the proclamation (of Indonesian independence in August 1945, there existed inside the country neither a strong Communist Party' nor mass' organisations connected with it. The uninterrupted terror of the Dutch imperialists since 1925 and the persecution by the Japanese occupiers of the Communists—the only force which came forward to lead the people's anti-Japanese resistance—had had its effect. Sjoerifuddin, one of the most militant leaders of the resistance movement, was thrown into prison by the Japanese usurpers, subjected to torture and escaped execution only by an accident. The leader of the Indonesian Communists, Sardjono, spent eighteen years in penal servitude. Other leaders of the Indonesian Communist Party were also thrown into prison, served penal servitude or were deported to Australia by the Dutch during the war and were able to return to their country only after the proclamation of Indonesian independence.

Under these conditions, independence and the Republic were proclaimed by the representative of bourgeois nationalism, Soekarno, who had collaborated with the Japanese occupiers. The Provisional Constitution conferred unlimited powers on Soekarno as President of the Republic. The Provisional Parliament created for the first time after the proclamation of the Republic was entirely composed of persons proposed by Soekarno. In the first ministerial Cabinet were included people who had enjoyed a legal position during the Japanese occupation and had actively collaborated with the Japanese imperialists.

However, the experience of the Second World War and the growing influence of the Indonesian Communists among the masses had created conditions extremely favourable for the Communist Party enabling it to conduct, after the proclamation of the Republic, a determined struggle for the leadership of the

national liberation struggle of the Indonesian people. The Communist Party was reformed in October 1945 immediately after the defeat of the Japanese occupation army earlier than the formation of the Soekarno-Hatta party, the National Party; the Masjoemi Party arose on the basis of the amalgamation of different Muslim organisations. The growth of the Communist Party numbering tens of thousands of workers and peasants testifies to the fact that by its leadership of the struggle for national independence during the war, the Indonesian Communists have won deserved authority among the people.

Already by the end of 1945, as a result of the consolidation of the democratic forces the state of affairs ensuring the unrestricted control of President Soekarno was in practice abolished in the Republic. In 1946, the party of the Socialist bloc began to play a more and more important role in the Parliament of the extended Indonesian Republic. The Socialist bloc was formed by the Communist Party and the Socialist Party in which the strong Left-wing section with Sjoerifuddin at its head predominated. It was created in December 1945 and headed by the old leader of the working class movement, the Communist Satiadjidom of the Workers' Party. Towards the end of 1946 and particularly by the beginning of 1947, this Socialist bloc had won not less than half the seats in the Provisional Parliament.

The Left bloc enjoyed the support of the workers' and peasants' organisations and the Socialist League of Youth. It was also able to mobilise the support of a considerable section of ordinary rank-and-file members of the Mussalman Party of Masjoemi and the National Party since the greater mass of these parties were comprised of peasants, artisans and the urban petty-bourgeoisie.

However, the Indonesian Communist Party did not wage a sufficiently consistent struggle for democratic transformation, did not expose those bourgeois and petty bourgeois leaders

who were taking the Indonesian Republic onto the path of compromise with imperialism, onto the path of bourgeois nationalism.

At the same time, events inside the Indonesian Republic in the postwar period were determined not only by the correlation of class forces inside the country but also by the attack of external reaction on the Republic. The Lingadjatti agreement signed in March 1946 was a temporary concession which Dutch imperialism was compelled to make since it was not strong enough to openly oppose the Republic. The support of this agreement by the Communists was a correct step on their part since this agreement secured the recognition of the Republic by Holland and was able to give a breathing space to the Republic. But later on when it became clear that the Lingadjatti Agreement was only a screen for Holland and the other imperialist powers behind her to prepare for a new attack against the Republic and when it became clear that the propertied classes of Indonesia were prepared to come to a compromise with the imperialists and renounce even that which was recognised by the imperialists in the Lingadjatti Agreement, the Communist Party was not able clearly to define its attitude to the policy of the bourgeois elements in the leadership of the Indonesian Republic.

In July 1947, at the time of the resumption of the colonial war against Indonesia by Holland, the activity of the Indonesian people increased sharply. President Soekarno was compelled under pressure of the popular masses to agree to the nomination of a coalition Cabinet of Sjoerifuddin, in which the Communist Satiadjit, representing the Workers' Party was Vice-President. A representative of the Communist Party also entered this Coalition Government. The Coalition Government was not able to utilise the wide possibilities that unfolded before it. It rejected the plan for the economic reconstruction of Indonesia worked out by the Socialist bloc and agreed to the

so-called “Ten-Year Plan” of the bourgeois leadership of the National Party—a plan which in essence meant the rejection of the policy of industrialising the country and of utilising the rich resources of Indonesia for the development of national industry. This “plan” did not also provide for decisive changes in the agrarian relationships.

The Republican Government placed great hopes in the intervention of UNO in the Indonesian conflict. However, the discussion of the Indonesian question in the Security Council revealed that it was only the Soviet Union and the People’s Democracies which were the consistent defenders of the Indonesian people, and the Soviet policy on the question met with furious opposition from the colonial powers. The bourgeois elements in the Indonesian Republic displayed their readiness to come to a compromise with the imperialists. The representative of the Republic, Sultan Sjahriar, withdrew his proposal on the ways and means of solving the Dutch-Indonesian conflict. He not only did not support the proposals of the Soviet Union, which alone corresponded to the aspirations of the Indonesian people, but under pressure from the colonial powers, he adopted their proposal for the creation of the so-called “Good Offices Commission.” This Commission which was screened by UNO, pursued the aim of defending the colonial interests of the Dutch and American imperialists. The USA utilised this Commission for the aim of its own imperialist expansion.

During the work of the notorious “Good Offices Commission”, the USA conducted negotiations with the Right-wing circles in Indonesia for the conversion of the weakened Republic into an obedient instrument of the imperialist plans of the American monopolies. These negotiations terminated in the signing of the so-called Renville Agreement. The parties of the Socialist bloc were unable to see it clearly and expose either the plans of American imperialism or the treachery of the

bourgeois elements in the leadership of the Republic. They did not expose the imperialist essence of the Renville Agreement which signified a deal between the Indonesian reactionaries and the USA.

The policy of the new Government which came into power after the Renville Agreement and which for the most part was composed of the American protégés headed by Hatta was characterised by treachery to the Republic. But even in this period, the Socialist bloc did not expose the joint attack of the American imperialists and the Hatta Government on the Indonesian democratic camp. The Communists did not conduct explanatory work in the mass organisations that were under the leadership and attempted, in spite of everything to maintain the United Front which by that time had already become a fiction.

It was only in September 1948 that the Socialist Party, the Workers' Party and the Communist Party merged into a single Communist Party in which was also united the Socialist Union of Youth. But Hatta's treachery was not sufficiently explained to the broad masses, the organisational changes were not firmly consolidated and thus a favourable situation was created for Hatta and his American patrons to come out with a further attack on the democratic camp.

In the beginning of September 1948, raids were made on the democratic organisations, Trotskyites were set free from jails and clashes provoked with the People's Democratic Front. It was only in this situation, after the first open blows of reaction on the democratic camp, that a rupture took place between the forces of the People's Democratic Front and the Hatta Government.

On September 17, a People's Democratic Government with Sjoerifuddin at its head was formed in Madiun. It put forward a broad programme of democratic changes and proclaimed the necessity of a determined struggle against Dutch and American imperialism and for the overthrow of the treacherous Hatta

Government. But all these slogans were not prepared for by previous work among the masses.

The Hatta Government resorted to a roguish trick. It demonstratively cut short the negotiations with the Dutch imperialists, declaring that the conditions put forward by the Dutch were unacceptable and thus disorientated the popular masses still more. For these reasons the People's Democratic Government did not find the proper support. The Hatta Government succeeded in a short period in crushing the first centres of popular uprising. The blow dealt to the revolutionary forces in the capital of Jogjakarta at a time when the People's Democratic Government had just been formed in Madiun considerably weakened the position of the democratic camp. On the eleventh day of the struggle, the reactionaries succeeded in capturing Madiun. The most prominent leaders of the United Communist Party and other people's democratic organisations were thrown into the prisons of Jogjakarta.

But the traitors celebrated victory prematurely. In spite of temporary defeat, the popular movement continued to develop and new centres arose. The partisan struggle became intensified. It was evident to the Hatta Government and its American masters that this growing popular movement could not be destroyed by the forces of internal reaction alone.

