

150

WORLD
SOCIAL-
IST
SYS-
TEM

and
NATION-
AL
LIBERA-
TION
MOVE-
MENT

1965



A. Yakovlev

Scanned / Transcribed by
The Socialist Truth in Cyprus – London Bureaux

<http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk/intro.htm>

<http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk/english/home/index.php>



THE WORLD
SOCIAL-
IST
SYS-
TEM

AND
THE NATIO-
NAL-
LIBERA-
TION
MOVE-
MENT

A. YAKOULEV

Novosti Press Agency
Publishing House
Moscow

А. ЯКОВЛЕВ

Мировая социалистическая система
и национально-освободительное движение

на английском языке

Цена 28 коп.

Contents

Two Viewpoints—Two Different Attitudes Towards the National-Liberation Movement	5
What Is the Dispute About?	8
Support of National-Liberation Fighters or Betrayal of Their Interests?	27
World Socialism, Mainstay of the Peoples' Struggle Against Colonialism, for Progress	44
The Revolutionising Influence of the Example of the Socialist Countries	45
Shoulder to Shoulder	53
World Socialism, an Obstacle to the Export of Counter-Revolution	66
The Socialist World and the Emerging Countries' Bid for Economic Independence	76
Socialism or Capitalism?	95
Unity of Revolutionary Forces Is the Main Pre-requisite of Their Victory	103

**TWO VIEWPOINTS—
TWO DIFFERENT
ATTITUDES TOWARDS
THE NATIONAL-
LIBERATION
MOVEMENT**

● The mid-20th century is a time of momentous social and political changes, the most important being the emergence of socialism beyond the boundaries of one country and its development into a world system which is becoming the decisive factor in the overall historical process. The collapse of the colonial empire of world capitalism is the next most important development of the present period and there is a very close connection between the fight of the working class for socialism and the national-li-

beration struggles of colonial and dependent peoples. The nature of this relation, and the place and role of the forces working directly for socialism and those coming out for the peoples' national liberation have become ultimately clear in the course of history.

The peoples fighting against imperialism for their national liberation are the main ally of the international working class and its offspring, the world socialist system. The convergence of these three mighty forces into a single revolutionary stream is a pledge of the ultimate triumph of socialism.

While they fully recognise the outstanding and growing role of the national-liberation movement in anti-imperialist struggle, Marxist-Leninists have never unduly overstated its part in the abolition of the capitalist socio-economic system. They believe that the proletariat is the chief force destined by history to replace capitalism with socialism and communism and that the success of the national-liberation movement essentially depends on the success of the proletarian class struggle in the advanced capitalist countries and on the growth and consolidation of the world socialist system. This is the viewpoint of all true Marxist-Leninists.

The Chinese leaders, however, have an entirely different view-point on the question, which they have been trying for some years to impose on the world revolutionary movement.

It has come to be a major point of the Peking ideological and political platform, generally noted for its extreme national egoism, a narrow nationalistic approach to the main problems of

the world revolutionary process and a petty-bourgeois, extremist and arbitrary handling of China's internal development problems. An erroneous, nationalistic conception of China's interests underlies the entire Peking line, however much they may try to conceal the fact. That is the source of the great-power ambitions of the Mao group that has set its sights for leadership of the world revolutionary movement. That is behind the age-old conviction that China is destined to show the world the "light of truth" and the notion that China's revolutionary experience, both in substance and detail, is undying and absolute for all peoples.

It is typically the position of a petty bourgeois hopelessly confused by the difficulties and complexities of intensified revolutionary struggle. It is apparent from the twists and turns of Peking's home and foreign policy, the frenzied cult of the infallible, omnipotent leader, the disregard of the objective laws of social development, the persistent restriction of democracy, etc.

Both the principal characteristics of the ideological and political platform of the Mao group and the nature of its practical activities in and out of China unmistakably show that the "Peking" line is indeed nationalistic, petty-bourgeois and hostile to proletarian internationalism and the revolutionary proletarian teaching, Marxism-Leninism. No wonder that the line as a whole and its main components have come in for sharp criticism from the world communist movement and progressive public. Marxist-Leninists completely reject the false propositions of the pre-

sent Chinese leaders together with their unscientific concept of the place and role of the national-liberation movement in the world revolutionary process.

Still, it will be a long, hard struggle against the dissentient ideology and practices of the Chinese leaders, who capitalise on the prestige of the CPC and have the resources and potential of a vast state at their disposal. Nor should it be forgotten that with broad peasant and petty-bourgeois masses being drawn into the world revolutionary process, conditions became favourable for the spread of all kinds of leftist, adventurous and nationalistic ideas. It is therefore a vital task for the entire anti-imperialist front to expose the reactionary nature of the Maoist ideological and political platform. It is especially important to prove the fallacy of Peking's unscientific conception of contemporary contradictions, of the historic part played by different social forces in overcoming them, and the role of the national-liberation movement in the world revolutionary process.

What Is the Dispute About?

In formulating their view on major problems of revolutionary struggle in the world today the CPC leaders habitually resort to bickering, to simultaneously advocating contradictory propositions, to disguising their petty-bourgeois conceptions with Marxist-Leninist terminology. Divested of its camouflage, the Peking position on the national-liberation movement, for ex-

ample, amounts to proclaiming it the main revolutionary force of the present epoch, the chief "grave-digger" of capitalism. It is claimed that "the principal contradiction of the contemporary world is the contradiction between the revolutionary peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America and the imperialists headed by the United States,"¹ that the three continents are the "world's main revolutionary storm area" wherein the fate of world capitalism is being decided. The Peking strategists assign to the international working class and the world socialist system the role of a subsidiary of the national-liberation movement; to them "the countryside, and the countryside alone, can provide the revolutionary base from which the revolutionaries can go forward to final victory"² and they consider Asia, Africa and Latin America to be "the world's countryside."

In other words, the CPC leaders have actually repudiated the Marxist-Leninist definition of the present epoch as one in which the principal content is transition from capitalism to socialism on a world scale, and the principal contradiction is between socialism and capitalism. The Peking theorists deny that the international working class and the world socialist system it brought into being are the major guiding force of the present. Thereby they reject the very idea of the leading role of the international working class in the world liberation process.

¹ Lin Piao. "Long Live the Victory of People's War!" *Peking Review*, No. 36, September 3, 1965, pp. 25-26.

² *Ibid.*, p. 24.

All this makes fairly obvious the overt attempts of the CPC leaders to sow distrust among the national-liberation fighters and working class of Asia, Africa and Latin America for the socialist countries and the proletariat of the advanced capitalist countries. This, too, denotes a conscious desire to misrepresent the stand of the world communist movement on the crucial question of the world proletariat's role in the world-wide liberation process.

As we see, the debate revolves around such cardinal questions of revolutionary theory and practice as the strategy and tactics of the world communist movement, which must be based on a correct analysis and definition of the present epoch, its basic contradiction, the place of, and the role played by, various social and political forces in resolving it.

The Chinese leaders' concept of the national-liberation movement presents a distorted picture of the main contradictions of the contemporary world and gives the wrong idea of the ways of settling these contradictions. By misrepresenting the actual alignment of world political forces the CPC leaders mislead revolutionary fighters on matters of strategy and tactics of the struggle against imperialism for national liberation, socialism and communism, incite those who are insufficiently versed in theory to a revision of Marxism-Leninism, though its sheer futility has been proved by the entire historical experience of the past hundred years.

The Chinese leaders' stand follows from their fallacious analysis of the contemporary process of world development as a result of the influence

of nationalist petty-bourgeois ideology on the outlook of the CPC leaders, especially Mao Tse-tung. The fallacy and subjectivism of this stand are quite obvious when confronted with real facts, with the experience of the world revolutionary movement.

Long ago, Marx and Engels, the founders of scientific communism, clearly perceived the significance of the national-colonial problem in regard to the class struggle of the proletariat and pointed out the close interrelation between social and national emancipation of the working people. Marx's well-known proposition that no nation can be free if it oppresses other nations is not merely a statement of fact, it is an appeal to the international proletariat to fight against national oppression and colonialism. At the same time Marx and Engels emphasised the decisive role of the proletarian struggle with regard to the social emancipation of mankind in putting an end to all national oppression. They wrote: "In proportion as the exploitation of one individual by another is put an end to, the exploitation of one nation by another will also be put an end to. In proportion as the antagonism between classes within the nation vanishes, the hostility of one nation to another will come to an end."¹ Marx and Engels saw that all the oppressed and exploited peoples must follow the revolutionary proletariat in their struggle for national freedom and social justice. They predicted the revolutionising role of the

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels. *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. Moscow, 1953, p. 77.

proletarian struggle and the great impact the example of socialist countries would have on the enslaved peoples.

In developing Marxism further, under new historical conditions, Lenin elaborated an explicit doctrine on the national and national-colonial questions. He showed conclusively that the struggles of colonial and dependent peoples would contribute to an ever greater degree to the final smashing of imperialism. Lenin resolutely brushed away the doubts voiced by some Communists as to whether support for national-liberation movements, bourgeois-democratic as they essentially were, would amount to enhancing the capitalist positions. He repeatedly noted the generally democratic content of the movements of oppressed nations and urged the Communists to give them every encouragement and support.

Lenin, who saw in the national-liberation movement a growing anti-imperialist force promoting the proletarian class struggle, especially emphasised that the success of the movement depended above all on the efforts of the international working class to abolish the capitalist system and establish socialism and communism. He wrote: "... this revolutionary movement of the peoples of the East can now develop effectively, can reach a successful issue, only in direct association with the revolutionary struggle of our Soviet Republic against international imperialism."¹

The emergence of the new anti-imperialist

force in the world promoted Lenin at that time to endorse the slogan calling on the proletariat and the oppressed nations of all lands to unite. It did not mean the proletariat played a less important role but simply indicated that it had gained a new and active partner in the anti-imperialist struggle. It also indicated the need for all revolutionary forces to rally together and support one another.

The victory of the proletariat in Russia brought to the fore the contradiction between the international bourgeoisie and the proletariat; the struggle between socialism and world capitalism became the hub of all diverse revolutionary processes. Here is what Lenin wrote about it soon after the Revolution: "... reciprocal relations between peoples and the world political system as a whole are determined by the struggle waged by a small group of imperialist nations against the Soviet movement and the Soviet states headed by Soviet Russia. Unless we bear that in mind, we shall not be able to pose a single national or colonial problem correctly, even if it concerns a most outlying part of the world. The Communist Parties, in civilised and backward countries alike, can pose and solve political problems correctly only if they make this postulate their starting point."¹

With the formation of the world socialist system the contradiction between socialism and capitalism became a more important issue and the main contradiction of the present epoch.

Today no serious problem of revolutionary

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 30, p. 151.

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 241.

struggle can be posed or solved correctly if the decisive role of the struggle between the two opposite systems is negated.

Success of the national-liberation movement is guaranteed by the existence of the world socialist system, by its growing economic and military might and its achievements in building socialism and communism. While emphasising that the world socialist system develops into a decisive factor of current revolutionary developments, the historical regularity of this process and its growing impact on the national-liberation movement, Marxist-Leninists also consider the reciprocal effect of the movement on the struggle of the world proletariat. The world communist movement has always admitted that the effectiveness of the blows against imperialism depends on how closely the forces working for social and national emancipation cooperate and on the stability of their unity, determining the success in solving general and specific tasks stemming from the class nature of these forces.

These points were clearly reflected in the principal documents of the world communist movement, the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement. That, however, did not prevent the Chinese leaders from criticising some Communist Parties, the CPSU first of all, for presumably "ignoring the support which the socialist camp obtains from the national-liberation movement."¹ Of course it would be wrong to con-

¹ "Apologists of Neo-Colonialism". *The Polemics on the General Line of the International Communist Movement*, Peking, 1965, p. 206.

sider this earnest criticism. It is plainly intended to slander the socialist countries and gain prestige for the Chinese leaders, who are seeking to prove that the destinies of world revolution ultimately depend on the national-liberation movement whereas world socialism has devolved into an ancillary revolutionary force.

But however great its role in the current emancipation process, the national-liberation movement cannot decide world social transformation, for it is not immediately aimed at ousting the capitalist system. If severed from the world socialist system and the international working class—as the Peking leaders would like it to be—the national-liberation movement would be unable to contribute significantly to doing away with the capitalist way of life or even fulfil its main task—to end all dependence on imperialism.

It has been proved in theory and in practice that the national-liberation movement could not have attained its present scope and intensity were it not for the development of the revolutionary struggle of the working class of colonial powers and the formation and development of the socialist system comprising first one and then a number of states. Imperialism has failed to maintain its political rule over its colonial possessions chiefly because the main drive was concentrated on fighting world socialism. Facts show there is a definite consistency in the development of the world revolutionary process: the growth and consolidation of socialism promote the growth and success of the national-liberation movement.

Just before World War I, colonies, semi-colonies and dependencies occupied 77.2 per cent of the globe's territory and accounted for 69.2 per cent of the population. The peoples enslaved by imperialism did not meekly submit to their lot—they stubbornly resisted colonial rule and rose time and again to fight for their independence. The Taiping rebellion in China (1851-64); the sepoy mutiny in India (1857-59); the uprising in Afghanistan (1897-98); the Yihotuan uprising in China (1899-1900) are but a few of the many anti-colonial wars and movements which flared up in different parts of the world in the 19th century. All of them, however, were mercilessly suppressed by the conquerors in league with local reactionary forces.

Mounting colonial oppression, the development of capitalism and rise of bourgeois nations, the emergence and growing role of the working class in the enslaved countries all contributed to the formation in the early 20th century of a new important section of the world revolutionary front, which was further enhanced by the powerful, and ever increasing revolutionising influence of the socialist world.

Under the impact of the 1917 October Revolution in Russia the revolutionary elements of colonial powers and of many Eastern colonial countries began to consolidate. Marxism, which had proved its merit as a guide to practical revolutionary action, began to spread rapidly all over the world. In China, Indochina, India and other colonial and dependent countries Communist Parties were formed and actively enga-

ged in the revolutionary struggles and national-liberation movements of their peoples.

The upsurge of the national-liberation movement in many Asian and African countries was immediately associated with the emergence of the first socialist state, the staunch supporter and ally of the enslaved peoples. The anti-imperialist "May 4 Movement" in China and the movement against the Japanese oppressors in Korea in 1919; the mass anti-colonial non-violent resistance movements and armed disturbances in India in 1918-22; Turkey's becoming a Republic in 1922; the upsurge of the guerilla movement in Iran in 1918-21; the popular uprisings in Egypt in 1919 and 1921; proclamation of independence by Afghanistan in 1919; the establishment of independent Mongolia in 1921—all were due to colonial and dependent peoples taking advantage of the favourable international climate induced by the October Socialist Revolution and benefitting from the moral and material support provided by the young Soviet state.

In turn, the national-liberation movement contributed in some measure to the international status of the Soviet Union and served to blunt the imperialist attacks against it in the period between the two world wars. Such mutual support is to this day a typical feature of the relationship between the struggle for socialism and the national-liberation movement.

With the triumph of the socialist revolution in Russia, the first significant breach was made in the imperialist colonial system. The revolu-

tion brought genuine national freedom to the scores of colonial peoples formerly incorporated in the Russian Empire. Mongolia won its independence thanks to Soviet Russia's direct support. Following the October Revolution the customary development of semi-colonies into colonies was reversed. Renunciation by the Soviet Government of the unequal treaties imposed on some Eastern countries by tsarist Russia served to enhance the sovereign rights of China and Iran. The colonialists had to recognise the independence of Afghanistan and Turkey, revise onerous treaties with Egypt and Iraq, agree to a semblance of representative bodies being set up in Birma, Indonesia, the Philippines and some other colonies. All these developments were eloquent proof that from its very inception socialism began playing a vital role in multiplying the successes of the national-liberation movement.

