SELECTED ARTICLES

from

ACADEMY OF SCIENCES OF THE USSR

INSTITUTE OF ECONOMICS

QUESTIONS OF ECONOMICS

(*Voprosy Ekonomiki)*

MONTHLY JOURNAL

"PRAVDA"
PUBLISHING HOUSE
1949

**This is a publication of STC — SPC — DD(CP).
October 2026.**

Source: ИНСТИТУТ ЭКОНОМИКИ, ВОПРОСЫ ЭКОНОМИКИ, ЕЖЕМЕСЯЧНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ, ИЗДАТЕЛЬСТВО, «ПРАВДА», 1949

Language: Russian

Produced by transcription, manually edited and prepared as an e-book. Translated into English using Gemini, Google Translate and Yandex Translate.

This is a publication of STC — SPC — DD(CP).

October 2026.

Direct Democracy (Communist Party)
Doğrudan Demokrasi (Komünist Parti)
Άμεση Δημοκρατία (Κομμουνιστικό Κόμμα)
Прямая демократия (Коммунистическая партия)
www.directdemocracy4u.uk

Kıbrıs'ta Sosyalist Gerçek
Σοσιαλιστική Πραγματικότητα στην Κύπρο
The Socialist Truth in Cyprus
Социалистическая правда на Кипре
http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk

Kıbrıs Sosyalist Partisi
The Socialist Party of Cyprus
Το Σοσιαλιστικό Κόμμα Κύπρου
Социалистическая партия Кипра
https://st-cyprus.co.uk/kibris-sosyalist-partisi

SELECTED ARTICLES

from

ACADEMY OF SCIENCES OF THE USSR

INSTITUTE OF ECONOMICS

QUESTIONS OF ECONOMICS

(*Voprosy Ekonomiki)*

MONTHLY JOURNAL

"PRAVDA"
PUBLISHING HOUSE
1949

Table of Contents

E. Varga.....6
AGAINST THE REFORMIST TREND IN WORKS ON IMPERIALISM.....6
I. Dvorkin.....28
LABOURISM — AN IDEOLOGICAL PILLAR OF IMPERIALISM28
CHRONICLE OF SCIENTIFIC LIFE.....74
EXTENDED SESSION OF THE SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL OF THE INSTITUTE OF ECONOMICS OF THE USSR ACADEMY OF SCIENCES.....74
M. Rubinshtein.....79
BOURGEOIS COSMOPOLITISM IN THE SERVICE OF AMERICAN IMPERIALISTS.....79
I. Lemin.....124
ECONOMIC CONTRADICTIONS AND THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN AMERICAN AND BRITISH IMPERIALISTS.....124
V. Balabushevich.....175
NEW STAGE OF THE NATIONAL LIBERATION STRUGGLE OF THE PEOPLES OF INDIA.....175
A. Shapiro.....218
THE RISE OF UNEMPLOYMENT IN CAPITALIST COUNTRIES IN THE POST-WAR PERIOD.....218
E. Zhukov.....256
QUESTIONS OF THE NATIONAL-COLONIAL STRUGGLE AFTER THE SECOND WORLD WAR.....256
V. Maslennikov.....273
ON THE LEADING ROLE OF THE WORKING CLASS IN THE NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT OF COLONIAL PEOPLES.....273
REPORTS AND DISCUSSIONS.....304

THE NATIONAL LIBERATION STRUGGLE IN COLONIAL AND SEMI-COLONIAL COUNTRIES AFTER THE SECOND WORLD WAR.....304
N. Pukhlov.....364
THE REORGANIZATION OF AGRICULTURE IN THE COUNTRIES OF PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY.....364
M. Danilevich.....403
THE WORKING CLASS OF LATIN AMERICA IN THE STRUGGLE FOR INDEPENDENCE AND DEMOCRACY.....403
CRITICISM AND BIBLIOGRAPHY.....433
I. Dudinsky.....433
CAPITALIST FINANCES — A WEAPON OF IMPERIALIST AGGRESSION.....433
A. M. ALEKSEEV, *Military Finances of Capitalist States. (Sources and Methods of Financing the Second World War.)* Gospolitizdat, 1949, 182 pp. 433
G. Grigoryev.....459
THE FORMATION OF THE GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC IS A TURNING POINT IN EUROPEAN HISTORY 459
V. Maslennikov.....500
THE HISTORIC VICTORY OF THE CHINESE PEOPLE.....500
V. Vasilyeva.....533
THE LENINIST-STALINIST DOCTRINE ON NATIONS AND THE NATIONAL-COLONIAL REVOLUTION.....533

E. Varga

AGAINST THE REFORMIST TREND IN WORKS ON IMPERIALISM

My book, *Changes in the Economy of Capitalism Resulting from the Second World War*, as well as a number of other works of the former Institute of World Economy and World Politics published after the war, and for which I bear responsibility as the head of this Institute, were, as is known, subjected to severe criticism in the party press and at scientific discussions. This criticism was necessary and correct. My mistake lies in the fact that I did not immediately recognize the correctness of this criticism as criticism, unlike other comrades who did. But better late than never.

The trouble does not lie in the fact that errors were discovered in my book in general, but in the character of these errors. It is difficult to avoid errors in a book in which an attempt is made for the first time to independently investigate such a complex problem as the impact of the Second World War on the economy of capitalism. The trouble lies in the fact, as critics correctly pointed out, that these errors constitute a whole chain of errors of a reformist trend, which taken together signify a definite departure from the Leninist-Stalinist assessment of modern imperialism.

It goes without saying that errors of a reformist trend also mean errors of a cosmopolitan trend, because they embellish capitalism.

Every reformist error, every encroachment upon the purity of Marxist-Leninist doctrine is particularly dangerous in the current historical situation.

The deepening of the general crisis of capitalism has led to the bourgeoisie relying ever more decisively on reformists in the struggle against working people, against communism and its citadel, the Soviet Union. In all bourgeois countries, there is close cooperation between the bourgeoisie and reformist traitors. Not a day passes without reformists rendering some service to the bourgeoisie or committing a betrayal of the interests of working people (attempts to split the World Federation of Trade Unions, agitation for the "Marshall Plan" and the North Atlantic Pact, slander against the Soviet Union, etc.).

In such countries as England, the Scandinavian countries, and Australia, reformists are "in power". This means that the bourgeoisie has entrusted the protection of its class rule and the representation of its class interests directly to traitors of the working class (in a number of other countries they take part in coalition governments alongside bourgeois parties and even cooperate with fascist hangmen of workers in Greece).

For the purpose of deceiving workers, reformists proclaim that, being "in power", they are turning the bourgeois state into an instrument of the working class and that through peaceful reforms, without revolution, socialism will be achieved. This dangerous counter-revolutionary deception can be exposed and liquidated through the consistent defense of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine on the class character of the bourgeois state,

regardless of who heads the government: a bourgeois or a "socialist" minister.

Any errors of a reformist trend regarding the bourgeois state, which unfortunately are encountered in my book (regardless of the author's desire), undoubtedly constitute support for the counter-revolutionary reformist deception of the working class and thereby support for the bourgeoisie.

Errors of a reformist trend in my works are currently particularly dangerous not only for working people of capitalist countries, but also for working people of the countries of people's democracy. Hundreds of thousands of social-democratic workers and hundreds of left-wing leaders of social democracy in these countries have individually crossed over into the communist party or collectively united with communist parties with the honest desire to become genuine revolutionary communists. But this requires complete liberation from the reformist ideology in which they were brought up, and principled Marxist-Leninist re-education. For people brought up for decades in reformist ideology, this is a difficult task; here, for a certain time, the danger of reformist relapses remains. Our fraternal parties need and expect help from scientific workers of the Soviet Union in the struggle against reformist ideology. If errors of a reformist trend creep into our works (as happened with me), then not only do we fail to render any help to our fraternal parties, but we hinder their important work of re-educating new party members who are former Social Democrats.

At the same time, I want to emphasize the following:

Openly reformist books cause less damage in this direction, and their effect can be more easily neutralized than a book like mine, in which errors of a reformist order are more or less concealed and therefore can be detected and corrected with greater difficulty[1].

The errors revealed by criticism in my book are all the more important because they predominantly concern questions of assessing the role and character of the bourgeois state in the present or the recent past.

It is common knowledge that the question of assessing the bourgeois state has been for more than half a century one of the main points on which revolutionary Marxists-Bolsheviks and counter-revolutionary reformists disagreed. Marx and Engels always and everywhere: in *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, in their analysis of the Paris Commune, in *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, in *Anti-Dühring*, etc., as well as in their letters—emphasize the character of the bourgeois state as an instrument of the class rule of capitalists, as an apparatus for the oppression of working people. Reformists conceal, hush up, and distort the statements of Marx and Engels on the state.

Lenin devoted one of his most brilliant militant works, *The State and Revolution*, to the struggle against reformism. He wrote in the preface: "We shall first examine Marx's and

---

[1] It should be noted that after the publication of my book in the Hungarian language, a critical article about my book was published in the central theoretical organ of the Hungarian Working People's Party, the content of which largely coincides with the content of critical articles published in our party press.

Engels's theory of the state, dwelling with particular detail on those aspects of this theory which have been forgotten or subjected to opportunist distortion."

Proceeding from numerous indications by Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin developed the doctrine of the state; they particularly emphasized that in the era of imperialism, the state of imperialist countries is an instrument of the financial oligarchy for the plunder of all working people.

How could it happen that, contrary to the theory of the state developed by Lenin and Stalin and known to all Marxists as the only correct one, a number of errors of a reformist trend crept into my book on the question of the role of the state in the war economy?

The basis, the starting point of this, as my critics correctly establish, is the methodologically erroneous separation of economics from politics; the attempt to present changes in the economy of capitalism "purely economically", outside of their connection with politics.

The departure from the Marxist-Leninist dialectical method, which requires a comprehensive study of all analyzed phenomena in their interconnection, was bound to inevitably lead to errors of a reformist trend.

Economics is the relation of classes. The struggle of classes constitutes the main content of politics in any class society. Politics is concentrated economics. If one attempts (as happened with myself and a number of other authors of the former Institute of World Economy and World Politics) to analyze the economy of capitalism "outside of politics", then

this departure from the Marxist-Leninist method inevitably, against the author's will, must lead to errors of a reformist trend.

Methodologically vicious exclusion of politics and of the analysis of the correlation and struggle of classes inevitably led to an incorrect assessment of the role of the state in the war economy, to the erroneous assertion about the "decisive role of the state" in the war economy. If one examines the role of the state in the capitalist war economy, as I incorrectly did, "purely economically", one arrives at the erroneous conclusion that in the "state", analyzed not from class positions, the financial oligarchy ruling there does not play the decisive role. On the basis of such a superficial, "purely economic" research, which replaced Marxist-Leninist class analysis, one inevitably arrives at the erroneous conclusion that in the interests of waging war, the state acts against the interests of individual monopolies.

My book pointed out regarding the bourgeois state:

"Its desire to utilize the country's resources most expediently for military purposes constantly collided with the private interests of individual capitalist enterprises, with their interest in extracting the highest possible profit" (p. 10).

Speakers at the discussion justly pointed out that these assertions give cause for recognizing the supra-class nature of the bourgeois state.

It goes without saying that I am far from denying the class character of the bourgeois state. But it is indisputable that, by characterizing the modern state as the "organization of the

bourgeoisie as a whole" and not—as should have been done—as the state of the financial oligarchy, I made a mistake.

Principally erroneous methodology led to errors of a reformist trend, despite the fact that the facts themselves were stated correctly. I specifically show (pp. 30–31) that in the highest posts in the organs of war economy management both in the USA and in England, representatives of major monopolies were everywhere to be found. I wrote: "Major monopolies retained during the war as well a decisive influence on the economic policy of the state in general and in particular on the activity of war-economy organizations, in the leadership of which they took a decisive part, actually heading them" (p. 37).

But correctly established facts, if they are cited without the application of the Marxist-Leninist method and outside of correct dialectical interconnection, if they are not theoretically generalized, have insignificant value from the standpoint of scientific research. These and similar facts should have been presented on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state as proof of the further intensification of the merging of the state apparatus with the financial oligarchy during the war, which ensured major monopolies their superprofits both in wartime and in peacetime.

My critics quite correctly pointed out another important error of a reformist trend on the question of the state, present in my book. On page 318 it is stated: "The role of the state will remain more significant in the future than it was before the war. The question of greater or lesser participation in state administration will constitute the main content of the political struggle between the two main classes of capitalist society: the

bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The ever-intensifying polarization of bourgeois society, its division into two main opposing classes, will increase the specific weight of the proletariat."

Any reformist would approve of these lines. They were written under the impression of the fact that immediately after the end of the war in 1945, in the majority of European countries—not only in the countries of people's democracy, but also in France, Italy, Finland, etc.—communists participated in governments. They were written in the hope that the communists of the respective countries, who were the soul of the resistance movement against fascist occupiers, using their influence in the masses, would be able to preserve their positions in the government, expand them, and in the struggle against the bourgeoisie conquer state power.

This train of thought did not take into account the decisive fact that the state apparatus remained bourgeois, that the apparatus of violence (army, police, gendarmerie) remained the same. When the communists who participated in the governments of bourgeois states undertook attempts to decisively defend the interests of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie—to change the class character of the state—they were ousted from all bourgeois governments. This became possible, despite the mass support rendered to the communists by the working population, because, anticipating such battles, the Anglo-American occupation authorities disarmed the communist-led resistance movement in France, Italy, etc., dissolved their combat formations, and supported reaction with their troops in its struggle against the communists.

The opposite process took place in the countries of people's democracy, where working people with the support of the Soviet Union retained weapons and power in the state, while representatives of the propertied classes, to the extent that they lost support among the people, were excluded from governments.

Post-war events in Europe are new, striking proof of the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state, according to which the question of state power is a question of the correlation of class forces, and it can be resolved only in class struggle.

Unfortunately, errors of a reformist trend are also present in one of my articles written in 1947, for the 30th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

"The bourgeoisie of Europe," it is stated in this article of mine, "this homeland of capitalism, itself recognizes now that the capitalist social system needs thorough reform, that one cannot do without such measures as the nationalization of important branches of production, state control over the economy, 'economic planning'."

This thesis, of course, is incorrect. All this is said by a part of the bourgeoisie and especially its lackeys, reformists of all kinds, only for the deception of workers, for the struggle against communist parties, against the ideas of communism. The smarter capitalists of Europe and in particular their reformist lackeys in words proclaim the necessity of a "thorough reform" of capitalism in a socialist direction.

But this is easy to understand. The capitalist economic system has plunged Europe within the span of one generation into two world wars that cost the lives of millions of working people, left hundreds of thousands blind, crippled, and orphaned, and led to famine and epidemics, while war suppliers enriched themselves incredibly. It has to its account fascist barbarism, concentration camps, racial hatred, and the extermination of millions of innocent people. This social system shows the masses with increasing clarity day after day that it has outlived its time, is thoroughly rotten, and is historically doomed to destruction. It has led to mass unemployment and chronic underloading of the production apparatus.

At the end of my book I formulated this in the following way:

"The terrible fact remains unchanged that for the past quarter of a century the only period when job-seekers in bourgeois countries actually found employment was the period of the world war. Only when millions of people were killing each other and other millions were manufacturing instruments of murder for this purpose was capitalist society in a position to give all workers work.

The terrible fact also remains unchanged that the years of the past quarter of a century when the means of production of the capitalist world were fully utilized were the years of humanity's most terrible sufferings" (p. 319).

It goes without saying that under such circumstances a capitalist or apologist for capitalism now rather rarely openly advocates the unchanged preservation of this social system hated by working people. Such a performance would lead

workers even faster into the camp of communism. Hence the loud words about thorough reforms of capitalism, while in reality all means are employed for the unchanged preservation of the existing system of capitalist exploitation[2].

Not to say all this in connection with the passage from my book cited by critics is undoubtedly a major omission, a service to reformism. As Lenin pointed out in the preface to the book *The State and Revolution*, "the struggle for the emancipation of the working masses from the influence of the bourgeoisie in general, and of the imperialist bourgeoisie in particular, is impossible without a struggle against opportunist prejudices concerning the 'state'."

In this same direction goes the incorrect characterization given by me of nationalization in England. It goes without saying that the nationalization of important branches of the economy is a further strengthening of state capitalism. Therefore, it was incorrect to write: "...bourgeois nationalization also means progress in the direction of democracy of a new type" (*Voprosy Ekonomiki*, No. 3, 1947, p. 5).

The error is based here too on ignoring the principled difference in the character of the present English state headed by the Labour government from the character of the countries of people's democracy.

---

[2] We would like to remind you here that the fascists in words also engaged in "anti-capitalist" demagogy, talking nonsense about "German socialism". In general, it is difficult today to distinguish reformists (such as, for example, Jules Moch) from fascists.

The state in England, where the Labourites are in power, is a bourgeois state, a state of monopoly capital, the main function of which consists in ensuring the class rule of the big bourgeoisie. True, from time to time Shinwell or Laski are permitted to deliver demagogic speeches in order to tie workers to the reformist camp, but the army, the apparatus of state violence are in hands reliable for the bourgeoisie and are used against working people. The bourgeoisie in this case throws crumbs of its monopolistic superprofits to the labor aristocracy, buys with high salaries the Labour bureaucrats employed in the state apparatus[3] and, as the recent trial against some of them

---

[3] A similar picture is observed in the USA. The major capitalist newspaper *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* (January 21, 1949) published a correspondence with the characteristic headline "The New Masters", in which we read: "In recent years, in the lobbies of the 'White House' in Washington and in ministers' reception rooms, a new type of person is encountered ever more frequently—the trade union leader. Outwardly, he is no different from the average American businessman... The income of trade union leaders now roughly corresponds to the income of an average businessman. The same can be said about their lifestyle... The ideology of the class struggle remains alien to them. They stand with both feet on the ground, and their head does not soar in the clouds. Their thoughts are directed toward the immediate tasks they are called upon to solve, and are not lost in dreams of the future. The American trade union leader feels himself in a growing degree responsible for the well-being of 'his' industry and 'his' economy." This description clearly shows the complete alienation of US trade union leaders from the workers, their merging with the bourgeoisie. Lewis, the leader of the mineworkers' union, receives a salary of $100,000 a year. Until recently, the President of the United States received a smaller

showed, bribes them with small gifts—all this is the tested policy of the English bourgeoisie.

How pleased the English big capitalists are with the actions of the Labour government is shown by the following lines from the "radical" weekly *New Statesman and Nation* (February 26, 1949): "A rather major industrialist, commenting on the political situation, said the other day: 'Of course, we had difficulties after the war, but now the workers are working well and everything is in order. You understand that I am a staunch conservative and have always been one. But I am afraid even to think about what would happen if the conservatives came to power now'" (emphasis added.—E. V.).

The states of people's democracy, on the contrary, are states of working people that perform the functions of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the interests of all working people, against the exploiting classes. The armies and the state apparatus in these countries are in hands reliable for working people and are used against exploiters.

Given this class character of the state, nationalization in England does not mean "progress in the direction of democracy of a new type".

At the head of the managements of nationalized branches of the economy continue to stand former owners, major monopolists. There can be no doubt that they find ways and means to put their unnationalized enterprises in other branches of industry in

---

salary than he did.

favorable conditions at the expense of nationalized ones, i.e., at the expense of the state.

Large compensations ensure the owners of nationalized enterprises not only their former incomes: they are insured against the consequences of an economic crisis that in the near future will shake England particularly strongly. They have nothing to fear from a crisis. Their incomes are ensured at the expense of taxpayers, which means working people, even in the event that nationalized branches of industry operate with a large deficit and the crisis causes the bankruptcy of many private enterprises.

Inconsistent application of the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state led to errors and ambiguities in the study of the colonial problem, in particular to an incorrect assessment of the change in relations between England and India.

The conversion of India into two dominions is a compromise between the ruling classes of England and India. The bourgeoisie of India in close alliance with landlord-feudalists betrayed the cause of India's national liberation in order to preserve its class rule over the million-strong masses of workers and peasants of India within the framework of the British Empire. The bourgeoisie of England renounced the exercise of direct power with the help of occupation troops in order to preserve its capitals and other economic positions in India, and to continue participating in the exploitation of Indian working people.

In my book I gave an incorrect assessment of England's financial relations with India. I wrote: "The conversion of India

from a debtor of England into its creditor signifies a most serious change in the economic ratio of these two countries, and moreover a change in favor of India. This new financial position of India was bought at the price of heavy sacrifices by its toiling population, the living standard of which fell sharply; in some provinces, for example in Bengal, the population literally starved" (p. 222).

Did India actually turn into a creditor of England? If we approach this question mechanically, in a bookkeeping manner, then undoubtedly yes. England owes India more than its capital investments in India amount to according to official estimates. But if we pose the question of who exploits whom, it will become clear that surplus value appropriated in England does not go to India, but on the contrary, despite the fact that India occupies the position of a creditor, it still pays England significant annual sums. This is easy to understand: the demands of India (and Pakistan) on England are predominantly interest-free state assets, whereas English capital invested in India represents predominantly direct capital investments and, on the basis of an extremely high level of exploitation, yields profits far exceeding the average rate. In terms of the sum of capitals, India is a creditor of England, but in terms of income from capital, England is still the exploiter of India.

Of course, English capital investments in India provide England with very strong economic and political positions, especially since the English state itself determines when, in what amount, and on what terms it "reimburses" India for its debts.

Some English politicians advocate not paying India at all under the pretext that the debts arose as a result of its defense. Naturally, India cannot force England to pay; it cannot send its fleet and bombard English ports, as England often did with its debtors who delayed payments. If England promises to make annual payments to India to cover its debts[4], this happens mainly because an open refusal to pay would lead to a dangerous intensification of the penetration of American capital and the growth of its influence in India.

Acknowledging this mistake of mine, I nevertheless want to note that it cannot be asserted that "absolutely nothing" changed in the relations between India and England. No matter how seriously we assess England's remaining economic, military, and political positions in India (England still enjoys preferential tariffs in India and Pakistan, and both these countries are part of the sterling bloc), the fact remains that from a colony occupied by English troops and administered by English officials, India has turned into a semi-colony, a dominion in which the bourgeoisie, out of fear of the peasant and worker movement, having betrayed the liberation movement through a compromise with British imperialism, commands its own apparatus of violence. It has the opportunity to maneuver between England and the USA, utilizing the disagreements between English and American imperialism.

---

[4] Indian economic journals are full of complaints that English industry is not supplying machinery and means of production ordered by Indian capitalists, the cost of which is to be covered from India's current account in London

In a word, while by no means overestimating the significance of India's transformation from a colony into a dominion, it should nevertheless be viewed as one of the links in the chain of the historical process unfolding before our eyes of the decline and impending breakup of the British Empire[5].

The complete independence of India, which the Indian bourgeoisie for class reasons shamefully betrayed, will be achieved in the immediate historical future by the working people of India under the leadership of the working class, which will put an end to the domination of Indian landlords and the bourgeoisie together with their English patrons.

The methodologically incorrect separation of the analysis of economics from politics, the non-dialectical division of the study of the role of the bourgeois state in the war economy into two chapters (and the study therein in the first chapter of regulation as such, and in the second chapter, in isolation from this, of planlessness and anarchy of production existing despite regulation), the exclusion of the analysis of the political side of the question create the impression that I deny the operation of spontaneous economic laws of the development of capitalism in the war economy and assert the presence of a planned economy in war under capitalist relations. But this was by no means my intention. On page 35 of my book I write: "...to call

---

[5] English imperialism is everywhere increasingly being ousted by American imperialism. The latter has actually ousted England from the Ruhr, Palestine, Greece, etc. The American plan of "assistance to underdeveloped regions" is also aimed at strengthening the penetration of American capital into the colonies of European imperialists, primarily English ones

war regulation of the economy 'economic planning'... is, of course, absolutely incorrect." But in my exposition of the question as a whole, the necessary Marxist clarity is absent.

As is usually the case when one wants to defend one's mistakes, during the discussion I aggravated these mistakes even more with my assertion that after the war "in some capitalist countries something like a peculiar 'Gosplan' has appeared."

I must acknowledge that all my assertions concerning the question of "planning under capitalism" are a major retreat from my correct position in 1935, when in my speech at the 7th Congress of the Communist International I explained the essence of the demagogic, bourgeois propaganda of reformists about "planning under capitalism" in the following way: "The main reasons are: 1) the insolubility of the market problem; 2) the desire to mask the plunder of the state treasury by the financial oligarchy; 3) the desire to mask the restructuring of the national economy in accordance with the needs of war; 4) the desire to retard the process of revolutionizing the working masses."

There can be no doubt that against the deceitful propaganda of "planned economy" under capitalism currently being conducted by reformists, connected with the propaganda of the "Marshall Plan"[6], an even more decisive struggle must be waged.

---

[6] American monopolists, who advocate "free entrepreneurial initiative" at home in the USA, demand that Western European countries "plan" their economy in the interests of the American financial oligarchy

It was absolutely erroneous to view the emergence of the countries of people's democracy only as a political formation and to transfer their analysis to the planned second political part of my work. The falling away of these countries from the imperialist system was undoubtedly one of the most important socio-economic consequences of the Second World War and signifies the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism.

The unilateral, "purely economic" approach to research led to an incorrect assessment of the significance and character of this group of countries, to such an assessment in which it was asserted that "no matter how important and significant the emergence in these countries of an economy of a new type, which cannot be called capitalism in the old sense of the word, the specific weight of these countries in the capitalist world economy as a whole is relatively small, and they basically do not change the general prospects of the development of capitalism as a whole" (p. 291).

This assessment is untenable and incorrect. It is incorrect to view these states as capitalist, even if "not in the old sense of the word", since they are undoubtedly in the process of rapid transition onto the path of socialism. It was incorrect to assert (as I already acknowledged at the discussion) that state capitalism predominates in these countries, and it was especially incorrect to assess their significance solely on the basis of economic-statistical considerations as "relatively small". The emergence of people's democratic states, their economic flourishing and rapid socialist development on the basis of the experience and comprehensive assistance of the Soviet Union under a regime that performs the functions of the

dictatorship of the proletariat, are of enormous fundamental importance. The non-dialectical, solely "economic" approach to research, the forgetting of Comrade Stalin's instruction on the necessity of orienting oneself toward what is new and in development, closed to me at that time the path to a correct assessment of the character and significance of the countries of people's democracy.

The separation of economics from politics also led to various other errors: to a unilateral study of the role of workers in the war economy, only as a production factor, outside the class struggle; the neglect of the struggle of the two systems and the incorrect assertion that within the democratic camp this struggle was "suspended" during the war; an incorrect assessment of the consequences of the agrarian reform in the countries of people's democracy, upon which I cannot dwell individually.

Of tremendous significance is the fact that as a result of the incorrect research method, the question of the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism found no place in the book. This inevitably creates the impression for the reader that the world war did not affect the deepening of the crisis. It is naturally impossible to investigate all questions in one book: but the absence of the problem of the general crisis of capitalism is a serious omission.

The prolonged delay in acknowledging the errors revealed by criticism on my part undoubtedly caused damage, and forced our economists to return to questions that have long been correctly resolved by Marxism-Leninism. But even worse is that this gave the warmongers in the imperialist camp the

opportunity to spread the lie that I am a man of "Western orientation", which would mean being a counter-revolutionaries, a traitor to the working class.

To honestly acknowledge the mistakes committed and their causes in order to avoid them in the future, to investigate thoroughly—this is what Lenin considered correct both in relation to communist parties and in relation to individual comrades.

In his theoretically profound, militant work "*Left-Wing" Communism: an Infantile Disorder*, Lenin wrote the following: "What applies to parties applies mutatis mutandis to individuals. He is not a wise man who does not make mistakes. There are no such men, nor can there be. He is a wise man who does not make very serious mistakes and who knows how to correct them easily and quickly."

Undoubtedly, I did not act wisely in this regard.

The errors revealed in the remaining works of the former Institute of World Economy and World Politics written during the war are of fundamentally the same nature. Their authors worked under my leadership, and as their leader I bear full responsibility for these errors.

It goes without saying that I must draw lessons for the future from the mistakes made. The development of political problems planned by me as a simple continuation, as the second volume of my work, is now unrealizable. It would also be methodologically incorrect to write an independent work on the politics of modern imperialism without taking economic changes during and after the war as a basis.

Lenin wrote in his work *Imperialism and the Split in Socialism* regarding Kautsky: "This definition of Kautsky's is theoretically utterly false... Kautsky divorces the politics of imperialism from its economics, divorces monopoly in politics from monopoly in economics, in order to clear the way for his vulgar bourgeois reformism..."

In short: instead of the planned second volume of my former work, a new, independent book must be written on the economic and political post-war problems of imperialism, without the reformist errors that were committed by me in the book *Changes in the Economy of Capitalism Resulting from the Second World War*.

Questions of Economics, No.3, 1949.

I. Dvorkin

LABOURISM — AN IDEOLOGICAL PILLAR OF IMPERIALISM

Comrade Stalin pointed out back in 1927 that "present-day social-democratism is the ideological pillar of capitalism"[7]. Under conditions of the aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism, the colossal growth and strengthening of the forces of socialism and democracy, and the weakening of capitalism as a result of the Second World War, the role of social-democrats as direct defenders of capitalism and enemies of socialism has become even more obvious than ever before. Right-wing socialists, being the inglorious continuers of social-democratism, are the main pillar of imperialism in its struggle against socialism and progress. They strenuously disseminate all kinds of "theories" with the aim of whitewashing and justifying capitalism, slandering socialism, disorienting the working class, and splitting its ranks.

The leading role in "developing" the ideology of social-democratism after the First World War was played by German and Austrian social-democrats—Hilferding, Kautsky, Renner, and the like, who were the leaders of the Second International during that period. With the establishment of the fascist dictatorship in Germany, the leaders of the French Socialist Party—Blum and Co.—became the main ideologists of international social-democratism for a short time. After the Second World War, British Labourites emerged as the main

---

[7] J. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, 11th ed., p. 181.

suppliers of ideological goods for right-wing socialists. The reactionary top crust of the Labour Party currently exerts a decisive influence on the "theoretical" guidelines and political line of Western European social-democratic parties.

The leading role of the Labourites among right-wing socialists is determined by the fact that they serve as the main pillar of American and British imperialism in Europe. Right-wing socialists are the instrument of aggressive American and British imperialism; they appear in the front ranks of the warmongers, acting as the vanguard in the struggle that the imperialist camp headed by the USA is waging against the camp of peace and democracy headed by the Soviet Union. Right-wing socialists are the agency of American and British imperialists in the labor movement.

British imperialism, despite the sharp weakening of its positions, still possesses a vast colonial empire. England is the strongest capitalist power in Europe. The right-wing Labour leaders placed in power in England by the capitalists zealously implement the policy of "saving" and strengthening British imperialism.

In the countries of people's democracy, the unification of communist and socialist parties on the basis of the all-conquering theory of Marxism-Leninism has undermined the influence of social-democratism among the masses. The influence of right-wing socialists in the working class of the capitalist states of continental Europe has sharply diminished. In England, however, the Labour top crust, relying on the trade union bureaucracy and the apparatus of its party, continues to retain the main workers' organizations under its control with

the help of lies and demagogy. British Labourites use their leading role among right-wing socialist parties to turn Western European countries into satellites of the USA and England, placing them at the service of the plans for the forcible establishment of Anglo-American world domination. American and British imperialists consider Labour leaders their most convenient and reliable agency for enslaving Western Europe with the help of the "Marshall Plan" and creating aggressive military blocs to prepare a war against the USSR and the countries of people's democracy.

The policy and ideology of Labourism serve as a vivid confirmation of Lenin's proposition that opportunists are "better defenders of the bourgeoisie than the bourgeoisie itself"[8]. Relying on the reactionary trade union leadership, the Labour government implements the policy of monopolistic capital. It increases taxes on working people, "freezes" workers' wages, and promotes the continuous growth of prices for food and consumer goods. This policy of offensive against the working class is conducted under the cover of "socialist" phraseology.