Then the American imperialists sanctioned a new attack by the Dutch troops, who were armed with American and British weapons. They tried to liquidate the national-liberation movement in Indonesia through unheard of torture and terror. Dutch parachutists captured the capital of the Republic and shot down political prisoners who had been flung into prison and had still survived the butchery of the Hatta Government. At the same time quite comfortable conditions were created on the Island of Bangkok for Hatta and other traitors, who had also been captured by the Dutch. And there negotiations were conducted with them with the aim of securing the complete

capitulation of the bourgeois nationalists. These negotiations terminated in the signing of an agreement, which converted the Indonesian Republic into a powerless puppet of the imperialist powers and a participant without any rights in the sham “United States of Indonesia”.

It is under difficult conditions of imperialist terror, execution and mediaeval torture that the revolutionary camp in Indonesia, the Communist Party, continues its struggle. The national liberation struggle of the Indonesian people continues. It relies on the growing national liberation movement in the countries of South-East Asia, on the world-historic victory of the Chinese people, on the ever-increasing might of the democratic camp led by the great Socialist Power—the Soviet Union. In their struggle, the Indonesian people are not alone and in this lies the guarantee of their future victory.

IV

Comrade G. L. Bondarevsky (Tashkent) devoted his report to a characterisation of the national liberation movement in Malaya.

In the course of the last decade, British finance-capital displayed tremendous interest in the colonies of British Malaya, British capital in the Malayan rubber plantations alone amounting to two hundred million pounds sterling. Two British firms—the British Tin Investment Corporation and the London Tin Corporation—completely dominate the tin industry of Malaya.

In the postwar period, the United States of America is more and more cornering the exports of raw materials out of Malaya.

In 1947, the USA took out of Malaya 457,000 tons of rubber and more than 20,000 tons of tin. Malayan exports to the USA-consist for the most part of strategic raw materials and in 1947 amounted to 346 million dollars, which is 166

million dollars more than the value of the entire exports of Britain to the USA in that very year.

In the prewar period, the colonial powers had in every way obstructed the formation of workers' organisations. It was only in 1940 that for the first time the workers succeeded in organising trade unions in Malaya. In the period of the Japanese occupation, the trade unions were partially smashed and those that survived went over into a semi-legal existence. The Japanese occupiers carried out brutal terror against the Malayan people. But already, in the period of the occupation, the working class movement had assumed a broad sweep.

Enriched by the experience of the liberation movement against the Japanese, the toiling masses of Malaya, headed by the Malayan Communist Party, are waging a struggle against British imperialism, for freedom and independence. In Malaya are developing the activities of such mass organisations as the People's Anti-Japanese Army, uniting the participants of the struggle against the Japanese occupiers, the League of Democratic Youth, the Malayan Youth League and the Pan-Malayan Federation of Trade Unions, comprising nearly five lakh members and affiliated to the World Federation of Trade Unions. The Malayan Youth organisations are affiliated to the World Federation of Democratic Youth.

The proletariat in Malaya, led by the Communist Party, is more and more winning the leading positions in the national liberation struggle of the peoples of its country. Its numerical strength, as distinct from certain other countries of South-East Asia, is considerable and (together with the workers of the rubber plantations) amounts to 10-12 per cent of the entire population of the country. The solidarity and the organisation of the Malayan proletariat, and particularly the workers of the mining industry, the tremendous authority and the popularity inside the country of the Communist Party, which is able to rally not only the proletariat but unites around itself the tens of

thousands of farm labourers and seasonal workers in the plantations—all this is determining the success of the struggle of the Malayan peoples, a struggle which enjoys the sympathy and support of the democratic forces of the entire world. The British colonisers supported by the American imperialists, are trying out all measures in order to suppress the growing national liberation movement of the Malayan people. The main base of the British Far Eastern Squadron was transferred from Hong Kong to Singapore, where they began amassing the army units that they proposed to use against the Malayan people. The British bourgeois press raised a hysterical campaign against the “Communist menace” in Malaya and about “foreign interference” in Malayan affairs, etc. In June 1948, at a signal from London, all over the country there took place raids against Communists—the smashing of trade union organisations, the arrest and massacre of leaders of democratic organisations. However, the attempts of the Anglo-American imperialists to smash within a few days the Malayan Communist Party and trade unions turned out to be unsuccessful.

In answer to British imperialist provocation, the workers in Malaya rose arms in hand for the defence of their rights. Partisan detachments began to arise all over the country, the war of liberation began.

On June 22, a state of siege was proclaimed in the four main rubber producing regions of Malaya and after two days, it was even extended to Singapore—the centre of the national liberation movement of Malaya. Even according to the official British figures, within five days from June 20 to 24, more than 800 members of the Malayan Communist Party were arrested in the big centres of Malaya. The police fired upon and tortured hundreds of workers,

But in spite of this repression, the advance of the national liberation movement continued. It embraced the regions

adjoining Kuala Lumpur. Partisan detachments were active all over the country.

From England, from the countries of the Near East, Malta, Ceylon and Hong Kong, troops were sent by air and sea to Malaya and hurled against the partisans. In these punitive expeditions the British widely utilised aviation for which destroyers and bombers were transferred from Ceylon to Singapore and Kuala Lumpur. In the second half of July all over Malaya big battles took place between the partisan detachments and the regular British army. The most serious engagement took place in Central Kadakh, in the region of Balito and also in Selangore, Perak, Negri-Sembilan. In the princedom of Johore (near Singapore) the workers of the rubber plantations supported the struggle of the partisans by calling a strike.

On June 23, the British Minister for the Colonies, Creech-Jones, declared in the House of Commons that the British Government had consented to the decision of the Malayan Council authorities for the immediate banning of the Malayan Communist Party. Speaking after him, the Communist Member of Parliament, Gallacher, exposed the slanderous attacks of the Conservatives and the Right Labourites. In an address to the Malayan working class and Communist Party Gallacher declared that events in Malaya are an expression of the open and legitimate demand of the peoples of that country to establish their freedom and independence.

The British authorities banned not only the Malayan Communist Party but also other democratic organisations—the Pan-Malayan Federation of Trade Unions, the League of Democratic Youth, the Association of Ex-Servicemen, the People's Anti-Japanese Army and the League of Youth for Struggle for the National Independence of Malaya; the Malayan Communist Party working underground led the struggle against the British colonisers.

In the autumn of 1948, the partisan war embraced almost the entire country. To Malaya were directed two British guard brigades, two squadrons of new destroyers, tanks and heavy artillery. The question was raised of a quick transfer of Australian occupation troops from Japan to Malaya. On August 6, a conference of British military and civil authorities in South-East Asia was held in Singapore to work out concrete measures for suppressing the national liberation movement in Malaya. The British Labourite Government transmitted by plane to Singapore for the war against the Malayan partisans, hidden in the jungles, the savage inhabitants of Borneo, the Dyaks, armed with poisoned arrows. The British colonial rulers began to carry out mass public executions of those captured from the ranks of the partisans. In the struggle against the partisans, the British made wide use of Malayan feudal reaction and the reactionary Muslim priesthood which set the Malayan Muslims against the Chinese.

According to British figures, by the end of 1948, a British army more than 50,000 strong was operating against 5,000 Malayan partisans. Still the British imperialists did not succeed in crushing the national liberation movement of the peoples of Malaya. At the cost of big sacrifices, they could only drive back the fighting detachments of the Malayan patriots into the Southern part of the country and in the main into Johore. In February 1949, the Conservative Lord Sandford admitted in the House of Lords that "it is difficult to understand what is now going on in Malaya. One thing is clear—we are not winning." Similarly, the journal of the British Conservatives, the *Yorkshire Post*, while noting that the number of the British troops and police in Malaya had increased to 70,000, was forced to admit that they had not succeeded in winning victory over the partisans.

Being unable to achieve the wished-for results through military operations against the partisans, the British colonisers

are resorting now to ferocious terror against the unarmed population. According to the bulletin, the *Malayan Monitor*, since the beginning of military operations in Malaya up to the end of 1948, 75 people were hanged and more than 500 patriots were shot, nearly 7,000 Malaysians languish in concentration camps; 200-300 Malaysians and Chinese have been deported from the country on suspicions of entertaining sympathy for the partisans. Applying fascist methods, the British burnt down eleven big villages, only because their dwellers were suspected of sympathy with the partisans.

But neither executions nor torture can break the win of the Malayan people for the struggle for freedom and independence. The Manifesto of three organisations participating in the struggle for national liberation of Malaya, the Fighting Organisation of Youth, the Peasants' Union and the Women's Federation, says:

“British imperialism has fully exposed its fascist character by the extermination of village populations, by the bombardment of villages and the banishment of people from the country.... Though the fight against the imperialists will be a long one, yet victory is with us because British imperialism is getting weak and is become more and more isolated while we have become more powerful because our struggle is a revolutionary war for the freedom of our country and of our people.”