The historic significance of the October Revolution for the colonial peoples was also evident in the first years of the Soviet state, becoming all the more obvious with the passage of time.

Sun Yat-sen, the famous Chinese revolutionary democrat, called the October Revolution the "great hope of mankind" and believed that the future success of the Chinese people's struggle depended on close alliance between revolutionary China and Soviet Russia. Addressing Lenin, head of the Soviet Government, the first Afghani Ambassador to the RSFSR said in October 1919: "I extend a friendly hand to you and hope that you will help the whole of the East to free

itself from the oppression of European imperialism." The Chinese revolutionary and the Afghani diplomatist both voiced the aspirations of millions enslaved by capitalism. Hundreds of letters and messages expressing similar hopes reached Moscow in those year. As time has shown, these hopes have been fully justified. Many years after the *Aurora* fired its history-making volley, representatives of the revolutionary forces of Asia, Africa and Latin America, looking back at the road that has been traversed unanimously note the immense impact the first socialist revolution has had on the destinies of colonial peoples.

President Ho Chi Minh of the DRV said: "The victory of the Great October Revolution was of especially inestimable significance for the historical destinies of Eastern peoples. It awakened the oppressed Asian peoples, showed the peoples of other colonial and dependent countries the way to liberty and demonstrated to them what real national freedom was like."

President Modibo Keita of Mali pointed out: "The October Revolution played a decisive role in the common liberation struggle of all oppressed peoples." The Resolution of the Central Committee Plenary Meeting of the Communist Party of India, held in April, 1967, states: "It was under the inspiration of the October Socialist Revolution that the working class and trade union movement of India of the twenties began to be orientated towards militant class struggle and later developed into a great force which played a significant role in the independ-

ence struggle."¹

The emergence of the first socialist state and the consequent upsurge of the national-liberation movement could not, however, bring about the immediate downfall of colonialism. Just before World War II imperialism was still going strong; it was still powerful enough to keep numerous nations from attaining their inalienable right to self-determination and independent statehood. On the other hand, socialism at that time was still gathering momentum. The Soviet Union was encircled by capitalist countries and constantly threatened with military attack. It had very little opportunity to render direct support to the struggling peoples though it did everything it could. Aside from that, in the period of relative stabilisation of capitalism in the twenties the working-class movement in colonial powers was at a low ebb while the national-liberation movement in the period between the two world wars was poorly organised.

The second stage of the general crisis of capitalism, which set in after World War II, radically altered the balance of forces in favour of socialism. Whereas after the October Revolution socialist nations accounted for 16 per cent of the territory and 8 per cent of the population of the globe, in the fifties the figures had soared to 26 and 35.5 per cent respectively. The overwhelming majority of the colonial and dependent peoples were drawn into the liberation struggle. It became much better organised thanks to the increased strength and growing unity of the work-

¹ *Pravda*, May 5, 1967.

ing class, and the mounting influence of the Communist Parties on the development of the revolutionary struggle of imperialist-oppressed peoples. The postwar international situation was also characterised by the fact that imperialism no longer was in the driver's seat in world affairs, either economically, politically or militarily.

Naturally the independence struggle attained much more impressive results after World War II. The colonial system began to crumble. The process started in Asia where 14 independent states emerged between 1944 and 1954. Imperialist political rule lost out in such big imperialist colonies and semi-colonies as China, India, Burma, Indonesia. Thanks to the hegemony of the proletariat, the existence of the socialist system and its direct and indirect support, the national-liberation revolutions in China, Korea and Vietnam gradually developed into socialist revolutions. The scope of world socialism grew, enhancing its impact on the course and issue of national-liberation movements in Asia and other continents.

The third stage of the general crisis of capitalism which began in the mid-fifties was characterised by a further growth of the economic and military might of the socialist community and its mounting and more immediate impact on world affairs. To give but one illustration, the socialist countries' share of world industrial output increased from 10 per cent before the war to 39 per cent in 1964 and now amounts to two-thirds of the total industrial output of the advanced capitalist countries.

The working-class struggle in developed capi-

alist countries has acquired far greater scope. The number of strikers trebled between 1958 and 1964. The struggle of the proletariat in these countries reached out beyond purely economic issues to grope with political problems, including the imperialists' attempts to suppress the national-liberation movement by armed force. Curbing US aggression in Vietnam has been, since 1965, a major point of the struggle waged by the progressive forces and above all by the proletariat in capitalist countries.

The collapse of the colonial system is a characteristic feature of the third stage of the general crisis of capitalism. Since the mid-fifties there have emerged about fifty newly independent states in Africa and Asia. Most of them are African states that have gained their independence in the past decade. However 34 millions (1.1 per cent of the world population) are still languishing under the colonial yoke.

The task of winning political independence for the peoples of the former colonial outskirts of imperialism has been solved in the main. It is noteworthy that the very process of solving this problem convincingly refutes the Chinese leaders' postulate about armed struggle being the only practical means of achieving social and national freedom. Two-thirds of the newly independent states won their independence without an armed struggle. Propagandists in the service of the Peking splitters are trying to hush up the unpleasant fact, for it shows that, as the world socialist system gains strength and the young nations have a more decisive say in world affairs, the peaceful forms of anti-imperialist struggle become more

effective. They deny that in the present conditions, with the bulk of imperialist forces being kept at bay by the socialist camp, revolutionary struggle can achieve its goal without so much as an exchange of fire. They also insinuate that the independence gained by many young states in a peaceful way is fictitious, illusory. They assert that "imperialism-granted" freedom cannot be genuine. These are strange words indeed coming from people who would call themselves Marxists. The imperialists have gone out of their way to make it seem as if they have done away with the colonial system of their "own free will." They would have people believe it was always their cherished dream to grant freedom to colonial nations. The British Prime Minister declared at the 15th General Assembly Session on September 29, 1960, that for more than a century their purpose had been to guide their dependent territories towards freedom and independence.

It appears then that, although motivated by different reasons, Chinese and imperialist propagandists alike seek to present a distorted picture of the colonial liberation process and its results. It is perfectly clear to those who would not deliberately shut their eyes to facts that in every instance the colonialists were compelled to effect their so-called voluntary withdrawal from their former holdings. The resolute, though often peaceful, struggle of the enslaved peoples, the entire atmosphere of anti-colonialism induced by the successes of the national-liberation struggle, and the consistent anti-colonial attitude and the struggle of the world socialist camp made it too hot for them, to remain there. Lord Ismay, then Chief

of Staff to the British Governor-General of India, described Britain's motives in granting independence to India as follows:

"India in March, 1947, was a ship on fire in mid-ocean with ammunition in the hold. By then it was a question of putting out the fire before it reached the ammunition. There was, in fact, no option before us but to do what we did."

Colonialists in Africa and the whole of Asia felt much the same way.

It is a fact, however, that while World War II was still raging the colonialists would not admit the possibility of having to relinquish their colonies. It was then that Churchill made the following notorious statement: "I have not become the King's first minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire." This declaration was supported by Labour leaders subsequently in office, who "stressed the resolve of the British people to keep the empire together after the war."

A conference called in January, 1944 by *la France combattante* leaders, to decide on the post-war relations of the world's second greatest colonial power and its colonies, rejected the very idea of their possible independence in future. Conference resolutions emphatically stated that "any prospect of autonomy for the colonies, even in a remote future, must be ruled out." History, however, decided differently. The colonies were liberated, and not in the "remote future" but some 15 or 20 years after the peremptory declaration was made.

Summing up the distinctive features and results of the historical development of the world revo-

lutionary struggle and the relation between various aspects of the world liberation process, the delegates at the 1960 Conference of the Communist and Workers' Parties stated: "The forces of world socialism have been decisive in promoting the struggle of colonial and dependent peoples to free themselves from imperialist oppression."¹

Most of the recently independent states have politically divorced themselves from the imperialist system, remaining in the orbit of world capitalist economy. It is now possible for these countries to conduct an independent home and foreign policy. However, the attainment of sovereignty by former colonies and semi-colonies does not signify the end of their anti-imperialist struggles. Their victory cannot be conclusive unless they attain economic independence and ensure their social progress. Hence the intensification of the national-liberation struggle and, consequently, its mounting impact on the revolutionary transformation of the world and the struggle between socialism and capitalism. This fact, however, does not alter in principle the limited historical role of the movement compared with that of the socialist forces, which will dust the capitalist system and finally rid human society of all social and national inequality and oppression.

In defending their position with respect to the national-liberation movement, the Chinese leaders have confused the issue of the main contradiction of the present. Moreover, they deliberate-

¹ Programme. *Documents of the Struggle for Peace, Democracy and Socialism*. Moscow, 1964, p. 64, Russ. Ed.

ly ignored the historical fact that the intensification of the popular national-liberation struggle and the deepening of its social content have always directly depended on the successes of world socialism and its growing influence on the process of radical transformation of the entire life of humanity. Their dogmatic approach to theory makes the CPC leaders see in the classics of Marxism-Leninism nothing but corroboration of the inevitably extending role of national-liberation movements in anti-imperialist struggle. They completely ignore the fact that the great theorists of the proletariat viewed the national-liberation movement in association with working-class struggle, that they examined it from the standpoint of the struggle for socialism and communism, clearly defining its auxiliary role with regard to the proletariat attaining its ultimate aims and specifying the international working class as the hub of the entire period of transition from capitalism to socialism and communism.

By declaring the national-liberation movement the forefront of the world revolutionary process the Mao Tse-tung group break off with Marxism-Leninism, deliberately ignore history, and commit themselves to a petty-bourgeois nationalistic policy. Their current utterances blot out their own previous views on the world revolutionary process. Before losing all sense of reality, Mao Tse-tung had properly estimated the historical role of socialism and the international proletariat and saw the direct connection between the success of socialism and the destinies of the national-liberation movement. In 1949, he assessed the conditions which made possible the victory of the

Chinese anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution as follows: "Were it not for the existence of the Soviet Union, had fascism not been defeated in the Second World War, had Japanese imperialism not been defeated, had the new democratic countries in Europe not arisen, had the oppressed nations of the East not begun to fight, had there not been a struggle in the United States, Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Japan and other capitalist countries between the popular masses and their reactionary rulers,—lacking the sum total of all these developments, the reactionary forces bearing down upon us would certainly have been immeasurably stronger. Could we be victorious under such circumstances? Obviously not."¹

Unfortunately, the leaders of the Communist Party of China—a party justly famous for its revolutionary traditions and victories—have in recent years succumbed to a petty-bourgeois nationalist view of the nature and essence of the world revolutionary process, a viewpoint that is resolutely rejected by Marxist-Leninists of all countries.

Support of National-Liberation Fighters or Betrayal of Their Interests?

Intentionally or not, the Chinese leaders' policy regarding the national-liberation movement is objectively a treachery not only of the world com-

¹ Mao Tse-tung. *On the People's Democratic Dictatorship*. Peking, 1950, pp. 13-14.

munist movement but also of the forces fighting to free the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America from imperialist oppression. By trying to split the socialist camp and the world communist movement, and diverting some of their effort from anti-imperialist struggle, the Chinese leaders undermine the central section of the international revolutionary front. Nor have they been averse to sowing dissension directly in the ranks of the national-liberation and other democratic movements. They have greatly harmed Afro-Asian unity. There, too, the Chinese leaders objectively supported the imperialists, who grudge neither money nor effort to cripple the solidarity of revolutionary Asian and African peoples and thwart their desire for unity with world socialism.

Peking's scandalous attempts to lump together the industrially developed socialist countries and the capitalist countries as being equally eager to exploit the young sovereign nations and turn them into agricultural and raw material appendages are the counterpart of imperialist theories of the world divided into "industrial" and "agrarian" communities, which presumably are the source of the most significant differences in the contemporary world. Nor is this similarity of views accidental. In this case both the Chinese leaders and the imperialists have a common aim, to shake the faith of the newly emerged nations in the Soviet Union above all, the most powerful industrialised socialist state.

By prompting the national-liberation forces to isolate themselves from advanced socialist countries, and particularly the Soviet Union, and

even inciting them to open hostility, the Chinese leaders actually hamstring the national-liberation movement. History has convincingly shown that national revolutions can solve their tasks only in close association with world socialism and the struggle of the international proletariat. These tasks are even more difficult today than when it was a question of ending imperialist political rule. To resolve them, the nations of the "third world" must be able to rely on the direct and indirect support of the countries of the socialist community. If they have only themselves to depend on, which is what the Chinese leaders expect of them, the economic gap between them and the more advanced countries will be widened instead of narrowed.

Undoubtedly, efforts of the newly free countries to overcome the economic, cultural and social lag on their own, and their co-operation and mutual aid are essential factors determining their historical progress. No amount of outside aid can take the place of national effort. But outside aid can certainly do much to enhance the effectiveness of endeavours and facilitate the solution of tasks which may otherwise prove unfeasible, inexpedient or too difficult.

Peace is essential if the new states are to achieve their current goals. Since the world socialist system plays the main role in securing and safeguarding world peace, it is up to the young nations closely to co-operate with the world socialist community in the international scene in order to secure the peaceful conditions so essential for their own development.

Peace and the overall rapid progress of the

newly emerged nations are, therefore, the two vital aims of the national-liberation movement at its present stage. But these goals will never be attained by following the course the Chinese leaders suggest.

Claims to China's particular mission concerning the national-liberation movement are far from new. Even before People's China came into being the idea was propagated that the October Revolution was classic as far as imperialist countries were concerned, whereas the Chinese revolution was classic for colonial and semi-colonial countries. In 1956, CPC leaders frankly told the delegates of different Communist Parties attending the 8th CPC Congress that European Communist Parties should not meddle in the revolutionary struggle in colonial countries and leave it up to the Chinese leaders, who were best able to judge such matters.

The sum total of the "theoretical" and practical activities of the Chinese leaders in the international revolutionary movement in recent years shows that their purpose in boosting the national-liberation movement as the main revolutionary force of the present epoch has nothing to do with the actual interests of anti-imperialist struggle. It is becoming quite obvious that the Mao Tse-tung group is prepared to sacrifice the unity of the international revolutionary front in order to rectify the "errors and iniquities" of history which have prevented China, a country with nearly a quarter of the earth's population, from exerting a decisive influence on world history. They are in a hurry to change all this without due consideration for China's possibilities, the interests of the

people or prevailing historical conditions. They regard ultra-revolutionism as a means of expediting world revolution and hastening the advance of the West's Communists, whom they accuse of complacency, and the peoples of the more advanced socialist economies to the world-wide triumph of socialism. In this way, too, they hope to gain the reputation of being the most fearless and invincible champions of all enslaved peoples and staunch fighters for socialism and communism. Hence their premise of the so-called shift of the world centre of revolution from the West to the East, to China.

According to Peking theorists, the centre of revolution has shifted from Britain to France, Germany, Russia, and now to China. For confirmation of this new-discovered regularity they refer to Marx, who mentioned that the centre of revolutionary movement was shifting from Western Europe to Russia. In this, as in many other instances, the Chinese leaders treat the ideas and postulates of Marxism-Leninism dogmatically, disregarding concrete circumstances of place and time. It is true that the centre of revolution shifted to Russia after the winds of revolutionary change had swept over Europe. At that time, Russia was approaching a revolutionary crisis. Later on, it went through a series of upheavals which resulted in the formation of the world's first state of the workers and peasants.