Labour ideology is openly hostile to Marxism. The fact that the Labour Party, which from its very inception has been an anti-Marxist party, now acts as the ideological inspirer of right-wing socialists clearly testifies that modern social-democratism is the ideological pillar of monopolistic capital and a fierce enemy of socialism and democracy. Of course, right-wing socialists in other countries—for example, Renner and Schärf

---

[8] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. XXV, pp. 343–344.

in Austria, Sering in Germany—juggling Marxist phrases, have just as much in common with Marxism as the open anti-Marxist Labourites.

On the other hand, some hardened Labour demagogues are not averse to passing themselves off as followers of Marx, following the example of the right-wing socialists of continental Europe, in order to fool workers and under this mask wage attacks on Marxism-Leninism. Thus, the Labour ideologist Cole resorted to this old trick of revisionist "critics" of Marx. In his book *What Marx Really Meant*, Cole fraudulently declared himself a "20th-century Marxist," while denying the fundamental tenets of Marxism: the theory of classes and class struggle, the doctrine of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the theory of value and surplus value, the law of absolute and relative impoverishment of the working class under capitalism, etc. Verbal "acceptance" of Marxism was necessary for Cole in order to attempt to emasculate Marxism of its revolutionary essence.

Now, when the working people of the whole world see the greatest achievements attained by the Soviet socialist power under the leadership of the party of Bolsheviks—a truly Marxist party of a new type—when the whole world is a witness to the growth of the forces of communism, Labour leaders are not averse to pretending to be Marxists. Thus, the propaganda apparatus of the Labour Party published Karl Marx's and Friedrich Engels's *Manifesto of the Communist Party* in 1948. In the preface to this edition, Harold Laski declares that the true heir to Marxism is... British Labourism! The meaning of this fraud was exposed by the Labour

magazine *New Statesman and Nation* (July 24, 1948), which admitted that for the right-wing Labourites "an assessment of the situation in Marxist terms is urgently necessary" and therefore the publication of the *Communist Manifesto* "should surprise no one".

Even the conservative *Times* (March 28, 1948) mocked the Labourites' fraudulent stunt, writing that "the concluding words of Laski's introduction may be called a conjuring trick. They reveal Professor Laski's ingenuity and versatile abilities." At the same time, the newspaper noted that Laski's attempt to pass the Labourites off as followers of Marx is hopeless. No one will believe it.

Juggling Marxist terms while imbuing them with an anti-Marxist, bourgeois content is an old fraudulent trick of the reformists. The brazen shamelessness of the former chairman of the executive committee of the Labour Party, who in his time spent no little effort on "refuting" Marxism *, reveals only the fear of the Labour top crust before the growth of the forces of socialism throughout the world, before the strengthening of the influence of the Communist Party in the working class of England.

The social basis of Labourism, like any opportunism, is the labor aristocracy. The colossal super-profits extracted by the British bourgeoisie through the exploitation of colonial and dependent nations served as the source from which it bribed the upper crust of English workers. Lenin pointed out that in England "the bourgeoisie—which has behind it the experience... has succeeded in bribing workers and creating a large stratum among them which in England is larger than in

other countries, but still not so large compared to the broad working masses. This stratum is thoroughly imbued with bourgeois prejudices and conducts a definite bourgeois reformist policy"[9]. The labor aristocracy of England became the pillar of the treacherous policy that the leaders of the Labour Party have conducted and are conducting.

One of the ideological sources of modern Labourism was Fabianism. Engels wrote that the Fabians are "a clique of bourgeois 'socialists' of various stripes, from careerists to sentimental socialists and philanthropists, united only by fear of the threatening rule of the workers and ready for anything to prevent this danger, securing leadership for themselves, for the 'educated'"[10].

Denial of Marxism and attacks upon it, the preaching of gradualism "piece by piece," according to Macdonald's expression, of the peaceful "growing into" socialism of capitalism, and other Fabian ideas constitute an inseparable part of Labour ideology to this day. However, the ideology of present-day Labourism cannot be regarded simply as the old Fabian ideology. The right-wing Labourites represent an incomparably greater danger to the labor movement than the Fabians. They have crossed the final line of betrayal of the working class's cause and have now turned into the main pillar of international reaction headed by American and British imperialists.

---

9 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. XXV, p. 368.

10 K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, vol. XXIX, pp. 114–115.

The Labour Party in its majority consists of workers, since trade unions enter this party on the basis of collective membership. Despite this, as Lenin wrote, it is "a thoroughly bourgeois party, because, although it consists of workers, it is led by reactionaries, and the worst kind at that, entirely in the spirit of the bourgeoisie, and with the help of English Noskes and Scheidemanns they systematically deceive the workers"[11].

The reactionary leaders of the Labour Party, consciously defending the interests of British imperialism, borrow without any hesitation the latest "theoretical" fabrications of bourgeois economists dictated by the interests of monopolistic capital.

The Great October Socialist Revolution, the successes of the Stalinist five-year plans, and the building of a socialist society in the USSR exerted a colossal revolutionizing influence on the English working class. The powerful development of the country of socialism represents a profound contrast to the decay of English capitalism, the acute economic crises, chronic unemployment, and growing misery of the masses in England.

Let us recall that the same Laski in his brochures *Karl Marx* and *Marxism*, written long before the Second World War, openly attacked Marx from the positions of bourgeois political economy, using for this purpose the tattered and long-refuted "arguments" of Böhm-Bawerk and other bourgeois economists.

An indelible impression was made on English workers by the world-historic victory of the Soviet Union over German fascism and Japanese militarism. The bourgeois leadership of

---

[11] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. XXV, p. 365.

the Labour Party could not fail to reckon with all this. By systematic deception of workers and measures that it falsely portrays as "socialist," it attempts to retard the process of revolutionization of the working masses of England, their withdrawal from reactionary Labourism. Hence the abundant "socialist" phraseology and sophisticated demagogy to which Labour leaders currently resort.

The incredible hodgepodge that constitutes the ideology of Labourism after the Second World War is called "democratic socialism". In the new historical setting, amidst the colossal growth of the forces of socialism and democracy and the further decline of capitalism, Labourism is forced more than ever before to touch up its old ideological junk as "socialism," covering up its arch-reactionary, imperialist essence with demagogic phrases.

The starting point of Labour views is the denial of the contradiction of interests between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the denial of class struggle, common to all right-wing socialists. Labour ideologists try to instill in the masses that there are no antagonistic contradictions between workers and capitalists, that there are "good" and "bad" capitalists, and that the task of the Labourites, so to speak, consists in blocking with "good" capitalists to correct and remake the "bad" ones. In the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, Labourites invariably stand on the side of the bourgeoisie.

Labourites assure that they will certainly establish "socialism" gradually, little by little, infusing "elements of socialism" into capitalism; socialism, according to their reasoning, will be

created along the paths of "pure democracy" and "bourgeois freedom".

By "freedom," Labour leaders understand freedom for the bourgeoisie, and they admit this quite frankly themselves. Thus, Labourite Douglas Jay in his book (which, incidentally, Attlee recommends as an exposition of the economic views of "democratic socialism") gives the following characterization of those "freedoms" that the Labour government considers itself obliged to defend. Firstly, Jay declares, freedom is the right of everyone to choose the employer for whom they will work. "On the other hand," he writes, "it is economic freedom—freedom to buy or sell, to hire people for industrial or other enterprises or to refrain from hiring"[12]. Thus, by "freedom" is unmistakably understood freedom for capitalists to exploit and "freedom" for workers to choose their exploiter. Such is the basic political principle of Labourism.

"Freedom" in the Labourist fashion means ensuring the most favorable conditions for monopolists to exploit the proletariat and obtain high profits. Under the conditions of the domination of capital, democracy cannot be other than curtailed, false, and hypocritical; it cannot be anything other than democracy only for the exploiters. This is democracy for a negligible part of the population and a regime of exploitation and oppression for the overwhelming majority of members of society. "Only supporters of capitalist slavery," Lenin pointed out, "can stand for bourgeois democracy"[13]. Modern Labourites are ardent supporters of capitalist slavery.

---

[12] Douglas Jay, *The Socialist Case*, London 1947, pp. 273–274.

Labourites proclaim the United States of America as the model of democratism. But who does not know that American imperialists have set foot on the path of fascism in the country's domestic political life, terror against all progressive forces, and the liquidation of even the remnants of democratic freedoms? In England itself, Labour leaders, following the example of their overseas masters, patronize fascists and organize baiting and persecution of communists. Labour leaders use Draconian wartime laws against strikers, organize monstrous persecutions of communists, and carry out a "purge" of institutions and trade unions of progressively minded Englishmen.

Thus, the slogans of bourgeois "democracy" preached by the right-wing Labourites are designed to cover up the actual destruction of elementary democratic freedoms and the use of terrorist methods of struggle against the working class, against its vanguard—the Communist Party.

"Social-democracy," Comrade Stalin wrote in September 1924, "is objectively the moderate wing of fascism"[14]. This proposition is confirmed by the entire course of events after the Second World War.

The more right-wing Labourites resort to fascist methods of struggle against communism, the louder they shout about "pure democracy". The more frequently Attlee, Bevin, and Morrison praise "pure democracy," "bourgeois freedoms," and preach the "peaceful growing into socialism of capitalism," the more hysterical their attacks on the Soviet system, and the more

---

13 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. XXV, p. 74.

14 J. V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 6, p. 282.

slanderous and provocative their ideological campaign against the USSR and the countries of people's democracy, directly connected with the imperialists' preparation of a new aggressive war.

The world-historic experience of the Soviet Union, like the entire history of the international labor movement, confirms the Marxist-Leninist proposition on the irreconcilability of the class interests of workers and capitalists—the exploited majority and exploiting minority—and on the necessity of overthrowing the power of the capitalists in order to create the basis for building socialism. Now the reactionary Labour leaders can no longer limit themselves to references to "empiricism" and "practicality" to justify their policy of "class conciliation". The fact that a socialist society was built in the USSR in the shortest historical period knocked the ground out from under the feet of Labour preachers of "gradualism" who accused communists of a lack of "practicality" and "subordination to abstract theory". The victory of socialism in the USSR proved and showed English workers that the path of Marxism-Leninism is the only practical path for building a new society. Under these conditions, precisely the preachers of "piecemeal" growing into capitalist swinishness turn out to be utopians, and reactionary utopians at that. Confronted by the fact of the victory of socialism in the USSR, Labour leaders could no longer limit themselves to references to their "empiricism" and "dislike of theory". That is why they display inventiveness in the department of all kinds of "theories" and slogans which, according to the expression of an official Labour bulletin, must "awaken that potential idealism of the

masses which has for so long been fed by disappointment and despair"[15]. In hurried order they invent "doctrines" having the aim of "proving" that capitalism in England has, strictly speaking, already "grown" into socialism. All these disquisitions in reality merely cover up the policy of "saving" and defending capitalism in England, the policy of a vicious struggle against socialism conducted by English right-wing Labourites.

The historical experience of recent decades shows that the more the contradictions of capitalism sharpen, the more persistently right-wing socialists strive to conceal and gloss over these contradictions. This old trick of bourgeois economists is applied especially broadly by Labourites in the modern setting. The economic views of Labourites are based on the most vulgar "theories" of bourgeois political economy.

Labour economists very willingly resort to the psychological "theory" reigning in bourgeois political economy. Labour leader Attlee adheres to the psychological method, which proceeds not from relations between people in the process of production, but from the psychology of the individual. He derives the categories of capitalism (profit, dividend, etc.) from the "relative scarcity of things," from the "psychology of scarcity," and at the same time from the policy of England's governments preceding the current Labour one. According to Attlee, the "producer" (capitalist) is interested in ensuring that goods are in short supply and prices are high, since this is a condition for obtaining large profits. Therefore, the "producer"

---

15 *Labour Press Service*, March 1943.

strives to curtail production in every possible way. At the same time, the "consumer" is interested in having plenty of goods, since then their prices will be lower. The task of transforming society "on the principles of socialism," in Attlee's opinion, boils down to transforming the psychology of the "consumer," i.e., the aspiration to expand production, into the guiding principle of the entire economy. For this, as Attlee stated even before the Second World War, it is enough to replace the conservative government with a Labour one, which, supposedly, will manage to convince capitalists of the advantages of the "psychology of abundance" compared to the "psychology of scarcity" and take care of expanding production[16].

Attlee engaged in propagating this "idea" later as well. Speaking on May 13, 1945, at a meeting of the Birmingham District Council of the Labour Party, Attlee stated that "the main cause of suffering throughout the world is the false doctrine of scarcity" and that "the remedy against it is the preservation of purchasing power"[17]. Attlee added to this that the economic views of Labourites are already being assimilated by bankers, industrialists, and figures of all other parties in England. Attlee assured that since the Labour "theory" has been perceived by bourgeois circles, the main prerequisite for transforming society has already been created.

---

[16] Clement Attlee, *The Will and the Way to Socialism*, London 1935, p. 29.

[17] *Reynolds News*, May 14, 1945.

Morrison speaks in the same spirit; the same is stated in the official brochure of the executive committee of the Labour Party, *Labour Believes in Expansion*, issued for the party conference in Margate in July 1947.

However, such capitalism as Attlee portrayed does not exist in nature. According to Attlee, it turns out as if the capitalist does nothing but strive to increase profit by curtailing production. But the world has not yet seen such capitalists. In reality, the capitalist expands production and intensifies the exploitation of workers in order to maximize the rate and mass of profit. In periods of economic crises, when all the disasters generated by capitalism—the misery of the masses, unemployment, etc.—are especially intensified, overproduction of goods is present, and shops and warehouses groan under their excess. However, Labour leaders are little bothered by the fact that the picture they painted has nothing in common with reality. Their main task is to deceive the working masses, conceal from them the insoluble contradictions of capitalist society, and instill the hope that all the ills of capitalism will disappear as a result of the expansion of production allegedly achieved by the Labour government.

The "doctrine of scarcity" preached by Attlee is an exact copy of the "theory of scarcity and abundance" of Bastiat, a vulgar economist of the first half of the 19th century, set forth in his *Economic Sophisms*. Attlee lays this "theory" at the foundation of Labour "socialism". However, the "doctrine of scarcity" is clearly insufficient to convince working people that under Labour rule they are "free" from capitalist exploitation.

Therefore, Labourites strenuously seek out additional "arguments" to "substantiate" their views.

In this regard, Douglas Jay's "concept" is revealing. He asserts that no surplus value exists at all, since interest is payment for a "necessary service" rendered by the owner of money capital to the entrepreneur, payment for expected income, and profit is a bonus for risk and at the same time payment for a "necessary service". Profit and interest, according to Jay, are the exact same elements of production costs and "factors of production" as wages 14. Here, as we see, the "theory of services" of Say—i.e., the basic tenets of vulgar political economy of the first half of the 19th century, which Marx subjected to crushing criticism—is resurrected as the official "substantiation" of "democratic socialism". Bastiat, Say—such are the teachers of Labourites in the field of political economy. In the struggle against communism, the Labour top crust uses the "theories" of vulgar bourgeois economists who viewed capital's privileges as a law of nature.

For Jay, the "introduction of socialism" by no means signifies the elimination of capitalists. In his representation, socialism boils down merely to the replacement of competition by monopoly. And the Labourites, without batting an eye, pass off capitalism as socialism. Once the capitalist is as necessary to production as the worker, exploitation can be considered "non-existent".

Labour politicians and economists declare exploitation and capitalism to have completely or almost completely disappeared. Proceeding from such "theoretical" premises, Labourite Crossman stated on September 11, 1947, that the

bourgeoisie in Western Europe has disappeared, just as the proletariat has disappeared. "There are still cases of exploitation of the working class. However, these phenomena in Western Europe have become an exception rather than the rule," he said. Morrison at the imperial conference in the autumn of 1948 also did not hesitate to state that throughout the British Empire the exploitation of man by man no longer exists.

All this is preached by the Labour leadership at a time when, at the bidding of the monopolists of Wall Street and the City, it is waging a launched offensive against the living standards of the working masses, is doing everything possible to intensify the exploitation of the working class, and is loading a huge burden of military expenditures onto the people. That is precisely why the ideologists and "theoreticians" of Labourism are eagerly engaged in composing "new" and patching up old "theories" denying the presence of capitalist exploitation in modern England, in the British Empire, and also in Western Europe. In this way they expect to deceive the working class and divert it from the struggle against capital, for its economic and political rights and interests, for socialism.

Avoiding an analysis of the production relations of capitalism, Labourites transfer the center of gravity of their reasoning into the sphere of circulation. This is done in order to gloss over the class contradictions of contemporary England, to escape the questions of class struggle. The right Labourites see the "root evil" of capitalism in the uneven distribution of wealth. "The main factor that divides society into classes," Attlee wrote, "is

the inequality of wealth"[18]. "The introduction of socialism" means, in the opinion of Labourites, the redistribution of purchasing power, the "equalization of wealth," and this redistribution of wealth should under no circumstances be accompanied by the struggle of workers against capital; it must be implemented solely on the basis of an agreement with capitalists.

Labour ideologists proclaim "just distribution" of wealth through the taxation of the rich as the most important means of "equalizing wealth". Thus, the Labour conference in 1934 declared that wealth can be "equalized" through the application of an appropriate system of taxation. In the electoral program of the Labour Party in 1945, it was declared that "the path to socialism," or what is the same thing for Labourites—"the path to high and constant purchasing power"—is social insurance and taxation[19].

"Just distribution of incomes" is an old petty-bourgeois idea. Its goal is to divert workers from the struggle to overthrow the power of capital, for socialism. In reality, while private ownership of the means of production is preserved, no system of taxation can destroy the power of capital, nor can it touch either the wealth of the bourgeoisie or bourgeois exploitation. That this is truly so is confirmed by the four-year experience of Labour rule in England. The Labour government, admitted to power by monopolists, implements only such a tax policy as fully answers the interests of its masters the monopolists and is

---

18 Douglas Jay, *The Socialist Case*, pp. 61, 62, 68–71.

19 *Let Us Face the Future*, London 1945.

radically hostile to the working class, to all working people of England.

Facts refute the false fabrications of ideologists and practitioners of Labourism. As is known, the Second World War was accompanied in England as well by a colossal growth of capitalist profits and the further impoverishment of the working masses, first of all the working class. Even the Labour magazine *Tribune* on April 12, 1946, i.e., less than a year after the Labour government came to power, wrote: "The monopoly positions of the rich have strengthened, and their profits have increased. If you are rich, it is easy for you to become even richer".

After the war, the profits of English capitalists continue to grow. Over the period 1945–1947, the sum of rents, interests, and profits after tax deduction increased by no less than 22% compared to the maximum wartime level, and taxes on capitalist profits not only did not increase, but on the contrary, decreased. Thus, in 1947, total revenues from profit taxes were much smaller than tax revenues of 1944, although profits then were significantly lower than in 1947. At the same time, the sum of workers' wages and employees' salaries after tax deductions remained almost unchanged, and prices rose sharply.

Even Cole, in an article published in the Labour magazine *New Statesman and Nation* (February 14, 1948), actually admitted that, contrary to Attlee's statement, the specific weight of workers' and employees' incomes in England's national income from 1938 to 1947 did not increase, despite the growth of employment. According to official data cited by the magazine,

which clearly embellish reality, the specific weight of wages in England's national income, before tax deductions, increased from only 41.4% in 1938 to 42.3% in 1946, while the specific weight of salaries fell from 25.3 to 21%. Thus, the total share of wages and salaries decreased from 66.7% in 1943 to 63.3% in 1946, while the share of rent, profits, and interests increased correspondingly from 33.3 to 36.7%.

But here, according to the statement of the Labour government, a wonderful means of salvation from all the evils of capitalism comes into play—taxation. The governmental "White Paper," issued in February 1948, asserted that the tax policy of the Labourites made it possible to redistribute incomes to the detriment of capitalists and in favor of workers and employees. By means of taxes, such a sum is now extracted from capitalists, according to the government's statement, as supposedly reduces the specific weight of capitalists' profits in the national income. According to official data, after the deduction of direct taxes, the specific weight of wages in the national income amounted to 44% in 1946, salaries—23%, profits—33%. If one is to believe this calculation, then the specific weight of profits in the national income stands at the level of the pre-war year of 1938. This means that even official data expose the mendacity of Labour assertions about the supposedly occurred "redistribution" of wealth. However, this calculation does not take into account indirect taxes, which, as is known, fall mainly on the shoulders of working people and are a deduction from wages. Indirect taxes, minus food subsidies, amounted to the huge sum of 1,180 million pounds sterling in 1946 against 600-odd million pounds sterling in

1938, or almost twice as much. According to data cited by H. Pollitt in his report at the plenum of the Executive Committee of the British Communist Party in February 1949, 75% of indirect taxes are paid by the English working class. But even if we consider that 75% of indirect taxes fall on workers and employees together, and 25% on the bourgeoisie, it turns out that the specific weight of profits in England's national income has increased significantly in recent times compared to 1938. England's national income equaled 8,100 million pounds sterling in 1946[20], the sum of indirect taxes paid by workers amounted to 885 million pounds sterling in 1946, or 9.1% of the national income, while no more than 295 million pounds sterling of indirect taxes fell on the bourgeoisie, or 3.6% of the entire national income. Consequently, if we take into account not only direct, but also indirect taxes, then the specific weight of profits in the national income will increase significantly (to no less than 36–37%); while the specific weight of wages and salaries will correspondingly be lower *. After 1946, a further redistribution of England's national income in favor of the bourgeoisie took place. In 1946–1948, direct taxes on the bourgeoisie were reduced by 50 million pounds sterling, whereas indirect taxes increased by 365 million pounds sterling. Profits are growing. Thus, the profits of 2,348 largest English companies increased in 1948 by 65% compared to 1945. Capitalist dividends under the Labour government exceed the extremely high dividends of wartime by one and a half times. These figures are the clearest indicator of in whose favor the national income has been redistributed in England.

---

[20] *Annual Abstract of Statistics*, 1937–1947, p. 220.

The cited data irrefutably testify that the tax policy proclaimed by Labourites as a lever for "equalizing wealth" and "building socialism" is in reality implemented in the interests of capitalists; wages are declining, profits continue to grow; the rich have become even richer, the poor—even poorer.

We are not even speaking of the fact that Labour statisticians classify directors and all sorts of other senior employees living off surplus value under the category of employees. Meanwhile, for example, directors and board members of "nationalized" branches of industry receive huge salaries at the expense of surplus value created by the workers of these branches.

Lenin wrote that "a billionaire cannot divide the 'national income' of a capitalist country with anyone else otherwise than in the proportion: 'according to capital' (and moreover with the addition that the largest capital receives more than it is due). Capitalism is private property in the means of production and anarchy of production. Preaching a 'just' division of income on such a basis is Proudhonism, the stupidity of the petit bourgeois and philistine. One cannot divide otherwise than 'according to strength'"[21].

Under the cover of talk about "just distribution" of incomes, about "social justice," the Labour leadership invariably helps large capitalists obtain and divide profits and dividends "according to strength," in the proportion "according to capital". But apart from this, the colossal growth of England's state budget, in particular at the expense of indirect taxes,

---

[21] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. 21, p. 310.

means nothing other than the use of the state apparatus by financial capital in order to shift the costs of past wars and the preparation of a new war onto the shoulders of the working class. The Labour "theory of equalizing wealth" simply covers up the redistribution of national income in favor of monopolists and holders of government securities. This is its true meaning.

Dalton, Attlee, and other Labour leaders attached special importance in the "realization of socialism" to the introduction of a progressive inheritance tax. They assured that through high taxation of inheritance, almost the entire capitalist economy could be gradually transferred to the ownership of the state. This "plan," like other "plans" of the Labourites, is thoroughly demagogic. The inheritance tax has existed in England for more than half a century—since 1895. This tax has no influence and cannot have any influence on the size of accumulated or existing capital. What kind of "liquidation of capitalism" through increasing the inheritance tax can we talk about when this tax, even according to the 1948/49 budget, amounts to the negligible sum of 160 million pounds sterling! Such is the state of affairs with this Labour "main instrument for building socialism".

The tax policy of the Labourites ensures the protection of monopolists' incomes under the cover of "socialist" slogans.

The preaching of "class cooperation" between workers and capitalists is supplemented by Labourites with disquisitions on the "supra-class character of the state". The state is portrayed by them as a certain neutral force allegedly standing above classes. The peaceful transition to socialism, without shocks and alarms, without struggle, the Labourites reiterate, is

ensured by a parliamentary majority. They proclaim the British parliament all-powerful, and the British constitution with the king at the head as the highest achievement of "democracy".

The thoroughly mendacious assertion of the Labourites that the bourgeois state stands above classes and is capable of creating new social relations pursues the goal of passing off state-monopoly measures as socialist. Labourites proclaim any property of the capitalist state as "socialist property," chattering about "two sectors": private and "socialist," which allegedly peacefully coexist under the aegis of the "supra-class state". Thus, Dalton asserted that in any civilized society there is a "socialized sector" and that "each such sector has a system of public finance, public service, its own laws, police, civil administration, and armed forces"[22]. Dalton counts the police, army, court, and of course prisons—precisely those instruments of bourgeois state power that are intended for the implementation of direct violence against the proletariat, for its suppression and plunder—among the "socialist sector".

The "theory of mixed economy" was borrowed by Labour ideologists from bourgeois economists—open apologists of monopolistic capital (the German fascist economist Sombart, American economists Lorwin, Chase, etc.).

Labour leaders, in search of ways to "save" and strengthen British imperialism, seek new forms of merging monopolies with the state, new channels of subordinating the bourgeois state to financial capital. Even before the Second World War,

---

[22] Hugh Dalton, *Practical Socialism for Britain*, 1935, pp. 26–27.

Morrison, Attlee, and Dalton strenuously propagated the creation of so-called "public corporations". The essence of "public corporations" boiled down to forming monopolies out of enterprises bought out by the state or owned by capitalists, under the leadership and management of government-appointed "business people," i.e., capitalist-monopolists. At the same time, it was envisaged that corporations should conduct business at their own discretion, while the government would generously finance these corporations from the state purse, i.e., at the expense of working taxpayers. These state-capitalist monopolies are proclaimed by Labourites to be "socialist enterprises"[23]. According to this recipe, the London Passenger Transport Board, the British Broadcasting Corporation, and the Central Electricity Board were formed. The latter subsidized large electrical monopolies at the state's expense and bought out the enterprises of their competitors, later transferred to the full control of those same monopoly associations of the electrical industry.

The "nationalization" of the coal industry, power plants, and railways carried out by the Labourites represents a new, modern form of state-monopoly capitalism in which the principles of "public corporations" are utilized in every possible way. Entire branches of industry passed into the ownership of the bourgeois state, and the owners of "nationalized" enterprises, receiving generous compensation,

---

[23] n reality, this form of monopolization was "discovered" not by the Labourites, but by the monopolists themselves, who began organizing "public corporations" long before Labour leaders declared "public corporations" to be "socialist" in nature.

not only lost nothing, but on the contrary, gained as a result of this measure.

In the 12 managements of "nationalized" enterprises (the National Coal Board, the Transport Commission and four transport executive committees, the British Electricity Authority, the Gas Council, Cable and Wireless, and three air corporations) there are 87 members. 13 of them are major capitalists, 9 are government officials, 4 are army officers, 4 are highly paid specialists and administrators, 17 are former trade union and cooperative officials. Thus, complete domination of monopolists is ensured in the managements. But the other part of the management members also consists of persons unquestioningly executing the will of monopolies, completely dependent on them. As for the trade union officials admitted to the managements, they passed a thorough "verification" from the standpoint of "reliability," i.e., devotion to the interests of the financial oligarchy.

In their economic activity, these managements are "autonomous," i.e., financial-industrial magnates retain the management of nationalized branches in their hands and have state-guaranteed profits. The owners of "nationalized" enterprises and the Bank of England received compensation bonds for the fantastic sum of 2,447 million pounds sterling. These bonds bring them a guaranteed income, independent of market fluctuations, in the amount of 81 million pounds sterling[24].

[24] Data cited in H. Pollitt's report at the plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Great Britain in February 1949.

Labour ideologists pass off the nationalization of individual branches of English industry as "socialism," trying to use new forms of merging monopolies with the state for demagogic propaganda in order to deceive workers. Their actual goal is to strengthen the shaken positions of British imperialism and enhance the domination of England's financial oligarchy. Labour "nationalization" is implemented in the interests of monopolistic capital as a whole, with maximum profit for the capitalists of the "nationalized" branches. Export monopolies also directly benefit from "nationalization," since this "nationalization" is aimed at increasing their competitiveness on the world market.

The bourgeois nationalization carried out in England ensures the redistribution of national income in favor of monopolies. "Nationalization" of the Labour type preserves intact the capitalist exploitation of workers at "nationalized" enterprises. The surplus value created by workers of "nationalized" branches goes to pay interest on bonds issued to former owners of enterprises, as well as high salaries to members and chairmen of managements of these branches, i.e., to those same former owners. The state exploits workers here both as a representative of monopolistic capital as a whole and as an authorized agent of the monopolists of "nationalized" branches of industry. No mendacious and hypocritical disquisitions of Labour ideologists can change this essence of Labour "nationalization".

Portraying their nationalization measures as "socialist" at workers' meetings, Labour leaders do not hide in books written not for the people that the purpose of these measures is to

protect and strengthen monopolies. Thus, in the book *Prospects and Policies*, published at the end of the Second World War, Morrison openly states that the domination of monopolies is an undeniable fact; the "shortcomings" of monopolies consist in the fact that they limit production and establish high prices. Monopolies, Morrison admits, generate decay, industrial decline, unemployment; with industrial decline comes a "decline in enterprise, inventiveness, a decline in the spirit of courage and risk". What exit from this situation does Morrison propose? Destroy monopolies? No, he proposes to reform them: monopolies must be improved by "legislative changes, careful public supervision, and a tax policy that encourages enterprise". "Our monopolies can become a true factor of growing prosperity," he writes[25]. Morrison is for "nationalization" (through transformation into "public corporations") of such "natural monopolies" as coal, electricity, and railways. But other private monopolies, especially export ones, must, in his opinion, be encouraged in every possible way.

As we see, there is no difference between such revelations of right-wing Labourites and the writings of bourgeois economists. Labourites are direct and conscious defenders of monopolistic capital.

Lenin and Stalin repeatedly emphasized the reactionary, bourgeois nature of Labour leaders. The bourgeois nature of the Labour Party's top crust is manifested especially sharply in its labor, or rather anti-labor, policy. Having adopted the

---

[25] Herbert Morrison, *Prospects and Policies*, 1944, p. 25.

economic views of Keynes, the ideologist of monopolistic capital, right-wing Labourites implement in practice his most reactionary guidelines on the inadmissibility of raising the nominal wages of workers despite the growth of prices for consumer goods.

The policy of "freezing" wages under conditions of inflation and the continuous growth of prices, which is implemented by the Labour government and the trade union top crust, fully corresponds to the interests of English monopolies and leads to a further decline in the living standard of English workers. "The offensive against the living standards of workers," states the declaration of the Communist Party of Great Britain of September 20, 1948, "is now in full swing. To work more intensively, to work longer, to lower real wages—such are the prospects Cripps offers to workers".

The Labour government has already stated that it will continue the policy of "freezing" wages in the 1949/50 budget year as well.

In 1948, prices for food and mass consumption goods increased significantly in England (by 9–10%) given the actual stability of wages. The reduction of budgetary subsidies in 1949/50 by 103 million pounds sterling means a new increase in retail prices for food and clothing. As a result of the subsidy reduction, prices for meat, cheese, butter, and margarine have already risen. Price increases are expected for other food products as well. Real wages of workers are falling, capitalist profits are growing—such are the fruits of the "socialist" policy of right-wing Labour leaders.

To justify the broad offensive against the living standard of England's working class conducted by big capital through the agency of its Labour intermediaries, assurances are put into circulation that raising wages will lead to a new growth of prices and inflation, cause a drop in production, and thereby an increase in unemployment, etc. Cripps, in his speech at the Margate Trade Union Conference in September 1948, managed to "prove" that a reduction of profits cannot lead to a rise in wages, and simultaneously defended the thesis that without increasing labor intensity no wage increase is possible. This is how Labourites "substantiate" the intensification of labor implemented by them jointly with English monopolistic capital. The Labour magazine *New Statesman and Nation* (September 18, 1948), in turn, asserted that capitalist profits cannot be limited, just as the laws of nature cannot be changed. The bourgeoisie must accumulate, the magazine wrote, any reduction in accumulation is harmful, and besides, the bourgeoisie will object to this (!)