The American imperialists are now staking on disrupting the national liberation movement in Malaya. They have embarked on a policy of disrupting the trade union movement in Malaya by the creation of yellow trade unions and appointing to them reformist British “trade union advisers”. Traitors to the people of the type of the leaders of the Malayan feudal reaction Dato Oma Vin Jaffar, who received his post as

Prime Minister of Johore at the hands of the British imperialists, are also being drawn into participating in this provocative disruptive activity.

The Malayan workers are boycotting the yellow unions. The Pan-Malayan Federation of Trade Unions, which has been driven underground by the British colonial authorities is enjoying as before tremendous authority and popularity. In their efforts to destroy this fighting organisation of the Malayan workers, the British authorities, in spite of the protest of the democratic forces all over the world, hanged the former President of the Pan-Malayan Federation of Trade Unions, Ganapathy, in May 1949 and subsequently shot his successor Veersenan.

The armed struggle of the Malayan people continues. In the beginning of June 1949 more than 40 per cent of the territory of the country was the arena of stubborn battles between the partisan detachments and the British troops. And though the partisans have not yet succeeded in winning the liberation of great regions and unifying them into a contiguous territory, one can state that the British troops rigged out with new weapons are powerless against the growing liberation movement -of the Malayan people.

V

Comrade O. I. Zabozaeva (Pacific Institute) threw light on the question of the national liberation movement in the Philippines. It is characteristic of the national liberation movement of the Filipino people that after the Second World War, for the first time the working class is coming forward as its leader. This has become possible, thanks above all to the great work done by the Communist Party of the Philippines, even in the prewar period—the work of struggling to win over the workers and the peasant masses from the

influence of the reformist trade unions and the bourgeois-landlord “Nationalist” Party.

In the period of the war and Japanese occupation, the bourgeois-landlord “Nationalist” Party, which was a pretender to the role of leader of the popular masses in the struggle for national independence had compromised itself by open collaboration with the Japanese and the suppression of the popular resistance to the occupiers.

The only political party in the Philippines, which while passing over to an illegal position during the Japanese occupation consolidated its organisation and still further strengthened its links with the masses was the Communist Party. It organised and led the armed resistance against the Japanese usurpers and linked the struggle against the occupiers with the general political and class interests of the toiling masses of the Philippines. It united all the progressive forces inside the country around itself. Into the United Front organisation which had arisen on the initiative of the Communist Party, had also come the Socialist Party, the Union of Civil Liberties, the Chinese Communist Association, the Chinese Anti-Japanese Association, the Workers’ and Peasants’ Unions, the Youth and other organisations. Towards the end of March 1942, the various partisan detachments were amalgamated into a single army of resistance, which was called the People’s Anti-Japanese Army (Hukbalahap).

The organisations of popular resistance set before themselves the tasks of cooperation with the United Nations in the anti-fascist struggle, the destruction of the Japanese usurpers, the creation of an independent Philippines, the overthrow of the power of the anti-patriotic bourgeois-landlord Nationalist Party, the carrying out of land and other democratic reforms. After liberating various regions the Hukbalahap helped the workers to organise a new People’s Democratic power and to carry out democratic transformations. In a

number of towns and villages in the Provinces of Pampang and Nuev Yesikh People's Councils which functioned as the authority in the locality—elected by the population—existed even in the period of the Japanese occupation. The population did not recognise the authorities appointed by the Japanese. The lands of the rich landlord collaborationists who had fled under the protection of Japanese bayonets to Manila, were confiscated and distributed among the landless peasants, the peasant debts to the landlords and the money-lenders were annulled. The landlords who had not collaborated with the Japanese were left with their landed property but the portion of the crop paid by the tenants was considerably reduced. Various feudal services of the tenant-isdolshis were abolished.

The non-collaborationist landlords who had at first sought an alliance with the Hukbalahap, regarded these democratic transformations as a threat to their class interests and left the national liberation movement.

Since the end of the war the struggle of the people of the Philippines for freedom and independence is taking place is a complex situation. In order to re-establish their domination, the American ruling circles utilised the fact that the USA troops had entered the Philippines in a period when the war in Europe was still not over. Fascism was the main danger and the Hukbalahap regarded the USA as an ally in the world anti-fascist struggle and co-operated with American troops in the war against the Japanese aggressors. The leadership of the Hukbalahap demanded that the USA treat the people of the Philippines as an equal ally and energetically resisted the attempts of the American Command to convert the army of the Philippines into a hired colonial army of the USA. The re-establishment of the pre-war bourgeois Government of Oswen by the Americans met with opposition among the population of Central Luzon.

The American imperialists reckoned on swiftly crushing

the national liberation movement in the Philippines. In February-March 1945, the American Counter-Intelligence Service arrested a number of leaders of the movement—among them Louis Taruc and Costo Alexandrino. However, the popular movement was not decapitated and the fighters for freedom were well organised and enjoyed the active support of the majority of the people. Then the American imperialists gave the power to the most reactionary strata of the Philippine bourgeoisie, which was closely linked with the big feudal landowners. MacArthur's Staff freed the former Japanese protégé, Roxas, from prison. In June 1945 a senate and parliament in which the collaborationists predominated was already functioning in the Philippines. Roxas was given the post of President of the Senate and in this capacity he directed the Commission which made the appointments for responsible administrative posts. He appointed his protégé collaborationists to all the most important posts in the Government, the courts of law and the army.

The restoration of the Japanese puppets to power was marked by a new wave of arrests of the political and military leaders of the Hukbalahap, of the workers' and peasants' unions and by the smashing and liquidation of the organs of people's power in the country.

The ruling classes in the Philippines, the big bourgeoisie, and the landlords—both the collaborationist and non-collaborationist—unreservedly supported the imperialist policy of the USA in the Philippines.

However, the division of the bourgeois camp into the collaborationists and the "loyal" nationalists which was maintained till the election of President Roxas had in the initial period after the war became a cover for the reactionary essence of both these groups. The Communist Party tried to utilise the temporary differences in the ranks of the national bourgeoisie in order to consolidate the democratic camp. In the period of

preparations for the Presidential elections in 1946, the Communist Party organised a Democratic Alliance—the unification of the mass workers’ and peasants’ organisations and partisan detachments. During the elections, this Democratic Alliance formed a bloc with that section of the “nationalist” Party, which was headed by Osmen and which had broken off with the collaborationists, and supported his candidature for the Presidentship in spite of all the inconsistency of his policy. In respect of this, the Democratic Alliance demanded that the Nationalist Party should adopt its election platform and promise to form a coalition government in the event of a victory in the elections.

However, already in the course of the elections, the bourgeois-nationalists showed that they were against the victory of the democratic forces and that they had formed a bloc with the Democratic Alliance only on account of the fact that with its help they would be able to ensure victory for themselves. A considerable section of the members of the Nationalist Party already in the course of the elections betrayed the Democratic Alliance and even their lead Osmen and crossed over to the side of the collaborationists.

The elections exposed to the popular masses the imperialist essence of the American policy in the Philippines, the close links of the bourgeois-nationalists with American imperialism and the inability of the national bourgeoisie and the landlords to fight for the national interests and for profound democratic transformations.

The victory of Roxas in the elections, the establishment within the country of an open fascist dictatorship with the support of the American bayonets, the unbridled terror against the participants of the democratic movement, the adoption of anti-national laws dictated by the USA—all this aggravated sharply the struggle in the Philippines. It made even more clear the demarcation of the political forces inside the country into

two opposite camps—the anti-imperialist proletarian and peasant camp of struggle for democracy and the agrarian revolution; and the reactionary anti-democratic bourgeois-landlord camp of the protégés of American imperialism.

The forces of the democratic camp in the Philippines are growing, the influence of the Communist Party is increasing. In the postwar years, the number of members of the Communist Party rose six times, the number of members of the National Peasant Union rose from 250,000 to one million; the Hukbalahap which in the initial period after the liberation of the Philippines comprised seventy thousand members, was composed of 200,000 combatants by August 1948. While towards the end of the war the influence of the Hukbalahap was spread over five Provinces, of late it has already been extending to ten provinces and spreading far beyond the borders of Central Luzon.

The Filipino people are more and more convinced. that the Roxas Government as well as the present Quirino Government are both agents of American imperialism. The repeated attempts of the ruling circles of the Philippines to liquidate the Hukbalahap have led to nought. The Hukbalahap repeatedly refused to give up its weapons and demands the fulfilment of the fundamental points of its programme. In August 1946, Roxas turned to the Hukbalahap with a proposal to cease the armed resistance. The Hukbalahap and the National Union put forward the following conditions on the basis of which alone they agreed to come to a truce:

Firstly, the cessation of the persecution of the partisans. and the members of the National Peasant Union;

Secondly, the admittance of democratic deputies into the Parliament and the Senate;

Thirdly, the removal of all the local reactionary officials and their substitution by the representatives of democratic organisations in those towns and provinces where the

Democratic Alliance had gained the majority of seats in the Parliament, and the appointment of local authorities under the direction of the Democratic Alliance.