As the trail-blazer of communism, the Soviet Union remains in the vanguard of revolutionary struggle, whose supreme goal is to build a communist society. The revolutionary process of building a new society now under way in the socia-

list countries and the fact that the socialist camp is a formidable counterforce opposing imperialism inevitably make the entire world socialist system the centre of the international revolutionary movement. These facts are obvious enough, but not to Mao Tse-tung and his group, who are blinded by their megalomaniac notions of China's unique position in human history. According to them, China today is the only bulwark and faithful sentinel of socialism; she alone is marching along the truly socialist way brilliantly conceived by great Mao Tse-tung; she alone carries out her internationalist duty before revolutionary peoples sincerely and selflessly.

What are the lessons to learn and examples to take from Peking's self-styled world revolutionary leaders? What, indeed, is this revolutionism and internationalism they have been flaunting in recent years?

For half a century now socialism has been a magnetic force attracting oppressed peoples and working people the world over. Socialism has made backward Russia one of the most advanced world powers and ensured the all-round progress of Soviet peoples in an unprecedentedly short span of time. The socialist system has changed the face of Eastern Europe. It enabled People's China, the Korean People's Democratic Republic, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the Mongolian People's Republic to make rapid economic progress and ensure rising material and cultural standards for their peoples.

Wherever scientific socialism has become the basis of government, impressive achievements have been scored in all spheres of life. As long

as China cooperated with the other countries, it built socialism successfully and enjoyed prestige and influence internationally. But some eight or nine years after its victorious revolution the situation began to change radically. The Mao group began manoeuvring the Party towards petty-bourgeois extremism and leftist gambles in home and foreign policy. The people's communes and the "big leap" vaunted as signal achievements of Chairman Mao's genius, brought the country to the verge of economic crisis. The building of socialism was halted. A strained atmosphere set in which worsened as time went on due to the persecution campaign initiated by the Mao group and blasphemously dubbed a "proletarian cultural revolution." Primarily aimed at establishing barrack-style socialism in China, the Mao line grossly discredited socialist ideas in the eyes of other peoples, whom the Chinese leaders would direct along the "only true road" towards progress.

Genuine national liberation has long been associated with socialism in peoples minds. The activities of the Mao group, which poses as the most zealous champion of equality between nations, undermine the prestige of socialism. The imperious nature of China's national policy has long been obvious to the most unprejudiced observers. The history of small nations in China has been one of age-old sanguinary struggle against their enthrallment by the Chinese state, against the great-power policy of Chinese rulers. Nonetheless, after the victory of the revolution it was the great-power concept, which Mao Tse-tung had long harboured and persistently imposed on the CPC since the mid-thirties, that was made the

basis for solving the national question. This concept ruled out declaration of the right to self-determination for small peoples of China. In this way the question of complete national equality was virtually rejected, being replaced by the territorial question. The aim of the Mao grouping was to retain the national fringe territories within China's frontiers. Furthermore, Mao Tse-tung has long harboured expansionist ambitions. Back in 1936 he remarked to Edgar Snow, an American journalist, that the Mongolian People's Republic would "automatically" rejoin China right after the revolution was over. In 1954, he unceremoniously suggested that the Soviet Government should without consulting the Mongolian people, decide the question of the Mongolian People's Republic being annexed to China. Naturally enough, he was told that it was up to the people and Government of Mongolia to decide such matters.

The Chinese leaders, seeking to justify their obviously great-power attitude to the national question refer to the fact that the autonomy granted to China's national minorities allows them to be "masters in their own homes." It is, however, self-evident to Communists that relations between peoples in a multi-national country cannot be truly democratic unless the right to self-determination is proclaimed. Lenin wrote: "Socialist parties which did not show by all their activity, both now, during the revolution, and after its victory, that they would liberate the enslaved nations and build up relations with them on the basis of a free union—and free union is a false phrase without the right to secede—these parties

would be betraying socialism."¹ And he continued: "...It would be a betrayal of socialism to refuse to implement the self-determination of nations under socialism."²

That was how Lenin assessed the principle of national self-determination with regard to building a socialist society. Having denied China's national minorities of the right to self-determination, the CPC leaders helped to perpetuate the great-power approach in every sphere of national policy and development.

As far back as 1956 that many delegates in speeches at the 8th CPC Congress noted that the great-power outlook was the most serious obstacle to realising even the relatively limited rights which had been granted to national minorities. The warnings were completely ignored. The subsequent, systematic, rapid assimilation of the national minorities practically became declared government policy. At a sitting of the All-China Committee of the People's Political Consultative Council in January, 1959, the deputy chairman of the Nationalities Committee, Wang Feng, claimed the merging of nationalities was an inevitable historical tendency which all minorities should warmly welcome and actively promote.³ The Chinese press frankly expressed the view that the Han (i. e., the Chinese as distinguished from the non-Chinese elements in the population) accounted for 94 per cent of the population; that the fusion must be effected on the ba-

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 22, p. 143.

² *Ibid.*, p. 321.

³ *Mintsu yantsi*, 1959, No. 2, p. 2.

sis of one nationality; and that the features of the Han nation must become "common features of the national minorities." The second Scientific Conference on Language and Writing Reform, held in March, 1960, declared that whoever opposed such assimilation opposed socialism, communism and historical materialism.¹

Marxist-Leninist theory describes the fusion of nations as an objective tendency of historical development. But any reference to this theory in connection with speeding up national assimilation, actually enforcing it to enable the Han people to absorb the national minorities of China, is nothing more than borrowed plumes to disguise anti-Marxist, anti-Leninist practices—a trick at which the Chinese leadership excels. To pose the question of accelerated merging of nationalities in the conditions prevailing in China, by implicating socialism, communism and historical materialism, is brazen profanity. The merging of nationalities is a lengthy, natural and historical process. From a Marxist-Leninist viewpoint there can be no question of accelerating it artificially, and least of all by coercive measures, restricting the rights of national minorities or forcibly foisting the "special features" of a large nation on them. The flourishing of national cultures, mutual exchange between them, the complete willingness for such exchange based on national equality—this is the communist conception of relations between nationalities under socialism and communism. Only thus can the tendency towards the merging of nations be prevented from being

¹ *Sintsiang Jihpao*, March 21, 1960.

reduced to pure assimilation. So far these conditions do not exist in China. And the undisguised course for assimilation of national minorities pursued by the Mao Tse-tung group only serves to discredit the national policy of socialist states.

The nationalist spirit of Mao Tse-tung's ideas is especially apparent in the foreign policy of the Chinese leaders. In trying to win over the peoples of the third world, who are still suffering from ruthless imperialist exploitation and extreme economic backwardness and poverty, the Chinese leaders sully the advanced socialist countries by claiming they are too concerned about their own well-being to take any risks for the sake of those peoples, maintaining that they refuse to fulfil their internationalist duty and to act in the interests of the national-liberation movement.

Having asserted that the Communist Parties of colonial powers and European socialist countries developed and conducted their struggle in different conditions and therefore are unable to understand the aspirations and hopes of the oppressed peoples, the Chinese leaders finally went as far as to say that the whites—Communists included—are generally unable to correctly understand and defend the rights of coloured peoples.

Speaking at receptions given in 1959 and 1962 in honour of K. Matsumura, a councillor of the Japanese Liberal-Democratic Party, Chou En-lai urged the development of close relations between the Chinese People's Republic and Japan, stressing the common culture of the two countries and the fact that they belong to "one race." A Chinese representative at the February, 1963 Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference in Moshi told the

Soviet delegates that countries of Eastern Europe should not interfere in Asian and African affairs and further expressed regret that the Soviet delegates had come at all since, he claimed, they were not wanted at the Conference and their presence was an insult to the Afro-Asian solidarity movement.¹ All this is a far cry from the class, Marxist-Leninist approach Chinese leaders like to talk about so much. There is not the slightest trace of proletarian internationalism. Instead, there is an obvious preference for a racial, rather than a class approach, a preference for selfish aims at the expense of the common interests and aims of the international proletariat.

This selfish nationalist approach to international problems was bound to result in open animosity towards neighbouring states and the socialist countries in place of goodneighbourliness and friendship. Mao Tse-tung and his like have made anti-Sovietism state policy of the Chinese People's Republic. Peking considers India, the largest Asian country, which enjoys international prestige and recognition by virtue of its active participation in the struggle to relax international tensions, as one of its worst enemies. Many countries in the "storm area" which the Chinese leaders aspire to guide have severed diplomatic relations with People's China.

Just what such "guidance" may lead to has been graphically illustrated by the tragic example of Indonesia, where heed for Peking's adventurous concepts resulted in grave dangers for

¹ From the conversation between Liu Ning-i and Soviet representatives at the Moshi Conference in February, 1963.

the progressive forces, the smashing of one of the strongest Communist Parties and the bolstering of the positions for the local reactionaries and imperialism. Adherence to these concepts also placed some sections of the national-liberation movement in a difficult position or led them into an impasse in other countries of South-East Asia. Inciting revolutionary forces in different countries to reckless moves in their struggle against home reactionaries and imperialism, the Chinese leaders are meanwhile in no hurry to free the Chinese-populated territory of Macao and Hing Kong annexed by Portugal and Great Britain. Peking would prefer to avoid a direct clash with imperialism. Instead, they keep accusing the Soviet Union and other advanced socialist countries of not giving Vietnam enough help.

The dissentient activity of the Chinese leaders has been a boon to imperialism, which immediately stepped up its struggle against socialism and the national-liberation movement. Since the early sixties US imperialism has committed aggression against Cuba, the Dominican Republic, the Congo (Kinshasa) and is carrying on an aggressive war against the people of Vietnam. Hostile position of the Chinese leaders towards the Soviet Union and other socialist countries made it easier for the US imperialists to escalate the war in Vietnam. Events show that the Chinese leaders have ruled out any possibility of common action by the socialist countries to beat off American aggression against Vietnam.

Moreover, it became clear recently that Peking is playing a shady game behind Vietnam's back hoping to profit by the tragedy of a neigh-

bouring people. The war in Vietnam is one of the political factors which enable the Mao Tse-tung group to explain away many of China's difficulties and divest themselves of all responsibility for them. On the other hand, the Vietnam problem is used to create the impression that no satisfactory solution of the crisis can be achieved without Peking's participation. Some people in the United States have begun to contemplate a deal with China. In April, 1966, the Senate Democratic majority leader, Mansfield, suggested settling the conflict by direct negotiations between the United States, China, the DRV and South Vietnamese representatives. In June, 1966, Mansfield proposed a meeting between Dean Rusk and Chen Yi to discuss the question of peace in Vietnam. It is highly revealing that these proposals coincided with Peking's statements to the effect that the conflict could not be resolved on the basis of the Geneva Agreements, which were signed by many states, the USSR included. Thus, *Jenmin Jihpao* wrote in July, 1966: "The Geneva Agreements were long ago torn to shreds by the devils's claws of American imperialism. In view of this, how can one speak of 'resolving' the Vietnam question on the basis of these agreements?" The fact, however, is that both the DRV Government and the leaders of the South Vietnam National Liberation Front constantly emphasise the great significance of the Geneva Agreements. But Peking could not care less about the opinion of the Vietnamese themselves.

With the escalation of the war in Vietnam, the Chinese leaders began more openly to renege on their "firm" promise to guarantee North Viet-

nam's security. The August 6, 1964 Declaration of the Chinese Government, unequivocally states: "Any encroachment on the Democratic Republic of Vietnam is at the same time an encroachment on China."¹ *Jenmin Jihpao* wrote on the same date: "Should American imperialism encroach at any time on the territory, territorial waters or air space of the DRV, the Chinese people will be unswervingly true to their promise to render most resolute support to the just war of the Vietnamese people against US aggressors."

Such statements are forthcoming to this day. But what do they actually mean? The Chinese leaders, who persistently reject common action with other socialist countries, are, in effect, stabbing the Vietnamese people in the back. They imply that the US aggressors may pursue their war against the Vietnamese as long as they please, and that China will not interfere unless her own territory is attacked. Early in 1965, Mao Tse-tung told Edgar Snow that "Chinese armies would not engage in war outside their own territory" and that "the Chinese would fight only if the Americans attacked them." The same idea was voiced by Chen Yi, on September 29, 1965, and Chou En-lai, in April, 1966. In September, 1966, US Defense Secretary McNamara, who naturally spoke on behalf of his country's ruling circles, hastened to reassure the Chinese leadership that "US limited aims in Vietnam constitute no threat to it (i. e. China.—A. Ya.) whatsoever."²

The Vietnamese problem is now the centre of

¹ *Hsinhua Information Bulletin*, August 7, 1964, p. 2.

² *L'Entreprise*, No. 74, September, 1966, p. 15.

world developments. Vietnam is the scene of a direct confrontation between the contemporary progressive forces, socialism and the national-liberation movement, on the one hand, and its most reactionary force, US imperialism, on the other. The attitude to the struggle of the heroic people of Vietnam, to the unity of revolutionary forces in defending Vietnam from aggression, is today the most crucial test of the truly internationalist position of countries, parties, movements and organisations forming the anti-imperialist front. The Mao-led Chinese leadership has not stood this test.

The shameful "cultural revolution," which helped to unleash anti-Soviet hysteria in the Chinese People's Republic, staged right at the time of the escalation of war in Vietnam, has most concisely exposed the empty "revolutionary" phrase-mongering of the Mao Tse-tung group. *La France nouvelle* commented: "It is increasingly clear that under the cover of ultra-revolutionary slogans and phrases the Chinese leaders are trampling, with a vengeance they never dared to display before on the principles of proletarian internationalism."

It is not accidental that with the onset of the "cultural revolution" American ruling circles gradually began to modify their view of future US-China relations. Some American observers maintain that President Johnson has initiated a "major psychological redeployment" in respect to the Chinese People's Republic. In September, 1966, he already spoke of a prospective long-term reconciliation with People's China.

A China guided by people who are hostile to

the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and who readily betray the interests of the national-liberation struggle is no longer an adversary in the eyes of American imperialists. It is obvious that you can't oppose imperialism while disrupting the unity of the forces fighting against it. To claim, as the Chinese leaders do, that the opposite is true, is to contradict the historical experience of the world revolutionary movement, which scored its major victories by consolidating its ranks.

**WORLD SOCIALISM—
MAINSTAY OF
THE PEOPLES'
STRUGGLE AGAINST
COLONIALISM
FOR PROGRESS**

■ Now, as before, the impact that socialism has on the national-liberation movement is expressed both in the gains it keeps wresting from capitalism—thereby reducing its strength as a world system and facilitating the peoples' struggle—and in direct support of their revolutionary effort. Naturally, the scale and direction of such support have varied at different times, depending on the available resources of world socialism and the targets to be achieved by the national-liberation movement at certain stages. Nonetheless, the ge-

neral tendency continues to be for world socialism to extend and intensify its support of the national-liberation movement in all respects. This trend, which shaped up when the USSR was the only socialist state in the world, is the most important aspect of the sum total of the manifestations of the main contradiction of the present epoch, the struggle between socialism and capitalism. This tendency has enabled Marxist-Leninists to conclude that socialism is beginning to exert a decisive influence on the development of mankind at large. Refusing, in fact, to subscribe to this profoundly reasonable conclusion, which reflects the real situation, the Chinese leaders juggle facts and resort to all sorts of outright lies in order to twist the arguments proving the absolute validity of the postulate about the decisive impact of socialism on the course of world development in the present epoch. The Mao Tse-tung group does everything it can to minimise the significance of the international solidarity of socialist countries and fighting peoples in the past and present. Therefore, in considering concrete ways and forms of the impact of world socialism on national movements we cannot ignore Peking's juggling and slanderous fabrications in this regard.