As usual in such cases, Labourites resort to demagogy. They motivate the policy of offensive against the living standard of the working class by the "interests of socialism". Cripps demanded that workers' labor intensity be increased and their wages "frozen," as it turns out, so that "British socialism" (in reality—monopolistic capital) could reduce production costs and raise the competitiveness of English goods on the world market. The policy of the Labourites consists in having the working class pay the costs of past wars. At the same time, they strive at the expense of the working class to retain old

positions for British imperialism on the world market and conquer new ones.

The offensive of monopolistic capital against the working class, implemented by the hands of right-wing Labour leaders, most vividly testifies to the reactionary character of Labour policy and ideology. As H. Pollitt noted, Labourites "have introduced into the labor movement the theory and practice of the capitalist class"[26].

The entire foreign policy of the Labourites, in particular on the German question, the question of the Ruhr, and in the policy of "unifying" Europe, pursues a single goal—the struggle under the aegis of the USA against the Soviet Union, the preparation of a war against the camp of socialism and democracy. The foreign policy of right-wing Labourites is aimed at destroying the national sovereignty of peoples, suppressing the democratic movement, and establishing Anglo-American world domination. The Labour government conducts a policy of implementing aggressive plans and defending the interests of British and American imperialism.

The Labour leadership before coming to power in 1945 operated under the slogan of "eliminating imperialism" in the sphere of colonial policy and promised to grant freedom to the colonies. After their electoral victory, Labour leaders did not cease to assure that "the old imperialism is already dead". "Imperialism," Attlee stated at the end of 1947, "by which I

---

[26] Harry Pollitt, *For Britain Free and Independent*, 1948, p. 32.

mean the political and economic domination of a strong nation, has no place in the British Empire".

Of course, the disquisitions of Labour ideologists about the "withering away of imperialism" are pure demagogy. The policy of right-wing Labourites, their activity in the colonies, is aimed at preserving and strengthening the colonial slavery of the peoples of the British Empire in every possible way.

The colonial wars that Labour imperialists are waging in Southeast Asia against the peoples of Malaya and Burma, and the brutal suppression of the national liberation movement in the African colonies of the British Empire, reveal the true essence of the Labour government's policy. It is developing and implementing plans to intensify imperialist exploitation in Africa under the flag of the necessity of developing the resources of the "black continent". The intensified export of English capital to African possessions is accompanied by the growth of exploitation of the peoples of Africa. The creation with the financial support and direct participation of the Labour government of new monopolies (the Colonial Development Corporation with a capital of 400 million dollars, the Overseas Food Corporation with a capital of 200 million dollars) testifies to the aspiration of British imperialists to expand the export of capital to their colonies. Invisible incomes from England's overseas capital investments are planned to increase from 35 million pounds sterling in 1948/49 to 263 million pounds sterling in 1952/53, i.e., by 8 times. This means a gigantic intensification of the exploitation of the peoples of colonial and

dependent countries, a huge pumping out of raw materials from Africa, Southeast Asia, and other English colonies[27].

Labour "liberators" of colonies in reality conduct a policy of the most brutal suppression and intensification of exploitation of colonial peoples in the interests of British imperialism, a policy of preserving the regime of colonial slavery.

Under conditions of the aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism, right-wing Labourites have become bearers of an aggressive, imperialist ideology. Precisely in order to retain influence over the working masses, Labourites cover up the imperialist content of their ideology with a thick veil of "socialist" phraseology. Such a combination of the most reactionary, imperialist views with "socialist" demagogy makes Labour ideology especially dangerous for the working class and especially valuable for English and American imperialists.

Labour politicians and ideologists have fully adopted the ideology of bourgeois, imperialist cosmopolitanism, which after the Second World War became an important weapon of American and English imperialism in the struggle to establish their world domination. Cosmopolitanism is the direct opposite of proletarian internationalism. Cosmopolitanism is inherent in the bourgeoisie as a class whose existence is based on the exploitation of the proletariat. In the chase for profit, capital knows no homeland. This cosmopolitanism of the bourgeoisie was noted by Marx and Engels back in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. Marx also wrote about the cosmopolitan nature of capitalist profit in the first volume of *Capital*.

---

[27] *Labour Monthly*, April 1949, p. 102.

In the book *The Civil War in France*, Marx pointed out: "The Second Empire was the jubilee of cosmopolitan swindling, upon whose call blacklegs of all countries rushed to take part in its orgies and in the plunder of the French people"[28]. Counterrevolutionary Paris, staging bloody orgies after the fall of the Commune, Marx characterized with the greatest hatred as a "cosmopolitan den"[29].

The cosmopolitan nature of the bourgeoisie manifests itself with special force in the epoch of imperialism. If the bourgeoisie is cosmopolitan by its nature, financial capital is doubly cosmopolitan. Lenin and Stalin repeatedly emphasized that monopolists in the chase for profit penetrate everywhere, seizing sources of raw materials, sales markets, spheres of capital investment. "Imperialism," Lenin wrote, "means the growth of capital beyond the framework of national states; it means the expansion and aggravation of national oppression on a new historical basis"[30].

The cosmopolitan nature of the bourgeoisie in general, and of monopolistic capital in particular, coexists quite well with the preaching of chauvinism, with national oppression. In an imperialist war, the bourgeoisie, pursuing aggressive, predatory goals, sets the workers of some countries against the workers of other countries. Bourgeois cosmopolitanism is inextricably linked with chauvinism, with the preaching of hatred toward other peoples, with racial discrimination. And just as bourgeois

---

28 Marx and Engels Archives, vol. III (VIII), 1934, p. 55.

29 *Ibid.*, p. 435.

30 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. 21, pp. 371–372.

cosmopolitanism is opposite to proletarian internationalism, so the chauvinism of the bourgeoisie is directly opposite to the patriotism of the working class. The working class defends the correctly understood interests of its homeland against the cosmopolitanism of monopolies which, in the chase for markets, raw material sources, and spheres of capital investment, recognize neither honor, nor conscience, nor homeland.

After the victory of the socialist revolution in Russia, the imperialist bourgeoisie began to intensively develop projects for creating "a united Europe" in various variants to fight against the USSR. The "crusade" against the Soviet Union before the Second World War was proposed by Coudenhove-Kalergi and Briand under the cosmopolitan slogans of creating a "super-Europe".

The sharp aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism as a result of the Second World War was marked by an intensification of the cosmopolitan preaching of imperialists. Bourgeois cosmopolitanism is aimed at abolishing the national sovereignty and state independence of peoples with the aim of subjugating them to Anglo-American domination.

Patriotism and national independence are disparaged in every possible way by the ideologists of the Anglo-American contenders for world domination, who operate under the slogan of a "world super-government" and a "world state" under the aegis of the USA.

Ardent defenders of cosmopolitanism are the right-wing socialists of Western Europe headed by the English Labourites.

Labour leaders cover up their cosmopolitan slogans with internationalist phraseology. By this trick, right-wing Labourites hope to deceive workers and justify in their eyes their policy of serving American imperialism. The preaching of cosmopolitanism serves as an ideological cover for the imperialists' preparation of a new world war.

Labour ideologists, alongside conservatives, put forward the slogan of a "United Europe" or "United States of Europe" after the Second World War. The complete coincidence of the guidelines of conservatives and Labourites on this issue testifies once again to the imperialist nature of the slogan of the "United States of Europe" itself and to the fact that both Labourites and conservatives fulfill the social order of imperialism. As Morrison expressed it in a fit of frankness, "the difference between the two parties is not in statute: they fulfill the same function"[31].

In the slogan of the "United States of Europe" itself, as is known, there is nothing new or original. Lenin subjected this slogan to crushing criticism back during the years of the First World War. "Under capitalism," Lenin wrote, "even growth in the economic development of individual economies and individual states is impossible. Under capitalism, other means of restoring disrupted equilibrium from time to time are impossible except crises in industry, wars in politics. Of course, temporary agreements between capitalists and between powers are possible. In this sense, a United States of Europe is also possible, as an agreement of European capitalists... about

---

[31] Herbert Morrison, *Prospects and Policies*, p. 30.

what? Only about how to jointly crush socialism in Europe, jointly guard the plundered colonies..."[32].

The slogan of a "United Europe" put forward at present pursues the same goal—the temporary unification of capitalist countries to fight communism, for the joint exploitation of colonies. It is even indicated which colonies are subject to joint exploitation: African and some others. All this is served up under the cosmopolitan slogans of a "single European parliament," a "single European cabinet of ministers," etc.—naturally under the leadership of American imperialists.

American imperialism regards the "unification of Europe" as a means of colonizing the European continent. The Labourites, acting as old preachers and practical conductors of the "unification of Western Europe," fulfill the role of lackeys of American imperialism. At the same time, they serve faithfully and truly their own "domestic" imperialism, which has not abandoned the policy of new conquests, the dream of world domination. The cosmopolitan slogans of a "United Europe," of a "European super-government," defended by imperialists and their Labour lackeys, are designed to serve as a cover for the imperialist plans of American-English world domination.

Labour leaders assured that they were leading their country along a special, "third path," different both from the path of the USA and from the path of CCCP. This lie was very quickly exposed by life. The notorious "third path" turned out in reality to be a capitalist, imperialist path, and the "democratic socialism" of Messrs. Attlee, Bevin, and Morrison—a simple

---

[32] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. 21, p. 310.

camouflage of Labourism's role as an instrument in the hands of imperialism.

In their ideological struggle against communism and in the preparation of war against the USSR, Labourites also resort to other falsifications. They state, for example, that imperialism—not only English, but also American—no longer exists. US imperialism, Bevin stated in a speech on January 22, 1948, does not exist in nature, and the "Marshall Plan" supposedly has "no other political motives than the selfless desire to help Europe get on its feet". Bevin tried to pass off the "Marshall Plan" as a manifestation of the purest "altruism" on the part of American "benefactors". Thus Attlee-Cole's old tall tale about "good capitalists" found international application today. If earlier it served the purposes of justifying English capitalism, now it is designed to whitewash predatory American imperialism.

But the more the imperialist essence of the "Marshall Plan" manifested itself during its implementation, the deeper the working people of Western Europe understood that the "Marshall Plan" is a plan for the enslavement of Western European countries by American imperialists—the more the mendacity of the right-wing socialists' assertions was exposed. The continuing decline in the authority and influence of right-wing socialists and Labourites among the workers and all working people of Western Europe is explained in no small degree by the fact that the "Marshall Plan" advertised by them led to the deterioration of the economy of "marshallized" countries, to the growth of impoverishment of the working population, and first of all the working class. At the same time,

the slanderous campaign conducted by right-wing socialist traitors against the Soviet Union and the baiting of communists became ever more vile and repulsive. The Western Bloc of five countries was the direct offspring of the "Marshall Plan" and the preparation of the aggressive North Atlantic Pact. Both the Western Union, the European Council, and the North Atlantic Pact, directed against the USSR and the countries of people's democracy, were prepared to a large extent ideologically and politically by right-wing socialists, and first and foremost by Labourites, at the bidding of the capitalist monopolies of the USA and England.

Labourites advertise the North Atlantic Pact as a new step toward creating a "world super-government," which, in their opinion, is destined to replace the United Nations organization. One of the "theoreticians" of Labourism, Crossman, wrote frankly in the *Sunday Pictorial*: "Why shouldn't the member states of the Atlantic Pact create a national body that will own atomic energy and control it? Why not create an international police force without waiting for Russia? By doing this, we will begin to turn the Atlantic Pact into the embryo of a world government". What is on the minds of American and English imperialists is on the tongue of their lackey. The "super-government" is the government of Wall Street, and the police forces that Crossman proposes to create for the pact's participants pursue the goal of suppressing the working class, which wants neither war nor Anglo-American domination.

The preaching of "democratic socialism," the "United States of Europe," "super-government," "international planning," etc., is the ideological cover for the political and economic preparation

of American and English imperialism for war for world domination.

At the basis of the socio-economic views of the Labour traitors to the cause of the working class lies the ideology of the reactionary bourgeois elements forming the top crust of the Labour Party. The stratum of the labor aristocracy and the trade union bureaucracy bribed and corrupted by imperialism was the nourishing base of English opportunism or, as it was called before the First World War, Fabianism. It also served as the basis for the degeneration of opportunism into the ideology of "defending" the imperialist homeland, into social-imperialism. This degeneration of opportunism into chauvinism, into social-imperialism, took place in England, as in other European countries, back during the First World War.

"Fabian imperialism" and "social-imperialism," Lenin wrote, "are one and the same thing: socialism in words, imperialism in deeds, the degeneration of opportunism into imperialism. This phenomenon has now, during the war of 1914–1918 and after it, become a universal fact". And further Lenin pointed out: "Opportunism or reformism had inevitably to degenerate into world-historic socialist imperialism or social-chauvinism, because imperialism singled out a handful of the wealthiest, advanced nations plundering the whole world, and thereby enabled the bourgeoisie of these countries to bribe out of their monopoly super-profit (imperialism is monopolistic capitalism) the upper strata of the working class of these countries"[33].

---

[33] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. XXIV, p. 391.

Between the early Fabians of the late 19th century and Fabian imperialists of the type of Hyndman, Blatchford, and others who helped the English bourgeoisie wage an imperialist war, the distance is immense.

After the Second World War, amidst a sharp change in the balance of power between the socialist and capitalist systems in favor of socialism, British imperialism assigns new tasks to its "workers' lieutenants". Now Labourism acts in a new role—in the role of an instrument of Anglo-American imperialism in its struggle for world domination. The distance between present-day Labourites and Fabian imperialists of the times of the First World War is no less, but even greater, than between Fabian imperialists and the group of bourgeois Fabian intellectuals of the late 19th century.

The Fabians helped the bourgeoisie drive workers into an imperialist war. Present-day Labourites, acting as "Her Majesty's Government," acting in concert with American imperialists, organize the war against the USSR and the countries of people's democracy themselves. The Fabians operated under the flag of chauvinism, setting workers of some countries against workers of other countries. Modern Labour imperialists operate under the flag of cosmopolitanism—the destruction of national sovereignty and national culture with the aim of enslaving the entire world by American billionaires. Of course, they do not refuse at the same time to use the old chauvinistic, nationalist poison, since cosmopolitanism is the flip side of chauvinism.

Modern Labourites, like right-wing socialists of other countries, act in the role of direct enemies of the working class. They have become direct conductors of the ideology of American and English imperialism, masking it with abundant "socialist" phraseology. Deception of the masses, slander against socialism, defense of the interests of monopolies and new forms of subordinating the state to monopolies under the flag of "democratic socialism," hatred for everything progressive, fear of communism, preparation of war against the USSR and the countries of people's democracy, conscious activity in implementing the predatory plans of Anglo-American imperialism—such is the "ideological" visage of right-wing Labourites.

In the sphere of domestic policy, the Labour Party currently rejects even the program of nationalization that externally distinguished it previously from the remaining bourgeois parties of England—Conservative or Liberal. In the electoral program *Labour Believes in Britain*, published on April 12, 1949, by the Executive Committee of the Labour Party, instead of nationalization of industry, the slogan of all-out support for monopolistic capital is put forward. Morrison's disquisitions about "improving" monopolies and "eliminating their shortcomings" while preserving their "good sides" are embodied in the new electoral program of the Labourites. "In the past," the program states, "monopolies tried to work behind closed doors. But now, when the government has created the Monopolies Commission, anti-social methods will be exposed". So, instead of destroying monopolies, Labourites are going to "improve" them; this "work" will have to be done by a

commission consisting of representatives of the City and trade union bureaucrats bribed by monopolies! Of course, the English financial oligarchy warmly welcomes such a policy, all the more so since in the same program Labour leaders announced their intention to subsidize monopolists in every possible way and not allow encroachments on their profits.

Support for the offensive of capital against the working class, poorly covered by a few phrases about "democratic socialism"—such is the essence of this document presented by the Executive Committee to the annual conference of the Labour Party held in Blackpool on June 6–10, 1949. At this conference, Labour leaders took all measures to prevent the discussion of either the program as a whole or the resolutions received in large numbers by the conference from local Labour Party organizations and trade unions, in which dissatisfaction with the policy of the Labour government was expressed. The bourgeois newspaper *Manchester Guardian* wrote that the provisions of the Labour Party program *Labour Believes in Britain* sound "more like an excerpt from a Liberal program". It is well known that any differences between the programs of the Liberal and Conservative parties disappeared a long time ago. Differences are disappearing between the programs of Labourites and Conservatives as well. Even the *Times* (April 13, 1949) wrote regarding the same electoral program of the Labourites that "it will now be harder than ever before to draw distinctions between parties on the basis of their programs alone".

If in the sphere of domestic policy the Labour Party rejects the implementation of reforms promising which it won the

elections of 1945, then in the sphere of foreign policy it has adopted Churchill's Fulton program—the program of preparing and unleashing a war against the USSR and the countries of people's democracy. The colossal growth of military expenditures, the provision of military bases to the USA in England, the organization of the Western Union, the signing of the North Atlantic Pact, support for the "Marshall Plan," and participation in organizing the "European Council"—all this is an expression of the foreign policy line of the Labourites, which is fully and completely approved by the Conservatives.

At the Blackpool Conference, Labour ministers once again spoke with slander and insinuations addressed to the Soviet Union, trying to justify their policy of the arms race and military bloc with the USA against the USSR and the countries of people's democracy.

The great Russian writer Maxim Gorky spoke about the spiritual impoverishment of the modern bourgeoisie. Spiritual impoverishment is a characteristic feature of the ideology of Labourism, which has adopted the most corrupted views of imperialist economists and politicians. "Obviously, history has chosen such a path on which the role of 'workers' lieutenants of the capitalist class' must be brought to the 'last limit' of bestiality, baseness, and vileness," Lenin wrote[34].

Resistance to the reactionary domestic and foreign policy of the Labour leadership is mounting more and more within the English working class. The strike struggle erupting in various branches of English industry expresses protest against the

---

[34] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. XXIII, p. 498.

policy of "freezing" wages. In numerous resolutions passed by local trade union organizations, acute dissatisfaction of workers with the Labour policy of patronizing and ensuring high profits to monopolies, a policy contributing to the growth of prices for prime necessities, finds expression. Progressive, democratic organizations of England demand a change in the foreign policy course of the Labour government, cooperation with the Soviet Union; the English people demand the repeal of the North Atlantic Pact and protest against the preparation of a new war by English and American imperialists.

The authority and influence of the Communist Party in the working class and among all working people of England are growing. There is no doubt that the offensive of monopolistic capital against the English working class, which encounters the full support of the Labour leadership, and the policy of preparation for war against the camp of socialism and democracy will encounter ever-growing resistance from the working masses. England is moving toward large-scale class battles.

The leaders of the Labour Party and the reactionaries from the leadership of the Trades Union Congress strive with all their might to paralyze the growing struggle of the working masses against Labour policy. Baiting and persecution of communists are regarded by them as the main means of struggle against workers' resistance. The expulsion from the Labour Party of the most prominent opponents of the party leadership's policy (Pritt, Zilliacus, and others), the use of intimidation methods against "backbenchers" in parliament, the increasingly broad use of police repressions against demonstrations and meetings

of progressive forces—all this testifies to the growing insecurity of Labour bosses and their fear of the working masses of England.

Increasingly numerous masses of workers of England under the leadership of the Communist Party of Great Britain are being drawn into the struggle for peace and the security of peoples, against warmongers, and are speaking out against Labourism.

The participation of representatives of progressive organizations of England in the World Congress of Partisans of Peace, the speech of a number of left-wing Labourites in defense of peace, against the North Atlantic Pact, testify to the fact that the English working class does not want war and is fighting more and more actively against the warmongers of a new war. Powerful forces of resistance and struggle against the imperialist policy of the Labour government are ripening in its ranks. The struggle of working people of England against the reactionary ideology and policy of Labourism will acquire an ever-broader scope.

The head of the delegation of Scottish miners at the World Congress of Partisans of Peace, Labourite John Wood, wrote on April 2, 1949, in the *Daily Worker*: "We would be foolish if we closed our eyes to the real reason for the Americans' striving for world domination; it represents an attempt to destroy socialism and intensify capitalist exploitation and tyranny. We do not want to be an instrument in the hands of financial capital. We will not raise a hand for an aggressive struggle against the USSR".

This statement expresses the mood not only of miners, but of all English workers. The working class of England does not want war; it wants friendship with the Soviet Union. There is no doubt that the struggle for peace will contribute to the liberation of English workers from the influence of Labour warmongers. The working people of England see more and more clearly along what ruinous path Labour traitors are leading their country. The policy of aggression of Labour disciples of Churchill is doomed to inevitable failure. The movement for peace and security, the struggle against the warmongers of a new war, have acquired a truly nationwide character. The World Congress of Partisans of Peace, held in Paris in April 1949, contributed to exposing the misanthropic ideology and policy of Anglo-American imperialism and its Labour agency.

Questions of Economics, No.5, 1949.

EXTENDED SESSION OF THE SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL OF THE INSTITUTE OF ECONOMICS OF THE USSR ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

At the end of March 1949, an extended session of the Scientific Council of the Institute of Economics of the USSR Academy of Sciences was held with the active workers of Moscow economists. The session discussed the issue "On the fight against bourgeois cosmopolitanism in economic science".

Doctor of Economic Sciences A. I. Pashkov delivered a report. He noted that the Soviet system of political and economic life, Soviet ideology and culture are the most advanced in the world. The scientific and art workers of our country faithfully serve their people. Fiery Soviet patriotism inspires the Soviet intelligentsia in the struggle for new achievements.

Cosmopolitanism is the poisoned weapon of American imperialism, which strives for the destruction of the independence of peoples and for world domination. Cosmopolitans are renegades of the people, devoid of a sense of love for the Motherland, indifferent to its interests and destinies, groveling before the bourgeois West, devoid of a sense of pride for their country. The Soviet people despise and hate rootless cosmopolitans.

The weeds of cosmopolitanism, shameful phenomena of groveling and obsequiousness before the bourgeois West have not yet been fully eradicated from our economic literature. The question of the struggle against cosmopolitanism, posed with all sharpness in the articles of the newspapers *Pravda* and *Kultura i Zhizn*, is of enormous significance for Soviet economic science as well. Comrade Pashkov subjected to sharp criticism the manifestations of cosmopolitanism in the works of individual Soviet economists in the fields of developing problems of modern imperialism, Soviet economy, history of economic thought, and history of the national economy of the USSR.

In the lively debate that unfolded after the report, 28 people took part, including comrades V. F. Vasyutin, A. N. Sidorov, L. N. Ivanov, I. E. Kaptyshev, I. A. Gladkov, A. A. Karavaev, S. G. Strumilin, T. S. Khachaturov, V. A. Maslennikov, E. S. Lazutkin, F. I. Morozov, I. A. Anchishkin, G. A. Kozlov, D. O. Allakhverdyan, P. S. Metislavsky, V. P. Dyachenko, M. I. Rubinshtein, and others. The speakers unanimously emphasized the necessity of the most severe and merciless struggle against the penetration of cosmopolitanism into Soviet economic science, subjecting to principled criticism the cosmopolitan errors, manifestations of bourgeois objectivism and apolitical stance contained in the works of individual Soviet economists.

Deep criticism at the session was leveled at the works of individual employees of the former Institute of World Economy and World Politics—Acad. E. Varga, Acad. I. Tachtenberg, L. Eventov, V. Lan, M. Bokshitsky, L. Roitburd,

and others. These works suffer from errors of a cosmopolitan character, bourgeois objectivism, obsequiousness, and groveling before foreign things; they gloss over the contradictions of American imperialism and the sores of modern capitalism.

Harmful ideas of bourgeois cosmopolitanism have also penetrated individual works on the Soviet economy. In Bernstein-Kogan's book *Economics of River Transport*, the advantages of Soviet transport over capitalist transport are glossed over, and open groveling before the bourgeois West is manifested. Errors of a cosmopolitan character are present in Prof. Kolesnev's textbook on the organization of agricultural enterprises. In the field of statistics, bourgeois cosmopolitanism found its expression in the works of Prof. Urlanis and Prof. Maslov. Cosmopolitan errors are also present in the books of Prof. Boyarsky and Acad. V. Nemchinov. Cosmopolitan errors are widespread in works on economic geography (e.g., N. Baransky, Kabo).

In works on the history of economic thought, bourgeois cosmopolitanism manifested itself in the denial of the independence of the development of Russian economic thought, in the false assertion of the dependence of the economic views of advanced Russian thinkers on Western European economic science. A striking example of dragging in the harmful ideas of cosmopolitanism is the thoroughly vicious book by Prof. Shtein *Essays on the Development of Russian Economic Thought of the 19th–20th Centuries*. Written in the spirit of cosmopolitanism is Prof. Blyumin's book *Essays on the History of Russian Economic Thought of the First Half of*

the 19th Century. Serious errors along the lines of denying the independence of Russian economic thought and its world significance are present in the book by Corr. Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences D. P. Rozenberg *History of Political Economy*, vol. I (1940).

At the meeting of the Scientific Council, Acad. Varga, Acad. Tachtenberg, and others spoke admitting their mistakes. A number of comrades who spoke in the debate, while noting this as a positive fact, at the same time pointed to the insufficiency and half-hearted character of these admissions and demanded that they speak out with criticism of their mistakes in the press and produce works imbued with the spirit of Soviet patriotism.

After A. I. Pashkov's concluding remarks, the Director of the Institute of Economics, Corr. Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences K. V. Ostrovityanov, spoke, summarizing the work of the session. He emphasized that the disease of cosmopolitanism has infected only an insignificant handful of Soviet economists, that a distinction should be made between rootless cosmopolitans and people who made individual mistakes in their works. It is necessary to unfold a more in-depth struggle against bourgeois cosmopolitanism, making the cultivation of Soviet patriotism the main task.

The session of the Scientific Council demonstrated the unity of the workers of the Soviet economic front, their determination to uphold the purity of Marxist-Leninist economic science from any encroachments on the part of rootless cosmopolitans and other preachers of bourgeois ideology. The eradication of cosmopolitanism, objectivism, and apoliticism contributes to the further upsurge of Soviet economic science.

Materials on the extended session of the Scientific Council of the Institute of Economics of the USSR Academy of Sciences will be published in upcoming issues of the journal *Voprosy Ekonomiki*.

Questions of Economics, 1949.

M. Rubinshtein

BOURGEOIS COSMOPOLITISM IN THE SERVICE OF AMERICAN IMPERIALISTS

Modern bourgeois cosmopolitanism is one of the main forms of the ideology of imperialist aggressors, especially the monopolies of the United States striving for world domination.

One of the most important economic foundations of bourgeois cosmopolitanism—the interweaving of the interests of financial capital of different imperialist countries—manifests itself most vividly in international cartels, trusts, and banks.

V. I. Lenin showed that financial capital casts its nets over all countries of the world. "Capitalism has long created a world market. And as the export of capital grew and foreign and colonial ties and 'spheres of influence' of the largest monopoly alliances expanded in every way, matters 'naturally' approached a worldwide agreement between them, the formation of international cartels"[35].

International cartels and trusts, which Lenin called "super-monopolies", strive to break down national borders and subjugate the peoples of all countries. Financial capital steadily pursues annexation, the liquidation of the political independence of countries and peoples subordinated to it, and the destruction of their national sovereignty. Monopoly capital enmeshes even those countries that have preserved formal independence in the nets of financial and political dependence.

---

[35] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. 22, p. 233

Thus, imperialism and its colonial policy are inextricably linked with the violation of national sovereignty and a huge intensification of national oppression. While brutally exploiting oppressed nations, constantly striving to seize new countries and turn them into de facto colonies, monopoly capital at the same time wages a cosmopolitan propaganda of national nihilism in order to paralyze the will of peoples to resist, to struggle for national independence. The ideologists of modern imperialism declare the national sovereignty of peoples an "obsolete concept", since it hinders the aggression of imperialists and their struggle for world domination.

In the period of the general crisis of capitalism, when the world split into two systems—socialist and capitalist—the ideology of bourgeois cosmopolitanism acquired a new direction. Despite all the contradictions existing between imperialist states, the financial capital ruling in them is united by the desire to strangle or at least weaken the Soviet Union—the country of socialism, which is the advanced detachment of the working people of the whole world.

Lenin pointed out in 1918 that "the alliance of imperialists of all countries, an alliance naturally and inevitably for the defense of capital, which knows no fatherland, has proved by many major, greatest episodes in world history that above the interests of the fatherland, the people, and anything else, capital places the protection of its alliance of capitalists of all countries against the working people"[36]. This protection of the alliance of capitalists of all countries against working people and rabid

---

[36] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. XXIII, p. 4

hatred for the Soviet Union, for the growing forces of democracy and socialism, are the source of the ideology of bourgeois cosmopolitanism.

The modern ideology of bourgeois cosmopolitanism, therefore, reflects the fact that in the era of imperialism, big capital became cramped within the framework of its states. It strives to seize new sales markets, sources of raw materials, and spheres of capital investment. The domination of monopolies over the state apparatus of capitalist countries allows them to use this apparatus for the struggle for "spheres of influence", for the economic, political, and military enslavement of other countries. The cosmopolitan ideology is designed to make it easier for monopolists to master foreign territory as if it were their own home. Under the screen of "the interests of humanity", "world planning", and similar hypocritical slogans, cosmopolitan ideologists try to make peoples give up their independence in the name of a certain "world government", which in reality masks the aspiration of capitalist monopolies for world domination.

The monopolies of the imperialist powers, having lost some lucrative objects of exploitation as a result of the Second World War and risking losing others, are trying by all means to liquidate the state sovereignty of peoples that hinders them, to extend their power to new territories, and to prevent the genuine liberation of colonies and dependent countries from under the yoke of capital. To this end, imperialists set in motion the most diverse means of military and political pressure, economic and ideological struggle. Fulfilling the social order of monopoly capital, the ideologists of imperialism

strive to discredit the very idea of national sovereignty and state independence, to undermine the feeling of national pride, the love of peoples for their homeland, for the progressive traditions of their national culture.

Comrade Stalin teaches that genuine proletarian internationalism requires respect for the rights and freedom of other peoples. Comrade Stalin said: "Soviet people believe that every nation—whether large or small—has its own qualitative features, its own specificity, which belongs only to it and is not possessed by other nations. These features are that contribution which each nation makes to the common treasury of world culture, complementing it and enriching it"[37]. Lenin and Stalin, emphasizing the importance of the national question, exposed the reactionary essence of national nihilism. As early as the First World War, Lenin pointed out that class-conscious proletarians of Russia are full of the feeling of national pride, love their language and their homeland, while capitalists are the worst enemies of the homeland.

At present, the main threat to peace and the security of peoples, to their national existence and state sovereignty, is American imperialism. The USA is currently not only the main country of capitalism, the center of the financial exploitation of the world, the citadel of the imperialist camp, but also the main, decisive node of all the unusually aggravated contradictions of the capitalist system as a whole, and first of all the contradiction between the growth of the productive capabilities of capitalism, calculated to obtain maximum capitalist profit,

---

[37] *Pravda*, April 13, 1948

and the relative reduction of solvent demand on the part of the million-strong masses of working people. In vain searches for a way out of the unprecedentedly aggravated contradictions of the general crisis of capitalism, the monopolies of the United States embarked on the path of unbridled expansion, which has been further intensified in connection with the mounting new economic crisis. After the end of the Second World War, American imperialism launched a furious offensive against the freedom and independence of dozens of independent states in all parts of the world. It strives to subordinate them to itself by the most diverse methods of military, diplomatic, economic, and ideological aggression. To this end, it knocks together military-political blocs directed against the USSR and the countries of people's democracy, which stand as an insuperable barrier in the path of the imperialist expansion of American monopolies.

As stated in the declaration of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs of January 29, 1949, the goals of the North Atlantic Treaty "consist in ensuring that the ruling circles of the USA and Great Britain take the reins into their hands in relation to as many states as possible, depriving them of the opportunity to conduct an independent national foreign and domestic policy and using these states as an auxiliary means in the implementation of their aggressive plans aimed at establishing Anglo-American world domination".