Similar conditions were also proposed by the democratic forces of the Philippines to the new President, Quirino, in May 1948 for an armed truce “for an indefinite period, till the time comes when a really democratic State will be created by peaceful constitutional means if that is possible or through the path of revolution if that remains the only way out.”

In the name of the Hukbalahap and the National Peasant Union, Taruc declared a propos this: “The enemies of the Filipino people—the landlords and the monopolists of Wall Street, are still in power and they must be removed.” He demanded the lifting of the American ban on trade, the removal of “equality of rights” of the Americans with Filipino citizens, the liquidation of American bases and the withdrawal of American troops from the country.

Quirino and other American puppets reckoned on duping the people with false promises about carrying out democratic reforms, amnesty of the partisans and the granting of freedom to all those organisations which had been declared “outside the law” by Roxas, under conditions of the registration and confiscation of arms of partisans. They hoped in this way that they would succeed in liquidating the Hukbalahap and also along with it the whole national liberation movement in the country. However, all these plans collapsed. In spite of the fact that the period of registration of weapons was prolonged twice, the reactionaries succeeded in confiscating arms from only ten people. After this failure, Quirino went over to an open attack on the democratic forces and renewed the armed struggle against the Hukbalahap and the National Peasant Union on an unprecedented scale. Under his orders police troops armed with American guns and aeroplanes, were let loose. The Philippine Government simultaneously intensified its attack on the

working class. The right of the workers to strike was curtailed by a decree of the High Court. The Congress set about debating legislation depriving the State employees of the right to strike. In the Philippines there was created on the American model a "Commission for the Investigation of anti-Philippines Activity" which accused the defenders of genuine national freedom and democracy with "anti-patriotic activity."

The American imperialists are trying to intimidate the Filipino people with false versions about the Soviet Union threatening the Philippines. However, this provocative propaganda meets with no success. The Filipino workers see in the peoples of the USSR a reliable ally in the struggle to end colonial slavery. In the achievements of the Soviet Union, the Filipino workers see the guarantee of their own liberation. They rightly consider the USSR as a reliable bulwark of the national independence of all the people, big and small.

"We have seen," said Louis Taruc, the leader of the Hukbalahap, "what the Soviet policy is in relation to other Asian peoples. 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 General Secretary of the Philippine Communist Party, Mariano Balgos declared: "In the event of a war, the Communists of the Philippines will be on the side of the Soviet Union. We will support the Soviet Union since we consider her to be the leader of world democracy and of the struggle for peace and also a fighter for the interests of the ordinary people all over the world."

The forces of the democratic camp are growing and consolidating in the struggle; the political influence of the Communist Party is extending and strengthening. Broad sections of the Filipino people are more and more becoming an active force in the anti-imperialist, democratic camp. The struggle against the American imperialists ruling the country

and their Filipino puppets is assuming a broader and broader sweep.

VI

Comrade V. B. Lutsky and I. N. Vatolina delivered the reports on the national liberation movement in the Near and Middle East.

Comrade V. B. Lutsky (Moscow State University) noted that at the end of the Second World War, the countries of the Arab East continued under the colonial oppression of British and partly French imperialism. Britain till that time retained her mandate over Palestine and Transjordan, fettered Egypt and Iran with unequal treaties and tried to squeeze out the French imperialists in Syria and Lebanon. These Arab countries were occupied by British troops. The key positions of their economy were concentrated in the hands of British and partly French monopolies.

At the end of the Second World War, the national liberation movement of the peoples of the Arab countries developed with renewed force. The class and national consciousness of the Arab masses rose sharply. The influence of the Communist Parties increased in the Arab countries and particularly in Syria, Lebanon and Iraq.

The defeat of the Axis powers by the armed forces of the Soviet Union, the liberation of the peoples of Europe from the oppression of Hitler fascism, the liberation of the peoples of the East from the yoke of Japanese imperialism. played a big role in the awakening of the peoples of the Near East. The new stage of the national liberation movement of the Arab peoples after the war is characterised by the fact that the workers are more and more often putting forward political demands; the strike and the agrarian movement is spreading. The working class which is growing numerically and consolidating organisationally is the basic core of the movement and in the

majority of cases leads it. The national bourgeoisie is being dislodged more and more from the leadership of the national liberation movement. The old bourgeois-nationalist reformist parties which used to lead the movement in the past, as for example the Wafd and Hizbst Watan in Egypt, Kutla Wataniya in Syria etc., are losing their authority and are breaking off from the movement. The Communist Parties, the trade unions and the organisations of the United Front of the antiimperialist forces are leading the national liberation movement.

The feudalists and the big bourgeoisie of the Arab countries have betrayed the national liberation movement and gone over to the camp of imperialism and reaction. They are waging a struggle against the national liberation movement; organising the shooting down of popular demonstrations and the execution of democratic leaders; they are persecuting the Communist Party and other progressive organisations, they are banning strikes and bringing into force extreme laws against trade unions. They unreservedly support the aggressive foreign policy of the bosses of the Anglo-American imperialist bloc.

The national liberation movement has assumed a tremendous sweep in Egypt. The popular masses in Egypt are fighting for the withdrawal of British troops from the Nile Valley, i.e., from Egypt and the Sudan as also for the unification of these two countries on democratic foundations and for the annulment of the unequal Anglo-Egyptian treaty of 1936. It was under these slogans that the mass demonstrations of the workers took place in 1945-47 during the Anglo-Egyptian negotiations and the discussion of the Egyptian question in the Security Council.

In spite of the Government terror in Egypt the forces of genuine democracy are growing and consolidating. A new progressive organisation, "Democratic Movement for the National Liberation of Egypt", operating underground has been created. In its programme manifesto, this organisation calls

upon the Egyptian people to wage an armed struggle against the imperialists, for an end to the state of the landlords and capitalists—the betrayers of the people—and for the establishment of a People's Democratic order inside the country.

The national liberation movement has also assumed big dimensions in the so-called Anglo-Egyptian Sudan. Here the popular masses have for the first time awakened to political life, to an active struggle for freedom and independence. National organisations and political parties which lead the popular resistance to the colonial policy of British imperialism have emerged in the Sudan. At present the Sudanese liberation movement is led by the national-revolutionary organisation—"Progressive National Liberation Movement of Sudan", which bases itself on the support of the workers, the farm-labourers, the progressive student youth; and by the petty-bourgeois organisation of the intelligentsia—the "Sudanese National Congress". Around the Congress are grouped the main political parties of the Sudan which are leading the struggle for the liquidation of the regime of colonial oppression—the "Unity Party", the "Party of the People," "The Party of the Partisans of Freedom" and the "Party of Our Own Brothers" (Hizb-al-Ashika). These parties are adherents of a joint struggle of the peoples of Egypt and the Sudan against imperialist rule.

Opposed to the democratic forces. are the. feudal compradore agents of imperialism in the Sudan, forming the so-called "Party of the Nation" (Hizbal Humma) which supports the British policy directed towards the separation of the Sudan from Egypt and towards the granting of fictitious independence to the Sudan whilst retaining the British colonial regime intact in the country.

The workers of Sudan are organising demonstrations and strikes. They boycotted the elections to the so-called "Legislative Assembly" conducted by the British in November

1948; more than 80 per cent of the electors did not participate in the voting. During the time of the elections and later too, at the opening of the Legislative Assembly, demonstrations numbering many thousands were held under the slogans "Down with the elections", "Down with the British imperialists!" "Out with the British imperialists!" In a number of towns, the demonstrators were fired upon by the British troops and many of them were arrested.

In Syria and Lebanon, the people's struggle for the final abolition of the mandate and for the withdrawal of the Anglo-French troops from the country, developed towards the end of the Second World War. The struggle was crowned with success, thanks mainly to the support rendered by the Soviet Union to Syria and Lebanon during the discussion in the Security Council, on the question of these two countries.

Towards the beginning of 1947, foreign troops were withdrawn from Syria and Lebanon. But the capitalist monopolies retained their enterprises and concessions there; the American and British monopolists received a number of new concessions. Syria and Lebanon were overrun with foreign and, predominantly British political and military advisers. The ruling cliques of Syria and Lebanon came to an agreement with the British and American imperialists. It was at their orders that the Communist Party of Syria was banned towards the end of 1947 and the Communist Party of Lebanon at the beginning of 1948; the Societies of Friendship with the Soviet Union and progressive organs of the Press were closed down; the trade unions were also subjected to repression.

In 1948, the British imperialists dragged Syria and Lebanon into the Palestine provocation and attempting to convert these States into their colonies, they tried to thrust their unequal treaties on them.

The USA and Britain are involving Syria and Lebanon in the various aggressive blocs formed by them in the Near East.