**The Revolutionising Influence
of the Example
of the Socialist Countries**

Russia's working class, in beginning the assault of world capitalism, has been an inspiration to all the working and oppressed people. The Oc-

tober Revolution has in practice blazed the trail to socialism and national liberation. It demonstrated how to fight for the liberation, and showed what kind of society should be built and how in order to consolidate and extend the newly won freedom. And this was achieved by a relatively backward country in unbelievably hard international conditions, all of which enhanced the revolutionising influence of Soviet Russia's example. In repudiating leftist demands to use the victory of the proletariat in Russia to implant socialism in other countries, Lenin emphasised: "...we have said, and still say that socialism has the force of example. Coercion is effective against those who want to restore their rule. But at this stage the significance of force ends, and after that only influence and example are effective. We must show the significance of communism in practice, by example."¹

In a historically short time, despite protracted devastating wars, socialism has turned formerly backward Russia into a mighty power marching in the van of humanity. Young socialist states embarked on the path of rapid economic and social development with the Soviet Union's support. All this nurtured the peoples' aspiration for freedom, made them more confident of final victory, and greatly accelerated the consolidation of world revolutionary forces, including those in colonial and dependent countries. In other words, the example of world socialism continues to inspire peoples of the capitalist world to struggle resolutely for social and na-

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 457.

tional liberation. But Peking quasi-revolutionaries, nothing doubtful, tell us that "the force of example and inspiration can never replace the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations. No oppressed people or nation can win liberation except through its own staunch revolutionary struggle."¹ The question arises: Where, when and who has ever been in favour of replacing the revolutionary struggles of the peoples? Who can take this reproach in earnest?

The inspiration of socialism, its proper example, have long been appreciated by all unprejudiced observers the world over. Jawaharlal Nehru, for instance, wrote in *The Discovery of India*: "...we had the example of the Soviet Union, which in two brief decades, full of war and civil strife and in face of what appeared to be insurmountable difficulties, had made tremendous progress. Some were attracted to communism, others were not, but all were fascinated by the advance of the Soviet Union in education and culture and medical care and physical fitness and in the solution of the problem of nationalities—by the amazing and prodigious effort to create a new world out of the dregs of the old... If others could do it, why not we?"²

Nothing impressed the colonial and dependent countries so much as the complete trans-

¹ *A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement*. Peking, 1963, p. 28.

² Jawaharlal Nehru. *The Discovery of India*. London, 1951, pp. 350-351.

formation of the former colonial outskirts of tsarist Russia. To throw off national oppression, to become the real masters of the country and change it in the same way as the peoples of Russia had done was the dream that possessed the minds and hearts of the revolutionary masses of the "third world."

It was natural that the example of socialism should promote, above all, the growth of class consciousness of the proletariat in colonies and dependent countries, enhance its organisation and facilitate its emergence as an independent political force. It found expression in the formation of trade unions and Communist Parties and in the gradual transformation of the proletariat of some countries into an advanced force of the national-liberation movement. At present, there are Communist Parties in nearly all developing countries. The example of socialism, which had successfully solved the agrarian question, significantly aroused the peasants of colonies and dependent countries to increasingly participate in anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggles.

The working people's resolve, bolstered up by the successes of socialism, to put an end to colonialism led to an obvious swing to the left among the national bourgeoisie in colonies and semi-colonies. In conditions when imperialism is losing ground, above all due to the strengthening of world socialism, and under the pressure of the increasingly revolutionised working people, the national bourgeoisie has been implementing to a greater or lesser extent radical anti-imperialist measures to enhance the political

independence of developing countries and even win economic independence. Development of the state-owned economic sector and the greater role of the state in economic matters are highly indicative of this. Aside from other considerations, a major source of these developments was the direct influence of the socialist countries, which demonstrated the great role of the state in concentrating money and effort on advancing the key industries, essential for the progress of the economy as a whole.

Following the example of the socialist states, which nationalised all private enterprises including those owned by foreign capitalists, developing countries are more boldly resorting to this method to free themselves from foreign capital. Thanks to the support of the socialist world, this practice is coming to be a norm in international law. In its resolution, the Cairo Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference described nationalisation as a "lawful method and the right of every state in keeping with the principles of national sovereignty."¹ The resolute action of the UAR in nationalising the Suez Canal and rebuffing, with the support of the socialist camp, all attempts of imperialism to oppose this step by force materially contributed to the recognition of nationalisation of foreign property as a lawful expedient used by former colonies and dependencies.

The development and strengthening of world

¹ *The Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference*. Moscow, 1958, p. 198.

socialism have increased the appeal of socialist ideas and made them popular throughout the world. The international bourgeoisie is well aware of this. The growing popularity of socialist ideals among the working people compels some groups of the bourgeoisie in developing countries to resort to disguising their class aims and to elaborate programmes allegedly destined for building a kind of "national-type" socialism. Such "socialist programmes" are, in a way, a variant of a certain propaganda approach adopted by the ruling circles of advanced capitalist countries long ago. They try to persuade the working people in those countries that capitalism, as it is today, is increasingly taking on the aspects of socialism or even that socialism is getting more and more like modern "democratic" or "people's" capitalism. As to the developing countries, the bourgeoisie seeks to make any more or less radical anti-imperialist move look like socialist. Naturally, the followers of scientific socialism, the only genuine socialism, will continue to oppose any attempts of the bourgeoisie of one country or another to hold back the development of working people's class consciousness.

Not always, however, are the programmes for building "national socialism" purely negative. In some cases the programmes do not emanate from the bourgeoisie. This class, incidentally either has not yet emerged in many African countries, or it is very weak, while the proletariat is only beginning to shape. The leading political force in these countries is comprised of the revolutionary democratic strata including

progressive patriotic intellectuals, military men, etc. As often as not, they sincerely desire their countries to proceed along the non-capitalist way. Here programmes for "national socialism" are a kind of preparatory step towards the adoption of scientific socialism. The latter course is clearly prompted by the practical activity of the revolutionary democrats and their ties with world socialism.

Throughout the entire epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism, socialist countries' achievements in ensuring the best possible living conditions for people will continue to influence immensely the course of the world revolutionary process and the scope of mass revolutionary activity in all capitalist countries, highly developed or not. Many years ago, Lenin stressed the enormous significance of Soviet economic successes for the triumph of socialism in the world and, consequently, for the destinies of mankind. He said: "We are now exercising our main influence on the international revolution through our economic policy. . . . The struggle in this field has now become global. Once we solve this problem, we shall have certainly and finally won on an international scale."¹ It is not accidental that Communists of the countries of the socialist community regard it their supreme internationalist duty to carry out successfully the tasks of building socialism and communism and prove the superiority of socialism over capitalism by ensuring a maximum material comforts for man,

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 32, p. 437.

besides fully providing for his spiritual development. This aim is scientifically grounded and therefore feasible. The principal ways of achieving it have also been theoretically elaborated and tested in the USSR and other countries.

Some time ago, the Mao Tse-tung group also recognised the exemplary force of socialism and even attempted to provide "remarkable" models for the building of socialism. The "big leap" and "people's communes" were the outcome of an attempt to set a superb "Chinese example" of overcoming economic backwardness on the basis of social ownership. The attempt, which had nothing in common with a responsible Marxist-Leninist approach to building socialism and communism, had the most disconcerting results for its initiators. Certainly, an "example" of this kind is anything but inspiring. And while the Mao Tse-tung group is now trying to underrate the significance of socialist successes as an example for the world revolutionary forces, it is doing so to offset its own failures and blunders in the complex matter of building a new society. The same fact underlies the provocative clamour, raised in recent years, about the necessity of direct confrontations between socialism and imperialism and negation of the significant achievements of socialism and its impact on the further development of the world revolution except for the support given to the national-liberation movement. And though the Peking leaders keep repeating that all socialist countries except China forget their internationalist duty to this movement, facts refute this deliberate falsehood.

Shoulder to Shoulder

In creating its colonial system, world capitalism relied from the very start on its enormous material and technical superiority over the enslaved countries. With the help of well equipped armies, it ruthlessly suppressed all attempts on the part of colonial and dependent peoples to throw off the foreign yoke. Capitalist monopoly of modern weapons and their manufacture was for a long time a formidable obstacle in the way of the struggle of the oppressed for their freedom and independence. Notwithstanding fierce rivalry among themselves, the imperialist countries abstained in principle from supplying munitions to the fighting peoples, thus maintaining a kind of international colonialist solidarity. Representatives of national-liberation forces in quest of arms found themselves, as a rule, knocking in vain at the closed doors of European and American arsenals.

Young Soviet Russia was the first country to open its armoury to them. Later on other socialist countries, too, became an important source of weapons for peoples who rose to a fight against imperialism or had to defend their new-found independence.

In the early twenties, Soviet Russia materially aided the struggle of the young Turkish Republic against foreign interventionists by supplying it with weapons. In 1936-39, the Spanish people fighting the home reactionaries and Italian and German fascists received generous aid from the Soviet Union, which sent considerable supplies of weapons and military equipment to

the Republican Army, aside from the Soviet volunteers who fought at the Spanish front. The Soviet Union provided constant help to the Mongolian People's Republic to defend its independence from the Japanese aggressors. When a large Japanese army from occupied Manchuria (North East China) invaded Mongolian territory in the vicinity of the Khalkhin gol, it was repulsed in the spring and summer of 1939 by the common effort of Soviet and Mongolian troops, fighting valiantly shoulder to shoulder.

The Soviet Union always gave the Chinese people much moral and material support in their protracted revolutionary struggle. And though the present Chinese leaders now insist that the Chinese people relied completely on themselves in the revolution and national-liberation war, they can neither change nor efface historical facts.

In the mid-twenties, when various militarist cliques aided by Western powers tried to stifle the Chinese anti-imperialist anti-feudal revolution, the Soviet Union was the only state which helped to consolidate the Kwangchow (Canton) government, headed by Sun Yat-sen, the great Chinese revolutionary democrat. The Whampoo Military Academy to train officers for the national-revolutionary army was set up with the help of Soviet specialists and funds. Between June, 1924, and October, 1926, 4,258 officers graduated from the Academy, many of them Communists. In mid-1926, for example, there were about 700 Communists among Whampoo cadets. In those years, besides, a great number

of Chinese citizens, Communists and non-Communists, were trained at Soviet military schools. By the middle of 1926, the armed forces of the Kwangchow government, reorganised with the help of Soviet advisers, were strong enough to begin their "Northern March" in order to rout the militarists, who had entrenched themselves in Peking.

Along with sending advisers to the revolutionary armies, the USSR supplied China with a great amount of munitions. The first consignment was delivered to Kwangchow in October, 1924, a critical time for the Sun Yat-sen government when the counter-revolutionary revolt in Kwangtung Province was launched. By mid-1926 the USSR had supplied the Chinese revolutionary armies with tens of thousands of rifles, hundreds of machine-guns and other weapons, as well as a large amount of ammunition with the intention of considerably stepping up armaments deliveries to the national-liberation forces. However, due to Kuomintang treachery, the united national front in China broke down in April, 1927. The revolution suffered a defeat.

During the years of the Japanese invasion of China, which started in the summer of 1937, the Chinese people again found in the Soviet Union a staunch and reliable support. The Kuomintang government, which was left by the Western powers to fend for itself and obliged to do what it could to repel the aggressors, had to seek succour from the USSR. It was of great importance to establishing a united anti-Japanese front and bringing the civil war in China to an end. In turn, the existence of the united front allowed

the Communist Party and the Red Army of China to recover in a short time from the heavy blows they had sustained from Chiang Kai-shek in 1934-36.

In 1937-39—during the first and hardest period of the war against Japan—the Soviet Union was the only state to give effective aid and support to the Chinese people. As for the West, they were, as Assistant State Secretary Sumner Welles wrote in 1944, “compelled to accept the bitter truth that their traditional friends, at the moment of their greatest danger, limited their action to the enunciation of phrases of eloquent, but highly ineffective, sympathy.”¹ While the United States continued to supply military and strategic materials and armaments to Japan up to the outbreak of war in the Pacific in early December, 1941, the Soviet Union almost completely halted its trade with Japan during 1937-39. The British *News Chronicle* wrote on July 24, 1939, that of all the Great Powers, the Soviet Union alone was selling no war materials to Japan.² While practically halting all trade with Japan, the Soviet Union extended its economic contacts with China on, it must be said, highly advantageous terms for the latter.

In the initial period of the war China was granted considerable credits from the USSR for arms purchases. Arrangements for the first credit of 50 million dollars were made in a very short

time, and deliveries began in autumn, 1937, long before the official agreement was signed.¹ It was an unprecedented incidence in the history of relations between states. The weapons that China bought with the first credit were sufficient to equip over twenty divisions. In 1938-39, the Soviet Union granted China two more credits totalling 200 million dollars.

China's attempts to obtain credit from the West were in vain at that time. It was not until February, 1939, that the United States granted China a loan of 25 million dollars in exchange for deliveries of tung oil, a valuable strategic raw material. In March and August of the same year Britain granted China credits of slightly over three million pounds sterling. The rather limited financial aid of the West that was nearly two years late, was saddled with a high interest (of 4 to 6.5 per cent annually), and had to be repaid with such scarce goods as tin, wolframite, antimony, and tung oil.

As to Soviet credits, they were granted without delay, at no more than 3 per cent per annum, and were repayable mostly with China's export staples—tea, leather, wool, cotton, etc. The Soviet Union not infrequently accepted credit repayments from China at prices 30 to 50 per cent higher than the world market price, while the United States got materials in short supply at a discount of 25 per cent. According to Chinese historians, Soviet aid to China in the initial years of the war was five times the total

¹ Sumner Welles. *The Time for Decision*. N. Y.-Lnd. 1944. p. 280.

² *News Chronicle*, July 24, 1939.

¹ Peng Ming. *History of Chinese-Soviet Friendship*. Moscow, 1959, p. 209, Russ. Ed.

amount loaned by the United States and Great Britain. And even that was practically negated by the damage resulting from the trade between the United States and Japan, which bolstered the potential of the Japanese war industry. Japanese Army Major Tanaka Simamatsu wrote in the *Nippon Heron* magazine in 1940: "There is no denying that Japan owes its present existence to British and American aid. Was the petrol spent in the forty-odd bombings of Chungking not American? It would be safe to say that the entire Armed Forces of Japan have always depended on Great Britain and the United States."

Soviet supplies of munitions and war materiel reached China in a steady stream throughout 1937-39. During the first years of the war with Japan, China's air space was defended mainly by Soviet planes. The Soviet Union at that time gave China 885 first-rate fighters and bombers, that were superior to the Japanese. The planes that China bought from Britain for hard cash were no good for combat action. Until US lend-lease deliveries started to arrive in the summer of 1942, Chinese pilots flew Soviet fighters and bombers.

Besides weapons and materiel, the Soviet Union sent thousands of military advisers, instructors, pilots, drivers and other trained personnel to aid the Chinese people. Soviet people in China displayed great heroism on the battlefield and selflessly fulfilled their internationalist duty. Chinese historian Peng Ming wrote: "The appearance of Soviet volunteer pilots in China's

air space took the starch out of the Japanese pilots. Whereas earlier the Japanese bomber bases were some thirty miles away from the frontline, after the appearance of Soviet volunteer pilots the Japanese had to move their bases three to four hundred miles to the rear... The 'Air Samurai,' 'Four Air Kings,' 'Wakikodzu' and 'Sasebo' air squadrons, which the invaders thought invincible, were mercilessly routed one after another."¹

The Soviet Government vigorously defended the interests of the Chinese people in the international arena, urging collective action to curb Japanese aggression. Aside from military and financial support to China, the Soviet Union had to engage Japanese troops twice—at Lake Khasan in 1938, and in the vicinity of the Khalkhin gol in 1939—which gave considerable relief to the Chinese Armed Forces and did much to strengthen their confidence in victory over the aggressors.