The struggle of the popular masses for freedom and independence, for the preservation of their national and state sovereignty, hinders the implementation of the aggressive plans of American imperialists and their English "junior partners". In

order to break the resistance of the masses, to undermine the will of peoples to struggle against aggressors, to clear the path to the subordination and exploitation of other countries, to the enslavement of small peoples, American imperialism set in motion the ideology of bourgeois cosmopolitanism. Its ideologists invent fables to the effect that the principle of national sovereignty and state independence in our time is allegedly "obsolete" and has become an obstacle to the "organization of peace", by which is meant the world domination of American monopolies.

Bourgeois cosmopolitanism, fulfilling for the monopoly capital of the United States the auxiliary role of an ideology "justifying" the policy of imperialist aggression, is at the same time for the bourgeoisie of states enslaved by American imperialism a convenient ideological cover for the betrayal of the national interests of their countries and their peoples.

The Second World War provided numerous examples in a number of countries of the most shameful national betrayal of the bourgeoisie, which went into the service of German fascism. The word "Quisling" became a synonym for betrayal. The monopoly capital of France sold the country wholesale to the Hitlerites and entered their service in the hope that it too would get at least a particle of the military loot and profits of German monopolies. The bourgeoisie of Belgium, Holland, and a number of other countries seized by Hitlerite thugs did likewise. The monopoly capital of the United States and England not only financed the creation of the Hitlerite war machine before the war, but during the war as well maintained ties with German monopolies, supplied them with patents,

missing raw materials, shared profits with them, in a word, at every step betrayed the interests of peoples who entered the great struggle against predatory German imperialism.

After the war, the Western European bourgeoisie, frightened by the growth of the democratic movement of the popular masses and the mighty upsurge of the forces of the anti-imperialist camp, went into the service of new masters—its American monopolies. It subserviently expresses readiness to sacrifice the state independence and sovereignty of its countries in favor of American monopolists, if only to preserve its existence as an exploiting class, if only to receive support from across the ocean in the struggle against the popular masses.

For the Western European bourgeoisie, which only recently sold its states to Hitlerite predators, bourgeois cosmopolitanism became the ideological "justification" for a new treason, a new trading of the interests of peoples.

The traitorous essence of the ideology of bourgeois cosmopolitanism found its completed expression in the modern role of right-wing socialists as advocates and agents of imperialist aggression. Right-wing socialists have long been agents of the bourgeoisie in the labor movement, armor-bearers of monopoly capital. V. I. Lenin wrote that "opportunists objectively represent a part of the petty bourgeoisie and certain strata of the working class, bribed out of imperialist superprofits, turned into watchdogs of capitalism, into corruptors of the labor movement"[38]. Lenin gave this characterization of the spiritual fathers of modern right-wing

[38] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. 23, p. 99

socialists in connection with the attempts of social-chauvinists and Kautskyites of that time to create the "United States of Europe".

As Lenin pointed out, "opportunists (social-chauvinists) work together with the imperialist bourgeoisie precisely in the direction of creating an imperialist Europe on the shoulders of Asia and Africa..."[39].

At present, right-wing socialists have moved on to the exact same work as cosmopolitan servants of American monopolies. They are waging a demagogic campaign in all countries of Western Europe in defense of American plans for the enslavement of the world. With cosmopolitan chatter about "the interests of humanity", they try to cover up the greedy, imperialist character of the expansion of the United States, to hide under the mask of "democracy" and "progress" the predatory essence of American imperialism. Undoubtedly, US imperialists would not have been able to deploy such rabid activity in knocking together imperialist blocs and preparing for a new war if they had not been helped by the treacherous actions and cosmopolitan propaganda of right-wing socialists of various countries and stripes. Right-wing socialists of Western European states vie with each other in offering their services to American monopoly masters, boasting in every way that they, right-wing socialists, under the guise of socialist phraseology will be able at the given stage to fulfill the tasks of financial capital better than the hard-nosed conservatives or liberals rejected by the masses. Right-wing socialists bend over

---

[39] *Ibid.*

backwards to prove by deeds to American imperialists their servile devotion and suitability for fulfilling the role of Quislings in the service of overseas monopolies.

Right-socialist ministers of Western European countries, accepting any conditions of Wall Street monopoly usurers, with extraordinary zeal urge peoples to renounce national sovereignty. Bevin, who as early as 1945 advocated the creation of a "world super-state" and the replacement of national sovereignty with the "sovereignty of humanity", with no less zeal than Churchill pursues the policy of turning England into an American aircraft carrier. Former Belgian "socialist" Prime Minister Spaak foams at the mouth trying to prove that state sovereignty has allegedly turned into an "out-of-fashion idea" that must be thrown into the dustbin. Blum declares any attempt to defend France's economic independence to be "egoistic nationalism" and in the name of "European solidarity" supports the elimination of customs borders in Western Europe, which is advantageous to American monopolies. He also preaches the liquidation of France's state sovereignty in favor of the notorious "world government". Fulfilling the role of agents of American imperialism, right-wing socialists wage a fierce campaign of slander against the USSR—the principled and consistent champion of peace and democracy, the loyal defender of the freedom and independence of all peoples, large and small.

The right-socialist lackeys of the bourgeoisie strive to outdo their masters in hatred of communism, in bestial malice toward the Soviet Union and the countries of people's democracy,

toward the forces of the anti-imperialist, democratic camp growing throughout the world.

Thus, cosmopolitan ideology in the hands of right-wing socialists is not only a means of disarming peoples before the onslaught of American imperialists striving for world domination, but also a direct instrument for fanning war against the Soviet Union and the countries of new democracy.

Cosmopolitanism is organically and inextricably linked with bourgeois nationalism and chauvinism, with the most reactionary, misanthropic racial theories. Chattering about a "world state" and "all-human community", American imperialists and their cosmopolitan ideologists proceed from the premise that nations and races are divided into "full-fledged" and "inferior", and that the peoples of the colonies, like Negroes in the USA, are not human beings at all.

Preaching the transformation of independent states into American "states" and sending their gauleiters into them, American imperialists at the same time try to educate the population of the USA and especially their occupation troops in the spirit of contempt for "inferior races", to which they assign not only all non-Americans, but also a large part of the American people, consisting, as is known, of recent immigrants. At the same time, they try to transfer the "laws of the jungle" customary in the United States, the segregation of Negroes, lynch law, and other most shameful attributes of American "civilization" to colonial countries and European countries as well.

Some American ideologists of bourgeois cosmopolitanism put forward new variants of the misanthropic "racial theory", in which it is "proved" that precisely the "cosmopolitan character" of Americans makes them a "nation of the highest type" destined to dominate the world. They impose upon other countries the notorious "American way of life", the thoroughly rotten American "democracy", and the corrupted "culture" of dying monopoly capitalism.

Lenin wrote in 1918: "Wilson's idealized democratic republic proved in reality to be a form of the most rabid imperialism, of the most shameless oppression and strangulation of weak and small peoples"[40]. This shameless oppression and strangulation of peoples by American imperialism bourgeois cosmopolites try to pass off as the "highest achievement of world civilization".

Bourgeois cosmopolitanism is merely the reverse side of aggressive imperialist nationalism, bestial chauvinism, and racism, which in essence are in no way inferior to Hitlerite chauvinism and racism.

The most reactionary and dangerous side of the ideology of bourgeois cosmopolitanism for humanity is that it serves American imperialist aggressors as an instrument for fanning and preparing a new world war. It is not by chance that the cosmopolitan ideology of financial capital, which preaches the principles "capital knows no fatherland" and "money does not smell", is most fully expressed in the activity of international

---

[40] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. XXIII, p. 292

arms trusts. These trusts particularly vividly embody and reflect all the main trends of modern rotting and dying capitalism, which is trying to postpone its inevitable doom through new imperialist wars. Let us examine the most characteristic examples of the manifestation of bourgeois cosmopolitanism in the activities of international trusts.

On the eve of the First World War, V. I. Lenin gave a remarkable analysis of the cosmopolitan interweaving of the interests of financial capital of different countries in international arms trusts. Using England as an example, he exposed the cunning capitalist "mechanics" of armaments, the inextricable connection between the cosmopolitanism of military-industrial capital and unbridled bourgeois nationalism. Lenin showed how thousands of millions of rubles are spent on preparations for an imperialist war, and "...all this is done," he noted ironically, "exclusively in the interests of peace, in the interests of protecting culture, in the interests of the homeland, civilization, etc."[41].

Admirals and prominent bourgeois statesmen of England are directors and shareholders of shipbuilding, gunpowder, cannon enterprises, etc. "A golden rain pours directly into the pockets of bourgeois politicians who constitute a close international gang instigating peoples to competition in armaments..."[42].

Armaments are considered a "national" and "patriotic" business, the secret of which is strictly guarded. In reality, however, "shipbuilding and cannon, dynamite and rifle

---

41 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. 19, p. 83

42 *Ibid.*

factories and plants are international enterprises in which capitalists of different countries harmoniously dupe and fleece to the skin the 'public' of different countries, building ships or cannons equally for England against Italy, for Italy against England. Cunning capitalist mechanics! Civilization, order, culture, peace—and the plunder of hundreds of millions of rubles by dealers and swindlers of shipbuilding, dynamite, and other capital!"[43].

Lenin notes that the famous arms firm Vickers (England) has its branches in Italy. "The shareholders and directors of this firm instigate (through corrupt newspapers and through corrupt parliamentary 'figures'—conservatives, liberals, all the same) England against Italy and vice versa. And they take profits both from the workers of England and from the workers of Italy, fleece the people here and there"[44]. The same thing happens in all capitalist countries. "Governments are clerks of the capitalist class. The clerks are paid well. The clerks are shareholders themselves. And the sheep are shorn together amidst the talk about 'patriotism'..."[45].

The subsequent development of imperialism provides thousands of examples of this cunning capitalist "mechanics" of armaments exposed by Lenin. These examples deserve careful study, since the activity of the international cosmopolitan gang of warmongers currently threatens the world with new disasters.

---

[43] *Ibid.*, pp. 83–84

[44] *Ibid.*, p. 84

[45] *Ibid.*.

An extremely characteristic figure of cosmopolitan military-industrial capital was the actual head of the English arms trust Vickers-Armstrong, Basil Zaharov. A Greek by origin, he began his commercial activity as a money changer in the bazaars of Constantinople, simultaneously engaging in blackmail and robbery. After a failed criminal adventure, he fled to England, taking with him money from the cash desk of the firm where he was employed. With the help of stolen money, Zaharov achieved acquittal in an English court and moved to Athens as an agent of the Anglo-Swedish arms firm Nordenfeldt, which traded in machine guns and recently invented submarines. Zaharov sold submarines and weapons to both Greece and Turkey, which were preparing for war against each other. When a fellow cosmopolitan, the Anglo-American Hiram Maxim, began marketing the machine gun he designed, Zaharov, through clever blackmail, forced him to unite with him into a cosmopolitan arms firm that earned huge profits in the Balkan wars. Then he sold his business to the "solid" English firm Vickers. Zaharov received a large block of shares in this arms concern and soon became its actual master, putting "business" on a wide footing. Orders poured in from all countries that fought each other and prepared for the world imperialist slaughter.

Zaharov managed to be a citizen of any country to which he sold weapons. He became a familiar figure at courts and ministries throughout Europe, where bribes to high-ranking officials ensured him profitable military orders. In England, this cosmopolitan financial adventurer was raised to the rank of lord. Zaharov directed the suspicious financial operations of

Lloyd George connected with his cabinet's conclusion of predatory treaties with the cosmopolitan Marconi trust, which stole the great invention of A. S. Popov—the wireless telegraph.

In France, Zaharov became one of the most prominent participants in the famous arms trust Schneider-Creusot, a French citizen and Chevalier of the Legion of Honour. Poincaré, Clemenceau, and a number of other leaders of imperialist policy were, like Lloyd George, shareholders of his military enterprises and mouthpieces of his policy of mutual intimidation so that all countries would stock up on weapons to back up their threats and give more orders to military-industrial trusts.

The numerous arms firms organized by Zaharov under various names were so cosmopolitan that no one could figure out which country they belonged to. For example, the Whitehead company, named after the English ambassador to France Whitehead, was formally considered French. However, 51% of its capital belonged to the English (Vickers). At the same time, among the largest shareholders of this firm was the daughter of the former German Chancellor Bismarck, one of the directors of the firm was the Austrian Count Goiyozis of Fiume, and the main tycoon was the cosmopolitan knight of military profit Zaharov, at the same time head of the English trust Vickers and a major shareholder of Krupp, Schneider-Creusot, Austrian military plants, the Skoda cannon trust, the Putilov plants, etc..

The First World War was a time of abundant harvest for Zaharov and other international arms merchants: on every

battle, on every one of the 10 million killed and tens of millions crippled in this war, they amassed untold profits.

Time and again, the armies of the German bloc and the Entente were shelled from cannons and machine guns that were manufactured in their own countries and sold to the enemy. Vickers sold Maxim machine guns to Germany and Austria, built a mine factory in Fiume, and constructed warships at major shipyards in Italy. Germans encountered Krupp cannons in Belgium, etc. All this was intertwined into a single snakepit, all this brought incalculable disasters to the peoples of all warring countries, and hundreds of millions in profits to Vickers, Krupp, Schneider, and Skoda.

Each of the participants in international arms trusts, through the press, political figures, and deputies of all parties bought by him, shouted about "war to the end" and assiduously supplied weapons to "their" armies and the enemy's armies. Basil Zaharov ended his days as the owner of the roulette principality of Monaco—a cosmopolitan nest where merchants of death of all countries and nations squandered part of their military incomes. But the system of international arms trade, of which he was a typical representative, continued to flourish after the First World War as well.

A characteristic example of the cosmopolitanism of military-industrial capital is the de Wendel family. One of the brothers, François de Wendel, was the president of the association of French heavy industry Comité des Forges; his brother, Carl von Wendel, was a member of the German Reichstag and, of course, an ardent German "patriot". Both branches of the de

Wendels—French and German—shouted about "war to a victorious end", both fattened on military profits and, directly interfering in the course of military operations, ensured that the enterprises and mines belonging to them on both sides of the front were not subjected to bombardment that could disrupt the flow of income of their military-industrial trusts. After the First World War, when Lorraine passed to France, representatives of both branches of the de Wendels sat in the French parliament.

Another such cosmopolitan association of merchants of death was the international Nobel dynamite trust. This trust, formally considered Swedish, had branches and dummy firms in almost all countries of the world—in England and France, in Italy and Spain, in Austria and the Balkans. In Germany, its branch merged with the Cologne-Rottweil gunpowder trust and monopolized the production of explosives. After the start of the First World War, the English and German Nobel companies—the main participants in this huge international trust—deemed it expedient to organize the comedy of "liquidating" the trust to deceive public opinion. With the consent of the governments of both countries, its representatives gathered in August 1915, i.e., already in the midst of the war, for a conference on "neutral" territory, where they amicably agreed on the exchange of shares and distribution of dividends. However, it is known that representatives of the Nobel companies of the warring imperialist states repeatedly met thereafter as well, continuing to share profits and jointly direct the efforts of their governments toward the maximum prolongation of the war and expansion of military orders.

During the First World War, the cosmopolites of financial capital on the widest scale conducted contraband trade in arms and strategic raw materials through so-called neutral countries. They openly mocked the blockade established by their own governments, while at the same time using this blockade to inflate prices and increase profits even further. Thus, despite the blockade, Germany systematically received the nickel, tungsten, lead, copper, and vegetable fats it lacked, and aniline dyes and pharmaceuticals were smuggled from Germany to England and America (sometimes even on German submarines), sold at rabid prices in the Entente countries. The largest Peñarroya lead mines in Spain throughout the war were under the joint control of German, French, and English dealers. In friendly agreement, they jacked up prices and supplied lead for bullets and shells that struck their own compatriots both in France and in Germany (via Switzerland).

International military concerns continued this criminal activity during subsequent wars occurring in various parts of the world in the period between the First and Second World Wars. At the same English military plant, for example, in the 1930s arms were manufactured for both Japan and China. At the same time, representatives of both governments who met at the plant agreed on general requirements for the English firm regarding prices and delivery conditions.

Military-industrial monopolies differ from other monopolies in that competition in many cases not only does not harm them, but on the contrary helps to expand product sales, the volume of orders, and increase profits: the more armaments one state acquires, the more others purchase them. The arms race

unfolds in a spiral, and competing military-industrial trusts, as well as governments subordinate to them, serve as pushers for each other, so to speak.

During the First World War, Lenin vividly showed the interest of financial capital in deploying the arms race. Exposing Kautsky's chatter that the intensifying international interweaving of financial capital cliques allegedly leads to disarmament, Lenin wrote: "The interweaving of financial capital is very great here and is constantly growing; German capitalists 'participate' in the affairs of an English firm; English firms build submarines for Austria, etc. Internationally intertwined capital makes magnificent business on armaments and wars"[46].

Already by the end of the First World War, American monopolies and banks began to play an increasingly prominent role in the cosmopolitan interweaving of financial capital and especially military-industrial concerns that made "magnificent business on armaments and wars". They profited most from the war; they looted billions of dollars on military supplies. As Lenin noted in his letter to American workers: "On every dollar there is a lump of dirt from 'profitable' military supplies that enriched the rich in every country and ruined the poor. On every dollar there are traces of blood..."[47].

After the First World War, American monopolies began to actively prepare for a new struggle for the redivision of the world, for domination over world markets and sources of raw

---

[46] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. 21, p. 202

[47] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. XXIII, pp. 179–180

materials. Like German trusts, they widely used international cartels, which were developing rapidly during this period, for this purpose.

Lenin called international cartels a new stage in the world concentration of capital and production, incomparably higher than previous ones, and traced in detail the growth of these "super-monopolies" in the electrical engineering, oil, and other branches of industry, noting that they "are only separate links of the imperialist struggle between the largest monopolists for the partition of the world"[48].

At the same time, international cartels were a kind of temporary "armed truce" between competing monopolies of different countries, organs of the cosmopolitan interweaving of the interests of financial capital directed, as Lenin vividly showed, not toward disarmament and peace between peoples, but toward new armaments, toward the preparation of new wars.

Extremely indicative is the history of ties between American and German monopolies, ties established long before the Second World War.

The fact that German monopolies were the creators, leaders, and main mainstay of the aggressive fascist state not only did not embarrass the leaders of American monopoly capital, but on the contrary attracted them to their German brethren with irresistible force. Fascist reprisals against the working class, the liquidation of workers' organizations, unbridled exploitation of

---

[48] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. 22, p. 238

working people, bestial nationalism, racial "theories", unprecedented militarization of the country—all this seemed to American monopolists a desired "ideal" which must not only be assisted in every way in Germany itself, but, as far as possible, imitated in the United States as well. The most outspoken representatives and ideologists of American monopoly capital like Henry Ford, Lindbergh, and others repeatedly declared this publicly, while others, more cautious, acted the same way, but covertly.

Finally, the most important thing that enticed American monopolists in the experience of their German "colleagues" and that, contrary to the competition dividing them on world markets, united them with the German monopolists by the closest ties, was a common burning hatred for the Soviet Union, fear of the rising labor movement, of the growth of communism, which was menacing to the very existence of monopoly capital.

Representatives of American and German monopoly capital not only sat together in the governing bodies of international cartels that divided world markets, inflated prices, and restricted output, but they also operated jointly in numerous American joint-stock companies that were actually branches of I. G. Farbenindustrie and other German concerns, as well as in many German monopolies where the greater part of the capital belonged to American banks and trusts.

Already at the beginning of the activity of the I. G. Farbenindustrie concern—that pillar of predatory German imperialism and Hitlerite aggression—the largest American trust, Standard Oil of New Jersey, provided it as payment for

patents with more than 500 thousand of its shares and agreed on the division of royalties for licenses sold to other American firms. Through Standard Oil, representatives of I. G. Farbenindustrie were introduced into circles that influenced the domestic and foreign policy of the USA. Armbruster in his book *The Treasonous World* cites a list of 240 largest American trusts that were connected with the German chemical concern by all sorts of treaties and agreements, joint participation, and a common policy of preparing and unleashing a new war.

The board of directors of the open branch of I. G. Farbenindustrie in the United States—American I. G. Corporation—included leaders of the German concern Bosch, Schmitz, and at the same time leaders of Standard Oil, Ford, and major investment banks of America. This board was a kind of official alliance of American and German imperialists. After the outbreak of war in Europe, this branch of I. G. Farbenindustrie changed its name, but both the composition of its leadership and the character of its activity remained unchanged. Only in 1942, i.e., in the midst of the war, was it revealed that this branch of the German arms trust owned in the United States not only its own enterprises of military significance, but also large blocks of shares in such trusts as Standard Oil, DuPont, aluminum and magnesium corporations, and many others upon which the armament of the American army and supplies to the countries of the anti-Hitler coalition depended. This tangle of interweavings of American and German financial capital was inextricably linked with certain leading government bodies of the USA, with the financial

interests of ministers like Forrestal and advisers like Baruch and Dulles, with nests of cosmopolitan spy-diplomats like Bullitt, Allen, and others.

American monopolies and banks actively and systematically armed Hitlerite Germany, striving to direct its aggression to the East—against the Soviet Union—and at the same time make money on the loans and credits granted to Germany, which were calculated in billions of dollars. These credits went entirely toward the revival and increase of the military-industrial potential of Hitlerite Germany and thus gave it the opportunity to unleash the Second World War.

American monopolies placed their science and technology at the service of arming Hitlerite Germany. American patents for new methods of producing aviation gasoline, lubricating oils, synthetic rubber, and other most important strategic materials that the Hitlerite military machine being created in those years lacked were transferred to German monopolies. At the same time, the results of the work of the largest American laboratories, immediately communicated to the Hitlerite "partners", were concealed from other American firms and were not permitted for production use in the USA, as this would threaten the depreciation of part of the fixed capital of American industry.

Standard Development Company transmitted information about the new methods of producing lubricating oils developed by it to German monopolies, and the Hitlerites thereby received the opportunity to build several lubricating oil plants. Methods for producing high-octane aviation gasoline, which had colossal significance for military aviation, were obtained by

extortion by the Standard Oil of New Jersey trust from two smaller oil firms, which in turn had received them from the Anglo-Iranian oil trust. These methods were immediately communicated to I. G. Farbenindustrie for use at German plants. Universal Oil Products trust developed other methods for obtaining aviation gasoline, which were not used in the USA, but were immediately transferred to Japan, where this American firm supervised the construction of corresponding enterprises. The method developed by Standard Development Company for producing butyl rubber, which had a number of advantages over German synthetic rubber "buna", was not applied in American production, but detailed technical information about it was transmitted to I. G. Farbenindustrie.

Dive bombers designed by Curtiss-Wright and Douglas Aircraft, kept in strictest secrecy in the USA, were demonstrated by representatives of these firms in Germany and widely used in Hitlerite aviation. The same thing happened with new designs of aircraft engines by Pratt & Whitney, licenses for the production of which were granted to the Bavarian Motor Works with the condition of paying $200 for each engine produced by the Hitlerites. Similar agreements were concluded regarding autopilots and other aviation instruments between the American company Sperry Gyroscope and the Berlin firm Askania, which supplied these instruments to German military aviation.

Many such examples can be cited. They leave no doubt that Hitlerite Germany during the period of preparation for the Second World War not only used American capital, but the

extensive research and design apparatus of American monopolies worked for it as well.

When these facts—or rather only an insignificant part of the facts that accidentally slipped through the veil of monopolistic secrecy—became known, albeit with a huge delay, ordinary people in the USA branded the policy of American monopolists as betrayal. Answering the accusations leveled against them, the cosmopolites of financial capital cynically declared in the words of one of the bosses of Standard Oil: "Technological development must continue regardless of whether a war is taking place or not", or: "Profit is profit, wherever it comes from", while the chairman of the board of General Motors trust, Sloan, asserted that "international companies must conduct their business operations regardless of the political beliefs of their leaders or the political system of the countries in which they operate". The imaginary apolitical nature of such statements covered up the cosmopolitan policy of financial capital aimed at supporting the forces of reaction and fascism throughout the world.

American and German monopolies continued to maintain the closest ties with each other during the Second World War as well. These ties, of course, were carefully concealed and even at present have been revealed only partially. However, even far from complete materials testify to the monstrous betrayal of the American cosmopolites of financial capital, who continued even during the war to arm the German fascists and receive huge profits from this, while the peoples of the warring countries suffered untold sacrifices and privations.

During the years of the Second World War, many cartel and patent agreements concluded earlier between American and German firms continued to operate. Under one such agreement, American monopolies, as before, received royalties from every shell produced in Germany with a tetracene fuse. At the same time, they refused to sell these fuses to England and other countries of the anti-Hitler coalition. Throughout the war, Standard Oil transferred to a special account of I. G. Farbenindustrie a certain percentage of the profits accumulated from the sale of its products manufactured according to patents of the German concern obtained at the time. Back in 1942, Standard Oil President Howard stated at a Senate committee hearing that "Farbenindustrie will be able to demand settlements after the war". Under other agreements, American "patriotic" monopolists received income from every German aircraft equipped with instruments of American designs, and from every liter of aviation gasoline or ethyl fluid used by Hitlerite aviation.

Since the transfer of such royalties to the United States, as well as the incomes of German branches of American monopolies, was difficult during the war (although in individual cases such operations were carried out through Swiss banks), the corresponding royalties and incomes were stored in special accounts "until the end of the war" or these funds, by agreement of American and German monopolists, were used to expand German military enterprises, for example, German Ford enterprises in Cologne, plants of the American telegraph and telephone trust in Bavaria, etc.

Thus, American monopolies profited during the war not only on every shell sold at exorbitant prices to the US government, but also on shells fired by German artillery at allied troops.

Under pressure from monopolies, the opening of the second front was endlessly postponed, the war dragged on, and the cosmopolites from American international trusts rubbed their hands, calculating military profits.

During the war, meetings and even consultations and conferences of American, English, and German monopolists repeatedly took place in Switzerland, Spain, and Portugal; in the "neutral" principality of Liechtenstein, filled with representations of international cartels, international spy-cosmopolites operated, directly connected with international trusts and simultaneously serving both German and American intelligence. One of such high-ranking intelligence officers was the special commissioner of the US government Allen Dalles (brother of John Foster Dulles), who conducted negotiations in Switzerland in 1943 with representatives of Hitlerite ruling circles on concluding a separate peace with Germany and saving German monopolies.

After the end of the Second World War, American monopoly capital openly launched a struggle for the establishment of its world domination. It embarked on the path of imperialist seizures unprecedented in scale, the enslavement of the peoples of other countries, and the preparation of a new world war.

An obstacle on this path is the Soviet Union and the countries of people's democracy, the national sovereignty and independence of peoples. Preparing a new war, American

imperialists resort to using ideological weapons to cover up their aggressive plans. As one of the most suitable methods for fooling the masses, they consider bourgeois cosmopolitanism tested by monopolies in the practice of international cartels, which after the war received new forms in the guise of the slogans of a "world state" and a "world government".

Back during the war, a number of books and articles appeared in the USA detailing the post-war "global", i.e., encompassing the entire globe, strategy of American imperialism. The goals of this strategic plan of the USA were revealed with cynical frankness by Welch, treasurer of the Standard Oil of New Jersey trust. At a meeting of the US National Foreign Trade Council, he stated: "As the largest producer, the largest source of capital, and the largest supplier to the world economy, we must chart the course and assume the responsibility that falls upon the holder of the majority of shares in this corporation known as the globe... This goal (world domination.—M. R.) is not established for any definite term. This is an obligation of a permanent character. American private initiative (read: monopoly capital!—M. R.) must strike a blow and save its positions throughout the world or else it will have to witness its own funeral".

The preaching of a "world state" as a cosmopolitan synonym for the omnipotence of American financial capital over the world was chosen by the ruling circles of the USA to deceive the broad masses, especially in countries targeted as primary objects of American enslavement.

In 1945, when American imperialists began to deploy their struggle for world domination on a wide scale, a booklet by a certain Emery Reves, *The Anatomy of Peace*, was published in the USA, which became a kind of gospel for bourgeois cosmopolites. A special letter calling for the widest dissemination of this vile booklet was signed by open warmongers like Senators Thomas and Fulbright, as well as a group of confused bourgeois intellectuals from among dreamers and pacifists. In Reves's book, through streams of high-flown phrases about peace and the salvation of humanity, the predatory claws of the warmongers clearly emerged. Reves wrote: "Now it would be a waste of time to look for the laws of economic life. In our world, only guns regulate production, trade, and consumption". According to Reves, politics and diplomacy, treaties and agreements between sovereign governments serve only to prepare for war. "Full employment" without war is a myth. Reves does not understand how sovereign states and national economies can exist without increasingly frequent and increasingly bitter armed conflicts. He considers the only "salvation", the only "chance to get out of the impasse" to be the destruction of the entire structure of national states, i.e., the unconditional subordination of peoples to American monopoly capital. Reves rages against the struggle of peoples for national self-determination and against the international labor movement, urging their replacement by the "universalism" of cosmopolitan financial capital. Reves not only preaches abandoning the struggle against the aggressor, but directly praises aggression as a factor that "prevents history from stopping" and helps achieve a new redivision of the world

in accordance with the changed correlation of forces in the imperialist camp, i.e., in favor of the USA.

Proclaiming the slogan of world domination by a single power, Reves asserts that allegedly only now, for the first time in the history of mankind, the implementation of this slogan has become possible, since Hitlerite Germany, which sought world domination, did not possess such industrial potential as the United States. At the same time, Reves advises new contenders for world domination to avoid the mistakes of the Hitlerites—to clothe this slogan for the sake of appearance in the garments of "unified democratic control over our planet", i.e., the notorious "world government", and "storm the modern Bastilles of national states".

Reves understands perfectly well what an insuperable obstacle to the implementation of all these delirious plans the Soviet Union is. Therefore, he not only openly calls for war against the USSR, but also states: "I consider it criminal not to talk about war between the Russian and Anglo-American spheres". At the same time, Reves reiterates that this must be a class, "civil" war against the working masses throughout the world. This booklet is entirely permeated with Hitlerite ideas, the desire to snatch up on the fly the ideology of German imperialism, which was just defeated by the forces of the Soviet Army, and once again rally the reactionary forces of the whole world to organize a new "crusade" against the country of socialism.

Thus, the echoes of the world war unleashed by predatory German imperialism struggling for world domination had not yet died down when the American imperialist, disguised as a

champion of "unified humanity", began openly calling for war against the Soviet Union, against the forces of socialism and democracy throughout the world, in the name of the world domination of American monopolies. With the help of these monopolies, Reves's vile booklet was distributed in millions of copies, and its "ideas" in all possible variants began to be hammered into people in all languages by American bourgeois newspapers and radio, corrupted "scientists", and fascist-leaning scribblers.

New food for this cosmopolitan propaganda was provided by the atomic blackmail of American imperialists, which unfolded since the end of 1945 on an unprecedented scale.

As is known, as early as 1946 American plans for using atomic blackmail for the purpose of the struggle for world domination received the concrete form of the notorious "Baruch Plan". The basis of this plan was an attempt, covering up with phrases about international control and using the majority of the UN Atomic Energy Commission obediently voting on American cue, to establish the control of American monopolies over world sources of atomic raw materials, over the production of atomic fuel, and scientific research work in the field of atomic energy. The "Baruch Plan" intended, under the signboard of an international control organization standing outside the Security Council and possessing greater rights and capabilities than the latter, to create under American leadership a world atomic super-trust and through its mediation establish the domination of American monopolies over the entire economic life of other countries, over the entire further development of science and technology. Despite the attempts of the "Baruch Plan" to cover

itself with the United Nations and cosmopolitan chatter about the "protection of humanity", this plan in its very essence contradicted the fundamental principles of this organization, its decisive goals and Charter. The world atomic super-trust proposed by this plan would liquidate the very foundations of the national sovereignty of states belonging to the United Nations, and hand them over head and foot to the American monopolies that master the United States and strive for world domination.