The popular masses of Syria and Lebanon are coming out against the agreement of the ruling cliques of these countries with the Anglo-American bloc and are demanding the liquidation of imperialist concessions.

In December 1948, mass demonstrations took place in Syria. The Djamilya Mardama Government which orientated towards Britain was overthrown. However, the American and French imperialists by use of these events in Syria—promoted their protégé, Khalid Azam to power. Khalid Azam's policy evoked the sharp displeasure of the popular masses. In March 1949 a mighty wave of anti-Government demonstrations arose in Damascus and all over the country Khalid Azam's Government found its existence threatened. On March 30, the military clique in Damascus, headed by Colonel Husein-ez-Zaim who commanded 'the Syrian army effected a military coup and seized power in its - own hands.

Husein-ez-Zaim established a regime of fascist dictatorship in Syria. Military courts functioned inside the country, concentration camps were overfilled with progressive leaders; and in the first instance, the Communists; Left papers were closed down; popular demonstrations, meetings and assemblies were dispersed. Husein-ez-Zaim tried to crush the national liberation movement of the Syrian people by means of fascist terror.

In order to hold on to his power, the new dictator of Syria resorted to demagogy. He declared that he was a champion of national independence and declared the military fascist coup accomplished by him—"a national revolution". But in actual practice, Husein-ez-Zaim sold the country to foreign imperialists. Against the will of the people, he concluded a currency agreement with France, with enslaving conditions for Syria (one-sided from the point of view of Syria) and granted the American oil companies the right of constructing oil-pipes in Syrian territory. The influx of American goods into Syria

has led to the dosing down of a number of industrial enterprises. (In August 1949, Husein-ez-Zaim was .deposed and shot down by a British agent).

The Communist Party of Syria is leading the struggle of the working masses for freedom and the independence of the country under difficult conditions of underground functioning and fascist terror.

In Lebanon great successes have been achieved by the democratic forces. But the Lebanese Government has intensified its repression. In 1948, hundreds of progressive Lebanese leaders were confined in a concentration camp in Baalbek. However, under the pressure of the mass movement of protest against this repression which arose inside the country, the Government was compelled to set free the captives of Baalbek. The Government's attempt to close down the Lebanese Federation of Trade Unions also failed as a result of the resistance of the proletarian masses of Lebanon.

In February 1949, many thousands strong popular demonstrations took place within the country as a mark of protest against the execution of the Iraq Communists. Lebanese progressive public took an active part in the World Congress of the Partisans of Peace.

In Lebanon as well as in Syria, the old bourgeois parties have proved bankrupt and exposed themselves in the eyes of the people as agents of imperialism. The leading role in the people's democratic movement belongs to the Lebanese Communists.

The working class of Lebanon has now become the leading force in the national liberation movement, in which the democratic trade unions and such progressive organisations the United Front like the League of Struggle against Fascism and Nazism, the Lebanese National Congress and the Lebanese Committee of the Partisans of Peace, etc., are also taking an active part.

The leader of the liberation movement of the people of Iraq also is the working-class which has the experience of the revolutionary struggle from 1948-49. Neither terror nor the repression of the hangman from the camp of Nuri Sayyed and his Labourite imperialist patrons can crush the will of the people of Iraq for freedom, independence and democracy.

British imperialism in the course of its thirty years' domination in Palestine fanned national enmity between the native Arab population and the Jewish population. The latter increased as a result of immigration from 55,000 persons in 1919 to 600,000 in 1948 (nearly one-third of the entire population of Palestine).

The British provocateurs and their agents utilised the anti-Arab chauvinism of the Jews and the animosity of the Arabs towards Zionism. The Arab-Jewish hatred assumed particularly sharp forms after the Second World War and hampered the advance of the national liberation movement in Palestine.

With the aim of ceasing the internecine war and liquidating the colonial regime the Soviet Union proposed the formation of two. independent democratic States—Arab and Jewish—on the territory of Palestine. On November 30, 1947, the General Assembly of the UNO adopted an appropriate resolution on this question on. the basis of the Soviet proposals.

However, the American and the British imperialists, who were attempting to maintain the colonial regime in Palestine adopted measures calculated to disrupt this decision of the UNO. The Zionist bourgeoisie serves as a prop for the carrying out of the Anglo-American plans.

Till 1939, the Zionist bourgeoisie including its Right-Socialist group of Mapai, which at present occupies a leading position in the State of Israel, had fully complied with the British Mandate and the colonial position of the country. However, in 1939, Britain attempted to ensure the support of the Arabs in the war and made concessions to the Arab feudal-

bourgeois upper strata and partially restricted the activities of the Zionists. This provoked friction between British imperialism and the Zionist bourgeoisie. The Zionist bourgeoisie began to demand the abolition of the British mandate and the formation of an independent State. But it could not conceive of its existence without the support of one or the other imperialist power. The USA easily converted the Zionist leaders into its agents. It is precisely on this basis that the Zionist bourgeois State of Israel is now built. Its leaders have begun their State functions by agreeing to the enslaving conditions of an American loan, conditions which were concealed even from the Constituent Assembly. The Government of Israel is henceforth obliged to render an account to the Export-Import Bank of USA and present it with all the information that they demand, which is incompatible with the conception of national sovereignty, Israel can expend the means received through this loan only for the purchase of American goods or the construction of different projects directed by the Americans and above all for military strategic communications (e.g. the construction of the Tel-Aviv Port under the supervision of American specialists). The ruling circles of Israel have opened the country's doors wide open to foreign capital and in the first place to American capital and presented it with all possible privileges.

The leaders of the State of Israel have expressed their readiness to enter into an aggressive Mediterranean Bloc, which has been knocked together by the Anglo-American imperialists. The leaders of the Mapai Party have come out openly against the World Congress of the Partisans of Peace and are manoeuvring for the withdrawal of the Israel trade unions from the World Federation of Trade Unions. In the UNO, the delegates of the State of Israel cringe before the Anglo-American bloc.

Thus, the UNO decision on the formation of an

independent democratic State of Israel in Palestine has not in essence been transmuted into life. The UNO decision on the formation of an independent democratic Arab State has also not been carried out. Along with the Anglo-American imperialists, the Arab feudal-bourgeois leaders, who are under the thumb of the British imperialists are also -guilty of this. Neither the Zionist nor the Arab bourgeoisie is interested in the liquidation of the colonial oppression in Palestine.

The advanced workers of Palestine, the Jewish as well as the Arab, are more and more conscious of the necessity of intensifying the struggle for independence and democracy under the leadership of the Communist Party of the State of Israel and the Arab League of National Liberation, which is the Communist organisation for the Arab sections of Palestine, which mark out the path for the solution of the fundamental tasks of the national liberation movement.

All the objective conditions for a new advance of the national liberation struggle exist at present in the Arab countries. The war in Palestine has sharpened the crisis of the colonial system in the Near East. It has displayed before the Arab popular masses all the rottenness and the reactionary character of the ruling cliques of the Arab countries, exposed their close links with British and American imperialism. It has worsened the already difficult economic situation of the Arab peoples and brought them to the verge of economic catastrophe. It has brought innumerable tribulations to the popular masses on whose shoulders were transferred all the burdens of the war.

* * *

Comrade I. N. Vatolina (Institute of Economics) in her report noted that the national liberation movement had intensified under the influence of the historic victories of the Soviet Union in the Second World War, the consolidation of

the democratic camp and the grandiose successes of the USSR in the building of Communism; it embraced the countries of the Arab East and is distinguished by its mass character and by a comparatively high organisational, ideological and political level. The different level and the distinctive features of the historic and socio-economic development of the Arab countries—among whom there are countries with relatively developed capitalist relationships and a bourgeois parliamentary system (Egypt) and countries with a patriarchal-tribal structure and a monarcho-feudalist system of government (Yemen and Arabia)—condition the different levels of the national liberation struggle and the great diversity of its forms in everyone of these countries.

The leadership of the national liberation movement in the Arab East is more and more passing over to the working class, which grew in number during the war. In Egypt (with a total population of 20 million people), the workers number 700,000 and together with the agricultural workers—more than one million. In Arab Palestine there are 25,000 industrial workers; in the State of Israel, 50,000 workers. In Syria and Lebanon, the number of the working class has risen to 150,000 (the total population being four and half million).

Of late a young proletariat had also begun to arise in Saudi Arabia, connected with the creation of an oil-extracting industry there.

The working class of the Arab countries has created its own mass organisations. Even according to the official figures in 1946, these numbered 465 trade unions in Egypt and 11 trade unions in the State of Israel.