Noting the immense value of Soviet aid Mao Tse-tung wrote in 1949: "If China wants independence she can never attain it without the aid of the socialist state and the international proletariat... In particular, aid from the Soviet Union is an absolutely indispensable condition for China's final victory in the war of resistance. Refuse Soviet aid and the revolution will fail."²

¹ Peng Ming. *History of Chinese-Soviet Friendship*. Moscow, 1959 p. 211, Russ Ed.

Mao Tse-tung. "On New Democracy". *Sel. Works*, Vol. 3. London, 1954 p 124.

When Germany invaded the Soviet Union in World War II, the latter could no longer continue its extensive, direct aid to China. But its indirect aid played a considerable role. Throughout the Second World War, the Soviet Union maintained up to forty divisions and a strong air and naval force on its Far-Eastern borders. According to Marshal Nieh Jung-chen, one of the better-known military leaders of People's China, by keeping at bay the million-strong Kwantung Army, called the "flower of the Emperor's army," the Soviet Union greatly diminished China's burden of the war with Japan.

The victory over German fascism, in which the Soviet people played a decisive role, also sealed the doom of the Japanese imperialists. The peoples of Asian countries occupied by Japanese troops, and most of all the Koreans and Chinese, who had long been under the heel of imperialist Japan, were looking forward to the day when the Soviet Union would declare war on Japan. Never will they forget that the Soviet people assumed the liberating mission in the Far East immediately after the bloodiest battles with Hitlerism, which carried away nearly two million Soviet lives. "...By entering Manchuria and completely routing and destroying the Kwantung Army, that bulwark of the Japanese imperialists, the Soviet Army forced the latter to capitulate,"—thus did Chu Te, the Commander-in-Chief of the People's Liberation Army of China, assessed the role of the USSR in the liberation of Northeast China and the routing of Japan.

The present attempts of the Mao Tse-tung group to minimise the significance of Soviet aid to China in its war of resistance are in flagrant contradiction to historical facts and their own previous statements. In connection with the 20th anniversary of the victory over Japan the Chinese press carried numerous articles distorting the circumstances which led to the defeat of Japanese imperialism. The magazine *Shijieh Zhishi*, in an article "People's War, People's Victory," asserts peremptorily that "this (anti-Japanese—*A. Ya.*) war, conducted without any outside aid, rested completely on our own efforts," and that "the 8th and 4th national revolutionary armies were the decisive force in achieving final victory over Japanese imperialism, while the Allies joined the war when the victory of the Chinese people was already near."¹ The newspaper *Kungjen Jihpao*, quite unabashed tried to impress on its readers that Northeast China (Manchuria) was liberated by the troops under the command of Lin Piao "in conjunction with the Northeast Joint Resistance Army" and "with the assistance of the Soviet Army."²

The struggle of the Chinese people, who had been resisting Japanese armies for more than eight years, was undeniably a great contribution to the defeat of militarist Japan. Much credit also belonged to the Allied Armies and guerrilla action by the peoples of Korea and countries of Southeast Asia. The mortal blow to Japanese imperialism was, nevertheless, dealt by the So-

¹ *Shijieh Zhishi*, No. 16, 1965.

² *Kungjen Jihpao*, August 21, 1965.

viet Army. Such is the historical truth which the Chinese leaders themselves acknowledged not so long ago. It was Mao Tse-tung himself who wrote on August 9, 1945, in connection with the Soviet Union's entry into the war with Japan, that "the time has come for us to defeat the Japanese invaders and all their jackals."¹ Chinese historians have always scored the decisive role of the USSR in the defeat of the Japanese militarists. In Peng Ming's *History of Chinese-Soviet Friendship* we read: "The Soviet Union's entry into the war with Japan was instrumental in the defeat of Japanese militarism. Until then for over three years British and US troops had been fighting in the Pacific without dealing a decisive blow to Japan."² The *History of the Contemporary Chinese Revolution*, published in Peking in 1958, states definitely: "Declaration of war on Japan by the Soviet Union in August, 1945, resulted in the liquidation of the hotbed of world aggression in the Far East."³

Current statements by Chinese leaders to the effect that the Chinese people defeated the Japanese invaders practically single-handed, without any outside aid, are intended to erase from people's minds all memories of their comradeship-in-arms with the Soviet people in the joint fight against a common enemy. Such statements reflect the Chinese leaders' desire to reduce the significance of international solidarity and stop

¹ Mao Tse-tung. *Sel. Works*. London, 1956, p. 331.

² Peng Ming. *History of Chinese-Soviet Friendship*. Moscow, 1959.

³ *History of the Contemporary Chinese Revolution*. Ed. by Ho Kan-hin. Moscow, 1959, p. 495, Russ. Ed.

co-operation between world socialism and the national-liberation movement. It is precisely because the Soviet Union was and continues to be a symbol of staunch adherence to internationalist duty in the eyes of all progressive-minded people that the Chinese leaders, consumed with an itch for hegemony, are ready to do anything to cast doubts on the past and present role of the Soviet country with respect to the world-liberation movement.

Defeat of the Japanese aggressors created favourable conditions for the development of the national-liberation movement in the Far East and Southeast Asia. The presence of Soviet troops in Northeast China was an important prerequisite of the further successful development of the anti-imperialist anti-feudal struggle of the Chinese people. Communist-led Chinese armies were able to shift part of their forces to that area and amply replenish their supplies with weapons captured by Soviet troops from the Japanese. By 1946, a strong Joint Army was formed in Northeast China. Having occupied Port Arthur and Dalny (Dairen) under an agreement with the Chinese Republican Government, the Soviet troops made it practically impossible for anti-revolutionary Chiang Kai-shek and American army units to effect a landing in Northeast China. At the terminal stage of the struggle for the establishment of the Chinese People's Republic, the Soviet Union rendered all-round direct and indirect aid to the Chinese revolutionary armies. The *History of the Contemporary Chinese Revolution* states: "The aid China received from the Soviet people proved indispensable for the

victory of China's war of resistance against Japan and the triumph of the Chinese revolution."¹

Of course the Mao Tse-tung group, obsessed by their anti-Soviet chauvinistic mania, can distort historical facts or forbid Soviet representatives and Chinese workers to lay wreaths on the common graves of Soviet soldiers who gave their lives for the liberation of the Chinese people, but they cannot erase the truth. History is written but once, and it is written by life itself.

During the twenty-odd years following the war, the Soviet Union has never turned a deaf ear to appeals for aid from the revolutionary forces of various countries. Soviet people gave extensive support to the Algerian revolution, which lasted for seven years. The Lebanese *Al-Akhbar* wrote that the Soviet Union had provided weapons and other aid for the revolution. "The USSR welcomed Algerian fighters, both soldiers and civilians," it stated. "Some of them were there to improve their military knowledge, others came to get an education, still others were being treated for wounds received in battle. All Arabs know it. They also know that immediately after independence the Algerian Army, equipped with Soviet-produced arms, advanced far inland." In his book *Algeria: A Revolution that failed. A Political History Since 1954*, which was published in 1966, Arslan Hunbaraci, a journalist of repute in the Arab world, observed that

¹ *History of the Contemporary Revolution*. Ed. by Ho Kan-chih. Moscow, 1959, p. 336.

the Algerian patriots had received material aid from many socialist countries, while Russia had become the major supplier of heavy weapons to the NLF. Speaking of the reasons for Egyptian people's victory over the aggressors in 1956, President Nasser remarked: "When the United States refused to supply us with weapons while Israel obtained any kind of arms from France, Russia agreed to provide us with arms and the oil we so badly needed."

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries gave support, weapons included, to the July 1958 revolution in Iraq, the revolution in the Yemen, the liberation struggle of the Congolese and other African peoples. The armies of many new independent states taking a resolute anti-imperialist stand are fitted out mainly with weapons and other materiel supplied by the USSR and other socialist countries. The up-to-date weapons provided by the fraternal socialist countries to the Vietnamese people multiply Vietnam's strength and enable it to withstand the aggressors and blast their hopes for military victory. The time is past when the imperialists, with their far better equipped armies, found it comparatively easy to suppress national-liberation movement. The socialist world today has a sufficiently high industrial potential to be able to support the fighting peoples by every means, including arms.

Such support in no way implies "export of revolution" which imperialist propaganda has been harping on for half a century now and which is, demanded in fact, by leftist elements in the world-liberation movement. Marxist-Le-

ninists have always firmly opposed the harmful idea of "spurring on" and "forcing" revolution in other countries. Social revolution is not to be imposed by some external force. It breaks out when certain profound internal and international contradictions inherent in capitalism come to a head. It is carried out by the working class and masses of each individual country. Marxist-Leninists have always believed that attempts from without to impose the socialist system on a people can only breed animosity between peoples and retard the development of revolutionary consciousness.

While they flatly reject the harmful, utopian idea that revolution can be exported and condemn the attempts at "spurring on" revolutionary processes from the outside, Marxist-Leninists consider it their duty to give every aid to those who break their fetters and remove obstacles to progress. They consider it their internationalist duty to rebuff imperialist interference in the domestic affairs of any sovereign nation and thwart all attempts to halt the march of history by exporting counter-revolution.

World Socialism, an Obstacle to the Export of Counter-Revolution

As socialist and national-liberation revolutions deal blow after blow on world imperialism, the latter strives frantically to retard the revolutionary transformation of human society by winning back at least some of the positions it has lost to

the international proletariat. The use of armed force, that is export of counter-revolution, figures prominently among the means employed to that end. The crusade of fourteen powers against young Soviet Russia, invasion of the Soviet Union by the Hitlerite hordes, the Korean war, the aggression against Cuba, the current US war in Vietnam are cases in point. In its desire to reverse history world imperialism has been warring persistently with the national-liberation movements of colonial and dependent peoples. As time goes on, however, the imperialists find their opportunities to export counter-revolution are diminishing in direct proportion to the growth of the economic and defence potential of the world socialist system, the growing might and cohesion of the developing countries themselves and extension of mutual aid between them and the socialist community.

The memory is still fresh of how vigorous action by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries helped prevent or curb imperialist aggression in Asia, Africa and Latin America. It is well known that the Suez adventure undertaken by French, British and Israeli imperialists in 1956, the imminent aggression against Syria, in 1957, etc., failed mainly because of the determined attitude of the Soviet Government, which made it plain at the time of the Suez crisis that it was prepared to use force, if necessary, to crush the aggressors and restore peace in the Middle East.

All remember the autumn of 1962, when the Soviet Union frustrated a fresh attempt by US imperialism to wipe out the first socialist country

in the Western hemisphere. Commenting on the role of the Soviet Union in the Caribbean crisis Fidel Castro commended its readiness to place on the scales of thermonuclear war all the benefits attained in 45 years of dedicated effort at the cost of tremendous sacrifices, for the sake of a small nation thousands of miles away. The Soviet Union, which lost more lives during the Second World War against the fascists than the entire population of Cuba, did not hesitate to take the risk of war to shield a small country, he said. It was an example of solidarity unparalleled in history.

Soviet moral and political support and material aid to the Vietnamese people immeasurably enhances their resistance to US aggression and guarantees their final victory.

Tensions in the Middle East caused by Israel's hostilities against the UAR, Syria and Jordan in the summer of 1967, led the Soviet Union and European socialist countries to issue a joint declaration in defence of the Arab countries, and subsequently break off relations with Israel. Cessation of hostilities in the Middle East was largely due to their prompt, resolute action. It also served to build up the positions of the united Arab front against the aggressor and its imperialist abettors.

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries demanded that Israel should withdraw its troops from occupied areas and make good the damage it had inflicted. On the initiative of the USSR, a session of the UN General Assembly was called to discuss the situation in the Middle East, where important resolutions aimed at settling

the issue were adopted.

During the crisis—which confirmed once again the imperative need for unity of the anti-imperialist forces—the Mao Tse-tung group engaged in an extensive mudslinging campaign against the USSR and other socialist countries in order to shatter the confidence of the Arab peoples in the socialist community and split the forces of national liberation and world socialism. Once again, Peking proved that its false revolutionism was grist to the imperialist mill; that to ingratiate themselves with the peoples of the “third world” and to direct their revolutionary struggle, the Chinese splitters were ready to betray the interests of the world anti-imperialist movement.

Sabre-rattling and armed aggression are not the only means imperialism has long since employed to quench revolutionary movements. It has often tried to re-establish its domination over recently independent countries by creating economic difficulties likely to aid the home reactionaries. A case in point are attempts to nullify the revolutionary achievements of the UAR, Guinea, Cuba by applying economic sanctions. But economic war, like other means of pressure on fighting peoples, is not as effective now as it used to be. The USSR and other socialist countries purchased cotton from the UAR and delivered the goods needed by the Republic. The USSR took part in financing the Aswan High Dam project and provided technical aid during its construction. Expectations that the difficulties attending the construction of the highly important Aswan project would affect Egypt's anti-

imperialist attitude, remained a pipe dream of Western monopolies. When France stopped all aid to Guinea in retaliation for refusing to join the so-called French Commonwealth, the USSR made big purchases from Guinea and supplied financial and technical aid. The socialist countries frustrated the economic blockade of Cuba. They bought Cuba's sugar, supplied Cuba with various foodstuffs and manufactured goods and provided financial and technical aid.

Another important safeguard against the export of counter-revolution was the socialist countries' sanctioning of new moral and legal principles on the international scene, thereby enhancing the sovereign rights of the young nations. Life has proved the correctness of Lenin's statement that the Bolsheviks establish completely different international relations which make it possible for all oppressed peoples to rid themselves of the imperialist yoke.¹

One of the first acts of Soviet Russia was to condemn colonialism as a flagrant violation of man's rights, as trampling upon the peoples' sovereignty, upon their right to free self-determination and independent statehood. Having denounced the inequitable treaties between tsarist Russia and Eastern countries, the socialist state dealt a crushing blow to the imperialist moral code justifying domination by brute force in international relations.

It required a long, determined struggle on the part of the socialist countries and emerging nations to win recognition of the right to self-deter-

mination of peoples as a principle of present day international law and to make colonialism universally abhorred. A draft Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples was worked out on the initiative of the USSR and submitted by 43 Asian and African countries for discussion at the 15th UN General Assembly Session in 1960. 89 delegations voted for the draft, while nine—the United States and other colonial powers—abstained. On the insistence of the USSR and other socialist and developing countries, the 16th Session of the General Assembly, convened in 1961, resolved that the Declaration provisions be implemented in the shortest possible time.

The struggle for international legal safeguards against aggression and imperialist export of counter-revolution has, in recent years, resulted in greater organisational unity of socialist and national-liberation forces. Socialist countries are taking an active part in the Afro-Asian solidarity movement, the movement of non-aligned countries, and the solidarity movement of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, all of which advocate the sanctioning of new norms of international law advanced by socialist countries. The Three-Continent Solidarity Conference, held in Havana in early 1966, was highly indicative in this respect. It promulgated the following principles: the right to national control of basic resources, nationalisation of banks and enterprises of vital significance, state control of home trade and exchange operations, extension of the state economic sector, reconsideration and repudiation of unauthorised debts imposed on the developing

V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 477.

nations. These principles help to institute in international practice the proposition advanced by the October Revolution regarding the invalidity of onerous treaties.