And it is not at all accidental that the most ardent preachers of the misanthropic "atomic religion", who urged using the atomic bomb to subjugate peoples and for war against the USSR, most often donned cosmopolitan vestments. This was a completely lawful development of bourgeois cosmopolitanism as the ideology of US monopolies striving for world domination and especially world arms trusts interested in the wide use of atomic energy for military purposes. It is not by chance that the author of this plan was the seasoned wolf of financial capital Bernard Baruch, who openly babbled about a "hateful world". It is not by chance that the ideologists of bourgeois cosmopolitanism immediately declared this plan of the instigators of atomic war to be the most important step toward a "world state", the "main mainstay of the future world government". Not only that. Just as the Hitlerites at one time tried to pass off the domination of German monopolies as socialism, so American imperialists, who are thrown into a tremor by the very word "socialism", hastened to declare the creation of the world atomic super-trust projected by them to be the realization of "world socialism". Characteristic in this

regard is the speech in early 1949 at New York University by the American representative on the UN Atomic Energy Commission, Osborn. Osborn cynically stated that the cosmopolitan cooperation of monopolies in the atomic super-trust proposed by the American delegation "very closely resembles the first great experiment with world socialism". Having made such a staggering "discovery", Osborn even expressed surprise that "the proposal concerning the theory of world socialism (?!) finds greater support in capitalist countries than in such socialist countries as the USSR".

Mr. Osborn in the role of herald of the "theory of world socialism" is a sight for the gods! He clearly counted on the political illiteracy and lack of fastidiousness of his listeners—the bourgeois students of New York University. But these same motifs were immediately picked up by other singers of bourgeois cosmopolitanism. Thus, under the flag of a certain new "world socialism", imperialists and their ideological arm-bearers—cosmopolites—preach the world domination of American atomic and other monopolies.

Bourgeois cosmopolites with American dollars create all sorts of organizations of "world citizens", associations of the "world assembly of peoples", "leagues of world federalists", and the like, which have proliferated recently like poisonous mushrooms both in the United States and in the marshallized countries of Europe.

During the session of the UN General Assembly held in 1948 in Paris, a certain American tourist-maniac Davis appeared, solemnly announcing to reporters that he was renouncing American citizenship and declaring himself "world citizen

number one". Davis turned out to be the "leader" of a certain organization named the "Association for the International Registration of World Citizens and the Assembly of Peoples". This organization announced in countless newspaper advertisements that it supplies everyone wishing with "identity cards of world citizens" and intends to elect an "Assembly of the Peoples of the World" in 1950.

At noisy rallies, Davis read letters received by him from hysterical women and men of both sexes who proclaimed him "Christ returned to earth". The French "socialist" press joined this campaign, trying with all its might to destroy France's national sovereignty and turn it into a spineless appendage of American imperialism. The slogan of "world government" imported from the United States along with dried egg powder turned out to be a welcome find for the French puppets of American monopolies.

Another American organization of this kind—"United World Federalists"—concentrated its activity on organizing plebiscites and referendums in individual states, adopting appeals to the US Congress with the demand to transform the United Nations organization into a "world federal government". With the help of "sympathizing" governors and senators, such resolutions were adopted in the states of Connecticut, Massachusetts, as well as by the parliaments of 14 other states. Describing the "successes" of this movement, the governor of Connecticut, major banker Bowles, frankly stated that "all who strive for a world state see in the United States a natural leader in the matter of creating world law and protecting it throughout the world".

Thus, behind the streams of pacifist phrases of cosmopolitan preachers of the "world state", the ominous figure of the American reactioner clearly emerges, striving to establish the "new order" of American monopolies throughout the world.

Almost all writings, declarations, and appeals of the champions of "world government" invariably end with the refrain: we, they say, would welcome with all our heart the entry of the USSR into the world state, but since the USSR does not agree to this and it is impossible to come to an agreement with it, we have to form a "world government" without and against the Soviet Union and countries sympathizing with it. Through such primitive and mendacious syllogisms, completely analogous to those used by the propagandists of the "Baruch Plan", the slogan of "world government" is specifically counterposed to the Soviet Union and becomes an instrument of ideological preparation for the imperialist war against the USSR and the countries of people's democracy.

The Trotskyite-cosmopolite Burnham directly calls for creating a "world state" in order to start a war against the USSR and the countries of people's democracy. Atomic scientist Urey, an ardent preacher of a "world parliament" and "world government" as "the only means to save humanity from a new atomic war", in 1948, casting aside all diplomacy, directly stated that if the Soviet Union does not agree to accept the notorious "Baruch Plan", the United States will have to intensify preparations for war against the USSR. In the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, this cosmopolite calls for the creation of a "world government" without the Soviet Union and the

countries of people's democracy, i.e., the knocking together of an anti-Soviet bloc under the aegis of the United States.

Thus, the propaganda of "world government" launched by the imperialists and picked up by a handful of dreamer-pacifists and intellectuals entangled in the contradictions of modern imperialism became the ideological mainstay of the North Atlantic Pact and other similar measures of the American warmongers of a new war.

At the same time, within the Anglo-American block of warmongers of a new war, with the growth of the economic crisis, more and more cracks are appearing. The participants in this aggressive block hate each other and fear each other. As Lenin said, imperialist predators "plunder the world, fight among themselves, and arm against each other. This cannot be hidden for long"[49]. Dissensions among imperialist predators reflect the deepest contradictions of their economic interests, which neither the ornate facade of the North Atlantic and other aggressive treaties nor the hypocritical phrases of the ideologists of bourgeois cosmopolitanism are able to cover up.

Preparing an aggressive war against the USSR and the countries of people's democracy, American imperialists pay special attention to organizing their Western European bridgehead. To this end, militarists from the American General Staff are conducting feverish work on arming and increasing the armies of Western European countries, which they want to turn into suppliers of cannon fodder for the US military machine.

---

[49] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. XXIV, p. 61

Along with this, the cosmopolitan ideologists of American imperialism have once again pulled out from under the rug and are reshaping in all sorts of ways the notorious idea of the "United States of Europe", put forward in its time by all imperialist groupings claiming domination over European countries and their colonies. During the years of the First World War, the idea of a "united Europe" was preached both by German imperialists and Entente imperialists, as well as their social-chauvinist echoes of all stripes.

Lenin showed that the "United States of Europe" under capitalism is either impossible or reactionary, that it can be spoken of only as a temporary agreement of European capitalists, an agreement on how to jointly crush socialism and guard plundered colonies.

After the First World War, the idea of "Pan-Europe", analogous to the "United States of Europe", was intensively propagated by French imperialism, which at that period was the most aggressive.

Comrade Stalin pointed out in 1930 that the most vivid exponent of the tendency toward adventuristic raids on the USSR and intervention at the given moment is "present-day bourgeois France, the homeland of the affectionate 'Pan-Europe', the 'cradle' of the Kellogg Pact, the most aggressive and militaristic country of all aggressive and militaristic countries in the world"[50].

---

[50] J. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, 10th ed., pp. 357–358

Following that, predatory German imperialism, which had raised its head again, also came forward with its plans for "uniting Europe from Bordeaux to Odessa", proclaimed by the bosses of the I. G. Farbenindustrie concern even before the Hitlerites seized power in Germany. The monopoly capital and ruling circles of the USA and England armed Hitlerite Germany and in every way pandered to its aggressive aspirations, directing German aggression against the Soviet Union. Precisely thanks to this, the Hitlerites were able to unleash the Second World War, which engulfed millions of human lives.

The bloody "new order" in Europe carried out by the Hitlerites demonstrated clearly to the peoples what disasters, what monstrous oppression these predatory imperialist adventures under the cosmopolitan flag of the "unification of Europe" bring them. After the defeat of German imperialism, its place as a contender for world domination and domination in Europe was taken by Anglo-American imperialism. The seasoned warmonger Churchill acted as the main ideologist of a "united Europe", openly lamenting that the cosmopolitan armies of foreign interventionists and Russian White Guards led by him in 1918–1920 failed to strangle the young Soviet Republic.

Old "specialists" on the issues of "uniting Europe", like Count Coudenhove-Kalergi and right-wing socialists of all countries and stripes, began hastily updating and touching up their "theories", adapting them to the "unification of Europe" as a single colony of the United States. All these theories are now sharpened against the Soviet Union, as well as against the

countries of people's democracy that have shed imperialist chains and embarked on the path of socialist construction.

Impertinent bill proposals on the "creation of the United States of Europe" as one of the links of the "Marshall Plan" are being introduced into the US Congress. Congresses and conferences of supporters of a "united Europe" are being convened one after another, representing motley gatherings of proponents of bourgeois cosmopolitanism united thanks to handouts from American monopolies.

In May 1949, at a conference of foreign ministers of ten Western European states, the so-called "Council of Europe" was created, representing an attempt to translate into life the reactionary plans of American imperialists and Churchill for the "United States of Europe".

The "Council of Europe" is an organ of propaganda for the ideas of bourgeois cosmopolitanism, the abandonment of national sovereignty by the peoples of Europe under the flag of creating a "pan-European parliament" and a "European government". In reality, the countries entering this council are being turned into colonies of the USA, into a "sum of European states" united by a common dependence on American monopolies. The preaching of the "United States of Europe" as an intermediate stage to a "world state" boils down in fact to attempts to cement the split of Europe, restore German monopolies and German militarism, expand the "Western bloc" directed against the USSR and the countries of people's democracy, and strengthen the reactionary forces in Western Europe put at the service of American monopoly capital.

The struggle against the ideology of bourgeois cosmopolitanism is inextricably linked with the struggle of the peoples of the whole world against the warmongers of a new war, against international arms trusts striving to "make money" on this war, against the monopoly capital of the United States of America, which has become the main force of the imperialist camp.

Bourgeois cosmopolitanism has currently become a kind of official ideology of American imperialists in their struggle for world domination, as well as of the Western European big bourgeoisie striving to play the role of the "junior partner" of American monopolies.

This is the common ideology that unites in their game with assigned roles both the open preachers of American expansion and militaristic aggression, and their right-socialist lackeys in Western European countries chattering about a "third force", and individual liberal-pacifist scientists who have frightened themselves with the atomic blackmail of the imperialists and zealously joined in the preaching of the "world state" so advantageous to American monopolies.

The common feature of all this reactionary ideological mess is the aspiration by all ways and means to undermine the principle of national sovereignty, clear the path for the expansion of American monopolies, and create an ideological cover for the unification of international reaction against the Soviet Union and progressive democratic forces throughout the world. The main task set by cosmopolites is the ideological disarmament of peoples, the weakening of their will to defend independence, to struggle against enslavement by American

imperialism. At the same time, the propaganda of bourgeois cosmopolitanism takes the most diverse forms—from the direct glorification of American "benefactions", American "democracy", corrupted American culture and science to calls for convening a "world parliament", establishing "world citizenship", etc. On the same basis, the preaching of the imaginary "unity of world science" is conducted, attempting falsely to pass off militarized bourgeois science in the service of American monopolies almost as the "peak of human knowledge".

Using the rags of cosmopolitan ideology as a cover, reactionary American scientists have placed themselves entirely at the service of the American warmongers of a new war. American cosmopolitan scientists do not stop at the most monstrous and abominable slander against the Soviet Union and Soviet science.

The systematic exposure of the background of these speeches, showing the role of American science as a handmaiden of monopolies, as an instrument of American imperialism and militarism, is an important task of our scientific workers, since they assist in exposing the warmongers of a new war.

American imperialists count on being able to confuse and fool the popular masses, passing off the interests of monopolists thirsting for new profits and striving for war as the interests of peoples. But in this gamble of the warmongers of a new war on deceiving millions of working people lies their most important miscalculation: at present, it is impossible to wage war without the popular masses and it is impossible to force these masses to fight for a cause alien to them, for the enrichment of a handful

of American monopolists and their cosmopolitan allies in Western European countries. Neither Western unions and European councils, nor the "Marshall Plan" and the North Atlantic Pact, nor the cosmopolitan propaganda of the "world state" can eliminate this factor.

Lenin wrote about the results of the First World War: "The war shook up the masses, awakened them with untold horrors and sufferings. The war pushed history, and it is now flying with the speed of a locomotive. Millions and tens of millions of people are now making history independently. Capitalism has now grown into socialism"[51]. As a result of the Second World War, not tens, but hundreds of millions of people in all corners of the globe have awakened and shaken themselves up. They strive for a lasting peace, for freedom, for national independence, for honest international cooperation, for genuine democracy and socialism.

The Communist Parties—the vanguard of the working class—have taken into their hands the banner of defending the national independence and sovereignty of peoples from the encroachments of American imperialists. They proceed in this from the great principles of proletarian internationalism, which have nothing in common with bourgeois cosmopolitanism, being directly opposed to this ideology of imperialist reaction and the struggle of imperialist predators for world domination.

Proletarian internationalism is inextricably linked with ardent love and devotion to one's own people, with respect for all other peoples, with the friendship of peoples and the

---

[51] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. XXII, p. 378

recognition of the complete equality of working people of all nationalities and races. The principle of internationalism is embodied in the Leninist-Stalinist national policy, in the multinational socialist state, in the Stalin Constitution of the USSR, in the mighty flourishing of the culture of Soviet peoples, socialist in content and national in form, in ardent and life-giving Soviet patriotism. The Soviet Union is a reliable mainstay in defending the equality, independence, and national self-determination of peoples.

The exposure and overcoming of all sorts of manifestations of cosmopolitan ideology in the USSR is of great importance for educating and strengthening Soviet patriotism, for the further development of Soviet culture and science. Individual manifestations of the ideology of cosmopolitanism in various branches of the social sciences are one of the survivals of capitalism in people's consciousness, which the capitalist environment tries to revive and support. The struggle against manifestations of cosmopolitanism in the USSR is inextricably linked with arming our entire intelligentsia with the knowledge of Marxism-Leninism, with the systematic exposure of all survivals of reactionary bourgeois ideology, with a decisive offensive against the positions of ideologists of modern imperialism in the international arena.

This struggle is based on a profound scientific revelation of all the advantages of the socialist economic system and socialist culture over the dying capitalist system and rotting bourgeois culture. The struggle against bourgeois cosmopolitanism requires the tireless defense of the priority of Soviet science, the exposure of all manifestations of servility and bow-scraping

before foreign things, of all attempts under the screen of objectivism to cover up and gloss over the deepest contradictions and ulcers of modern imperialism.

The Communist Parties in all foreign countries in their struggle against the reactionary ideology of bourgeois cosmopolitanism have the great example and fraternal assistance of the peoples of the Soviet Union, who have opened the path to communism for humanity. They rely on the invincible theory of Marxism-Leninism, on the Marxist-Leninist science of the laws of society's development, which smashes to dust the pathetic pseudo-scientific intricacies of the ideologists of bourgeois cosmopolitanism. In their struggle against the encroachments of American imperialism on the independence of peoples, against the attempts of imperialists to ignite a new war, against the cosmopolitan propaganda of warmongers, the Communist Parties encounter the ardent support and most active assistance of the multi-million popular masses of the entire globe.

The manifesto of the World Congress of Partisans of Peace in Paris and Prague resounded throughout the world, declaring on behalf of 600 million men and women that peoples have ceased to be passive, that the propaganda of war has not clouded their reason. The Congress declared: "We fight for national independence and peaceful cooperation of all peoples, for the right of peoples to self-determination, which is the basic condition of freedom and peace". At the same time, the Congress called on the working people of all countries to completely neutralize the propaganda of war poisoning public consciousness, to tirelessly expose war hysteria, racial hatred, and enmity between peoples.

For the implementation of this great task, the most important role is played by the exposure of bourgeois cosmopolitanism as one of the main forms of the ideology of imperialist aggressors, as the poisoned ideological weapon of American monopoly capital.

The struggle against the cosmopolitan ideology of imperialist aggressors and its reverse side—bourgeois nationalism—is the struggle against the warmongers of a new war, it is the struggle for peace, for life, for the national independence and flourishing of the culture of all peoples, large and small, it is the struggle for the international solidarity of the working class, for socialism. The struggle against bourgeois cosmopolitanism is the struggle for the further strengthening of the mighty force of life-giving Soviet patriotism—the source of the greatest heroism of Soviet people fighting under the leadership of the great party of Lenin and Stalin for the further strengthening of the might and prosperity of their socialist Fatherland, for the complete victory of communism.

Questions of Economics, No.7, 1949.

I. Lemin

ECONOMIC CONTRADICTIONS AND THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN AMERICAN AND BRITISH IMPERIALISTS

The signing and ratification of the Atlantic Military Pact and the discussion of the American program for arming Western European states testify to the unceasing aggressive activity of the imperialist camp. The edge of all aggressive activity of the warmongers, their reactionary ideology, mendacious propaganda, diplomatic intrigues, and combinations is directed against the Soviet Union, which heads the camp of peace, democracy, and socialism and serves as the main obstacle to the realization of imperialist plans for world domination.

Bestial hatred for the USSR—the great socialist power —, for the countries of people's democracy, for the workers' and democratic movements throughout the world, for the national liberation movements of the oppressed peoples of colonies and dependent countries unites the camp of modern aggressors and its organizers and inspirers—the monopolists of Wall Street and the City.

The fact that the USA and Britain head an aggressive military coalition does not abolish the deep and acute contradictions between these imperialist predators—partners and competitors at the same time. Imperialist blocs and coalitions are created for the purpose of repartitioning the world, for the purpose of the struggle for world domination.

The relationship between participants in imperialist blocs and coalitions is determined by the balance of power between them. V. I. Lenin wrote: "...under capitalism no other basis for the division of spheres of influence, interests, colonies, etc., is conceivable except an assessment of the strength of the participants in the division, general economic, financial, military strength, etc. And strength changes unevenly among these participants in the division, for under capitalism there can be no even development of individual enterprises, trusts, branches of industry, or countries."[52] Methods of peaceful and non-peaceful struggle between participants in imperialist coalitions replace each other, moreover, as Lenin pointed out, regardless of "in what form these alliances are concluded, whether in the form of one imperialist coalition against another imperialist coalition, or in the form of a general alliance of all imperialist powers." "Peaceful alliances," Lenin wrote, "prepare wars and in their turn grow out of wars, conditioning each other, giving birth to a change in the forms of peaceful and non-peaceful struggle from the same soil of imperialist ties and relations of world economy and world politics."[53]

At present, the most militant, aggressive force in the international arena, the bulwark of reaction and obscurantism, is American imperialism, which acts as the main warmonger against the USSR and the countries of people's democracy. In its struggle for world domination, American imperialism blocks with British imperialism, which, although greatly weakened, nevertheless continues to remain the most active

---

52 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. 22, p. 281.

53 *Ibid.*, pp. 281–282.

ringleader after the USA in the camp of world reaction and aggression.

World wars are generated by the uneven development of capitalist countries, and they, in turn, lead to a further aggravation of this unevenness. Already after the First World War, as Comrade Stalin pointed out, "the circle of the main world-exploiting states, compared with the pre-war period, has shrunk to the utmost limit" and "the center of financial power in the capitalist world, the center of financial exploitation of the whole world has shifted from Europe to America."[54]

After the Second World War, only two "great" imperialist powers remained—the USA and Britain, and the balance of power between them clearly shaped up in favor of the USA. It is precisely this reduction in the circle of ruling capitalist powers that determines the acuteness and tension of the imperialist struggle and rivalry between the USA and Britain, despite the fact that both of these powers head the camp of imperialism and reaction, opposing the camp of peace, democracy, and socialism.

It is well known that the USA emerged from the Second World War enriched and fattened, while Britain emerged even more weakened and decrepit. The balance of power between these two powers can be judged by the following indicators: in the USA in 1947, the number of employed was 3 times greater than in Britain, electricity generation 6 times, coal mining 3 times, steel production 6 times, wheat harvest 16 times greater than in Britain. By the end of the Second World War, arms

---

[54] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 7, pp. 268, 266.

production in the USA was 3 times greater than in Britain. During the war, Britain fell into economic and financial dependence on the USA, and after the war this dependence increased even more as a result of the anti-people policy of the British Labour government. Thus, American imperialism possesses enormous advantages over its "junior partner" in the acute Anglo-American competitive struggle.

However, one should not underestimate the significance of those positions in the capitalist system that British imperialism still commands. Britain is the largest colonial power. Possession of vast colonies provides British imperialism with relatively stable markets, spheres for capital investment, and numerous sources of raw materials.

Lenin, exposing Kautskian sophistry regarding "free markets" and the imaginary obsolescence of annexationist-colonial policy, emphasized the role and significance of colonial monopoly. "The possession of a colony alone," Lenin wrote, "gives complete guarantee of success to the monopoly against all contingencies of the struggle with a competitor—up to such a contingency when the competitor might wish to protect himself by a law on state monopoly. The higher the development of capitalism, the more acutely the shortage of raw materials is felt, the sharper the competition and chase for sources of raw materials throughout the world, the more desperate the struggle for the acquisition of colonies."[55]

British imperialism still possesses very significant financial positions in the capitalist world. The opposing "sterling zone"

---

[55] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. 22, p. 247.

and "dollar zone" personify the unceasing struggle between the USA and Britain in the sphere of currency and credit, their struggle for financial hegemony. In the hands of British imperialism are the largest raw material monopolies in rubber, tin, nickel, gold, diamonds, wool, etc. Before the war, Britain was the largest exporter of capital: British foreign investments were approximately twice as large as American ones. After the war, the situation changed. During the war years, Britain sold off a significant portion of its foreign investments, while the USA increased its capital export by leaps and bounds and in the post-war period became, in essence, the monopolistic exporter of capital. An intense struggle between Britain and the USA continues for spheres of capital investment.

The significant contraction of the sphere of domination of capitalism as a result of the Second World War and post-war development leads to an even greater aggravation of the Anglo-American struggle for the markets and "spheres of influence" remaining under the control of capitalism. At the same time, Britain's world positions are severely undermined. The national liberation movement of the peoples of British colonies, the intensified action of centrifugal forces within the British Empire—factors of its disintegration and decay—undermine Britain's colonial monopoly and its associated advantages regarding markets, sources of raw materials, and spheres of capital investment. American monopolies, enriched by the war, unceremoniously kicking out their competitors in world markets, and placing a number of capitalist countries in financial and economic dependence, are further intensifying the expansionist course of their policy. They have put forward the

aggressive "Truman Doctrine" and "Marshall Plan," and various projects for creating a global "American empire." In all these programs, a prominent place is occupied by the task of ousting British imperialism from world commodity and capital markets.

During the Second World War, the "Axis" powers encroached upon the colonial possessions of British imperialism in Asia, Africa, and the Far East, striving to seize them. After the end of the war, the monopolists of Wall Street—the main contenders for world domination—reach out to the British Empire. American imperialism wants to seize the British colonial "inheritance" predominantly by "peaceful" means, acting as Britain's "ally," "partner," "protector," and "guardian." But the essence of the matter does not change from this. It is characteristic that American imperialism, like German imperialism in its time, hypocritically covers up its predatory intentions and aggressive plans with the bugbear of the "struggle against communism," with talk of its desire to "shield" the British Empire—this greatest colonial empire—from the dangers threatening it.

Militant American imperialists sometimes state their true goals and intentions regarding the British Empire quite frankly. In American political literature, the British Empire, by analogy with the Ottoman Empire of the late 19th and 20th centuries, not infrequently figures as the "sick man." American journalist C. Wiegand wrote: "The British Empire is passing into history. America is the natural heir to the power and world leadership

that have been in the hands of the British Empire for so long."[56] American "geopolitician" Bernard Brodie, in an article entitled "How Strong is Britain?" published in the April 1948 issue of *Foreign Affairs*, writes that Britain, with all its dominions and colonies, must constantly be under US military and economic tutelage. Some American politicians go even further: they openly discuss the question of incorporating the British Empire into the United States of America.

British capitalists and their Labour lackeys submit to American imperialism, believing that without its help, without an alliance with it, they will not be able to keep the British people and especially the peoples of their colonial and dependent countries under their domination, will not be able to crush the national liberation movement in the empire, and will not be able to unleash an aggressive, reactionary war against the Soviet Union and the countries of people's democracy. At the same time, American imperialism uses the prevailing situation to place Britain in a vassal position and, under the flag of alliance and "cooperation," oust Britain from its old "spheres of influence," deprive it of markets and sources of raw materials, and take the British Empire into its own hands.

The "Marshall Plan," the Western Union, the Atlantic Pact—all these are links in the chain chaining Britain to the chariot of American imperialism. The more Britain bogs down in aggressive, adventuristic enterprises in Europe and other bridgeheads of the war being prepared by the imperialists, the more brazenly American imperialism penetrates into remote

---

[56] Quoted from *Labour Monthly*, April 1947.

parts of the British Empire to seize the long-coveted "British inheritance."

British imperialism retreats before the onslaught of American imperialism, but nevertheless it tries to defend its shaken positions and strengthen them. Hence the intense Anglo-American struggle unfolding within the framework of the military-political alliance and exposing the deep and acute internal contradictions of the modern bloc of aggressors.

The economic offensive of American imperialism against the positions of British imperialism unfolds along the following main lines:

offensive against British sales markets,

offensive against the positions of the British pound sterling,

offensive against British raw material sources and the positions of British raw material monopolies, and, finally,

offensive against British spheres of capital investment.

The period of the general crisis of capitalism is characterized by an exceptional aggravation of the struggle for markets. Comrade Stalin, in the Political Report of the Central Committee to the 15th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) [VKP(b)], pointed out that "the contradiction between the growth of productive capacities and the relative stability of markets has formed the basis of the fact that the problem of markets is now the basic problem of capitalism. The aggravation of the problem of sales markets in general, the aggravation of the problem of foreign markets in particular, the aggravation of the problem of markets for the

export of capital in particular—such is the present state of capitalism."[57]

The new contraction of the sphere of domination of capitalism as a result of the Second World War has made the problem of foreign markets even more acute for the main imperialist powers. The following table gives an idea of the intense Anglo-American struggle for world markets (see table on page 65).

Struggle Between the USA and Britain for Sales Markets [58]

	1938	**1947**	**1948**
US Exports (in mln. dollars)			
to Continental Europe	727	4,469	3,582
Latin America	485	3,858	3,161
Africa, Middle East, India	195	526	1,459

[57] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 10, p. 275.

[58] Compiled from *Monthly Digest of Statistics*, April 1949; *Foreign Commerce Weekly*, 7. III. 1949.

	1938	1947	1948
Far East	522	1,945	1,573
UK Exports (in mln. dollars)			
to Europe	860	1,550	2,060
Latin America	222	398	595
Africa, Middle East, India	600	1,420	1,929
Far East	440	816	1,190

For the USA, annual average for 1936–1938.

Foreign Commerce Weekly, 11. IV. 1949.

These data testify, firstly, to the process of ousting Britain from world sales markets as a result of the competition of a more powerful imperialist power—the USA—and, secondly, to the unevenness of this process, to the sharp aggravation of the competitive struggle in 1948 under conditions of a ripening economic crisis, and to the attempts of British monopolies to at least partially restore their lost positions in sales markets.

However, it should be taken into account that in 1949 a decline in British exports began.

The American offensive on world markets is carried out not only at the expense of capturing the markets of Germany and Japan, but also at the expense of British markets. As can be seen from the table, US exports to Europe in 1947 increased compared to the pre-war period (in monetary terms) by 6 times (in physical volume, of course, less, since prices rose more than twofold). At the same time, British exports to Europe (in monetary terms) only doubled, thus remaining lower than the pre-war level in physical volume. In 1948, British exports increased and American exports decreased, but even in that year US exports to Europe exceeded British exports by more than 1.5 times, whereas before the war they lagged behind them.

Very revealing are the data on American and British trade with Latin American countries. While US exports to Latin America increased 6-7 times over the years cited in the table, UK exports grew only about 2.5 times. The process of Britain being squeezed out of the trade of Latin American countries by the United States can be judged by the following table:

Share of the USA and Britain in Exports and Imports of Latin American Countries (in %)

	1938	1946	1947
Imports of Latin American countries			

	1938	1946	1947
from the USA	33.9	59.2	63.9
Britain	12.1	6.2	5.4
Continental Europe	35.7	9.6	12.5
Exports of Latin American countries			
to the USA	32.3	40.2	39.1
Britain	17.5	12.2	14.8
Continental Europe	30.6	20.2	22.0

As can be seen from the table, the USA almost monopolized the imports of Latin American countries. Before the war, 1/3 of their imports came from the USA, and in 1947 already 2/3. Britain's share during this time fell from 12 to 5%. At the same time, insignificant changes occurred in the exports of Latin American countries. In 1938, the USA absorbed 1/3 of their exports, and in 1947 about 35%. Britain's share, like that of the countries of continental Europe, decreased relatively little. Consequently, the USA did not replace Britain and the states of continental Europe as a buyer of Latin American goods, and this is the weak point of the American positions in the markets

of Latin America. Utilizing the interest of Latin American countries in marketing their raw materials and agricultural goods, Britain is trying to force exports to these countries on the basis of bilateral agreements and thereby weaken the monopoly positions of the USA there.

In 1948, US exports to Latin America decreased by 18% compared to 1947, while British exports grew by almost 50%, although they were still less than double the American ones.

American expansion into Africa, the Middle East, and India intensified sharply: US exports to these regions increased in 1947 compared to pre-war times by almost 7 times (in monetary terms), while British exports increased by only 2.5 times. Similarly, American exports to the Far East increased 4 times, and British exports less than doubled.

In 1948, changes also occurred in these markets: under the slogan "export or die" (willingly used in their time by German fascists), British monopolies increased exports. The share of the USA in the imports of Far Eastern countries in 1948 rose to 34% compared to the pre-war level of 17%, while Britain's share rose from 6 to 10.5%.[59] The USA completely monopolized Japan's and the Philippines' trade, and took a predominant place in Indonesia's trade, decisively pushing Britain aside.

A special place in the Anglo-American struggle for sales markets is occupied by the British Empire. During the world economic crisis, in 1932, a system of preferential tariffs for

---

[59] *Foreign Commerce Weekly*, 13. VI. 1949.

intra-imperial trade was established at the Ottawa Imperial Conference. As a result of this, Britain's trade with imperial countries and intra-imperial trade as a whole revived significantly. In 1913, 37% of British exports were directed to the countries of the British Empire, in 1929—44%, in 1938—50%, and the share of British imports from British Empire countries increased from 25% in 1913 to 30% in 1929 and 42% in 1938.

The specific weight of intra-imperial trade in the aggregate imports of British Empire countries increased from 37% in 1929 to 45% in 1938, and in exports respectively from 45 to 56%. In 1948, the Empire accounted for 47% of Britain's imports and 52% of its exports.

The edge of the Ottawa preferential tariff system was directed against the USA, and the latter continually attempts to undermine, weaken, and liquidate this system. The Anglo-American financial agreement of December 6, 1945, stipulated that Britain would accept American proposals concerning "the reduction of customs tariffs and the elimination of discrimination in international trade." By this it was meant that Britain would soften and then abolish the system of imperial preferences, i.e., would widely open the gates of the empire to American goods. The Anglo-American agreement on the "Marshall Plan" also contains a number of conditions facilitating American expansion into the countries of the British Empire. At the international trade conferences held in Geneva in October 1947 and in Havana in April 1948, the USA exerted strong pressure on Britain and the countries of the British Empire, also demanding the softening or even

liquidation of imperial preferential tariffs. The Havana "Charter for International Trade" provides for the possibility of preserving preferences with the permission of the International Trade Organization, however, it imposes a number of obligations on Britain regarding the reduction of customs tariffs. Although this "charter" was not ratified by the majority of the states that adopted it, it became an instrument of American interference in the foreign trade policy of other capitalist countries.

The following table gives an idea of US expansion in British imperial markets:

US and UK Exports to British Empire Countries (in mln. dollars)[60]

	UK Exports			**U Ex**
	1938	**1947**	**1948**	**19**
To all British Empire countries (except Britain)	1,150	2,250	3,312	75
Including:				

[60] Compiled from *Monthly Digest of Statistics*, April 1949; *Foreign Commerce Weekly*, 7. III. 1949.

	UK Exports			US Ex
to Canada	114	173	278	45
Australia	192	385	506	72
New Zealand	96	173	210	22
Union of South Africa	198	370	485	76
India	168	365	460	35

The cited data testify to the intensity of the Anglo-American struggle for the markets of the British Empire. In 1938, British exports to the countries of the empire exceeded US exports by 1.5 times. In 1947, American exports exceeded British exports by 2/3, and in all countries listed in the table (except Australia and New Zealand), the USA outstripped Britain. In 1948, an acute dollar deficit forced the empire countries to adopt a number of measures to curtail imports from the USA while simultaneously forcing imports from Britain. British exports and US exports to the countries of the British Empire leveled off. Only in Canada does the USA occupy first place as an exporter; in the Union of South Africa, the shares of Britain and the USA are approximately equal; and in the remaining countries, Britain is once again in first place.