The position of the working class in the Arab countries is exceedingly difficult. It is subjected to capitalistic and semi-feudal exploitation; working class legislation is non-existent. In Egypt, before the war, according to election figures, in certain branches children comprised 12 percent of the entire labour

force; in more than 37 per cent of the enterprises the working day lasts for more than 12 hours. Egypt occupies first place in the world in the rate of her child mortality. Almost slave-owning methods of exploitation of labour power are employed in the American oil trade in Saudi Arabia.

In its struggle for freedom and independence, for an end to the system of colonial slavery the proletariat of the Arab States has a mass ally in the person of the dispossessed peasantry. The main mass of the peasantry in all the Arab countries is deprived of land, which belongs to the local feudalists and to the landlords and also to the religious communities and foreign companies. The poor peasants, the farm labourers and the fallahi tenants are ground down by semi-feudal exploitation of the landlords and the kulaks, by the arbitrary rule of the local authorities, the bondage of the usurers, foreign companies and banks. The peasants in the Arab countries are struggling against both imperialist oppression and against the feudal-landlord landownership. The successes of Socialist construction in the USSR and also the agrarian reforms and the transfer of land into the hands of the peasantry in the countries of People's Democracy inspire the colonial peasantry in its struggle.

The Communist Parties of the Arab countries have considerably intensified their activities. They have become politically and organisationally consolidated and have grown numerically. The industrial workers, the urban poor, the student youth, teachers and other strata of the population of these countries are joining and becoming more and more active in the Communist Party. The Communist movement assumed particularly big dimensions in Syria and Lebanon, where it existed legally till 1947-48. The Communist Parties of Syria and Lebanon play a leading role in the revolutionary movement in the Arab East.

Alarmed at the sweep of the national liberation movement

of the Arab peoples and the increasing role in it of the working class and the Communist Party and also at the activity of the numerous democratic organisations which are shooting up everywhere, the national big bourgeoisie of 'the countries of the Arab East, instigated and supported by their imperialist masters is attempting to hold back the national liberation struggle in every possible way and is resorting to terror and social demagoguery.

In the postwar years, the ruling circles of the Arab countries are employing particularly savage repression against those participating in the working class movement. They have more than once proclaimed a state of siege in Egypt, Iraq and other Arab countries; they have banned demonstrations, meetings and the various organised gatherings of the workers. In order to decapitate and to crush the working class movement, the big bourgeoisie is attempting to thrust it on to the path of trade unionism, to separate the economic struggle from the political struggle and to restrict the movement to narrow trade union tasks and place it under the control of the Government. Trade unions of the "Zubatov" type are well-known in the history of the working class movement of Egypt. After the Second World War, the Egyptian Government once again tried to plant similar organisations. The ruling circles in other Arab countries are also resorting to exactly this policy.

The Anglo-American imperialists who are preparing for an aggressive war against the USSR and the countries of People's Democracy are using the Arab East as one of their jumping-off grounds. They are trying to conceal their war preparations by slanderous, anti-Soviet propaganda and intimidation about the "Communist menace". But the peoples of the Arab East do not believe the false fabrications of the imperialists and show growing resistance to the aggressive policy of the imperialist bosses and their agents in the Arab countries. A characteristic feature of this resistance is the solidarity of the workers, which

embraces the still broader masses.

The close link of the national liberation movement of the Arab peoples with the international democratic movement, the growing international solidarity of the workers, the activisation of the work of the representatives of the Arab countries in the international democratic organisations and Congresses, the going over of the leadership of the national liberation movement into the hands of the working class and its vanguard, the Communist Party—all this testifies to the fact that the national liberation struggle in the countries of the Arab East is rising to a new and higher stage.

* * *

Comrade v. M. Fedorenko (Institute of Economics) spoke on the discussion on the reports on the national liberation movement. He noted that in spite of the fact that in the numerical strength of its population, Syria (in 1945, 3,052,500 persons) and Lebanon (in 1949, 1,227,000 persons) are considerably exceeded by other countries of the Near East, the Communist Party and the trade unions of these two small Arab countries are the strongest in numerical strength and in their solidarity. This is explained by the fact that the peoples of Syria and Lebanon under the leadership of the Communist Party have waged a prolonged struggle against the French imperialists, German and Italian fascism and at the present time continue to lead the struggle against the Anglo-American imperialists and internal reaction;

The Great October Socialist Revolution pointed out to the colonial peoples and among them to the peoples of Syria and Lebanon, the path to freedom and independence. The Communist Party of Syria and Lebanon was formed in 1923 and participated actively in the general uprising of the Syrian people against the French colonisers in 1925-27 and led the

then nascent working class movement inside the country. Before long it was compelled to go underground. It was only in 1937, that thanks to the successes of the Popular Anti-Fascist Front in France and the advance of the national liberation movement in Syria that the Communist Party was legalised. It became one of the most influential political organisations in the country. Its journal *Saut-ash-shaab* (Voice of the People) played an important role in the development of the working class movement in Syria and Lebanon.

In July 1939, the French reactionaries, after having dismissed the national Government of Syria, revoked the Republican Constitution and once again drove the Communist Party underground. It was under the difficult underground conditions that the Communists continued the struggle against fascism and reaction in the course of two years. After the driving out of the fascists from the Levant countries, the Communist Party of Syria and Lebanon once again emerged from underground into the wide political arena. The Communists conducted active work in the mass non-Party democratic organisations and stood at the head of the movement for national independence and the democratisation of Syria and, Lebanon.

In January 1944, the Communist Party of Syria and Lebanon adopted a programme which was set forth in a National Charter and in which the basic demands for the democratisation of the country and the ensuring of its independence were put forward.

That very same year was marked by the setting up of Syria and Lebanon as sovereign States, a fact which was made possible through the Support rendered to them by the Soviet Union. The single Communist Party of Syria and Lebanon was divided into two Communist Parties—the Communist Party of Lebanon with Faraj Alla Khela and Nikolai Shaup at its head; and the Communist Party of Syria, headed by Khaled Bagdashe

and Rashid Issa. This led to an improvement in the organisational work in the Parties and in particular to an improvement in their leadership of the trade unions and the working class movement.

The trade unions of Syria and Lebanon have for more than 25 years waged a struggle for their rights in semi-illegal conditions. In 1945, they entered the World Federation of Trade Unions. In 1949, the membership of the democratic trade unions reached 45,000 and unified 110 trade unions; they waged an organised struggle for the interests of the workers whose conditions of life were and continue to be very difficult. By utilising unemployment and widely exploiting child labour, the owners are lowering the wages of the workers and particularly those of unqualified workers. Thus, an unskilled worker working for 10 hours a day received $1\frac{1}{2}$ to 3 lira; the farm labourers even less— $1\frac{1}{3}$ lira. And at least 7-8 lira a day is essential for the meagre subsistence for a family of 4-5 people. The indignation of the workers has often burst forth into strikes which are led by the trade unions. Thus several general and more than 50 local strikes were successfully conducted under the leadership of the trade unions. In 1946, after a continuous and stubborn struggle, the workers of Syria and Lebanon achieved a big victory. For the first time in the history of these countries, the Parliaments of Syria and Lebanon adopted labour legislation (though considerably curtailed in comparison with those in the plan of the trade unions).

In December 1947, at the command of the Anglo-American masters, internal reaction in Syria and Lebanon passed over to an attack on democratic organisations. Both the Communist Parties were once again forced to go underground. But even under the difficult conditions of underground work, they continue to lead the struggle of the working class—distribute leaflets, organise strikes. In the summer of 1948, the

Communist Party called upon the people to intensify the anti-imperialist struggle for the independence and sovereignty of Syria and Lebanon, to fight the machinations of the imperialists and against the British plan for the creation of a "Greater Syria". In November big strikes burst forth in Aleppo and Beirut. Towards the end of 1948, the already difficult material condition of the workers still more worsened with the drought. Famine attacked Syria.

In spite of the rage of reaction, the movement for peace is spreading in Syria and particularly in Lebanon. In April in Paris at the World Congress of the Partisans of Peace, a Lebanese delegation headed by the well-known public leader of Lebanon, the architect Antoine Tabet was present. In the name of the Lebanese people, Tabet declared at the Congress that the Lebanese people will not fight against the Soviet Union, and will fight against the forces of imperialism. Tabet and the representative of the Lebanese Trade Union Federation, Livan Mustafa El Ariss, were elected members to the Permanent Committee of the Partisans of Peace. During the war years, the Communist Parties of Syria and Lebanon grew considerably. By fighting consistently for the interests of the workers, they strengthened their influence among the broad popular masses. Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the people of Syria and Lebanon have won a certain amount of democratisation of the election law and the substitution of indirect by direct election.