In a statement published in May, 1961, the Soviet Government called on all states and peoples to force Portugal to end its brigand colonial war in Angola and abide by the provisions of the UN Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The Statement implied that a recalcitrant colonial power should be treated as an aggressor and its victim should be entitled to unrestricted external aid. This stand was widely supported by the Three-Continent Solidarity Conference and also by most countries of the world. The Cairo Conference of Non-Aligned States called on the participating countries to assist the work of the Special Bureau set up by the Organisation of African Unity for the purpose of applying sanctions against Portugal, to cease all diplomatic relations and consular service and take effective measures for halting all trade and economic relations with Portugal in order to force it to comply with the General Assembly decision on granting freedom to colonies. The Three-Continent Conference declared the right of Asian, African and Latin American peoples and all progressive states and governments to give moral and material support to the peoples fighting for their liberation or suffering direct or indirect acts of aggression by imperialist powers.

Universal condemnation of colonialism, resulting from the firm stand of the socialist countries and the victories of the national-liberation move-

ment, consolidates the anti-imperialist forces, encourages peoples to defend their sovereign rights and compels imperialism to manoeuvre and yield ground. It is amply proved by the "willingness" on the part of colonial powers to restore sovereignty to peoples. Imperialism also had to resign itself to the loss of Daman, Goa and Diu on the territory of India and West Irian in Indonesia owing to the resolute action of those countries.

Therefore, greater economic and military might of the socialist world and its stronger unity and solidarity with the developing countries and all anti-imperialist forces ensures reliable and effective guarantees against continuing imperialist aggression and the export of counter-revolution.

In this light the dissentient activities of the Mao Tse-tung group appear frankly egotistic and treacherous. And though Mao Tse-tung and his supporters keep boasting of their own loyalty to internationalism, they cannot conceal the fact that at certain critical moments for the destinies of the world revolution and all mankind the Mao group betrayed the interests of the international proletariat and anti-imperialist struggle.

The Chinese splitters raised a good deal of fuss about what they called the adventurist and defeatist position of the USSR with respect to the Caribbean crisis. Nothing, however, can obliterate the plain truth that Cuba was saved from a fresh invasion by efficient Soviet aid, not by Peking's hysterical denunciation of US-imperialists. This aid was highly appreciated by the Cuban people and their government. Today, at the time of the most dramatic confrontation between the forces of socialism and national liberation and the

forces of imperialism, the Mao Tse-tung group is, in fact, again encouraging the aggressors. By refusing to join hands with the other socialist countries in aiding the struggle of the Vietnamese people the Mao Tse-tung group does incalculably more harm than good its aid could do.

As in the days of the Caribbean crisis, the Mao Tse-tung group is sullyng the efforts of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries to beat off US imperialist aggression. The Peking splitters are not the least disconcerted by the fact that the leaders of the DRV and South Vietnam National Liberation Front highly evaluate Soviet aid.

However paradoxical it may seem at first sight, this actual complicity in imperialist ventures is a natural consequence of the "ultra-left" attitude of Mao Tse-tung and his group who are assiduously advocating the adventuristic Trotskyist idea that the socialist world should be active in "spurring on" revolution in other countries. From advocating this non-Marxist-Leninist theory of the "export of revolution," Mao Tse-tung and his group have sunk to unmitigated connivance at the export of counter-revolution.

That is how those who are truly dedicated to the cause of anti-imperialist struggle see the present position of Peking. When speaking at the 18th Congress of the French Communist Party in January, 1967, Jacques Duclos declared: "The dissentionist policy pursued by the CPC leadership accords, in fact, with the interests of imperialist reaction." Manuel Candero, a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Chile, said: "The Peking leading group has

substituted bourgeois nationalism for proletarian internationalism and replaced anti-imperialism by anti-Sovietism." Alejandro Idrovó, a leader of the Communist Party of Ecuador, said in a press interview: "Chinese leaders are pursuing a policy of splitting the Communist Parties of the world thereby causing grave harm to the popular national-liberation movement, especially in Latin America." In a February 17, 1967 editorial, the Lebanese *An-Nida* wrote that in pursuing its anti-Soviet policy the Mao Tse-tung group "had fallen in with the interests of American imperialism," that the policy "was causing enormous harm to peoples' national-liberation struggle and above all to the struggle of the Vietnamese people." After observing that China had rejected repeated Soviet proposals for joint discussion with a view to co-ordinating aid to Vietnam, the Swedish weekly *Ny Dag* emphasised: "One cannot help thinking that these refusals were prompted by anything but concern for the interests of the struggling Vietnamese people."

The Vietnam war has been going on long enough to ascertain the attitude of different countries to the heroic Vietnamese people. That is why Peking's shabby attempts to impugn the irreproachable conduct of the Soviet Union look ridiculous. The Soviet country is steadfastly working to establish the broadest international unity—which should include China too—in order to curb the US imperialist aggression in Vietnam, giving the Vietnamese all the aid they now need. The objective reality of this fact is not to be changed or denied by any amount of abuse from the Peking double-dealers.

The Socialist World and the Emerging Countries' Bid for Economic Independence

Under the blows of the world-wide liberation movement colonialism of old collapsed for all time. With the collapse of its system of direct military-political domination of a handful of imperialist powers over the larger part of the globe, there began a new stage in the national-liberation movement. The principal aim of the emerging countries at this stage is to achieve economic independence, build a self-reliant economy and overcome the economic and cultural lag in their development. Their political independence is, of course, an indispensable condition for solving these tasks.

In other words, at the present stage the anti-imperialist struggle of the newly free countries continues but its stress is shifting to the economy. That, however, does not preclude political and ideological struggle of imperialist powers. Moreover, it is widely known that the imperialists would resort to open military pressure to achieve their neo-colonialist ends. Therefore at the new stage of the national-liberation movement armed opposition to imperialist aggressors is unavoidable. Nevertheless, the drive for economic and cultural progress and economic independence from the imperialists is the principal feature of the young nations' activities at this stage.

The Mao Tse-tung group, however, has its own opinion on this point too. According to the Pek-

ing theorists, the new stage of the national-liberation movement differs little from the previous one. They assert: "It is important for the newly independent countries to develop their independent economy. But this must never be separated from the struggle against imperialism, old and new colonialism, and their lackeys."¹ But who, one may ask, thinks differently? Whom do the Chinese leaders seek to enlighten by expounding such well-known truths? Strange as it may seem, they have in mind the world communist movement and the CPSU in the first place. As bold as brass, the Chinese leaders ascribe some preposterous view or other to them and then raise a hue and cry against it. They assert, for example: "According to this theory of theirs (of the CPSU leaders—*A. Ya.*), the fight against imperialism, old and new colonialism, and their lackeys, is of course, no longer necessary, for colonialism is disappearing and economic development has become the central task of the national-liberation movement. Does it not follow that the national-liberation movement can be done away with altogether?"²

Such inventions, however appealing to Peking, do not disprove the Marxist-Leninist view of the national-liberation movement, for this realistic, scientifically-substantiated view reflects accurately the actual vital interests of former colonial and semi-colonial peoples at the current stage of their anti-imperialist struggle.

¹ "Apologists of Neo-Colonialism." *The Polemic on the General Line of the International Communist Movement*. Peking, 1965, p. 192.

² *Ibid.*, p. 192.

It is no secret that many new states are one or two hundred years behind the industrial countries. In the early sixties the developing countries' share of total capitalist output did not exceed 13.1 per cent. These countries are still being drained by the imperialists. About a sixth of their aggregate national income finds its way into the coffers of the monopolies and banks of advanced capitalist countries as profit on foreign investments, proceeds of non-equivalent exchange and through other channels. Per capita national income in the developing countries is much lower than in the United States and Western Europe. In 1961, it amounted to \$425 in Latin America, \$257 in the Middle East, \$164 in Africa, \$154 in South and Southwest Asia against \$1,427 in Western Europe and \$2,790 in the USA.

The peasants, who make up the bulk of the population of the third world, want land. Agrarian reforms effected in many developing countries have not solved the problem, nor have they ousted feudal relationships. Three-quarters of Indian peasants have practically no land of their own. In Latin America, 70 per cent of the peasants own no land. It should also be pointed out that under prevailing social and economic conditions agricultural production in Asia, Africa and Latin America is unable to keep pace with the needs of the growing population. From 1939 to 1965, per capita food production dropped by 2.8 per cent in the poorly developed countries of South and Southeast Asia, by 4 per cent in Africa and by 5.7 per cent in Latin America.

Poverty and starvation are unailing compani-

ons of Asian, African and Latin American peoples. According to UN data, no less than 500 million in the world subsist at starvation level, and twice as many are chronically undernourished. The third world accounts for the bulk of these. Poverty, hunger and disease are the reasons why life expectancy in these areas of the globe, most heavily populated, is from 50 to 100 per cent less than in the advanced countries.

Mass unemployment is a characteristic feature of the situation in Asia, Africa and Latin America, though in recent decades the number of wage earners has notably increased there. Millions of peasants leave for towns, where they hope to make enough to keep body and soul together. But neither industry nor construction is developing fast enough to provide all the jobs that are needed. Economists have estimated the number of unemployed in poorly developed countries to be 200-250 million. Thus up to a quarter or even a third of the able-bodied population is out of work.

Low cultural standards are as much a legacy of colonialism as economic backwardness and poverty. As recently as the mid-fifties over 80 per cent of all adult Africans could neither read nor write. In Latin America over 40 per cent of the people over 15 were illiterate and in Asia the proportion was 50 per cent.

To overcome backwardness, economic growth rates in a developing country must roughly approximate the increase in the aggregate national product. In such countries, however, the latter tends to drop. While in 1950-55 the annual in-

crease in the national product averaged 4.9 per cent, in 1955-59 it dropped to 4.5 per cent and in 1960-63 to 4 per cent. As a result, instead of narrowing, the gap between the developing and developed countries becomes still wider. In terms of per capita production this gap is even more significant, since the birth-rate in the developing countries is twice that of the rest of the world. At the 1955-60 economic growth rate, the gap between the old capitalist countries and the third world countries in per capita production of the gross national product will have reached, by the year 2000, a ratio of 16 to 1. At the 1960-63 rate it will amount to 20 to 1. At the current rate, it will take the former colonies and semi-colonies some 150 or more years to reach the present level of the advanced capitalist countries. Certainly, the latter will not stand still, they will advance far ahead. To catch up with the gross per capita output, the poorly developed countries should step up their industrial growth rates to 14-15 times the present rate.

All this shows the considerable difficulties the emerging nations will have to surmount to rid themselves of the imperialist yoke and ensure an economic and cultural upsurge.

The attitude of world socialism with regard to the development of the emerging nations has always been clear and consistent, to give them every possible support, to promote their progress. Directly after the October Revolution, the Soviet Union began to supply economic, cultural and technological aid to neighbouring states in the East. With the assistance of Soviet funds and specialists, industrial enterprises and modern

highways were built, a network of cultural and educational centres established, veterinary service and agricultural pest control was introduced in Mongolia and Western China. The Soviet Union rendered economic and technical assistance to Turkey, Afghanistan and Iran. It developed mutually advantageous, equal trade with all countries. The trade policy of the Soviet Union with respect to its eastern neighbours was impairing the system of onerous agreements established by the colonial powers.

After the revolutions in China, North Korea and North Vietnam, the Soviet Union and European socialist countries did everything to help them rehabilitate and develop their economies. Because of the existence of the socialist system, these countries had no need to fear an economic blockade. To quote the example of People's China, by 1957 the socialist camp accounted for 77.9 per cent of its foreign trade. China's main imports from the Soviet Union and European countries consisted of machinery and capital goods, mostly complete plant. Soviet plant and materials were supplied at 20-30 per cent less than the prices charged by the United States and Great Britain, and Soviet prices of heavy industry plant, especially needed by China, were 30 to 60 per cent less. During China's first five-year plan (1953-57), the USSR helped to build 166 major enterprises, including three metallurgical complexes, 21 shops, 27 power stations, 27 coal mines, several engineering plants, and various non-ferrous metal, chemical, oil-processing, radio- and electrical-engineering enterprises. As Chinese leaders themselves pointed out,

the projects built with Soviet aid during the first five-year plan "formed the backbone of China's industry." Other socialist countries helped China to construct and commission 27 industrial projects by the end of 1957.

In the space of some seven or eight years the Soviet Union helped China to build over 200 major modern-equipped industrial enterprises, shops and other projects and set up such vital industries as motorcar and aircraft construction, power engineering, heavy and precision engineering, instrument-making, radio engineering and various chemical industries. The Soviet-built munition factories became the basis for the development of the Chinese defence industry.

Aside from that, before 1961 the Soviet Union had granted China long-term credits totalling 1,816 million roubles, or more than half the total Soviet credits to developing countries from 1955 to 1965. The credits were granted on terms advantageous to China.

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries significantly promoted China's industrial, technical and scientific progress by training Chinese engineers and scientists and providing China with technical documentation. In 1951-62, there were over 11,000 Chinese under- and post-graduate students at Soviet colleges, while over 10,000 Chinese engineers, technicians and workers and about a thousand scientists were given opportunities for training and practical work at Soviet enterprises and research centres. From 1954 to 1963, the USSR handed over to China—practically gratis—more than 24,000 research and development files, including blueprints for 1,400 indus-

trial projects. These documents embodied the valuable experience of the Soviet people, its scientific and technical specialists.

With the failure of the "big leap" and "people's communes" policy and the sharp change in the policy of the Chinese leaders, the rapid economic development of People's China was halted. Animosity towards the USSR and other socialist countries which did not share the views of the Mao Tse-tung group became typical of the new course adopted by the Chinese People's Republic. In 1960-64, the Chinese leadership committed a series of provocative acts which thoroughly marred China's relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

The Soviet Government, falsely accused by Chinese propaganda of curtailing economic relations with People's China, continued, even after 1960, to fulfil obligations incurred in the agreements with China. It did so despite the snowballing anti-Soviet campaign. In 1963-64, the Soviet Union was assisting China with the construction of some 80 industrial projects, some of them in the defence industry, and continued to teach Chinese technologists and researchers. Chinese students and post-graduates studied at Soviet colleges until 1966. When China had a food crisis in 1961, the Soviet Union, out of friendship for the Chinese people, loaned China 300,000 tons of grain and flour and 500,000 tons of sugar besides postponing payments on China's outstanding debts.

For several years after 1960, the Soviet Government continually made constructive proposals concerning the development of economic links

with China and, incidentally, three times renewed its offer to send Soviet personnel to China again provided they were guaranteed normal conditions for work.

These steps met with no response from the Chinese leaders. They prefer to pick holes in Soviet aid, for all its sterling quality and the contribution to China's economic independence. What is more, they now allege in Peking that Soviet aid to developing countries "harms the economic and political interests of the recipient countries."¹ Still, it is not so long ago that the Chinese leaders viewed Soviet aid and that of other socialist countries as a major factor in overcoming the country's backwardness. It was Mao Tse-tung himself who, speaking at the 8th CPC Congress in 1956, about China's success in building a new life, said: "On an international scale we owe our victories to the support of the camp of peace, democracy and socialism led by the Soviet Union and to the profound sympathies of the peace-loving peoples the world over."² Also at the 8th Congress, Chou En-lai said: "...Both in rehabilitating our economy and implementing the first five-year Economic Development Plan we received, in every sphere, immense and sincere aid from the Soviet Union and considerable aid from the fraternal countries. This aid helped us to surmount many of our difficulties and enabled our country to advance the cause of building socia-

¹ *Apologists of Neo-Colonialism*. Peking, 1965, pp. 194-195.