In the competitive struggle between the USA and Britain for supremacy in world markets, the backwardness of British industry tells. British goods, as a rule, are significantly more expensive than American ones. British President of the Board of Trade Wilson was forced to admit that in Canada excessive expensiveness of British goods is noted; in Australia, for example, they are sold at 25–30%, and sometimes 2–3 times more expensive than American and Australian ones. In addition, America uses various advantages and privileges granted to it under the "Marshall Plan" and similar "aid" acts to strengthen its expansion. Thus, for example, having used the "Marshall Plan" as an instrument of blackmail and pressure, the USA at the Geneva Conference achieved Britain's agreement to reduce import duties on goods making up 30% of total British imports. In addition, Britain undertook to reduce preferences for a number of British goods in the colonies and thereby facilitate the penetration of American goods there.

But Britain also has a number of advantages over the USA, not to mention the imperial preference system. Britain is the largest importer of raw materials and food and enjoys the benefits of concluding bilateral long-term agreements and contracts that facilitate the penetration of its goods into other countries in exchange for food and raw materials imported by it from these countries. Before the war, total British imports exceeded American imports by approximately 2 times, and in 1947 and 1948—by 1.5 times.

However, the USA cannot replace Britain as a buyer of food exported from British dominions and a number of other countries. Among the countries of the British Empire, only in

Canada does the USA now act as a larger buyer than Britain. In the exports of the dominions, Britain's share is significantly higher than that of the USA. Before the war, Britain bought 40% of Canadian exports, and the USA—32%. In 1947, the roles reversed: Britain received 30%, and the USA—43% of Canada's commodity exports. Britain accounted for 55% of Australia's exports in 1938, and the USA for only 3%; in 1947—37 and 30%, respectively. However, in 1948, Britain's share increased again, and the US share sharply declined. Before the war, Britain absorbed 85% of New Zealand's exports, and the USA only 8%. This ratio was preserved in the post-war period. In 1938, 40% of the Union of South Africa's exports went to Britain, and 8% to the USA. In 1947 and 1948, the specific weights of Britain and the USA approximately equalized.

In response to the pressure of American monopolies demanding, on the basis of the Anglo-American financial agreement, the "Marshall Plan," and the Havana Charter, that Britain abandon the system of imperial preference and bilateral agreements with other countries, British monopolies have recently intensified their campaign for "imperial unity." In the spirit of demands to strengthen Britain's economic ties with the empire, against attempts to weaken the preferential system—this economic hoop binding the integrity of the empire—was compiled, for example, the appeal of the Association of British Empire Industries, adopted in the summer of 1948.

The attack of the United States on the system of bilateral trade agreements is conducted under the flag of the struggle for "multilateral trade," for the principle of "equal opportunities," for the "general reduction of customs barriers." The hypocrisy

of this policy is evident if only from the fact that the USA itself by no means agrees to any serious reduction of the high customs barriers shielding the domestic American market. These slogans serve American imperialists merely as a smoke screen covering up their policy of expansion, economic subordination, and enslavement of other countries. Britain also uses similar demagogy in its dealings with weaker contractors. But in this case, it itself becomes the object of American blackmail and extortion. A peculiar hierarchy of imperialist pressure and predation!

The nature of American interference in Britain's foreign trade policy can be judged, in particular, by the US reaction to the Anglo-Argentine trade agreement concluded on June 27, 1949. Argentina is the largest supplier of meat to Britain. Argentine supplies make up slightly less than half of all British meat imports and an equal share of Argentine meat exports. The new Anglo-Argentine trade agreement, concluded for 5 years, provides that during the first year Argentina will supply Britain with 320 thousand tons, and subsequently 420 thousand tons or more of meat per year. Britain, in turn, must supply Argentina with oil, coal, textiles, and other industrial goods. American monopolies sharply opposed this agreement. In this case, they were not interested in the British meat market, since the USA does not export meat in large quantities: in 1947, they exported approximately 10–12% of the amount of meat Argentina exports. The American attack was directed against British exports to Argentina. The Anglo-Argentine agreement provides that trade turnover from each side will amount to 80 million pounds sterling for the first year and that in the future it will be

significantly expanded. Argentina's commitment to purchase goods in Britain threatens to curtail exports from the USA to Argentina, which has been flagging since the beginning of 1949 anyway. The Anglo-Argentine agreement caused such strong commotion in Wall Street circles also because it concerns an attempt by Britain to ignore American claims to monopoly in the Western Hemisphere and restore its pre-war positions in a major Latin American country.

Protesting against bilateral agreements, American monopolists refer, firstly, to the "Marshall Plan," which prohibits marshallized countries from applying "discrimination" against American goods, and, secondly, to the Havana Charter, which establishes the principle of "free, multilateral trade." This was also used to motivate the American protest against the Anglo-Argentine trade agreement. Later, however, the US State Department announced that it was withdrawing its objections to the Anglo-Argentine agreement, since after "consultations" with Britain, the terms of this agreement "became significantly more flexible." Apparently, Britain made certain promises not only regarding the scale of its trade expansion in Latin America, but also regarding concessions it will make to the USA on general issues of trade and financial-monetary policy.

No less revealing is the pressure exerted by the USA on Britain and Canada in connection with the wheat agreement concluded between these states. Britain absorbs half of Canada's wheat exports, thereby satisfying more than half of its import requirement for wheat. The USA is a major exporter of wheat, occupying second place in this export article in the capitalist world after Canada. The US government in May 1949

protested against the Anglo-Canadian agreement and threatened that it would not permit the use of Marshall Plan funds for British wheat purchases in Canada, in other words, would correspondingly reduce credits to Britain. The USA refers to the fact that the Anglo-Canadian agreement establishes discrimination on the part of Britain regarding purchases of US wheat and thus contradicts the Anglo-American agreement on the "Marshall Plan." The USA tries to force Britain and other countries "subject" to American "aid" to buy only American goods, in this case wheat; it lays claim to establishing its complete control over foreign trade and, in general, over the foreign economic policy of these countries. The principle of "multilateral trade" in the American interpretation turns into a desire to establish a certain world preference system for the USA, under which other countries are obliged to buy goods produced in the USA in the first place. The principle of "equal opportunities" in the mouths of American expansionists is Wall Street's claim to trade hegemony, to monopolistic control over world markets.

In close connection with the Anglo-American struggle for world markets is the financial rivalry between Britain and the USA, the war between the pound and the dollar. The overwhelming part of the gold reserves of the capitalist world is concentrated in the hands of the USA. In the post-war years, the USA acted as almost the monopolistic creditor of other capitalist countries. They have at their disposal such levers of financial pressure on other countries as the International Bank and the International Monetary Fund. The American financial oligarchy strives to use these levers to establish its hegemony,

to turn the dollar into the main world currency, so that the currencies of all other capitalist countries are tethered to the dollar. Hence the launched offensive of the American financial oligarchy against the international positions of the pound sterling. Hence its persistent attempts to undermine and liquidate the sterling zone, formed in the 1930s as a sphere of financial influence of Britain and including countries that orient themselves in their trade and financial settlements toward the British pound. At present, the sterling zone officially includes the British Empire (except Canada), Burma, Iraq, Iceland, and the Irish Republic. It must also be taken into account that the formal withdrawal from the sterling zone of such countries as Egypt and Sudan has essentially not changed their actual position as participants in the sterling block. Finally, a number of other countries are indirectly adjacent to this zone. Mutual trade and credit settlements between Britain and the countries of the sterling zone are carried out in pounds. If any of these countries exported more goods to Britain than it imported from it, it accumulates a sterling asset in London, which can be realized only within the sterling zone. Thus, the sterling zone places Britain in a privileged position both in terms of ensuring its exports and in terms of its control over the credit and monetary policy of the respective countries, not to mention the disguised forms of robbing these countries by British imperialism through the prolonged freezing of sterling assets.

If the US demand for the gradual liquidation of the sterling zone and the free convertibility of pounds into dollars, fixed in the agreement on the American loan to Britain, had been

implemented, Britain's contractors could have transferred their assets in sterling accounts into dollars and used them to purchase goods in the USA. Thus, the US demand for free currency exchange is aimed at blowing up the sterling zone, removing currency barriers in the path of American economic expansion in the markets of the British Empire and the sterling zone. In August 1947, in accordance with the Anglo-American financial agreement, Britain began the free exchange of sterling for dollars, but this led to a catastrophic drain of Britain's gold and currency reserves: over 6 weeks it lost 250 million pounds sterling in gold and currency, and the exchange of pounds for dollars was stopped.

The development of the economic crisis in the USA is accompanied by a sharp intensification of US pressure on Britain and other marshallized countries, the consequence of which is a further growth of contradictions between the USA and Western European countries. The approach of the crisis in the marshallized countries led to a sharp aggravation of contradictions between them. Already in the first year of the practical implementation of the "Marshall Plan," its complete bankruptcy was revealed. Naturally, the "Marshall Plan" led not to the restoration of the economy of the countries that fell into its orbit, but to the intensification of economic ruin in them, to the unilateral dependence of these countries on the USA, to their transformation into appendages of the American economy. One of the decisive factors in the deterioration of the economic situation of the marshallized countries is the course pursued by them under Washington's dictation to boycott trade

relations with the Soviet Union and the countries of people's democracy.

The failure of the "Marshall Plan" dispelled the hopes of American monopolists of escaping the crisis by forcing foreign economic expansion. US exports decreased from 15.3 billion dollars in 1947 to 12.6 billion dollars in 1948, i.e., by 2.7 billion dollars, or by 18%, over the year. This is the direct result of aggravated imperialist contradictions on the soil of the struggle for sales markets. Over the same year, US exports to British countries (including Britain) decreased by 1 billion dollars.

Britain tried to occupy a special, privileged position in the system of the "Marshall Plan" and play the role of the "European factory." It expanded exports to the continental countries of Western Europe and in 1948 almost liquidated the passive balance of its total trade with these countries, which before the war amounted to approximately 750 million dollars a year.

The intra-European payments agreement concluded between the countries adhering to the "Marshall Plan" gave Britain a certain advantage both in terms of strengthening the positions of the pound sterling and in terms of its control over the foreign trade operations of Western European states. This agreement provides for a system of bilateral settlements between marshallized countries and a certain opportunity for them, for the purpose of covering foreign trade deficits, to make "borrowings" from funds accumulating in national currency by way of payment for deliveries under the "Marshall Plan." Thus, countries having an active balance in trade with Britain

accumulated certain sums in sterling accounts, but they could use these sums only in Britain, and not in the USA and not even in other marshallized countries.

Faced with the threat of an economic crisis, Britain was not averse to increasing pressure on its European partners, but the latter, in turn, began to exert pressure on Britain. At the same time, the US government decisively supported (and actually inspired) their demands directed against Britain for the unfreezing of sterling accounts and the free convertibility of currencies, which threatens Britain with the complete exhaustion of currency reserves, the aggravation of competition on European markets, and the necessity of lowering its export prices. For the United States, this would provide an opportunity to intensify the flow of its goods into Europe.

Under these conditions, Britain found itself forced to yield its positions. In July 1949, at a meeting of representatives of marshallized countries, it was decided to establish partial (within 25%) currency convertibility. Behind this "compromise" lay Britain's next capitulation to the USA.

The "Marshall Plan" led economic relations between the USA and Western Europe into a deadlock. Even the bourgeois press of the USA and marshallized countries, including Britain, was forced to recognize the complete bankruptcy of calculations on balancing trade between Europe and America. As was to be expected, the "Marshall Plan" led to a sharp aggravation of the dollar dependence of Britain, the British Empire, and the marshallized part of Europe. If in 1946 the dollar deficit of Britain and the sterling zone exceeded 1 billion dollars, then in 1947 it reached an astronomical figure—4.1 billion dollars. In

1948, the dollar deficit of Britain and the sterling zone dropped to 1.7 billion dollars.[61] This was achieved by adopting forced emergency measures along the lines of curtailing imports from the dollar zone and increasing British exports to this zone. But Britain's measures were palliatives and did not weaken the suffocating effect of the dollar noose thrown over Britain.

By the summer of 1949, a new, even more catastrophic breach in Britain's financial and monetary system was discovered. The dollar deficit in the first half of 1949 rose to the level of 2.4 billion dollars a year. This led to a rapid drain of Britain's currency and gold reserves, which shrank to 400 million pounds sterling, i.e., turned out to be 100 million pounds sterling below the minimum level considered necessary to maintain the exchange rate of the British pound. Britain once again found itself facing the threat of financial bankruptcy. The British government announced a reduction in imports from the dollar currency countries by 100 million pounds sterling a year, i.e., by 25%, and in the second half of July 1949 convened a meeting of Finance Ministers of the "British Commonwealth" in London. This meeting also adopted a decision to reduce imports from the dollar zone and force exports to this zone.

But the USA strives to "export" crisis and unemployment to other countries, to find a way out at the expense of foreign expansion. In the atmosphere of a unfolding economic crisis, American imperialists increased pressure on Britain and other marshallized countries, demanding the removal of all barriers in the path of their economic expansion, especially financial

---

61 *Economist*, 15. I. 1949.

and monetary ones. This pressure found its most concentrated expression in the American demand for the devaluation of the pound sterling and other Western European currencies, put forward either directly or in a disguised form (under the flag of "stabilization" of these currencies). At the same time, the USA strives for the general discrediting of the pound sterling and the undermining of its international positions. American monopolies count:

firstly, by reducing the value of the pound, to "tether" it to the dollar and thereby undermine and subsequently liquidate the sterling zone, if only under the guise of merging it with the dollar zone;

secondly, by devaluing the pound and facilitating its convertibility, to abolish the system of bilateral trade agreements and clear the way for American "multilateral trade," i.e., for further US trade expansion;

thirdly, as a result of the devaluation of the pound sterling and other Western European currencies, to ensure the implementation of Truman's announced colonialist program of significantly increasing long-term US foreign capital investments.

It is needless to explain the illusory nature of all these calculations of American financial capital. No financial manipulations will succeed in eliminating that universal disorder of monetary and financial relations in capitalist countries, which is one of the manifestations of the general crisis of capitalism. Devaluation of the pound and other Western European currencies will not solve the issue of

balancing Anglo-American trade either, since American monopolists do not intend to allow the expansion of British exports to the USA and continue to shield their domestic market with high customs barriers.

Finally, the American demand for lowering the value of the pound sterling and other Western European currencies must inevitably lead to a new growth of prices, to a reduction in real wages, and to a further decline in the living standards of the working class and all working people in the marshallized countries. Thus, the demand for the devaluation of Western European currencies put forward by American imperialists testifies to their desire to find a way out of the crisis at the expense of other countries, by intensifying the offensive against the living standards of the working masses of the marshallized countries.

The American bourgeois press, in connection with Anglo-American negotiations on monetary and financial issues, openly stated that "Britain is living beyond its means," i.e., in other words, that it is necessary to achieve a further decline in the living standards of the British people. US Secretary of the Treasury Snyder during the meetings in London in mid-July 1949 also demanded an intensified campaign against the living standards of the working people of Britain and other Western European states. On the issue of the offensive against the working class, the monopolists of Wall Street and the City, despite their dividing disagreements, easily find a common language.

Right-wing socialists and reformists in the USA and Western Europe fully support the policy of the monopolists of Wall Street and the City aimed at shifting the entire burden of the crisis onto the shoulders of the working masses, at seeking a way out of the crisis along the paths of militarization and aggressive foreign policy. However, the working masses, led by communist parties, respond to the capital offensive with an upsurge of the strike movement, powerful demonstrations of international solidarity, and a broad nationwide struggle for peace and friendship with the Soviet Union.

The struggle surrounding the devaluation of the pound is at the same time the center of Anglo-American economic rivalry. It is not surprising that in the ruling circles of Britain itself there are disagreements on the question of how far one should go along the path of further subordination to American dictation. The meetings held in July in London between the finance ministers of the USA, Britain, and Canada yielded no results. The question of the pound's devaluation was postponed to a new conference in Washington in September 1949. The Washington negotiations were a milestone on the path of subjugating Britain to US economic and political control. The recommendations of the conference to the Labour government are directed toward a further offensive against the living standards of the British people, the reduction of workers' wages, and the increase of unemployment. The Washington negotiations, as was to be expected, were incapable of finding effective means to balance trade and payment balances or to seriously alleviate Britain's financial situation. The negotiations did not eliminate the deep and steadily sharpening economic

contradictions between the two countries amidst a developing crisis.

No less fierce in character than in the sphere of trade and monetary-credit policy is the Anglo-American struggle for raw material sources.

As is known, the epoch of imperialism and especially the period of the general crisis of capitalism are characterized by an aggravation of the struggle for raw material sources. The chase of capitalist monopolies for raw materials is connected not only with the development of technology and mass production, but also with their preparation for new wars. Thus, at present, the countries of the Atlantic Bloc are creating large reserves of military-strategic raw materials. The US state budget for the 1949/50 fiscal year provides for an appropriation of 525 million dollars to increase strategic raw material reserves. The USA receives large consignments of important raw materials from Western European countries as payment for notorious deliveries under the "Marshall Plan" and demands from these countries a sharp increase in raw material extraction in the colonies.

The Anglo-American struggle for raw material sources is aggravated even more due to the fact that in many types of raw materials the British Empire acts as the largest producer, and the USA as the largest consumer.

In 1938, world production of natural rubber amounted to 1,150 thousand tons, including 530 thousand tons produced in British Malaya, 50 thousand tons in Ceylon, and 330 thousand tons in Indonesia. In 1948, world rubber production amounted to 1,500

thousand tons, of which 700 thousand tons in Malaya, 150 thousand tons in Ceylon and North Borneo, and 432 thousand tons in Indonesia.[62] In other words, the British Empire produced 56%, and together with Indonesia—more than 80% of world natural rubber production. At the same time, Britain consumed 200 thousand tons of rubber in 1948, and the USA—627 thousand tons of natural rubber and 440 thousand tons of synthetic rubber.

The USA is trying in every way to undermine the British monopoly in the field of natural rubber. As a result of the fact that a law is in effect in the United States on the compulsory consumption of synthetic rubber in a certain proportion to natural rubber, the USA has the opportunity to curtail its purchases of natural rubber and dictate prices for it, achieving their artificial reduction. British exporters note that prices for natural rubber are only 1/3 higher than pre-war prices, while the price index for other types of raw materials exceeds the pre-war level by 100–200%. Approximately the same situation exists with tin and some other types of strategic raw materials. American penetration into Indonesia, which accounts for about 1/3 of world rubber production and about 1/5 of world tin production, is directly connected with the US desire to seize Indonesian rubber and tin and undermine the British monopoly in the extraction of this raw material. In addition, Indonesia has rich sources of oil. American assistance to Dutch imperialists in the armed suppression of the national liberation struggle of the Indonesian people is used by US monopolies to oust Dutch

---

[62] *Record and Statistics*, 2. IV. 1949; *Economist*, 4. VI. 1949.

and British capital from Indonesia and to seize raw material sources in this richest region. As a result of an agreement concluded in the summer of 1948 between American companies and the puppet Hatta government—a US placeman—the American-Indonesian Corporation was formed, headed by major Wall Street operator Fox. This corporation, in which 30 American monopolies participate, received the right to develop Indonesia's raw material resources and a 15-year monopoly on Indonesian foreign trade. A number of American monopolies, especially rubber and oil ones, have already deployed active operations in Indonesia. *Business Week* (8/I 1949) listed 26 such monopolies, including Goodyear Tire & Rubber, United States Rubber, General Motors, Standard Oil of California, etc.

From this it is completely clear why American monopolists harbor "tender feelings" toward the Hatta government, which concluded a treaty with Fox's company, and why the USA had a certain "falling out" with British and Dutch monopolies on the Indonesian issue. Parallel to the joint war of British and American imperialists against the Indonesian people, a covert, "cold" war is taking place between British and American imperialism for the richest raw material sources of Southeast Asia.

For the relations between both partners in the Anglo-American block, the heralds of aggressive, gangster "atomic diplomacy" and atomic war, contradictions in the field of atomic raw materials are also characteristic. The main suppliers of this raw material for the production of atomic bombs in the USA are the British Dominion of Canada and the Belgian Congo, which

before the war was, in effect, an economic colony of Britain, and in the first years of the war was annexed by Britain. In 1942, joint Anglo-American control was established over the Congo, but all extraction of uranium ore from here is directed to the USA, although 49% of the shares of these mines belong to Britain. Exploration work for uranium ores in the Union of South Africa is headed by an American, not an Englishman. At the same time, the USA refuses to share the secrets of atomic production with its British ally. In the summer of 1949, Britain demanded that the USA exchange information on atomic production or provide it with a corresponding share in the extraction of uranium ore. Anglo-American rivalry in the Antarctic is also connected with the search for atomic raw materials.

The Anglo-American struggle for oil is of an extremely intense character. Back in 1925, at the 14th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), Comrade Stalin, characterizing Anglo-American contradictions, said: "...despite a certain block between America and England, a block the basis of which is an agreement between America and England against the cancellation of allied debts, despite, I say, this block, the struggle of interests between England and America does not weaken, but, on the contrary, intensifies."[63] Comrade Stalin cited the Anglo-American struggle for oil as an illustration of this proposition. Emphasizing the increased importance of oil both in peacetime and in wartime, Comrade Stalin further noted: "And it is precisely in this sphere that the struggle between the oil companies of England and the oil companies of

---

63 J. V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 7, p. 277.

America is a mortal struggle, not always, it is true, having an explicit character, but always existing and smoldering, as can be seen from the history of negotiations and from the history of clashes between England and America on this soil."[64]

At present, British and American oil monopolies are bound to each other by various cooperation agreements and divisions of "spheres of influence." They act in unison in preparing war against the USSR and the countries of people's democracy and in creating oil bases to service the armed forces of the aggressive bloc on potential fronts. At the same time, the ever-existing and smoldering internal contradictions corrode the basis of Anglo-American "oil cooperation," flaring up with the bright flame of an open mortal economic war for the repartition of oil spheres, for oil monopoly.

90-95% of the oil resources of all capitalist countries are under the control of American and British monopoly associations. Their share in oil production of various countries by the end of the Second World War is seen from the following table:

Control of US and British Oil Monopolies Over Oil Production in Various Countries (in % of total production) [65]

---

[64] *Ibid.*, p. 278.

[65] M. Brooks, *Oil and Foreign Policy*, London 1949, p. 13. In Kuwait, not listed in this table, control is exercised jointly by American and British monopolies. As for Mexico, despite the nationalization of the oil industry carried out there, foreign monopolies actually retain some positions in it. In Iraq, American companies have recently increased their share

Country	USA	Britain	Other countries
Venezuela	57.5	23.7	18.8
Iran	—	100	—
Indonesia	—		100
Mexico		—	—
Iraq	23.7	52	24.3
Colombia	71	—	29
Trinidad	—	100	—
Argentina	—	—	100
Peru	18	18	64
Burma	—	100	—
Bahrain Islands	100	—	—

through the purchase of shares of other participants.

Country	USA	Britain	Other countries
Saudi Arabia	100	—	—
Canada	18	—	82
Egypt	18	82	—

In 1938, American oil companies controlled an annual production of 180 million tons of oil, and British ones—about 40 million tons. In other words, American trusts produced 4.5 times more oil than British ones. At the same time, the lion's share of American oil production was made up of the country's domestic resources, and only 20 million tons accounted for concessions in other countries. British oil resources, on the other hand, were entirely based on sources located outside Britain itself. By 1948, British oil companies increased their production to almost 54 million tons, i.e., by 1.5 times, and American ones to 350 million tons, i.e., by 2 times. In other words, American trusts produced 7 times more oil than British ones. A significant part of the additional oil production of the USA (approximately 60 million tons) is accounted for by increased production in external regions, mainly through ousting British oil monopolies from their old "spheres of influence." In the hands of American monopolies, 2/3 of the explored oil resources of the capitalist world are now concentrated, and 1/3 in the hands of British ones. If in 1929

the USA owned only about 1/4 of all explored oil resources of the capitalist world (excluding the USA), now 1/2 of these resources belong to them.

Thus, British oil monopolies under the onslaught of American oil monopolies are forced to retreat continuously, surrendering position after position. But at the same time, they try not only to retain everything they plundered in foreign countries, but also to seize new production, to profit at the expense of other, weaker countries.

The decisive front of the Anglo-American struggle for oil is the Middle East with its vast oil resources. Now American capital has firmly established itself in this region, which British imperialism has always regarded as a sphere of its "special interests," as an officially unlegislated but really existing "British Middle Eastern Empire." When this "empire" began to collapse under the blows of the national liberation movement of the peoples of the East, British imperialists resorted to the help of Wall Street monopolists. But the latter, now acting as the main gendarmes and stranglers of the national liberation movement, care above all about creating an American "oil empire" in the Middle East and preparing an American military bridgehead on the southern approaches to the Soviet Union.

A fierce struggle between the USA and Britain is also underway for spheres of capital investment. An exporter of capital deeply and comprehensively penetrates into all pores of the economic and political life of debtor countries, stimulates the broad export of goods from its country, clears the path for economic enslavement, and then for political and military annexation of dependent states entangled in a network of

financial obligations. That is why in the plans for the struggle for world hegemony, Wall Street attaches enormous importance to the export of capital.

Before the Second World War, US foreign investments amounted to 11.5 billion dollars, while British ones—22.9 billion dollars. During the war, significant changes occurred in the foreign investments of both countries: British ones decreased by 4-5 billion dollars, and American ones sharply increased.

After the war, Britain partially liquidated its foreign capital investments. However, starting from 1947, it resumed, and in quite significant amounts, the export of capital. By the beginning of 1949, the total amount of British capital investments apparently did not lag far behind the pre-war level.

After the end of the war, programs for the broad export of American capital, developed in the USA back in the war years, began to be implemented. The intention of American monopolists to expand capital exports even further in the future is evidenced, in particular, by the 4th point of Truman's program announced by him upon taking office as US President on January 20, 1949, regarding the "development of backward areas of the world." This aggressive expansionist program for the repartition of colonies and the enslavement of colonial peoples by American imperialism is directly connected with forced capital export.

Post-war capital export from the USA was carried out mainly in the form of government loans and subsidies. It went and

goes toward the implementation of aggressive political and military designs of the USA, to support and subsidize reactionary regimes throughout the world, to intervene in other countries in order to suppress their democratic movement. Partially, the sums appropriated by the American government for other countries settled in them in the form of direct long-term capital investments.

As for private American capital, for now its expansionist aspirations in the field of foreign investments are restrained by the fear of "risk" caused by the growth of the democratic and labor movement and the national liberation struggle. Nevertheless, capital investments of American monopolies reached 1,230 million dollars in 1947, and 1,498 million dollars in 1948. 45% of US capital investments went to colonial and semi-colonial countries.[66] The National Association of Manufacturers of the USA—the most influential organization of American monopolies—shortly after Truman's speech stated that after 1952 American foreign investments should reach 2 billion dollars a year.[67]

The organ of American monopoly circles, *Business Week*, outlining the program of US foreign capital investments, demands that American investors be granted: 1) guarantees against losses in the event of war; 2) guarantees in the event of the introduction of various currency restrictions by other countries and the provision to investors of the right to transfer

---

[66] *Pravda*, 29/VII 1949. From the UN report on the world economic situation.

[67] *Times*, 22. III. 1949.

profits received in other countries to the USA (in dollars) through the establishment of free currency convertibility; 3) special guarantees in the event of property confiscations, nationalization, etc. In other words, American monopolies essentially demand the establishment of a regime of capitulations and economic extraterritoriality for themselves in other countries.

Truman's program is a program for the repartition of the colonial world in favor of the USA and the creation of an American colonial empire, a policy aimed at seeking a way out of the crisis at the expense of intensifying the plunder and exploitation of colonial peoples. At the same time, it is a policy of enslaving other capitalist countries by American imperialism, since under the flag of "aid to backward areas" the ruling circles of US capital intend to expand private American investments not only in colonies, but also in metropoles. Since this program has the goal of repartitioning colonies, it is directed against European colonial powers and especially against Britain.

It is not by chance that American investors put the question of political guarantees for their capital investments abroad in the forefront. The labor and democratic movement in capitalist states, the national liberation movement of the peoples of colonial and dependent countries are pulling the rug out from under the feet of the imperialists. The sphere of their predatory, robber rule is narrowing more and more, and the struggle between imperialist rivals is becoming more and more intense. The interests of the USA and Britain, the main imperialist

powers exporting capital in significant volumes, inevitably collide in the very same markets.

The object of a very acute Anglo-American struggle for capital markets is currently the British Empire. On the eve of the Second World War, British capital investments in the countries of the British Empire amounted to 11.6 billion dollars, exceeding American ones (4.2 billion dollars) by 3 times. At the same time, the overwhelming part of American capital investments in the British Empire was concentrated in Canada; in all other British countries, American investments were negligible. During the war, British capital investments in the empire decreased by 2.9 billion dollars, or 720 million pounds sterling, including: in India—by 325 million pounds sterling, in Canada—by 195 million, in the Union of South Africa—by 135 million, in Australia—by 65 million pounds sterling. The total amount of British capital investments in the empire thus decreased to 9 billion dollars, but this decrease occurred predominantly not through direct investments, but through government loans.

American capital investments in the British Empire increased during the war years, and their total amount was approximately 6 billion dollars. Consequently, by the end of the war, the size of British capital investments in imperial countries exceeded the size of American capital investments no longer by 3 times, but only by 1.5 times. These changes occurred mainly due to Canada, which, despite the fact that it continues to remain a British dominion, is increasingly drawn into the orbit of US economic and military-political influence. In its other

dominions and colonies, Britain still preserves its superiority over America, but here too it is subjected to persistent attacks by American monopolies.

In Canada, British investments decreased from 2.5 billion dollars in 1938 to 1.8 billion dollars in 1945, and income from them decreased accordingly from 81 million to 53 million dollars. At the same time, American investments in Canada increased from 4.1 to 5.0 billion dollars and make up 70% of the total amount of foreign capital in Canada, while British investments make up 25%.

According to the official statement of the Canadian Minister of Economy, 1% of all new capital investments in the country in the post-war period account for American enterprises. In reality, their specific weight is significantly greater, if one takes into account that American capital often acts through dummies, under the signboard of Canadian "national" firms. The rather rapid development of Canadian industry during the war was carried out under US control, as a result of which Canada's industrial growth led not to the strengthening of its independence, but, on the contrary, to the fact that the Canadian economy is now even more than before the war on a leash with the USA. Canada's imports from the USA increased compared to pre-war times by 4-5 times: from 419 million dollars in 1935–1939 to 2 billion dollars in 1947 and 1.8 billion dollars in 1948. There are 2 thousand American enterprises operating in Canada, many of which import not only equipment but also finished parts of the products they manufacture from the USA. These American enterprises try to direct almost all their products to the countries of the British Empire, enjoying

the benefits of imperial preferential tariffs as "Canadian" firms. Thus, in the system of Anglo-American economic relations, Canada plays, as it were, the role of a pump for pumping British and imperial currency reserves into the pockets of Wall Street monopolists. On this, strictly speaking, is based Canada's notorious "triangular trade," i.e., trade in which Canada's passive balance in trade with the USA is covered by an active balance in trade with Britain.

Of course, Britain is trying to regain its lost positions in Canada. Cripps's trip to Canada in September 1948 pursued the goal of ensuring the maximum expansion of British exports of goods and especially capital to Canada. Even earlier, in July 1948, the British government announced that investments of British capital in Canada would be encouraged. The Canadian government, for its part, promised to create favorable conditions in the country for British capital by facilitating currency exchange. Reports frequently appear in the Canadian press about the expansion of activities of old British enterprises in Canada and the formation of new British enterprises there.

Canadian ruling circles declare Canada to be the "connecting link" of the Anglo-Saxon world and adhere to the slogan of "dual partnership" both in the economic and in the military-political spheres. In practice, this policy boils down to turning Canada into an appendage of the aggressive Anglo-American bloc, to ensuring the uncontrolled rule of American monopolies in Canada, to forming a military-industrial base and a military bridgehead of the aggressive Atlantic bloc on the territory of Canada.