The parliamentary elections of 1947 demonstrated, notwithstanding the atmosphere of terror, the strengthened ties of the Party with the masses. The workers, the peasants, the intelligentsia, contributed in one lira bits and less and in a short time collected nearly 20,000 lira for the Fund for the candidates put forward by the Communist Party. The pre-election meetings where the candidates of the Communist Parties of Syria and Lebanon spoke were well attended. It was

only through falsifying the results of the elections that reaction did not admit the Communist candidates in the Parliaments of Syria and Lebanon although, for example, the leader of the Communist Party of Syria, Khalid Bagdashe had received a sufficient number of votes to become a member of Parliament. The people of Syria and Lebanon, like those in all Arab countries, cherish profound sympathy for the USSR. It was thanks to the support of the Soviet Union for the demands of Syria and Lebanon that in the beginning of 1946, foreign troops were withdrawn from their territory.

Democratic publications "*At Tarik*", "*Saut-ash-Shaab*", the Bulletin of the Society for Cultural Relations between Syria and Lebanon and the USSR regularly publish articles devoted to the Soviet Union. The leaders of cultural of Syria and Lebanon who visited the Soviet Union in the spring of 1947 related in their articles about the advantages of a Socialist system of economy and the achievements of Soviet science and art.

The attack of reaction has extremely complicated the political situation in Syria and Lebanon. The popular masses are continuing the struggle against Anglo-American imperialists, who with the help of native agents are attempting to utilise Syria and Lebanon in their imperialist plans.

VII

Comrade S. M. Melman (Institute of Economics) spoke in the discussion on the report by Comrade V. V. Balabushevich on the national liberation movement in India. She noted that the partition of India into two dominions did not bring national independence to the country, did not solve the contradiction between the Indian people and British imperialism, did not solve a single social and economic problem. Neither in the Indian Union nor in Pakistan were any social and economic

changes in the interests of the popular masses carried out. The contradiction between the toiling masses and the exploiting classes of India was still more aggravated and deepened.

The agrarian question—which is the basic question for India—cannot be solved under the rule inside the country of the bloc of imperialists, big bourgeoisie and landlords. The growth of the mass movement forced the Provincial Governments of the Indian Union to set about the working out of agrarian legislation; but the laws which now exist in almost all the Provinces were not directed against the feudal survivals in the economy of India and did not in any degree correspond to the needs of the popular masses.

The position of the peasantry continues to worsen after the partition of India. Debt-slavery in the shackles of which millions of toiling peasants find themselves, has not yet been abolished. Even after the war, famine is the scourge of the population in a number of districts, particularly in the South. After the partition of India the volume of agricultural production has still not reached the extremely low prewar level. Indian agriculture continues to deteriorate.

Indian industrial production had somewhat developed during the years of the Second World War. However, after the termination of the war, the level of industrial production is once again falling. Thus, the general index of production in terms of value (1938-39 = 100) fell from 126.8 in 1943-44 to 106 in 1947-49. In 1947-48 production in the textile industry was in all 77.3 per cent of the war period maximum, and production in the jute industry was also lower than the war maximum and smelted iron 76.7 of the war maximum; production is also decreasing in other branches of Indian industry.

Towards the end of the war, the fixed capital of Indian industry and railway transport had become badly worn out. Thus, for example in the textile industry, the fixed capital was

required to be renovated by not less than 50 per cent. However, the renovation of fixed capital is being carried out at an extremely slow rate. This is conditioned in the first instance by the peculiar features of the colonial economy in India, which possesses no machine-building industry of its own, as well as by the policy of the Anglo-American imperialists who are hindering the industrialisation of the country. Indian industry continues to find itself chained to British and particularly also to American imperialism. During the war years, owing to the straitened financial situation in England, the shares of a number of British enterprises passed over into the hands of Indian capitalists. However after the termination of the war and after partition of the country resulting from the treacherous capitulatory policy of the Indian big bourgeoisie, the position of British capital is being once again consolidated in the industry of India. To this day not a single British enterprise has been nationalised and the “British Managing Agencies” which control a considerable part of the industry and trade of India continue to function as before. One of the forms of the further penetration of British capital into India is the organisation of a number of joint Angle-Indian companies. American capital is also being more and more directed into Indian industry.

The fate of the so-called British Sterling Debt to India also testifies to the fact that as before the country is enslaved to British imperialism. After the partition of India in 1948 a financial agreement was concluded between the British Government and the Nehru Government by which a considerable part of the Sterling Debt was in fact annulled. 275 million pounds, i.e., more than 20 per cent of the debt, are officially written off. Out of this 100 million pound sterling was put down to cover the expenses of war materials forced upon India by the imperialists. 175.5 million sterling was “reserved” for the pensions of officials in Britain. It is projected to freeze a total of 160.5 million pound for three

years. As for the remaining 850 million pounds, the agreement does not even mention them—this sum continues to remain in essence blocked in England.

Thus, this agreement once again shows the imperialist essence of the Labourite British Government and the capitulatory policy of Indian big capital.

Towards the beginning of the Second World War as a result of Japanese penetration into the Indian market, Britain lost a considerable part of its foreign trade in India. Thus while on the eve of the First World War, she sent approximately 3 milliard yards of cloth into India, on the eve of the Second World War it was only 270 million yards. Towards the end of the War, the dislodging by American industry and the growing Indian industry deprived the British textile industry of the Indian market and the import of British cloth decreased to two milliard yards. In 1947-48 Britain's export of textiles to India decreased to 50 million yards. She is hardly likely to succeed in re-establishing her former positions. In the postwar period, besides Indian and American competition, England is once again threatened by Japanese competition, which is spurred on by the American imperialists. The competition between British and American imperialism for markets in India and Pakistan is more and more intensifying. Already in 1947, the shares of Britain and the USA in the foreign trade of India and particularly in its imports were almost equal.

At present, it is apparent that the attempt of American imperialism is to convert India into a colonial appendage and to utilise it as one of the military and strategic bases of the USA in the East, as a jumping-off ground to suppress the national liberation movement of the peoples of East and South East Asia. American capital is directed and particularly active in industry of military importance. The American imperialists are also attempting to enslave India through the aid of loans.

The Indian Government finds itself at the present time in

the position of a “servant of two masters”—British and American imperialism. A certain section of the Indian big bourgeoisie is evidently orientating towards the USA. Thus, the journal *Eastern Economist*, the organ of the Birla group demands the establishment of “business ties” with the American monopolies and “justifies” the expediency of receiving loans from USA.

The consolidation of the democratic forces in India under the leadership of the working class is leading to the further advance of the national liberation movement of the Indian people against British and American imperialism and against the Indian big bourgeoisie which has formed a bloc with them.

The Indian liberation movement is closely bound up with the world revolutionary movement and together with it, is going forward towards victory. In his time, V. I. Lenin pointed out—

“In the last analysis, the upshot of the struggle will be determined by the fact that Russia, India, China, account for the overwhelming majority of the population of the globe. And it is precisely this majority that, during the past few years has been drawn into the struggle for emancipation with extraordinary rapidity so that in this respect, there cannot be the slightest shadow of doubt that the final outcome of the world struggle will be. Victory of Socialism is fully and absolutely assured.” (*V. I. Lenin, Selected Works, Vol. II, Moscow; Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1947, p. 854*)

* * *

Comrade F. D. Gapchenko in his speech dealt on the problem of agrarian relations in India and on the particular significance of this question for the national liberation movement after the partition of the country. She threw light on the character and the significance of the peasant armed uprising

in the princely state of Hyderabad. This uprising has dealt a blow to British imperialism and feudal reaction in the very centre of India. Though for the time being the uprising has spread to only a limited part of the territory of the country, yet it is of exceedingly important significance.

Hyderabad is one of the biggest Indian princely states, with a population of 17 million and its territory exceeds that of England. The British potentates in India have always utilised this artificially created principedom in order to crush the national liberation movement of the Indian people. At the time of the partition of India, Hyderabad did not become part of anyone of the Dominions. The British imperialists had reckoned on the fact of this feudal princely State becoming henceforth their obedient instrument in the struggle against the national liberation movement in the countries of South-East Asia.

After the partition of India, Hyderabad received a loan, amounting to 60 million pounds sterling from the British capitalists. The Americans were engaged in equipping three war factories in Hyderabad. And American advisers rushed thither. With the help of American and British imperialists, the reactionary authorities of Hyderabad armed a one hundred thousand strong army which was utilised above all to crush the uprising in Telengana. But these troops did not succeed in destroying the democratic movement of the Hyderabad peasantry. The peasants of Hyderabad having seized land from the feudalists are continuing their heroic struggle. They declined the offer for the carrying out of a new "re-distribution" of all the land put forward by the Hyderabad organisation of the National Congress which is an agent of the bourgeoisie and sets before itself the aim of restoring the land to the Hyderabad feudalists.