² *Materials of the 8th All-China Congress of the Communist Party of China*. Moscow, 1956, p. 4, Russ. Ed.

lism at a rather rapid rate".¹ And if now Mao Tse-tung and his disciples say entirely different things, let it be on their conscience.

The socialist countries will continue to utilise every means and opportunity they have to facilitate, directly and indirectly, the developing countries' efforts to win economic independence and overcome social, economic and cultural backwardness. This attitude springs from the very essence of socialism, from the character of the current stage of the national-liberation movement, and from the interests of the anti-imperialist struggle.

Having lost in principle the possibility of direct military and political domination over the countries of the third world, the imperialists have now taken to more sophisticated and flexible methods of exploiting the peoples of poorly developed countries. They look to neo-colonialism to help them preserve their old positions and secure new ones. They hope to extend their social base in these countries by winning over the national bourgeoisie and installing acquiescent military-bureaucratic regimes.

Today, as before, the imperialists try to prevent the industrial development of the emerging states. The old-time colonialists used to say: "Industry is the enemy of colonisation." The neo-colonialists believe the same. The widely publicised programmes of Western aid to the third world are not meant to facilitate the economic progress of newly free peoples. On the

¹ *Materials of the 8th All-China Congress of the Communist Party of China*. Moscow, 1956, p. 4, Russ. Ed.

contrary, their aim is to make the new national states continue indefinitely as agrarian and raw material appendages of advanced capitalist countries. The West is in no hurry to accelerate the economic progress of former colonies. Compared with the actual possibilities of the West, its aid to the developing countries is relatively meagre, not exceeding, in fact, 0.69 per cent of the national income of the capitalist countries of North America and Europe, which, when all is said and done, owe the developing countries an enormous debt, for have they not battered upon centuries on colonial plunder?

The true implications of Western "aid" have long ceased to be a secret to many progressive leaders in the national-liberation movement. As early as 1960, H. D. Malavia, Secretary of the Permanent Secretariat of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee, said at the Second Conference of that organisation in Conakry: "This sudden desire of the West to aid the poorly developed countries is certainly a very remarkable thing. What it actually means is that the capitalists would like to work out a joint line of action in view of the imminent threat to the economic control of wealthy territories by the West. The object of their aid programme is evidently to make the African and Asian countries continue mainly as agrarian producers of raw material and prevent us from industrialising."¹ After the passage of five years the purposes of Western aid have become manifest enough to have prompted the influential

¹ *2nd Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference. Materials and Documents.* Moscow, 1961, p. 150, Russ. Ed.

Egyptian *Al-Gomhouria* to observe: "The capitalist countries consider aid to the developing countries merely as a means of increasing their own wealth. A brief glance at the economy of our country is enough to make one see that the money contributed by the capitalist countries has done nothing to further the completion of modern industrial projects in our country, despite the promulgation of special laws to encourage their completion or the granting of all kinds of privileges and guarantees. So the money contributed by the West, as our experience testifies, does not actually help us to progress economically." "Aid" proved a very profitable business for the West. From 1946 to 1959, every dollar invested by the United States in the developing countries yielded 2.5 dollars in profit.

The developing countries today are in dire need of outside economic aid to enable them to secure genuine economic independence, eliminate the economic and cultural gap and to frustrate neo-colonialist imperialist designs. That is precisely the kind of aid they get from the socialist countries, whose all-round cooperation with the recently independent countries embodies Lenin's precept that the victorious proletariat should render "disinterested cultural assistance" to countries whose development was retarded by imperialist oppression in order to facilitate their transition "to the use of machinery, to the lightening of labour, to democracy, to socialism."¹

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 23, p. 67.

The Peking leaders, however, choose to underrate the importance of international revolutionary solidarity; they keep talking about "self-reliance," which in truth can only slow down and even increase the relative lag in the development of new states. The Chinese leaders refer to the experience of People's China to justify this approach. But China's isolation from the socialist camp succeeded only in making its economy mark time for some years in many respects never exceeding the 1957 level. If this is not conclusive enough proof of the erroneous policy of "self-reliance," what is?

The surest way for the emerging nations to overcome their age-old backwardness is not through isolation from the socialist states but through all-round cooperation with them. Exercising a realistic approach to the favourable opportunities provided by the existence of the socialist camp, many young states have chosen precisely that way.

The economic cooperation between the USSR and other socialist countries and the new independent states, including various kinds of aid, proceeds along the following lines:

—it is based on the principles of equality and mutual advantage (certainly not in a mercenary sense), due respect of national sovereignty and non-interference in one another's home affairs;

—it precludes any terms incompatible with the national dignity and interests of the parties concerned;

—it proceeds from the belief that progress can be ensured above all by the developing countries' own efforts and resources while external

aid and assistance are a supplementary factor; —it promotes first of all the establishment of the basis of industry, the most rapid growth of the economic potential of the newly free countries and helps to meet certain economic needs of the socialist countries;

—it is adjusted to the plans of local governments for promoting the state sector as a major means of securing economic independence and setting up a modern economy.

Many-sided cooperation between the socialist and developing countries is an important aspect of the economic links between these countries. Repayment of loans and credits, granted on easy terms, is effected mainly by traditional exports of the developing countries. Construction of industrial and other projects with the aid of socialist countries is carried out with the maximum participation of local economic bodies, enabling them to gain first-hand experience and arranging for the training of national personnel. Aside from all this, socialist aid differs fundamentally in that it is a part of the national income attained by the efforts of the peoples of the socialist countries, while imperialist "aid" is a part of the profits they have amassed from the efforts of the recipient peoples themselves.

The socialist world currently provides economic and technical assistance to 28 Asian and African countries for the construction of 1,300 projects, half of them industrial. The USSR undertook to help construct 600 industrial and other projects, including 34 iron and steel works, over 30 engineering and metal-working factories, 20 power stations, 20 chemical plants, more than

a hundred educational, health and scientific research centres, etc. Of these, 180 are already in operation. By 1965, the socialist countries had granted the developing countries for these and other purposes about 4.4 thousand million roubles in long-term credits, including 3.5 thousand million roubles from the USSR. The credits are repayable over 12-30 years at 2-2.5 per cent interest compared with the usual 5-7 per cent charged by the imperialist powers. In many developing countries socialist credits account for a considerable portion of capital outlay over lengthy periods. For example, Soviet credits were responsible for roughly 50 per cent of capital investments under Afghanistan's 1962-67 economic five-year plan; 12 per cent of total investments in industry under India's third five-year plan (1961-65); and about 20 per cent of total capital expenditure in Mali under its 1961-65 economic development plan.

Socialist community countries contribute materially to the training of professionals among the native population. Educational centres like the Patrice Lumumba University in Moscow, November 17 University in Czechoslovakia, the Heckert Trade Union Institute and Karl Marx University in the GDR, etc., have been set up especially for the purpose. The number of specialists trained for the developing countries is increasing year by year. In 1966 over 10,000 students from more than 80 African, Asian and Latin American states were receiving an education in the USSR alone, compared with 4,000 in 1960. Assistance given locally is also steadily increasing. The number of Soviet teachers, doc-

tors and other specialists in 28 Asian and African countries increased fourfold between 1961 and 1965. Industrial and other projects constructed there with the assistance of socialist states were at the same time training centres for skilled workers. In this way 15,000 skilled workers were trained in India, over 8,000 in the UAR, about 30,000 in Afghanistan. The total of skilled workers trained this way in Asian and African countries amounts to about 100,000.

The list of agreed upon projects and the terms of cooperation are in themselves convincing evidence of the sincere and disinterested desire of the socialist world to further overall progress of the new states and help them free themselves of economic dependence on imperialism and defeat neo-colonialism. The number of developing countries which have economic and technological cooperation agreements with socialist states is rapidly growing. Whereas in 1955 the Soviet Union had such agreements with only two Asian countries, it now concluded agreements with 31 Asian and African countries.

The easy terms, the growing scale of socialist aid and high technological standards compel the capitalist countries to make concessions to the young states. The imperialist powers now have to agree to assist the developing countries not only in building up the light industries, transport and communication but also in constructing heavy industry projects, though previously they had persistently refused to grant credits for them. The imperialists also have to revise the terms of their financial aid, reducing the interest on loans and prolonging repayment.

Trade is a highly important sphere of struggle against neo-colonialism. The imperialists try in every way to recoup their "losses" being unable any longer to plunder the third-world countries outright by monopolising trade. By 1961 the EEC members accounted for 65 per cent of total exports of the Associated African countries against 49 per cent only a short time before.

As long as the imperialist powers have a monopoly of trade with the developing countries, the latter will be unable to ensure their economic independence. The way for the emerging nations to get around this is by extending trade with the socialist countries and stepping up trade among themselves. In 1959-63, the developing countries increased their own trade turnover from 5.2 to 6.6 thousand million dollars. Their turnover with the Soviet Union increased almost sixfold from 1955 to 1965. The USSR proposes to extend its trade with this group of countries first of all by stepping up deliveries of machine-tools and other capital goods needed to establish their national economy and by buying more of their farm produce, raw material and manufactured goods.

The USSR is currently trading with 60 developing countries compared with 29 in 1960. Other socialist countries are also extending their trade with Asian, African and Latin American countries.

The developing countries which resolutely introduced state monopoly of foreign trade have been the most successful in counteracting the domination of foreign capital in trade. In trading with the developing countries the socialist coun-

tries make it easier for them to establish complete control over their foreign trade and prevent the imperialists from using it as a means of neo-colonialist plunder.

The socialist world was the first to insist on ensuring favourable conditions for the developing countries in world trade. In 1962, the Soviet Union suggested that a UN conference be called to discuss trade and development. The proposal was widely supported and in 1964 the UN Trade and Development Conference was held in Geneva. The Soviet Union, together with other socialist countries insisted at the conference that steps be taken to improve the position of the developing countries in the world market. The Soviet Union declared at that time that it was in a position to increase its commodity turnover with the developing countries seven- or eightfold by 1980 compared with 1963. In keeping with the conference decisions, the USSR in early 1966, removed customs duties on goods imported from the developing countries.

For all their fine sounding declarations, the imperialist powers have done nothing substantial to facilitate the import of goods from developing countries. The so-called programme of action adopted in 1963 by GATT (the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, in which many capitalist states took part) providing certain concessions to the third world has not been carried out to this day.

The West is firmly opposed to the establishment of stable prices for raw materials and farm products from the poorly developed countries. The prices of these commodities have been fal-

ling over a long period while the prices of manufactured goods from the advanced capitalist countries have been rising. From 1950 to 1962, the price of a ton of European exports grew on the average by 19 per cent while African exports dropped by 4 per cent. It has been estimated that a 5 per cent decrease in the price of raw materials exported from the developing countries represents an annual loss of up to a thousand million dollars.

The conditions in world trade will certainly be changing for the better as far as the developing countries are concerned. Both they and the countries of the world socialist system are working towards this end. The capitalist monopolies will have to reckon with it. The tendency for liberating the young states from the fetters of economic oppression is a progressive tendency, and therefore is invincible. It is invincible because the forces of socialism and national liberation are growing and gaining strength. And the closer their unity and cohesion become, the more powerful their impact on imperialism will be. Economic and cultural cooperation between the socialist states and the developing countries, their effective support of the freedom-loving peoples' struggle against neo-colonialism are the major forms of the cooperation of these two strongest revolutionary, anti-imperialist forces at the present stage. This is, above all, what Marxist-Leninists regard as fulfilment by the socialist countries of their internationalist duty to the emerging nations and the national-liberation movement of our times.

The Mao Tse-tung group, who claim to be

the only sincere friends of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples, tried at one time to persuade the developed socialist countries to reduce to a minimum their aid to the young independent nations and use their available resources instead to build up the economic and military might of the less developed members of the socialist community, China in the first place. This attitude, which ignores the interests of the anti-imperialist front as a whole, including the interests of the peoples of the third world, who have to strain every effort to rid themselves of the political and economic oppression by world imperialism, was firmly rejected. While they give full attention to the strengthening of the socialist system—the main anti-imperialist force—the Communists, being internationalists, have never thought it possible to postpone aid to the national-liberation movement. Reality, the fifty-year record of socialism and its struggle against world imperialism have borne out the correctness of this internationalist line. The international working class and its offspring, the world socialist system, shall continue this policy regardless of all obstruction.

Socialism or Capitalism?

The enormous complexity and difficulty of the tasks involved in doing away with the legacies of colonialism has faced the emerging countries with the vital question of deciding the ways of their social and economic development. In the present epoch of the world-wide struggle be-

tween socialism and capitalism, the only real choice is between the capitalist way and the non-capitalist, leading to socialism. The experience of some retarded countries which have for some time pursued the capitalist way has shown that capitalism has failed to ensure fast progress for them. Ali Aybar, Chairman of the Turkish Workers' Party, wrote in *Öncü*: "As an economic system, private enterprise is not new to us. It has been maintained here for at least a hundred years. Turkey has not been, nor will it ever be, set up on her feet with the help of private enterprise. . ."

Some 15-20 years of political independence and capitalist development of some young states have also failed to produce hopeful results. There is nothing strange about it, for only the most progressive social system of an epoch can enable retarded peoples to overstep decades of economic development and enter the modern age. In our times, it is the socialist system. It has given brilliant examples of the rapid social upsurge of many peoples, which is especially the case in the Soviet Union.

The present correlation of the two opposite world systems has created highly favourable conditions for peoples' transition to socialism, irrespective of their economic levels and geographical situation. Not long ago, "geographically," socialism was characterised by the victory of socialist revolution in countries adjacent to the Soviet Union. And only within this territorially undivided socialist camp were there opportunities for socially and economically retarded peoples to go over to socialism.

The victorious revolution in Cuba—a small country situated next door to the most powerful imperialist state in the world—has shown that now socialism can triumph and grow stronger on any continent. Today the world socialist system is able not only to protect the emerging countries from the export of counter-revolution but also to give them broad support in building the new society.

History has fully confirmed Lenin's conclusion that with the assistance of the proletariat of advanced countries less developed nations will be able to go over to socialism by-passing the capitalist stage. This conclusion expresses the objective regularity of replacing capitalism by socialism on a world scale. Hundreds of millions, including many Soviet peoples, have circumvented the capitalist stage or are circumventing it. That path has been followed by Mongolia, China, the Korean People's Democratic Republic and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam; it is now being entered by other Asian and African countries. It is the only realistic way to ensure rapid progress for the young states.

Of course, the process of going over to the non-capitalist way will differ in various countries. But they all go through the stage of the national-democratic revolution, during which anti-imperialist and anti-feudal tasks are resolved, providing the objective and subjective factors needed for socialist reform. Of these, the main factors are the provision of material requisites for such a reform and, above all, the hegemony of the working class in the national-

democratic revolution and in the united front of the revolutionary patriotic forces. The proletariat, rallying around itself the non-proletarian sections of the town and countryside, can solve most consistently the tasks of the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggle, and is alone able to direct the efforts for the final victory of socialism. The historical experience of Mongolia has shown that countries which have no working class of their own can also take the non-capitalist way provided the leadership of the national-democratic revolution is assumed by a Marxist-Leninist party firmly pursuing a policy of close cooperation and unity with the socialist system and world communist movement, with the struggle of the international proletariat.