Reactionary, imperialistic circles of Canada are economically interested in maintaining their ties with the British Empire, since they also get a certain share of the super-profits received as a result of the exploitation of the peoples of the British Empire. However, in the policy of "dual partnership" implemented by Canadian ruling circles, the American orientation clearly predominates. If in economic terms Canada is an instrument for the USA to breach the imperial customs barrier, then in political terms it acts in intra-imperial affairs as an agency of the USA, preventing the strengthening of imperial unity.

It is not surprising that under these conditions, US expansionist circles are already raising the question of the complete incorporation of Canada into the Pan-American system, of the complete absorption of Canada by the United States. In March 1948, the editor of *Life* magazine, the well-known preacher of American expansion Henry Luce, wrote: "Since Canada has convinced itself by its own experience that it cannot exist in the modern world as an independent financial entity, and since Britain has become financially impotent, the time has come for the United States to act. The step we must take is a complete customs union between the USA and Canada."[68] It is completely obvious that the customs union demanded by Luce is a synonym for turning Canada into the 49th state of the USA. American expansion along the line of capital export is also unfolding in other British dominions. In the Union of South Africa, British capital investments reach 1.5 billion dollars, while American ones, according to 1947 estimates,

---

[68] Quoted from *Economist*, 3. IV. 1948.

were 10 times smaller. The gold mining industry of the Union of South Africa, which constitutes the basis of this country's economy, was in the hands of several large British companies closely connected with each other. During the war and after its end, the penetration of American capital into the Union of South Africa sharply intensified. By 1947, American capital investments here doubled compared to pre-war times. American capitalists became participants in more than a hundred different gold mining firms. In 1947, the mixed company American Anglo-Transvaal Investment Corporation was formed, and thanks to this, American capital began to play a major role in the South African gold mining industry. This corporation laid its hands on new rich gold-bearing regions of the Transvaal. American automobile firms General Motors and Ford, which have assembly plants here, as well as rubber companies Goodyear Tire & Rubber, General Tire & Rubber, shipbuilding companies State Marine Corporation, Kaiser, etc., have developed active operations in South Africa. American capital shows special interest in the uranium ore discovered here, as well as in deposits of copper, manganese, and diamonds. It was noted in the British press already during the war that "South Africa is flooded with American goods, films, press, literature," that it is increasingly being "Americanized."[69] This is happening at the expense of ousting British influence.

Britain, for its part, is forcing capital exports to South Africa. In 1947–1948, the influx of British capital into the Union of South Africa amounted to a huge sum—180–200 million pounds sterling, or 700–800 million dollars. In 1948, the Union

---

[69] See L. Sowden, *The South African Union*, London 1945.

of South Africa granted Britain a gold loan of 80 million dollars. At the same time, the coming to power in the Union of South Africa in May 1948 of the racist-nationalist Malan government means a certain reorientation of the ruling circles of the Union of South Africa toward American imperialism, to the detriment of British imperialism, and undoubtedly facilitates the further penetration of the USA into South Africa.

The positions of British imperialism are significantly stronger in Australia and New Zealand. The governments of these two dominions invariably act at imperial conferences and meetings as supporters of the maximum strengthening of imperial unity and the creation for this purpose of a permanent mechanism in the form of an imperial secretariat, imperial staff, etc. However, American monopolies are also intensively penetrating these dominions. Britain, for its part, is actively directing new capital there. According to a statement by Australian Prime Minister Chifley on April 10, 1949, 107 new foreign enterprises were opened in Australia during the first three years after the end of the war, of which 59 were British and 42 American. In addition, 119 firms with the help of foreign capital (70 firms with the help of British capital and 45 American) significantly expanded their activities here.

The foreign press defines post-war British capital investments in Australia at 30–35 million pounds sterling and even up to 50 million pounds sterling, and American investments at approximately 20 million pounds sterling. It should be assumed that new British capital investments in Australia exceed American ones by approximately 1.5 times. If this ratio is compared with the pre-war one, when British capital

investments exceeded American ones by 15 times, it is clearly visible how much the scale of American penetration into Australia has expanded. Ford and Kaiser are building automobile plants here. American capital is showing special activity in the oil, chemical, engineering, rubber, and footwear industries, as well as in the film industry of Australia. The American military establishment shows heightened interest in the interior regions of Australia. According to a statement by a US State Department representative, negotiations are underway to allow US armed forces to use the Anglo-Australian test site designed for testing atomic and rocket weapons.

American monopolies are also stepping up their activities in India. In January-February 1949, a mission of the International Bank visited Bombay, which negotiated regarding the participation of American capital in the "reconstruction" of the country. This mission was primarily "interested" in the problem of political "guarantees," and the Nehru-Patel government, willingly meeting the mission's requirements, stated that for 10 years it would not even raise the question of nationalization.[70]

American capital, relying on the "Marshall Plan," is penetrating all British colonies and especially Britain's African colonies. For a long time, Britain tried to carry out its programs for intensifying the exploitation of the peoples of Africa with its own means. However, under US pressure, it was forced to agree to the participation of American capital in this matter. American experts are even attached to the British Colonial Office for this purpose. American capitalists are crowding out

---

[70] *New Age*, 27. II. 1949.

British ones in those African colonies that do not belong to Britain, but in which Britain occupied a predominant position, for example, in the Belgian Congo.

On the basis of the "Marshall Plan," the penetration of American capital into the British Isles also intensified. According to reports in the French economic press, the City does not hide its alarm over "the invasion of private American capitalists into British industry."

We have touched upon only some aspects of Anglo-American economic rivalry. It is difficult to find any sphere of international economic and political relations where the rivalry between the USA and Britain does not make itself felt. In particular, a fierce struggle is underway between the two powers for world communications and bases. Before the war, the British merchant fleet exceeded the American one by twofold (21 million tons and 11 million tons, respectively), while in 1947 it was already almost 2.5 times smaller than the American one (17 million tons and 40 million tons). In 1948, this ratio changed somewhat in favor of Britain (21 million tons and 29 million tons). However, the USA, exerting pressure on Britain and using the conditions of the "Marshall Plan," achieved a reduction in British shipbuilding. An intense struggle is also unfolding for dominance on air routes. American imperialism, creating a global system of military, naval, and aviation bases, also clashes with the interests of British imperialism.

The Anglo-American economic struggle is neither partial nor local in character. It covers all aspects of the economic expansion of both countries, all directions and bridgeheads of

this expansion without exception. The Anglo-American contradiction is a fundamental contradiction within the imperialist camp. The unfolding of the economic crisis in the capitalist world gives the Anglo-American struggle an especially intense, especially fierce character.

In the aggravated Anglo-American clashes, British imperialism retreats before the onslaught of the relatively stronger American rival. The "successes" of American imperialism in the competitive struggle with British imperialism are largely determined by the capitulatory, anti-people policy of Britain's ruling circles, which regard the alliance with the USA as the only means of preserving their domination over the British people and over the colonial peoples of the British Empire. The participation of Britain and the British Empire in the system of the aggressive Atlantic military bloc headed by the United States essentially consigns the British Empire to US military tutelage and facilitates the "cold conquest" of the British Empire by American monopolists. "The consequences of Churchill-Bevin's foreign policy," states the election program of the British Communist Party, "are catastrophic and lead to Britain's bankruptcy. Britain is subordinated to American economic domination and occupation."

Anglo-American contradictions unfold within the framework of the Anglo-American imperialist bloc. This circumstance stimulates the tendency toward compromises and agreements, but a disease driven inward acts no less destructively. This same circumstance stimulates the tendency for the USA and Britain to resolve their own contradictions at the expense of foreign countries, along the paths of foreign aggression. Joint

aggressive, adventuristic foreign policy is the main base of the Anglo-American bloc. But the experience of history, and not very ancient history at that, the lessons of the defeat of Hitlerite Germany, have shown that this base is extremely fragile and unstable, that the policy of aggression and military adventures ends very lamentably for its inspirers and organizers. Even more untenable and doomed to failure is the adventuristic policy of the aggressors in the modern historical setting, when the balance of power between the camp of imperialism and fascism and the camp of peace and socialism has radically changed in favor of the latter. In the USA and Britain themselves, new social forces are growing and strengthening that actively oppose the criminal, aggressive policy of the monopolists of Wall Street and the City, for peace and international cooperation, for friendship with the Soviet Union. The movement of partisans of peace is acquiring an ever broader scope in Britain and the USA and clearly testifies that the peoples of these countries do not support the Atlantic Pact of war and aggression.

The monopolists of Wall Street and the City are also united by a common reactionary, anti-people policy of an offensive against the living standards and political rights of the working class and all working masses, a joint struggle against the national liberation movement of colonial and dependent peoples. But the forces of peace, democracy, and socialism surpass the forces of reaction and imperialism. The democratic camp is growing and strengthening, while the camp of imperialism is shaking and weakening. The plans of the imperialist colonizers and warmongers are being overthrown

by the course of historical development, as a result of the struggle of peoples for freedom and independence, peace and democracy, which further narrows the base of the Anglo-American bloc and aggravates imperialist contradictions within this bloc.

The camp of aggressors is corroded by deep internal contradictions. The camp of peace, democracy, and socialism is strong in its cohesion and unity. This further changes the balance of power between the two camps in favor of the great invincible host of partisans of peace and socialism and contributes to the final triumph of their just cause.

Questions of Economics, No.7, 1949.

V. Balabushevich

NEW STAGE OF THE NATIONAL LIBERATION STRUGGLE OF THE PEOPLES OF INDIA

Marxism-Leninism teaches that the hegemony of the proletariat is a decisive condition for the success of the national liberation struggle of the peoples of colonial and dependent countries. Only under the leadership of the working class—the only consistently revolutionary class—can the peoples of colonial and dependent countries rid themselves of imperialist oppression and achieve genuine independence. In conditions of the extreme aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism, the further deepening of the crisis of the colonial system, and an unprecedented upsurge in the national liberation movement of the peoples of colonial and dependent countries, its main tendency is becoming ever more clearly revealed: toward the further expansion and intensification of the struggle of oppressed peoples against imperialist oppressors and internal reaction, and toward the steady strengthening of the leading role of the working class in the popular liberation movement. In the majority of colonial countries, the working class has now become the recognized hegemon in the nationwide struggle against imperialist oppression, which testifies to the transition of this struggle to a new, higher phase of development.

In terms of its size and population, India occupies one of the leading places among colonial countries. India's territory exceeds 4 million square kilometers, and its 400 million population constitutes more than three-quarters of the population of the British Empire and more than half of the

population of all the colonies in the world. Naturally, the struggle of the peoples of India for their independence is of great significance for the entire democratic camp.

India is a typically agrarian country: England, having seized India, converted it into its agrarian and raw-material appendage. The overwhelming majority of India's population is engaged in agriculture. According to the last census (1941), 339.3 million people, or more than 87% of the country's entire population, live in villages, and only 49.7 million people (about 13% of the population) are urban residents.

Despite very favorable natural and climatic conditions, Indian agriculture is degrading; it is characterized by an exceptionally low level of development of productive forces. Being the largest agricultural country, India cannot feed its population. It has not only ceased to export food, but is forced to import it. India is the classic country of famine, which systematically claims millions of lives of working people.

The cause of the degradation of Indian agriculture is the prolonged domination of British imperialism, and the system of agrarian relations planted and cultivated by British colonizers, the basis of which is feudal-landlord landownership. More than 2% of all cultivated land in the country is concentrated in the hands of the British and Indian landlords.

The vast majority of India's landlords lease out land to large tenants who, having divided this land into smaller plots, in turn lease them out. The "pyramid" of subtenants in India sometimes reaches 20 stories or even more. Between the owner of the land and the peasant cultivating it, there exists a

numerous layer of parasitic intermediaries sitting on the peasant's neck. Landowner-landlords serve as one of the mainstays of British imperialism in India. The Indian village is entangled in all kinds of remnants of feudalism, which hinder the country's economic development and intensify the degradation of its agriculture.

Although India is one of the most industrially developed colonies, its industry is small. Following the cotton and jute industries, which arose as early as the second half of the last century and are the most developed branches of Indian industry, the metallurgical industry grew in India during the interwar period and especially on the eve of the Second World War. True, the output of ferrous metallurgy is very insignificant. In 1948, it amounted to a mere 1,470 thousand tons of pig iron and 854 thousand tons of steel. The Second World War gave an impetus to the development of the chemical industry, which until then had virtually not existed in the country. The sugar, food, and leather branches also received significant development during the interwar period.

However, despite the growth of certain branches of Indian industry, the general level of India's industrial development remains extremely low even now. Industrial output accounts for only 20% of the total value of all of India's production and less than 2% of the industrial production of capitalist countries, despite the fact that approximately one-sixth of the entire world's population lives in India. This alone eloquently testifies to India's extreme backwardness, which is the direct result of the predatory rule of British imperialism.

India's industry bears a typically colonial character. It is in exceptional dependence on British capital. The predominant place in it is still occupied by branches of light industry: cotton, jute, food, etc. The share of heavy industry branches, and first of all metallurgy, remains as before insignificant in the country's total industrial output. Thus, in 1947, workers employed in the cotton and jute industries accounted for over 44% of all factory-and-plant workers in India, while workers in metallurgy and so-called engineering (to which Indian bourgeois statistics attribute all kinds of mechanical and other workshops) accounted for a mere 14%. The share of workers in metallurgy and engineering in the total number of factory-and-plant workers in India rose over 5 war years (from 1939 to 1944) by only 3%. These indicators refute the fabrications of British colonizers to the effect that the industrialization of India was taking place at a rapid pace during the war. India practically has no engineering industry, which is the basis of genuine industrialization and the base of the country's economic independence. British imperialists took all measures to prevent the emergence and development of this branch even during the Second World War.

Two centuries of colonial slavery under the heel of British imperialism and the strongest feudal remnants have fettered India's productive forces and turned this country, possessing the richest natural resources, into one of the poorest countries in the world, and millions of Indian working people into beggars leading a starvation existence.

The partition of India into two parts—India and Pakistan—carried out by British imperialism in August 1947 and the

granting of fictitious independence to both these parts in the form of dominion status did not change the colonial character of the economy of these dominions.

One of the most important goals of the partition was precisely the consolidation of the backwardness of the economy of India and Pakistan, the hindrance of their independent development, and the securing of their continued dependence on British capital. The partition of India disrupted economic ties between the individual parts of the country and placed both dominions in an even more difficult economic situation than before.

Pakistan is a backward agricultural country possessing fairly significant resources of food and certain types of agricultural raw materials (jute, long-staple cotton), but almost completely devoid of large-scale factory industry. Except for railway workshops, the entire industry of this dominion consists of 1 wool and 14 cotton mills, 9 sugar, 5 cement, 4 glass, and 2 oil-refining plants. With an annual coal requirement of 3.4 million tons per year, Pakistan can mine only 300 thousand tons of very poor quality coal. The metallurgical industry is completely absent in Pakistan.

The Dominion of India consists of regions relatively more developed in industrial terms. Before the partition, approximately 90% of all large-scale factory industry in the country was located here. At the same time, the Dominion of India experiences great difficulties regarding food and certain types of agricultural raw materials, since important agrarian regions of the country went to Pakistan. The largest branch of Indian industry—the jute industry, almost entirely concentrated in the territory that went to the Dominion of India—lost its

local raw material as a result of the country's partition, since over 73% of jute crops are concentrated in Pakistan's territory; the cotton mills of Bombay and Ahmedabad found themselves cut off from the long-staple cotton regions cultivated in the Punjab regions that went to Pakistan. The dismemberment of India increased the economic non-independence of both dominions, sharply worsened their economic situation, and further retarded the development of productive forces in them. All this creates favorable conditions for British imperialism to preserve Pakistan and India as agrarian and raw-material appendages of England.

The economy of India and Pakistan is in a state of decline. Both dominions continue to remain objects of predatory exploitation and plunder by imperialists—British, and now also American. Industrial production in both dominions is now below the level achieved during the war. Output in the jute branch has even fallen below the pre-war level. The production of cotton fabrics in 1946/47 amounted to 3.8 billion yards, or 79% of the wartime maximum and 90% of the 1938/39 output; in 1947/48 it declined even further. In 1948/49 it was about 90% of the wartime maximum. The production of jute products in 1947/48 equaled 80% of the wartime maximum and 85% of the 1938/39 level. Pig iron smelting in 1947/48 amounted to 74.5% of the highest wartime level and was below the 1938/39 level. Steel and rolled product production, although somewhat exceeding the pre-war level, is below the wartime maximum, and over the past three years it has been systematically falling.

After the partition of India, both dominions actually continue to be in economic, political, and military dependence on England.

British capital, even after the country's partition, has retained and is strengthening its dominant position in the economy of India and Pakistan. This is evidenced, for example, by the fact that many mixed Anglo-Indian joint-stock companies are being created in various branches of industry in both dominions, in which a leading position is secured for British capital. British capitalists try to use their positions in these companies by no means in the interests of India's industrialization. It is known that many mixed companies under their own brand release products in India that are mostly manufactured in England.

The ruling circles of India and Pakistan, having betrayed the interests of the people, are making every effort to create the most favorable conditions in these dominions for the operations of foreign capital. Speaking not long ago at the annual meeting of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of India (an organization of British capitalists in India), Matthai, Minister of Finance of the Indian government, addressed British capitalists with the statement: "We have no intention whatsoever of taking any steps that could in the slightest degree prejudice British interests in India. On the contrary, we shall be glad if the interests represented by you are preserved in the country and prosper"[71]. Representatives of the ruling circles of Pakistan are no less frank in their desire to subordinate the country to the interests of foreign monopolies.

In the post-war years, American capital has been penetrating India's economy with increasing activity. The share of the USA in India's imports rose from 7.4% in 1938 to 30.3% in 1947,

---

[71] *The People's Age*, December 19, 1948

equaling the share of England, which in that same year accounted for 30.2% of total Indian imports (in 1938—30.4%). In 1948, the share of the USA in Indian imports dropped somewhat due to an increase in England's share. US monopolies are trying in every way to strengthen their positions in India. This is evidenced first of all by the creation of mixed American-Indian joint-stock companies and enterprises both in India and in Pakistan. This is evidenced by the granting of loans to India by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, intended, of course, not to assist the country's industrialization, but solely for the development of agriculture and transport. The organ of Indian capitalists, *The Eastern Economist* (January 14, 1949), wrote: "India will need foreign capital and foreign technical expertise for many years. And all this must come mainly from the USA and England".

Both British and American imperialists, despite the contradictions and competitive struggle between them in all regions of the world, particularly in India and Pakistan, are equally interested in suppressing the national liberation struggle and hindering the independent economic development of both dominions. At the heart of American and British policy in India and Pakistan, as well as in other countries of the Asian continent, lies as before a course toward strengthening the domination of imperialism, toward the all-out hindrance of their industrialization, and toward preserving these countries as colonial agrarian and raw-material appendages and sales markets for imperialist metropolis-states.

At the promptings of Anglo-American financial capital, the reactionary press of England and the USA has recently stepped up propaganda for the false thesis that the development of heavy industry in the countries of the East allegedly does not correspond to the needs of the economic development of these countries, and that they supposedly should concentrate their efforts mainly on agricultural production. With such reasoning, English and American imperialists strive to cover up the true colonizing essence of their policy and to ensure the preservation and expansion of the former economic base of their domination in the countries of Asia.

The USA and England continue in every way to hinder the import of industrial equipment into India and Pakistan. Their trade with these dominions even now bears a clearly expressed colonial character.

Contrary to reality, the leaders of the ruling parties of India and Pakistan—the National Congress and the Muslim League—talk about how a "bloodless revolution" has taken place for them, how they have achieved "independence," and that prerequisites have now allegedly been created for the "rapid industrialization" of both dominions. The facts cited above decisively refute such false fabrications. It is perfectly obvious that under the conditions of the rule of imperialist country monopolies, under conditions when the ruling circles of India and Pakistan pursue a policy dictated by the interests of the exploiting classes, it is impossible to achieve an economic upsurge. Only complete liberation from imperialist oppression and the feudal remnants cultivated by colonizers, only a radical democratic reorganization of India and Pakistan can create

solid prerequisites for overcoming their economic backwardness and for the rapid development of their productive forces.

The mass anti-imperialist movement that unfolded with unprecedented force in India after the Second World War, being an integral part of the general revolutionary upsurge of the national liberation struggle of the peoples of colonial and dependent countries, has acquired new features that substantially distinguish it from all previous stages of the revolutionary struggle of the Indian popular masses. The new stage into which the national liberation movement of the peoples of India entered after the war is determined first of all by the fact that the working class, led by the Communist Party, has taken the lead of the popular masses in their struggle for liberation from the yoke of imperialism, for genuine independence, and for the democratic reorganization of the country, while the big Indian bourgeoisie has openly passed into the camp of reaction and imperialism.

The tasks of the national liberation movement have also expanded. Now the struggle of the peoples of India is directed both against foreign imperialism and toward the implementation of decisive democratic transformations within the country and, above all, an agrarian revolution, without which it is impossible to lead the country out of the economic impasse and win the broad masses of the peasantry over to the side of the working class.

The regrouping of class forces that has taken place in the country, the promotion of the proletariat as the leader of the mass movement of the Indian peoples, and the expansion of the

content of the tasks of the struggle are indicators that the national liberation movement in India has entered a new, higher phase of development, and that it will continue to develop at ever-accelerating paces.

The transfer of leadership of the popular liberation movement in India to the working class was necessitated by the entire course of the historical and socio-economic development of the country. Along with the development of capitalist industry—which, despite all their efforts, British colonizers could not completely halt—the working class grew, developed, and strengthened in the country, called upon to head and bring to a victorious conclusion the struggle of the Indian working masses for national and social liberation.

Comrade Stalin as early as 1925 in his historic speech at KUTV, speaking about the features of the development of the colonial and dependent countries of the East, pointed out that in some of these countries, for example in India, a more or less numerous class of local proletarians had grown and that "the question of the hegemony of the proletariat in such countries and the liberation of the popular masses from the influence of the conciliationist national bourgeoisie is acquiring an increasingly vital character"[72]. Since that time, the number of the Indian industrial proletariat has increased significantly.

By 1947, approximately 3.5 million people were employed in the factory-and-plant industry, mining, and railway transport of India. Of course, for a country with a population of 400 million, this is a very large figure, testifying to India's colonial

[72] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, Vol. 7, p. 145

backwardness. True, a significant number of workers also exist in India on plantations, in irrigation works, and so on. Finally, India numbers, even according to official statistics, several tens of millions of agricultural workers.

The role and significance of the proletariat in revolutions and national liberation movements is determined, however, not so much by its numerical strength as, above all, by its organization and the strength of its ties with all working people. The proletariat is the only, the only completely revolutionary class, and as such it is called upon to be the leader, hegemon, and guide in the struggle of all working and exploited people against oppressors and exploiters. In colonies where the exploitation of the peasantry—which constitutes the main mass of the population—bears monstrous forms, there is a broad basis for creating a firm alliance of the proletariat with the peasant masses, for the all-out strengthening of ideological and organizational leadership over the peasantry on the part of the proletariat, and for the successful winning by the working class of hegemony in the nationwide struggle against imperialism and internal reaction.

The struggle of the Indian working class against feudal-capitalist exploitation and for the improvement of its position was closely linked from the very beginning with the struggle against imperialism. The growth of the impoverishment of the proletariat—an inevitable companion of the capitalist mode of production in colonial conditions, as a result of the intertwining of capitalist and pre-capitalist forms of exploitation—proceeds especially acutely and at especially rapid paces. In the chase for superprofits, imperialists apply the most barbarous and

predatory methods of exploiting the working class of colonies. Consequently, the struggle of workers in colonies for the realization of their immediate demands and for the easing of their economic position cannot be separated from the struggle against imperialist oppression, from the struggle for freedom and independence. As their class organizations strengthened, Indian workers stepped out more and more resolutely as the leading force of the popular revolutionary movement in the country. It was precisely thanks to the activity of the working class and its impact on the broad masses of the peasantry that the national liberation movement in India became increasingly massive and revolutionary in character.

Already at the beginning of the 20th century, a force capable of uniting the broad working masses for the struggle to overthrow the rule of British imperialism appeared on the political arena in India in the person of the growing proletariat. In connection with the first mass political action of the Indian working class —the general strike of Bombay textile workers in protest against the sentencing of the Indian democrat Tilak—Lenin pointed out in 1908: "The proletariat in India has also matured for a conscious political mass struggle, and once that has come to pass, the days of English-Russian methods in India are numbered!"[73] Since that time, the Indian working class, having passed through a stern school of class and anti-imperialist struggle, has grown immeasurably politically and organizationally. It has learned much from Russian workers, who in October 1917 destroyed capitalist orders in their country.

---

[73] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 15, p. 161

Already the first mass upsurge of the labor movement in India was organically linked with the general upsurge of the national liberation struggle that engulfed the country in 1918–1922 under the influence of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia. Already in these years, the working class of India played a most active role in the popular struggle against imperialist oppression and colonial exploitation, despite the fact that there was no communist party in the country at the time, and trade unions were only beginning to be created.

During the new upsurge of the national liberation movement in India, which began in 1930, the working class of the country, in the person of its advanced detachments, already acted as an independent political force and for the first time waged a struggle for leadership of the national liberation movement. This was a new, most important feature of the movement. However, even then revolutionary trade unions existed only in a few of the largest cities, and the All-Indian Communist Party had not yet been created, although communist groups operated in a number of provinces and in some industrial centers.

In the mass anti-imperialist movement that flared up anew in India in the years preceding the Second World War, the role of the working class grew even more. This was facilitated above all by the fact that in 1933, as a result of the unification of separate communist groups, the All-Indian Communist Party was created. The creation of the All-Indian Communist Party was of enormous significance for the further upsurge of the labor and nationwide anti-imperialist movement. The Communist Party began to expand its influence within the working class, which exerted an increasing impact on the

course of the anti-imperialist struggle and won over the peasantry, striving to snatch it from the influence of the bourgeois leadership of the National Congress.

During the Second World War, the Indian working class strengthened significantly in organizational and political respects. From 1937/38 to 1942/43, the number of workers organized in trade unions increased from 390 thousand to 685 thousand people, i.e., by 75%. By the end of the war, the number of trade union members exceeded 1 million. Communists were elected to the governing bodies of most of the created trade unions. The Communist Party became the leading force in the country's labor movement. During the war years, the working class under the leadership of communists came forward with an elaborated program of struggle for the improvement of the position of working people and for the implementation of the demands of the national liberation movement, which largely contributed to the growth of influence of the working class and its party among the broad masses of the Indian people. The working people of India became increasingly convinced that it is precisely the working class, led by the Communist Party, that is the force capable of rallying all working people, leading them into a decisive struggle against the imperialist oppressors of the country and "domestic" exploiters, and achieving the realization of the tasks of the popular liberation movement.

In the struggle for hegemony in the popular liberation movement, the Indian working class has achieved significant successes by the present time. This is confirmed by the entire

course of events in India, especially after the Second World War.

The successes of the Indian working class in the struggle for hegemony in the popular liberation movement find their expression first of all in the organizational and ideological growth of the vanguard of the proletariat—the Indian Communist Party. This is of enormous importance, since, as Comrade Stalin teaches, "the hegemony of the proletariat can be prepared and carried out only by the Communist Party"[74].

An important stage in the life of the Indian Communist Party and a major political event in the country was the 2nd Congress of the Communist Party, held at the end of February and beginning of March 1948. The Congress demonstrated the great growth of the Communist Party's influence.

The Congress put forward as the most important task at the new stage the struggle for the all-out rallying of the popular-democratic front, which should serve as the embodiment of the alliance of the working class, peasantry, and urban petty bourgeoisie under the leadership of the working class. As the central slogans of the popular-democratic front at the current stage of the national liberation movement in India, the Congress proclaimed the following demands:

1. Complete national independence, a break with the British Empire and the Anglo-American reactionary bloc, and the establishment of close economic, political, and cultural ties

---

[74] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, Vol. 7, p. 148

with genuinely democratic countries and above all with the Soviet Union.

2. Abolition of landlord landownership without compensation and transfer of land to those who cultivate it.

3. Decisive democratization of India, transforming it into a Union of National People's Democratic Republics on the basis of the principle of national self-determination and the liquidation of feudal princely states.

4. Nationalization of key branches of industry, confiscation of foreign, primarily British, enterprises, and a radical improvement in the position of the working class.

The Communist Party set before itself, as an especially important task, the establishment of unity of democratic movements in the Indian Union and in Pakistan, emphasizing that this unity is a necessary condition for the liberation of both dominions from imperialist oppression and a most important prerequisite for the successful struggle for the genuine democratization of both parts of India.

The influence of the Communist Party among the working people of both dominions has expanded significantly primarily because on the basic questions of the struggle against imperialism and colonial oppression, and for the improvement of the position of working people, it comes forward with its own platform, which reflects the aspirations and expectations of the broadest masses of the Indian people.

The position of the Indian working class, which had led a beggarly existence even previously, sharply worsened during

the Second World War and after its conclusion. The partition of India deepened even further the process of the absolute and relative impoverishment of the working class. Indian capitalists and Anglo-American monopolies, together with the governments of India and Pakistan, stepped up their offensive against the living standard of workers and all working people in both dominions.

The rise in prices of food and manufactured consumer goods, bringing new enrichment to Indian and foreign capitalists as well as merchants and speculators, led to a further decline in the living standard of working people. According to even official, falsified data, the cost-of-living index of the working class is steadily rising. In Bombay—one of the country's largest industrial centers—it rose from 103 in 1939 to 265 in 1947 and to 296 in March 1949; in Nagpur it amounted respectively to 104, 320, and 374; in Kanpur—to 105, 378, and 468[75]. As a result of the unceasing rise in prices even at present, workers' real wages are steadily falling. Everywhere under the guise of "rationalization" of production, the exploitation of workers is intensifying, and the intensification of their labor is increasing. The army of the unemployed is growing. In 1948, registered unemployed at urban labor exchanges alone numbered over 2 million people.

The struggle of the working class assumed huge proportions in India after the war. The strike movement rose to a level it had never reached before. In 1947, in the Indian Dominion alone, almost 2 million workers and employees participated in

---

[75] *The Eastern Economist*, July 1, 1949, p. 36

economic strikes; as a result of these strikes, about 16 million working days were lost. Strikes of the post-war years in India are distinguished by mass character, solidarity, and activity of workers, and the wide inclusion of new strata of the proletariat and working people in the struggle: workers of small enterprises, workers in princely states, employees of state and private enterprises, and so on.

It is characteristic that in the strike movement the share of general strikes is growing, embracing broad strata of workers and employees both of individual industrial centers (a series of general strikes in Bombay, Calcutta, and other cities) and of entire provinces (the general strike of textile workers of the Central Provinces and Berar, general strikes of teachers in Bombay Province, in the Punjab, in the United Provinces, and others). Workers of individual branches also struck on a national scale (the general strike of postal and telegraph workers). The widest scope of the strike struggle of the Indian working class played a major role in the growth of the revolutionary consciousness of the popular masses and in rallying them around the proletariat.

The Indian working class, struggling to satisfy its economic demands, is at the same time the instigator and leader of mass anti-imperialist actions directed against British rule. During mass anti-British unrest in Calcutta in November 1945 and February 1946 and in other cities, and during bloody clashes and barricade fights in Bombay in January—February 1946, the working class led the broad masses, and as a result of the working class's activity, these actions assumed a militant, revolutionary character.

The uprising of naval sailors in Bombay and other cities in February 1946 would have been impossible without the active support of the working class. The general strike of Bombay textile workers in solidarity with the sailors, which turned into three-day barricade fights, as well as solidarity strikes in other centers of the country, vividly revealed the leading, guiding role of the working class in the anti-imperialist movement of India's working people. The vanguard role of the working class also manifested itself in mass movements that flared up after the end of the war in a number of Indian feudal princely states (Travancore, Hyderabad, Indore, etc.)—the strongholds of reaction. The struggle of workers served as a signal for the unfolding of a mass movement against feudal princes and British rule, for the liquidation of feudal orders in the princely states, and for their democratization.