In Hyderabad the peasants have created a democratic power, ousted the landlords and set about organising an economy free from the fetters of slavery. The acreage under

crops is being extended and includes sowing of virgin soil. In the villages, sanitary improvement measures are being carried out—mass vaccination against epidemics, etc. The intelligentsia is also participating energetically in the democratic transformation. The deterioration of agriculture, hunger, poverty and the oppression of the workers in backward India stand in contrast to the fruitful creative labour begun in Telengana.

In Hyderabad the Communists wield extremely great influence. They headed the struggle of the peasant masses when the terror against Communists was particularly unbridled and many Hyderabad villages rose in defence of the Communists. All over India the movement for solidarity with Telengana is extending. The uprising of the peasants in other districts of India is becoming more and more bound up with the working class movement. The historic example of Hyderabad and Telengana is inspiring the progressive forces in India in their struggle for genuine national independence of the country and for the democratic path of development.

* * *

Comrade N. D. Grodko (Moscow Finance Institute) elucidated the question of the penetration of foreign capital into India. The Indian ruling big bourgeoisie opened wide the door in India to the British and American monopolies. Already in February 1947, Dr. John Matthai, the Finance Minister, declared in the Legislative Assembly of the Indian Union on “the desirability of the influx of foreign capital into India.” The Australian economist, Colin Clark, invited to India in the capacity of an expert, attempted to give a “scientific basis” to the treacherous, anti-national policy of the top strata of the Indian bourgeoisie and the feudalists and to justify the alliance of Indian big capital with British and American imperialists. In

this alliance, the British and American capitalists occupy the dominating position and they are attempting to convert India into a jumping-off ground in the East for the aggressive Anglo-American bloc, directed against the USSR and the national liberation movement of the peoples of the East.

In the joint Anglo-Indian enterprises, it is British capital which is dominating and which determines all its activities. In the interests of the magnates of British finance-capital in India, nationalisation of industry, about which the leaders of the Indian National Congress had made demagogic promises at the time of the election campaign, will not be carried out. While deciding not to repudiate nationalisation of industries immediately after the Punjab tragedy and the wave of mass strikes and uprisings, the Government of the Indian Union organised a “discussion” on the “advantages and disadvantages” of nationalisation. And already in 1948, it declared in its decision that nationalisation was “untimely” and postponed it by 10 years, i.e., in essence it admitted that it had only cheated the people.

The Nehru Government’s programme passes over the urgent interests of the workers of India; it is surcharged with secondary details as well as hackneyed demagogic recipes like proposals about “cooperation in production”, about the consolidation of small landownership and the elaboration of schemes to relieve indebtedness, the desire for conducting reform of land taxes, etc. No small place is given to the “plan” conceived in the Gandhian spirit—a “plan” for the development of domestic and light industry on “non-capitalist foundations.” De-centralisation of industry is being propagated and the absurd “idea” is being put forward about creating in a single region with a population of one million “a complete economy, satisfying all the needs of the region.”

The Indian people drag out a poverty-stricken existence. Their difficult position is aggravated by inflation, about which

the Indian bourgeois press is silent. The abolition of the meagre controls which existed over prices and of the rationing system (in the beginning of 1948) proved a scandalous failure and only gave rise to a fresh increase in prices and the accentuation of inflation. The Government was alarmed and compelled to re-establish the rationing system—only to meet that situation. The normal provision is 6-12 ounces of grain daily per person but in fact, it is still less. Apart from the grain, the population receives nothing else at fixed prices. The Government officials like the President of the Agricultural Conference, Nanavaty, proposed for the fight against famine a programme unsurpassed in its hypocrisy and cynicism: (1) the improvement of the “human factor”; (2) the improvement of statistical and economic investigations; (3) the strengthening of “co-operation”.

Comrade Grodtko recalled that as a result of the Hindu-Muslim riots, provoked by British imperialism after the partition of India, more than 10 million people were rendered homeless and compelled to flee (Muslims to Pakistan and Hindus to the Indian Union). To this day the problem of arranging for work for these people has not been solved—they are starving and have no dwellings. The responsibility for the tragic fate of the millions of dispossessed people lies not only with British imperialism but also with the ruling top strata of the Indian bourgeoisie.

* * *

Comrade E. M. Zhukov gave a summing up of the three day's work of the session. He remarked that a wide circle of problems of the national liberation struggle of the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries had been broached in the reports and speeches. Of course, not all problems had been analysed with due attention. Lack of time had not permitted them. to place the report on the struggle of the peoples of the

African continent, although these peoples already are awakening to political life and are undoubtedly casting off imperialist oppression.

The working class in the colonies and dependent countries has become the recognised leader, the hegemon of the national and colonial revolution. This signifies that the national bourgeoisie is dislodged from the leadership of the national liberation movement in almost all the countries of the colonial East. Thanks to this, the colonial revolution in many countries has assumed the form of a People's Democratic Revolution, a form of the struggle for People's Democracy.

Whichever country under question—the countries of the Near or Far East or the countries of Latin America—everywhere the main enemy of the national liberation movement is American imperialism. This is precisely why it is impossible to regard the national liberation movement in every individual country of the colonial world apart from its connection with the struggle of the two camps, the struggle of the forces of democracy and Socialism against the forces of imperialism and reaction.

The progressive character of this or that social movement, the revolutionary or the reactionary nature of this or that party is at the present time determined by its attitude towards the Soviet Union, to the camp of democracy and Socialism. Therefore, the controversy as to at what stage the colonial bourgeoisie begins to play a reactionary role, can be solved only under the conditions when an answer is given to this main question.

A number of new problems and in particular those connected with the activities of the Communist Parties of the countries of the colonial East were put forward at the session. The reports revealed the necessity of conducting scientific discussion on problems relating to the national liberation struggle in the colonies and semi-colonies.

PEOPLE'S CHINA

Published from Peking, the citadel of Chinese revolution, the cradle of colonial revolutions, the capital of the great People's Democratic Republic of China, this fortnightly magazine brings to us in India as well as to other peoples; the rich experience of the Chinese people in liberating the people from imperialist oppression and capitalist-landlord exploitation. It brings the message of inspiration, self-confidence and the sympathy and support of the Chinese people to us.

In its own words,

"This is a journal dedicated to cementing unity and friendship between the Chinese people and the progressive peoples of all lands and to the cause of the lasting peace and People's Democracy. Through its pages, we intend to inform our readers, twice a month, of the thought and life of the China that has freed herself from the clutches of domestic reactionaries and the yoke of foreign imperialists,—that is, the People's China.

"From now on, we shall do our utmost to inform our readers about the political, economic and cultural activities of this country in order that the friends of new China may follow the progress being made in the gigantic work of national construction.

"We believe that this journal can make a useful contribution to the struggles of our fellow Asians, who are still fighting for their national liberation by casting off the chains of feudalism and imperialism as we have done. Since we have now just emerged from the prolonged darkness of feudal and colonial oppression, it is only natural that we feel a particularly warm sympathy for them in their present struggles and wish to extend them staunch support during their ordeals ahead."

Subscription Rates:

Annual: Rs. 18-8-0; Half yearly: Rs. 10-4-0; Single copy: As. 11.

*

PEOPLE'S PUBLISHING HOUSE LTD.,

190-B Khetwadi Main Road, BOMBAY 4.

FOR A LASTING PEACE, FOR A PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY!

is the weekly organ of the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers' Parties.

It is on the initiative of the Information Bureau and through its organ, that the ideological fight against the alien influences inside the Communist and Workers' Parties have started throughout the world in the postwar period.

It is this magazine which, since its very inception, carries on the fight for peace throughout the world under the leadership of the working class.

It is this paper which more than anything else reflects the work of the Communist Parties of the People's Democracies and the achievements of the People's Democracies—economic, political and cultural.

It is this paper which for the first time came out sharply against the repudiation of all Marxist principles by the Yugoslav Communist Party.

It is the same paper which relentlessly fought the enemies of Marxism—the leaders of the Yugoslav Communist Party by mercilessly exposing all the Trotskyite treachery of these renegades.

It is the same paper which helps all genuine Socialists to isolate the Right-wing "Socialists"—the paid agents of the bourgeoisie and also to maintain revolutionary vigilance, to expose in time the enemy agents.

It is the same organ of the Cominform which day in and day out brings before the eyes of all the Communist Parties that without the unity of the working class no fight worth the name can be carried out to emancipate the working class from wage-slavery. It teaches us to guard the unity of the working class as the apple of our eye.

For all Marxists this paper is absolutely essential in order to be ideologically and politically prepared to carry out the tasks of today and tomorrow.

All readers of COMMUNIST must subscribe to this magazine of international importance.

Rates: Rs. 10. (annual); Rs. 5. (6 months); 3 As., a copy

*

PEOPLE'S PUBLISHING HOUSE LTD.,

190-B Khetwadi Main Road, BOMBAY 4.