In view of the new world alignment of forces the search for solutions to the social and economic problems facing the emerging nations is bound up with the necessity of opposing neo-colonialism. The 1960 Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties propounded the idea of a national democracy, i.e., of "a state that consistently defends its political and economic independence and fights against imperialism and its military blocs, against military bases on its territory; one that opposes the new forms of colonialism and foreign capital penetration; one that rejects dictatorial and despotic forms of government; one that ensures the people broad democratic rights and freedoms, the opportunity of having the agrarian reform and other democratic and social renovations carried into effect, and a say in govern-

ment policies."¹ The CPSU Programme states in this connection: "The political basis of a national democracy is a bloc of all progressive, patriotic forces fighting to win complete national independence and broad democracy, and to consummate the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, democratic revolution."²

Under a national democracy conditions are created which provide for a gradual extension of the role of revolutionary forces to achieve the transition to socialism, going through some of the stages. The establishment of a national democracy is a feasible prospect for many emerging nations, though not obligatory for all. Moreover, even in countries where there is a united front of patriotic progressive forces the national bourgeoisie may be completely barred from taking part in it, the opposition to the national bourgeoisie assuming the most violent forms. Bearing in mind the multiformity of historical, social and economic conditions distinguishing one newly free country from another, Marxist-Leninists have a broad approach to the definition of the ways of transition of the national-liberation struggle into the movement for socialism. The Chinese leaders on the contrary claiming to be theoreticians and strategists of the national-liberation struggle, generalise the one and only way of revolutionary development for the emerging countries—the establishment of a

¹ *Programme Documents of the Struggle for Peace, Democracy and Socialism*. Moscow, 1961, pp. 67-68, Russ. Ed.

² *Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*. Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1961.

people's democracy, which is one of the forms of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Consequently, the Chinese strategists ignore intermediate stages, even for those countries where the proletariat has not yet emerged or is not strong enough to play an independent political role. That attitude has nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism, which rejects adventuristic notions of leaping over objectively necessary and unavoidable stages of revolutionary development and mass movement— notions which lead to a senseless dissipation of the revolutionary energy of peoples and ultimately discredit slogans and targets which are perfectly correct in other circumstances.

In criticising the Marxist-Leninist approach to the non-capitalist way of development the Chinese leaders quite often consciously misrepresent the stand of the international communist movement. They claim that the Soviet Communists "are now actively preaching that socialism can be built without the proletariat and without a genuinely revolutionary party armed with advanced proletarian ideology."¹ Naturally enough the Peking critics do not mention when and who said it. The theory of the non-capitalist development of backward countries has long been a major part of the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory and the truth of this theory has been borne out conclusively by the practical experience of many peoples after the October Revolution. Non-capitalist development

¹ Lin Piao. "Long Live the Victory of People's War!" *Peking Review*, No. 36, September 3, 1965, p. 25.

is not the building, and even less the "implementation" of socialism. It is a stage leading to the establishment of such society. And even in discussing this stage Marxist-Leninists always emphasise the decisive influence of the international proletariat and in particular the role of socialist aid to countries embarking on the non-capitalist way.

National-democratic revolutions may be headed by different class forces—by the proletariat, the national bourgeoisie or—where the latter has not yet emerged as a class—by progressive patriotic elements of other sections. But whichever the case, this revolution solves, either more or less radically, general democratic problems. That is why the non-proletarian forces which come out for the solution of such problems naturally enjoy the support of the local working class and its Party, the support of the socialist camp and world communist movement. It is clear that when all is said and done these forces do much that the van of the proletariat in the developing countries would have to perform if they had enough influence among the masses of the people to occupy political key positions there.

The working class supports the non-proletarian forces leading the masses in the national-democratic revolution insofar as these forces set out to abolish imperialist oppression eliminate feudal relationships and ensure democratic freedoms to the working people. The proletariat does not tolerate appeasement, so characteristic of the national bourgeoisie with its desire to confine the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal strug-

gle to its own class aims, and strives to increase its influence among the people and achieve hegemony of the national-democratic revolution in order to carry it through and pave the way for the socialist revolution.

The non-proletarian forces guiding the national-liberation movement are far from uniform. There is perpetual struggle going on in their midst, and in certain situations it may result in victory for revolutionary democracy, which is characterised by a consistently radical anti-imperialist and anti-feudal attitude and a critical assessment of the ability of capitalism to solve vital problems of the emerging nations. In turn, the revolutionary democracy, which has set a number of nations (the UAR, Mali, Guinea, etc. on the non-capitalist road, is not immutable. As a rule, the logic of struggle, accumulated experience of management, and so on, make its leaders gradually discard their ideological doubts and begin to see that scientific socialism is the only trustworthy pilot of their social and economic development and that the concepts of so-called national socialism do not hold water. Indicative of this is the statement of UAR President Nasser, who said that "Arab socialism" had been invented by the Egyptian newspapers and that he himself had never used it either in his speeches or in the Charter (the Charter of National Action of the UAR, published in 1962.—*A. Ya*). There are no "socialisms", he maintained, there is only one universal scientific socialism.

A similar stand is being taken by other leaders of revolutionary democratic forces in many

young states. It is not always a simple and easy process. But the main thing is that the views of revolutionary democrats make such an evolution possible. These views may lead to scientific socialism, though this does not rule out under any circumstances, a swing to the right.

The growth of the modern industrial proletariat in the developing countries, its accumulation of experience of anti-imperialist class struggle and increasing influence among the people, on the one hand, and the expanding aid of world socialism to these countries, on the other, decisively promote the anti-imperialist orientation of the national-liberation movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Lenin's prediction that "in the impending decisive battles in the world revolution, the movement of the majority of the population of the globe, initially directed towards national liberation, will turn against capitalism and imperialism and will, perhaps, play a much more revolutionary part than we expect,"¹ is coming true.

Unity of Revolutionary Forces Is the Main Prerequisite of Their Victory

Marxist-Leninists proceed from recognition of the fact that the world liberation process is an agglomeration of various social and national revolutionary movements. Their union is based

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 32, p. 482.

on the identity of interest in fighting the common enemy—imperialism. Of decisive importance here is the convergence of such major forces reforming the life of mankind as world socialism, the international working class and the national-liberation movement. It is not accidental that the imperialists do everything in their power to disrupt the existing or emerging unity and solidarity of different units of the world revolutionary army. They seek to divide the socialist community and the world communist movement, to breed strife in the young Afro-Asian solidarity movement, to drive a wedge between the socialist world and developing countries, and to sow discord among peace fighters and world democratic movements.

The imperialists would like to isolate the forces of national liberation, to deprive them of the tremendous moral and material support of the socialist camp. In fighting against the union of national liberation and world socialism they now add anti-communist preachings to the familiar means of political blackmail and economic pressure. Anti-communism and all attempts to gain ideological influence are meant to breed animosity towards Communists and make the peoples of developing countries suspicious of the world communist movement and the socialist countries. "Red imperialism," "socialist oppression" and other such aspersions are the favourite stunts of imperialist propaganda.

In their ideological offensive against the developing countries the imperialists quite unexpectedly found an active confederate in the Mao Tse-tung group. Since anti-Sovietism is the

pivot of anti-communism, the rabid smear campaign against the USSR, doggedly pursued by Peking over some years in Asian, African and Latin American countries in particular, directly overlaps with imperialist anti-communist propaganda. The Peking aspirers to the ideological guidance of the third world could think of nothing better than to rake up same hackneyed and threadbare ravings about "Soviet imperialism" over again, about the Soviet Union's desire for world domination, the selfishness of the socialist countries, and so on and so forth.

The Peking leaders and the Chinese press have established a new high in anti-Sovietism. Anti-communist propaganda agencies in imperialist countries are often compelled to recruit new blood to keep up with the Peking pace-setters. In the second half of 1963, the United States Information Agency, the main official channel for spreading anti-communist ideology abroad and publicising the American way of life, began batch dismissals of its workers in Southeast Asia, mainly renegade Communist Party and trade union members. Some of them said quite plainly: "They are throwing us out because we cannot curse the Soviet Union as loudly and blatantly as the Chinese do."

While openly besmirching the Soviet Union and the world socialist system, the Chinese leaders, like the anti-communist forces, are using propaganda methods that disguise the true nature of their intentions. They have long been trying to sully and misrepresent the policy of peaceful coexistence of countries with differing social systems, which is consistently pursued by

the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. They assert that this policy is presumably a "concession" to imperialism amounting to disregard of the interests of national-liberation and the working class struggle in the capitalist countries. In Peking, they go as far as to say that the "modern revisionists" extend this policy not only to the relations between states with different social systems but also "to the relations between oppressed and oppressor nations, between oppressed and oppressor countries or between oppressed and oppressor classes," that this policy allegedly "leads to a substitution of class collaboration for the class struggle in the world arena."¹

In reality, the policy of peaceful coexistence, as it is understood and pursued by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, has nothing in common with this interpretation. Peaceful coexistence of countries with differing social systems means a grim and irreconcilable struggle politically, economically and ideologically against imperialism. No Communist Party has ever mentioned the possibility of peaceful coexistence between oppressed and oppressor countries, between exploited and exploiter classes. Ascribing such opinions to other parties, the Chinese Communist Party leaders make clear their obviously unprincipled stand to all the revolutionary forces. The socialist countries have

¹ "A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement." *The Polemic on the General Line of the International Communist Movement*. Peking, 1965, p. 31.

always combined their efforts for the establishment of the principles of peaceful coexistence with systematic all-round aid to peoples endeavouring to achieve their social and national emancipation and to firmly rebuff all armed attacks by the forces of imperialism and aggression.

The process of world revolutionary development and strengthening the international solidarity of all sectors of the international revolutionary front inevitably arouses fierce opposition on the part of imperialism. In present conditions this may mean a new world war. The task of all progressive forces is to prevent this. It is the duty of all Communists to force imperialism to renounce export of counter-revolution to the developing countries, to compel the imperialist bourgeoisie to accept the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with differing social systems. The Mao Tse-tung group understand their duty in an entirely different way. By their hostile attitude to the Soviet Union and other socialist countries they approve of imperialism and goad it on to use armed force in fighting socialism and national liberation. The bourgeois press smugly notes this role of the dissentient course pursued by Peking. The April 1965 issue of the *Magazine of Wall Street and Business Analyst* had the following comment: "The ability of the United States to maintain its exceedingly tough stand in the Vietnam conflict has been due in no small extent to the ever widening split between Russia and Red China."

The Peking strategists keep repeating that a

brink-of-war situation and war itself provide the best possible conditions for the development of the entire revolutionary process and, incidentally, for the national-liberation movement. In reality, however, quite the opposite is true. The most conclusive proof of it is the fact that the colonial system collapsed in the fifties and sixties, that is in conditions of peaceful coexistence of the two world systems. Peaceful coexistence accords with the interests of the further development and consolidation of the national-liberation movement. The liquidation of the sorry aftermath of colonialism, the development of the national economy, improvement of the social and material living conditions of the millions—all these colossal, pressing tasks can be solved only in conditions of world peace.

In keeping with the principal aims of the national-liberation movement is the drive for disarmament conducted by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. It is systematically attacked by the Chinese leaders who contend that one should urge general disarmament only "to expose" imperialism, otherwise it will be just an attempt "to put an end to the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations under the pretext of disarmament."¹ If general disarmament, as Marxist-Leninists see it, means disarmament of the forces of war, then how can the elimination of all land forces, navies, air forces, military bases on foreign soil, atom and hydrogen bombs and long- and

¹ *A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement*. Peking, 1965, p. 28.

short-range rockets prevent or in any way delay the liberation of oppressed peoples? Peking has no answer to this.

It is clear, however, that resolute and persistent efforts for bringing about disarmament could substantially profit the whole of mankind, including the peoples of the developing countries. Ending the arms race would release enormous resources. The investment of only a tenth of these resources in the industry and agriculture of the emerging nations could accelerate their economic growth 50 or 100 per cent compared with the levels of the first half of the sixties.

Disarmament and peaceful coexistence would be a loss to the imperialists but not to the world revolutionary forces. It is for good reason that the imperialists oppose any real steps to reduce armaments. Unfortunately the Chinese leaders' attitude to the question of war and peace, peaceful coexistence and general disarmament is helping imperialism and easing the pressure of the peace forces on the forces of aggression and war.

Peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems is an objective necessity of current social development. The CPSU Programme states: "War cannot and must not serve as a means of settling international disputes. Peaceful coexistence or disastrous war—such is the alternative offered by history."¹ A new world war if it is allowed to break out—will spread to every continent, every country and every people.

¹ *Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*. Moscow, 1961, p. 56.

According to the estimates of some military specialists, the first thermonuclear blows in case of war would smite 700-800 million people, obliterating from the face of the earth the largest cities in the United States, the Soviet Union, the European countries, China and Japan. The consequences of war would tell on the life and health of many generations. Therefore to make the imperialists observe the principle of peaceful coexistence as a built-in norm of contemporary international relations is the supreme goal of the entire revolutionary front, the national-liberation movement included.

* * *

Though eager to play the part of the "sole" theoreticians and strategists of the national-liberation movement, the Chinese leaders have displayed neither any real understanding of the character of the revolutionary process in the contemporary world or the actual problems of the national-liberation movement at its present stage, nor a clear-cut view of the prospects of this movement, which are most intimately connected above all with the successes of the world socialist system.

The attempts of the "leftist" aids of imperialism to undermine the growing alliance between world socialism and the national-liberation movement meet with resolute resistance from the socialist countries and the international communist movement, on the one hand, and the democratic public, the patriotic governments and peoples of emerging countries, on the other. The General Declaration adopted in September, 1963,

by the Executive Committee of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Organisation stressed the necessity for strengthening the ties between the countries fighting for their national independence and "the anti-imperialist progressive movement in the whole world in the common struggle being waged against our common enemies—imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism."

The growing neo-colonialist tendencies of imperialism, its recent military adventures, and the intensified splitting activities of the Mao Tse-tung group on the world revolutionary front—all this has clearly shown once again that it is necessary to step up the struggle for the unity and consolidation of the anti-imperialist forces.

Afro-Asian Solidarity Organisation has revealed a profound understanding of this. Its 8th Session, held in Nicosia in February, 1967, adopted some important decisions which dealt another blow at the dissentient Peking line. In a special resolution, the Session scored the significance of the Great October Socialist Revolution and called on all peoples to take an active part in celebrations on the occasion of its half-centenary. In expressing its disapproval of the "cultural revolution" going on in China since the summer of 1966, the Session deemed it impossible to hold the 5th Conference of Afro-Asian Solidarity, scheduled for 1967, in Peking. It emphasised the importance of unity of action and solidarity of all forces coming out against US aggression in Vietnam.

The struggle of the Mao Tse-tung group for leadership of the national-liberation movement, which was openly launched in 1962, has ended in failure. It is the natural outcome of the reactio-

nary course for disrupting international anti-imperialist unity. After their miserable failure, the Peking leaders publicly broke off with the Afro-Asian Solidarity Organisation to inaugurate another, parallel body, which, no doubt, will direct its efforts not against imperialism but against the national-liberation movement and the international organisations representing it. Such is the logic of the splitters and their activities.

As for the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, and the world communist movement, their course for a stronger anti-imperialist front has been, and continues to be, the same. Close alliance with the national-liberation movement is a corner-stone of this course. The Programme of the CPSU, for example, states: "The CPSU considers fraternal alliance with the people who have thrown off colonial or semi-colonial tyranny to be a corner-stone of its international policy. This alliance is based on the common, vital interests of world socialism and the world national-liberation movement. The CPSU regards it as its internationalist duty to assist the peoples who have set out to win and strengthen their national independence, all peoples who are fighting for the complete abolition of the colonial system."¹

Both world socialism and the national-liberation movement are vitally interested in cooperation in all spheres of the anti-imperialist struggle and in strengthening their unity and solidarity. That is why their alliance will grow stronger and develop regardless of the opposition of world imperialism and its abettors.

¹ *Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, Moscow, 1961, p. 48.