After the partition of India, the strike struggle against the offensive of capitalists and ruling circles against the living standard of workers and all working people has not ceased in both dominions. In the Indian Dominion in 1948, there were 1,634 economic strikes, in which over 1.3 million workers participated.

Political strikes and mass actions of workers against the anti-popular policy of the National Congress government in India and the Muslim League government in Pakistan, and against the persecution by the governments of both dominions of communist parties, the All-Indian Trade Union Congress, and other progressive, democratic organizations assumed a large scale after the country's partition.

Major events in the life of India were such political actions of the proletariat as the one-day general strike of 700 thousand Bombay workers in protest against the abolition of price controls by the National Congress government (December 1947), the one-day general strike of 100 thousand workers in Calcutta against the adoption by the legislative assembly of Bengal Province of a law granting emergency powers to the Bengal government (January 1948), the one-day general strike of 200 thousand workers of the Central Provinces and Berar against the anti-worker policy of the government (March 1948), the one-day strike of 50 thousand Calcutta workers in protest against the introduction of anti-worker legislation (July 1948), and a whole series of other major political actions, including a large number of protest strikes against the persecution of the Communist Party.

The brilliant victories of the people's liberation armies in China find a wide response in India and Pakistan. In a number of cities of both dominions, under the leadership of the Communist Party and other progressive organizations, meetings and demonstrations of solidarity with the Chinese people are taking place. The heroic struggle of the Chinese people for freedom and democracy cannot but exert a great influence on the further expansion and deepening of the national liberation movement in India and Pakistan.

The growing political struggle of the Indian proletariat vividly testifies to the fact that it resolutely comes forward in defense of not only its economic interests, but also leads the struggle in defense of the interests of the broad working masses, against the reactionary bloc of imperialists, the big Indian bourgeoisie,

and landlords. By this it in practice elevates itself to the level of the leader of the nationwide struggle.

In the struggle for the masses, the Indian working class and its party have to overcome serious difficulties and, above all, to fight for the restoration of unity within their own ranks. In the Indian Union, through the efforts of the reactionary leadership of the National Congress and the Socialist Party, the trade union movement is split. Apart from the All-Indian Trade Union Congress, headed by progressive figures including communists, three new parallel trade union centers have appeared in the country since its partition: the Indian National Trade Union Congress—a government-employer organization created by the leaders of the National Congress and the Indian government, Patel and Nehru; Hind Mazdoor Sabha, formed on the initiative of the Socialist Party leadership; and the United Trade Union Congress, recently created in Calcutta. And although the last three trade union centers are significantly weaker than the All-Indian Trade Union Congress, nevertheless the subversive, scissionist activity of their leaders hinders the working class's struggle. A striking example is the wrecking by "socialist" leaders of the general strike of 800 thousand railwaymen scheduled for March 1949, for which 95% of the members of all railway trade unions voted. The trade union movement is also split in Pakistan.

The lack of unity in the Indian working class is largely a consequence of the fact that among certain of its strata the influence of bourgeois national reformism has still not been eradicated, which appears both in the reactionary guise of Gandhism—continuing to remain a most important ideological

weapon of the bourgeoisie—and in "leftist" garments (socialist and other "left" parties). "Left" national reformism currently presents a great danger to the labor movement, as it tries to cover up its service to the interests of foreign and national capital, its obsequiousness before it, with demagogic, pseudo-revolutionary slogans. All the activity of the Socialist Party leadership, which has recently stepped up its subversive work in workers', peasants', youth, and other organizations in both India and Pakistan, is permeated with the aspiration to preserve imperialist, colonial slavery and capitalist oppression in the country.

One of the decisive conditions for the exercise of hegemony by the proletariat of India in the national liberation movement is the strengthening of its ideological and organizational influence on the peasantry, which constitutes the overwhelming majority of the population in this typically agrarian country. The peasantry is the most important driving force of the colonial revolution and the main ally of the proletariat in its struggle against imperialism, for national liberation, and for democratic transformations. The success of this struggle depends on the extent to which the broad masses of the Indian peasantry, together with the working class and under its leadership, are drawn into the revolutionary struggle against colonial oppression, against feudal remnants, and for democratic transformations.

The domination of British imperialism and the preservation of strong feudal remnants have doomed the multi-million peasant masses of India to appalling destitution, and agriculture to degradation. The pauperization of the peasantry in India has

reached such proportions that the principal figure in the village is currently the poor, landless, or nearly landless peasant. The impoverishment of the peasantry is vividly illustrated by the systematic growth in the number of agricultural workers. The size of the agricultural proletariat in India grew from 7.5 million in 1882 to 21 million in 1921 and to approximately 33 million people in 1931. By the present time, the number of agricultural workers has increased even further and, even according to the testimony of Indian bourgeois economists, constitutes in some regions of the country approximately half of the entire population engaged in agriculture.

The huge army of the agricultural proletariat is a striking manifestation of relative agrarian overpopulation in India. Agricultural workers in India differ substantially from agricultural workers of developed capitalist countries. Along with workers employed in kulak and landlord households (as a rule as day laborers and for no more than 3–4 months a year), huge masses of agricultural workers also consist of enslaved so-called "agricultural servants," debt slaves, and other strata of the destitute rural population crushed by feudal exploitation. To this same category belong impoverished and proletarianized rural artisans (potters, leatherworkers, blacksmiths, etc.). The position of small owners and small tenants working on dwarf plots of land differs little from the position of agricultural workers. It is perfectly obvious that only radical changes in social relations, only an agrarian revolution can liquidate feudal remnants and ease the position of the Indian peasantry and agricultural proletariat.

The multi-million Indian toiling peasantry, crushed by untold destitution and massively driven from the land, cannot but be a most important ally of the proletariat. Peasants can win their freedom only under the leadership of the proletariat, just as the proletariat can bring the colonial revolution to victory only in alliance with the peasantry, only by leading it.

The struggle of the peasant masses of India against feudal-landlord exploitation and against the oppression of British colonizers assumed fairly significant proportions as early as the second half of the 19th century. However, the broad peasant movement began in India only in 1918–1922. But then the peasant movement, although it unfolded under the impact of the strike struggle of the working class, bore a spontaneous and isolated character and often proceeded under religious slogans. The struggle of peasants assumed an even greater scope during the mass anti-imperialist movement of 1930–1932. But even then the peasant movement unfolded to a large extent spontaneously. The peasant masses continued to remain under the influence of the bourgeois leadership of the National Congress and especially under the influence of Gandhism. However, in a number of places the actions of peasants bore a militant, revolutionary character. Independent peasant organizations began to appear here and there.

On the eve of the Second World War, the influence of the working class and the Communist Party on the peasant masses of India had noticeably strengthened. A significant number of peasant unions led by revolutionary elements appeared in the country. Many mass actions of peasants were already conducted under revolutionary slogans, under the leadership of

communists. During the war years and especially in the post-war period, peasant unions, which united into the All-Indian Peasant Organization, strengthened significantly and head the mass peasant movement. Peasant unions led by revolutionary elements now exist throughout the country, including in the princely states. They enjoy particularly great influence in the south of India.

The post-war peasant movement in India develops under the sign of strengthening the alliance of the working class and peasantry; it is closely intertwined with the general democratic movement unfolding under the leadership of the working class and the Communist Party. It should be noted, however, that although the peasant movement in some regions has reached a high level, it is still distinguished by great unevenness and does not bear an all-Indian character. In particular, in Pakistan the peasant movement is developing more weakly.

In Eastern and Northern Bengal, as well as in some regions of Orissa, tenant peasants are waging a struggle to reduce the landlords' share in the harvest. This movement acquired the widest scope and militant character shortly after the war in Bengal. Tenant peasants of twenty districts of this province stopped hauling the grain harvested in the fields to the landlords' barns and refused to pay them half the harvest. They left the grain for themselves by way of a fait accompli, giving landlords no more than 1/3 of the harvest. The movement of the peasants of Bengal, widely known under the name "Tebhaga" (which means "1/3", i.e., the struggle to reduce rent to 1/3 of the harvest), has in fact been continuing, now subsiding, now flaring up anew, for about three years already.

In a number of regions of Bihar and Orissa (India), as well as Western Punjab and the North-West Frontier Province (Pakistan), the struggle of peasants against their mass eviction by landlords from leased land is widening. Time and again peasants refuse to vacate the plots they lease, entering into open struggle with the police.

In Madras Province, where the position of the peasantry has particularly worsened in recent years in connection with crop failure and famine, the peasant movement has assumed a very acute character. In this province, not only entire villages, but even entire districts follow the revolutionary peasant unions. The peasant movement here proceeds mainly in the form of confiscating grain from landlords, which peasant unions then systematically distribute among particularly needy peasants. Frequently, peasants hand over part of the confiscated grain to workers, especially during strikes (as was the case in Chirakkal and other regions). The movement to confiscate grain stocks from landlords, which unfolded particularly widely in North Malabar, very often turns into an open struggle of the peasant masses against police and military detachments. In some regions of Madras Province (Kistna, Godavari, Guntur), peasant partisan detachments operate.

In many regions of the country, agricultural workers play a major role in the peasant movement, as they cannot but be a most important force in the unfolding of the agrarian revolution. Agricultural workers' strikes in Bihar exerted a decisive influence on the growth of the peasant movement. In Bengal, in regions where the "Tebhaga" movement is unfolding, agricultural workers act jointly with peasants,

holding strikes and actively participating in peasants' meetings and demonstrations. Agricultural workers of Madras Province organized into unions participate together with peasants in confiscating grain from landlords. The struggle of agricultural workers is intensifying in the United Provinces and other provinces. In the Gorakhpur region, 1,500 farm laborers of a single estate, in response to an attempt to deprive them of the right to cultivate plots of land for themselves, declared this land their own and hoisted a red flag over the estate. In Bombay Province (India) and Eastern Bengal (Pakistan), the struggle of agricultural workers for emancipation and for the introduction of monetary payment for their labor has assumed significant proportions (Varli and Halip in Bombay Province, Nankari in Bengal).

Peasants in India and Pakistan are increasingly beginning to put forward the demand for the confiscation of landlord land without compensation and the transfer of this land to peasants. Such a demand has been put forward by numerous peasant meetings and conferences in Madras and Bombay Provinces, in Bihar, in Western and Eastern Bengal, in the North-West Frontier Province, and in other places. The complete inability of the National Congress government in India and the Muslim League government in Pakistan to carry out even the most modest democratic agrarian reforms and the open support by these governments of feudal-landlord reaction cannot but lead to a further intensification of the peasant movement, to its transition to a higher stage.

Numerous peasant meetings and demonstrations that flared up across the country in protest against the persecution of the

Communist Party and against mass arrests of communists testify to the growing influence of the working class and the Communist Party among the peasantry, and to the growth of the political activity of peasants.

In the Guntur region of Madras Province, a many-thousand-strong peasant demonstration took place under the slogan "We demand an end to repressions against the Communist Party!" The demonstration, warmly welcomed by the peasant population, ended with a meeting attended by 10 thousand people.

In Betnaha (Bihar), 7 thousand peasants gathered at the call of peasant unions for a meeting, demanded the immediate confiscation of landlord lands without compensation, the release of arrested communists, and the lifting of the ban on the Communist Party in West Bengal.

In Darbhanga (Bihar), where a political conference convened by the provincial committee of the National Congress was taking place, a 15-thousand-strong peasant demonstration was held under the slogan "We demand an end to repressions against peasants! Long live the Communist Party!" The peasants did not let the provincial government minister who spoke at the conference speak, and he was forced to leave the rostrum.

Such meetings and demonstrations of peasants occur everywhere.

The peasant movement reached its highest level in the post-war period on the territory of Telangana, in the princely state of Hyderabad. Peasants belonging mainly to the Telugu (or

Andhra) nationality rose to the struggle against feudal exploitation, simultaneously putting forward the demand for the incorporation of their national territory, included in Hyderabad, into the corresponding national territory of the Indian Union. The combination of the anti-feudal and national struggle caused the particular acuteness of the peasant movement in Telangana. The movement of peasants against landlords and against the despotic power of the Nizam assumed the character of an armed uprising and an agrarian revolution in Telangana. As a result, the power of the Nizam and landlords was overthrown on one-sixth of the territory of the princely state with a population of 4 million people. In 2,500 villages of Telangana, landlord land was distributed among landless and land-poor peasants and agricultural workers, the indebtedness of workers to landlords and usurers was canceled, elected popular organs and courts were created, and a people's militia was formed. The government of the Indian Dominion introduced troops into Telangana in September 1948 to crush the revolutionary struggle of peasants. For a year now, punitive detachments have been raging in Telangana, but they have failed to break the fighting spirit of the peasants and crush their heroic struggle. The struggle of the peasants continues, increasingly assuming the character of partisan warfare and spreading to neighboring regions, especially regions of Madras Province inhabited by the Andhra.

The peasant movement in Telangana is closely linked with the struggle of the workers of Hyderabad and proceeds under the leadership of the working class and left organizations. The events in Telangana represent a striking example of the

revolutionary struggle for land and democracy, the first attempt to create a people's democracy in India. And although this attempt is limited in its scope and character, it unquestionably has enormous significance for the further unfolding and intensification of the general democratic movement in India and Pakistan. The struggle in Telangana is the first swallow of the agrarian revolution, which constitutes the most important content of the current stage of the national liberation struggle in India.

Peasants in other parts of India and Pakistan are also already beginning to follow the example of Telangana to one degree or another. In a number of rural regions of the United, Central, and other provinces, peasant uprisings against landlord oppression occur increasingly often. As the Press Trust of India agency reports, in the first half of 1949, 2,057 peasant uprisings and disturbances occurred in the United Provinces of India alone.

The working class and the Communist Party of India have to overcome serious difficulties in the struggle for the peasantry. Among peasants, the influence of reactionary Gandhism remains strong. Despite the betrayal and treachery of the National Congress ruling apex, the Congress still continues to preserve a certain influence among the peasant masses. Unsurvived illusions regarding the National Congress can also explain the fact that the scissionist All-Indian Peasant Congress, headed by the proteges of Patel and Nehru (Ranga and others), finds fertile ground among peasants for its treacherous work. Socialist leaders try to conduct subversive work in the peasant masses. Not long ago they created a

parallel peasant organization, striving to hinder the unfolding of the revolutionary struggle of the peasantry and the growth of the Communist Party's influence.

An important ally of the proletariat of India in the struggle for freedom, independence, and democracy is also a significant part of the urban petty bourgeoisie. The difficult situation and exploitation by foreign and national capital increasingly push broad strata of the petty bourgeoisie onto the path of joint struggle with the proletariat. In recent years, the authority of the working class among the lower stratum of the urban petty bourgeoisie has strengthened significantly. Evidence of this is the active participation of the urban petty bourgeoisie in mass militant political actions taking place under the leadership of the Communist Party. In recent years, the influence of communists has strengthened in a number of mass democratic student, youth, and other progressive organizations. At the same time, among a certain part of the urban petty bourgeoisie, the influence of national reformism is still strong. This manifests itself, in particular, in the presence in some provinces of a fair number of petty-bourgeois parties and groups which often cloak themselves in "leftist" signboards, while in reality they are used by reaction to fight against the democratic movement.

One of the most important conditions for consolidating the hegemony of the proletariat in the national liberation movement of India is pushing the national bourgeoisie away from leadership of the movement and isolating it.

The Indian bourgeoisie—not only the commercial bourgeoisie, but also significant strata of the big industrial bourgeoisie—has

been closely linked by diverse threads to British imperialists from its very inception. This connection was established and strengthened both through the credit system, since all major banks in India belonged to British capital, and through so-called "managing agencies," which are one of the specific forms of the subordination of Indian industry by the British financial oligarchy; this connection was established through other channels as well. The dominant position in the Anglo-Indian capitalist alliance has of course always been occupied by the financial magnates of England.

Significant strata of the big Indian bourgeoisie are also closely connected with feudal landownership and frequently with usurious capital. This was greatly facilitated by the British policy of hindering the country's industrial development.

Finally, another characteristic feature of the big Indian bourgeoisie should be noted. India, as is known, is a multinational country, and the process of nation-formation proceeds unevenly within it. Along with more capitalistically developed regions where nations have already formed, the country also possesses a significant number of economically extremely backward regions where the process of nationality formation is still far from complete. Closely linked with the process of capitalist development and nation-formation is the process of the formation and growth of the bourgeoisie of India's individual nationalities. At present, there are not only large enterprises belonging to national capital in India, but national monopolistic amalgamations have also formed (the Birla, Tata, Dalmia joint-stock companies, etc.) which play a major role in the country's economy. These monopolies of

course have a specifically colonial character: they are closely linked with foreign capital and directly dependent on it. The dominant position in these monopolistic amalgamations is occupied by the Gujarati and Marwari groupings of the bourgeoisie, and the interests of these monopolistic groups above all are represented by the right leadership of the National Congress and the government of the Dominion of India. The struggle of already formed monopolistic groups for dominance on the domestic market inevitably runs into the resistance of the growing bourgeoisie in the more backward national regions of the Indian Dominion in terms of the level of capitalist development.

In Pakistan, which is characterized by an even greater backwardness of industrial development and capitalist relations, the big industrial bourgeoisie is relatively weak. Leading positions both in the Pakistan government and in the apex of the Muslim League are occupied mainly by feudal-landlord elements.

The characteristic features of the big Indian bourgeoisie noted above, determined by the features of India's colonial development, are of no small importance for understanding its position in relation to British imperialism and to the struggle of the popular masses.

The policy of British imperialism, which invariably strives to retard India's development, could not of course fail to cause discontent among the big Indian bourgeoisie. Serious disagreements existed between the Indian bourgeoisie and British imperialism. However, the big Indian bourgeoisie, which from its very inception grew closely together with

British capital and with internal feudal reaction, was not capable of and did not strive for any active struggle against imperialism.

The Indian bourgeoisie in the person of the National Congress leadership tried, it is true, to use the mass movement in order to haggle some concessions in its favor from British imperialism. However, the decisive and invariable aspiration of the Indian bourgeoisie has always been not to allow the activation and expansion of the struggle of the broad working masses for their independence and freedom, since in the era of imperialism genuine freedom implies freedom not only from the yoke of colonizers, but also from the yoke of "their own" national bourgeoisie. The big Indian bourgeoisie always went to an agreement with British imperialism, counting on its support in the struggle against the proletariat and the working masses of India.

V. I. Lenin emphasized as early as 1920: "A certain rapprochement has taken place between the bourgeoisie of the exploiting and colonial countries, so that very often—perhaps even in the majority of cases—the bourgeoisie of the oppressed countries, although it supports national movements, at the same time in agreement with the imperialist bourgeoisie—i.e., together with it—fights against all revolutionary movements and revolutionary classes"[76]. This Leninist proposition finds striking confirmation in the example of the positions of the Indian bourgeoisie. The big bourgeoisie of India embarked on the path of betrayal, national treason, and deals with

---

[76] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XXV, p. 352

imperialism at the very earliest stages of the national liberation movement, when it was directed mainly against foreign oppression, when the Indian proletariat had not yet taken shape as an independent political force.

Already the mass movement of 1918–1922 showed that the big industrial bourgeoisie of India, represented by the leadership of the National Congress, is conciliationist, that it cannot be regarded as a revolutionary force in the struggle against imperialism. Comrade Stalin pointed out that, "fearing revolution more than imperialism, caring for the interests of its wallet more than for the interests of its own homeland, this part of the bourgeoisie, the wealthiest and most influential, places both feet in the camp of irreconcilable enemies of revolution, concluding a bloc with imperialism against the workers and peasants of its own country"[77] . The big bourgeoisie of India betrayed the masses and went into a deal with British imperialism during the upsurge of the national liberation struggle of Indian working people in 1930–1932 as well.

After the Second World War, in connection with the fact that the national liberation movement assumed unprecedented scope and leadership over it is increasingly passing into the hands of the working class, the big Indian bourgeoisie openly passed into the camp of reaction and imperialism and began to deal harshly with the democratic movement in the country. Its fear of the working masses of its country is intensifying as a result of the growth and rallying of the democratic forces of the entire world headed by the Soviet Union, as a result of the

---

[77] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, Vol. 7, p. 148

unprecedented upsurge of the revolutionary movement in the countries of Southeast Asia and the brilliant victories of the people's liberation army in China.

Whereas earlier the big Indian bourgeoisie, despite a whole chain of betrayals and capitulationism before imperialism, was nevertheless in a certain opposition to imperialism, at present it has completely and openly passed into the camp of imperialism.

The open transition of the big Indian bourgeoisie into the camp of reaction is evidenced first of all by the fact that not only the bourgeois apex of the Muslim League, but also the bourgeois-landlord leadership of the National Congress fully accepted the "Mountbatten Plan". As a result of the implementation of this plan, both dominions continue to remain in dependence on England, although the forms of this dependence have changed and local exploiting classes have been admitted to power in both dominions by British imperialists. That the big bourgeoisie of India and Pakistan betrayed national interests is also evidenced by the entire domestic and foreign policy of the ruling circles of both dominions.

The domestic policy of the ruling circles of India and Pakistan is entirely placed in the service of the interests of the reactionary bloc of the big Indian bourgeoisie, landlords, and feudal princes. The Indian bourgeoisie, having come to power, took all measures to preserve such a relic of the Middle Ages and stronghold of reaction as the feudal princely states—the strongpoints of British imperialism in India. It directs all efforts to preserve landlord landownership, which represents the main basis of feudal remnants, which are currently still the

predominant form of oppression over the Indian peasantry. This is vividly evidenced by draft agrarian reforms developed in a number of provinces of the Indian Dominion. These reforms everywhere preserve remnants of feudalism in landownership. But the implementation of even these reforms is hindered in every possible way by the ruling circles of India. Contrary to previous demagogic statements of the National Congress leadership, the rulers of India refused to nationalize large-scale industry. Like the ruling circles of Pakistan, they wide open the doors to foreign capital, thereby cementing the economic and political dependence of both dominions on British and American monopolies.

The ruling circles of both dominions resort to brutal reprisals against the working class and its organizations, against all democratic elements. In their struggle against progressive forces, especially against the Communist Party, they employ essentially fascist methods. Trade unions and peasant organizations led by democratic elements are brutally persecuted. Thousands of democratic figures have been thrown into prisons. In connection with the threat of a general strike of railwaymen in February 1949 alone, over 3 thousand people were arrested in India. News comes from various parts of the country about brutal shootings of striking workers, peasant meetings, and student demonstrations. A law is currently being prepared in India that in fact completely bans strikes. Nehru at a meeting of the Constituent Assembly threatened to ban the Communist Party, which is already in fact in a semi-legal position.

In their foreign policy, the ruling circles of India follow the dictates of the ringleaders of the Anglo-American imperialist bloc. Ignoring the demands of their peoples, they meekly expressed readiness to keep the dominion further within the system of the British Empire. They take active part in creating a bloc of Southeast Asian countries and the Pacific Ocean—branches of the aggressive North Atlantic Pact.

The Indian bourgeoisie and its agency in the trade union movement, implementing the plans of Anglo-American reaction, took the initiative in implementing a split in the labor movement in the countries of Southeast Asia. It is precisely this goal that is pursued by the creation of the Asian Federation of Trade Unions, carried out with the direct and active participation of the reactionary Indian National Trade Union Congress, knocked together by the National Congress.

The facts irrefutably testify to the fact that the big Indian bourgeoisie willingly assumes the role of bailiff for Anglo-American imperialism in rallying all reactionary elements in the countries of East Asia for the struggle against the national liberation movement of oppressed peoples, against the forces standing for a lasting democratic peace.

The statements of certain leading figures of the Indian Dominion to the effect that India is allegedly pursuing an "independent" or "neutral" foreign policy, that it supposedly adheres to a special, "third" path in the sphere of international relations, therefore sound very unconvincing. All this talk has the goal of deceiving the popular masses, of misleading public opinion both inside the country and outside it. In reality, the reactionary circles of both India and Pakistan have set a course

toward consolidating their countries' position in the role of satellites of the Anglo-American imperialist bloc. Even some Indian bourgeois journalists are forced to acknowledge that the "middle path" that India allegedly implements in international politics differs less and less from the policy of the Western powers and their satellites.

The Communist Party of India resolutely exposes the machinations of the Indian bourgeoisie aimed at leaving India and Pakistan tethered to the Anglo-American reactionary bloc. The Communist Party spoke out against the so-called London Agreement on keeping India within the system of the British Empire, characterizing this agreement as a further step on the path of turning India into a satellite of the Anglo-American imperialist bloc. The Communist Party noted that the groupings of Southeast Asian countries and the Pacific Pact created by the imperialists will serve as an addition to the aggressive North Atlantic Pact, an instrument of struggle against the growing national liberation movement in the countries of Southeast Asia and of preparing a hotbed of aggression against the USSR in the East. The Communist Party emphasizes that the working masses of India see in the Soviet Union the leading force in the struggle against world reaction and that they will resolutely take their place in the democratic camp headed by the USSR.

Both in India and in Pakistan, the popular movement for a lasting peace and democracy, against the Anglo-American warmongers and their henchmen, is acquiring increasingly wide dimensions. At a crowded meeting in defense of peace recently held in Firozabad, a resolution was adopted stating:

"Indian workers under no circumstances will raise weapons against the Soviet Union—the greatest defender of peace and democracy. If imperialists try to turn our country into a military base for attacking the Soviet Union, they will meet a crushing rebuff from the Indian people. The working class of India, together with the working class of the whole world, will fight for peace, democracy, and socialism"[78].

The final transition of the big Indian bourgeoisie into the camp of reaction and imperialism does not exclude the possibility that individual groupings of the national bourgeoisie may still for one or another term, for one or another period, turn out to be fellow travelers of democratic forces in their struggle against imperialism, against its allies in India. These are first of all those elements of the bourgeoisie whose interests are particularly infringed upon by foreign capital heavily flowing into the country. These are also the growing bourgeoisie of the most backward national regions of India in their development, dissatisfied with the dominance on the Indian market of already formed monopolistic groups. At the same time, it must be taken into account that in the current conditions of the extreme aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism, when a particularly sharp polarization of class forces is occurring both on the international scale and within the bounds of each individually taken capitalist country, these opposition strata of the Indian bourgeoisie should not be regarded as any sort of reliable and permanent participants in the anti-imperialist camp.

---

[78] *Pravda*, August 19, 1949

In close connection with the final transition of India's big bourgeoisie into the service of Anglo-American imperialists, the policy of the Indian National Congress should also be viewed, the leadership of which has always been in the hands of the bourgeoisie and liberal landlords. At present, the National Congress has finally turned into the party of the reactionary bloc of the big Indian bourgeoisie, landlords, and feudal princes, while preserving the leading role in this bloc for the bourgeoisie.

It cannot be ignored that the National Congress still enjoys a certain influence among the masses. This is manifested partly by tradition, since for a long time it was considered that the Congress is in a certain opposition to the policy of British imperialism in India. This is also explained in part by the nationalist demagogy of the Congress leaders, with which they try to cover up their deal with imperialists. But the reactionary policy of the National Congress is beginning to cause growing discontent and indignation among the working people of India. Thanks to the exposure of the reactionary, treacherous role of the bourgeois-landlord leadership of the National Congress and reactionary Gandhism, illusions regarding the National Congress are dispersing ever faster among the masses.

It is becoming increasingly obvious to the broad masses of Indian working people that only the proletariat is called upon to be the leader of the national liberation movement, and that only under its leadership can the victory of the toiling people be ensured.

Questions of Economics, No.8, 1949.

A. Shapiro

THE RISE OF UNEMPLOYMENT IN CAPITALIST COUNTRIES IN THE POST-WAR PERIOD

Four years have passed since the end of the Second World War. These were years of new victories for the great socialist power—the USSR, of the further growth of its might and international authority, of a powerful upsurge of the Soviet national economy, of the steady growth of the material well-being and cultural standard of living of the Soviet people. These were years of major achievements by the countries of people's democracy, which are confidently marching toward socialism, successfully fulfilling plans for the restoration and development of the national economy, having eliminated unemployment, and raising the well-being of the working masses. These were years of an unprecedented upsurge of the national liberation movement in colonial and semicolonial countries, years of the victorious popular-democratic revolution in China, which culminated in the creation of the People's Republic of China.

A diametrically opposite picture is presented by the capitalist world. In the countries of the imperialist camp, an economic crisis is unfolding, inevitably leading to a further deterioration ofazir the position of the working class and all working people, and to a further growth of armies of the unemployed.

In the era of the general crisis of capitalism, unemployment has acquired a chronic, permanent character. Comrade Stalin, in his

political report of the Central Committee to the 16th Congress of the CPSU(B), giving his classic definition of the general crisis of capitalism, pointed out that the First World War "left the majority of capitalist countries a heavy legacy in the form of chronic underload of enterprises and the presence of millions of armies of the unemployed, which have turned from reserve into permanent armies of the unemployed..."[79]

The capitalist mode of production by the very course of its development, spontaneously, on an ever-increasing scale, generates the industrial reserve army. The greater this reserve army in comparison with the active labor army, the more extensive is the permanent overpopulation, whose poverty is inversely proportional to the torments of its labor. Finally, the greater the impoverished strata of the working class and the industrial reserve army, the greater is official pauperism. This is the absolute, general law of capitalist accumulation.[80]

In the era of the general crisis of capitalism, despite the fact that the movement of unemployment has retained its cyclical character, the armies of people—growing continuously from one industrial cycle to another—whom capitalist society cannot provide with work are no longer absorbed in the inter-crisis phases.

Comrade Stalin pointed out in January 1933 that at that time there were no less than 30–40 million unemployed in capitalist countries. "What kind of people are these?" Comrade Stalin said. "It is usually said of them that they are 'finished people'.

---

79 J. V. Stalin, *Works*, Vol. 12, p. 247

80 K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. 1, 1937, p. 708

They strive for work every day, look for work, are ready to accept almost any conditions of work, but they are not given work because they are 'superfluous' people. And this at a time when vast masses of goods and products are squandered for the whims of the favorites of fortune, the sons of capitalists and landowners. The unemployed are denied food because they have nothing to pay for food, they are denied shelter because they have nothing to pay for an apartment. How and where do they live? They live on meager handouts from the master's table, by digging through garbage cans where they find rotting scraps of food, they live in the slums of large cities, and most of all in shacks outside the city hastily built by the unemployed from crate boards and tree bark. But that is not all. It is not only the unemployed who suffer from unemployment. Workers who have jobs also suffer from it. They suffer because the presence of a large number of unemployed creates an unstable position for them in production, an uncertainty about tomorrow. Today they work at an enterprise, but they are not sure that, waking up tomorrow, they will not find out that they have already been laid off"[81].

In early 1933, in the capitalist countries, the "finished," "superfluous" people doomed by the bourgeois system to starvation and living in slums and shacks, together with members of their families, numbered 100–130 million people. This is roughly equal to the population of England, France, and Italy combined.

---

[81] J. V. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, 11th ed., pp. 385–386

The domination and yoke of monopolies, which intensify the exploitation of the working people and increase the absolute and relative impoverishment of the working class, have led to a sharp narrowing of markets. The production apparatus of capitalist industry turns out to be underloaded not only in years of crises, but also in years of relatively high economic conjuncture. Thus, in England and the USA during the interwar period, the production apparatus was loaded by less than half. In the period following the end of the Second World War, the production apparatus of the USA is once again significantly underutilized. In 1948, even before the onset of the economic crisis, the American shipbuilding industry was operating at approximately 40% of its capacity, metallurgy at 60–70%; over 70% of synthetic rubber production capacities were idle, and so on. The chronic underload of the production apparatus, accompanied by chronic unemployment, is a striking indicator of the decay of capitalism in the period of its general crisis. In this period, the main "means" of temporarily reducing chronic unemployment is the expansion of military production, the conversion of the unemployed into cannon fodder, and their physical destruction in imperialist wars.

On the eve of the Second World War, there were 10.4 million unemployed in the USA. In the war years, according to official, understated data, the number of fully unemployed dropped to 1 million people.[82] At the same time, the US armed forces absorbed more than 11 million people. The number of employed in industry, transport, and the electric power industry increased by 5.4 million people over three war years. These 16

---

[82] *Monthly Labour Review*, December 1947, p. 638

–17 million people were recruited from among the unemployed or potential unemployed. The fact that only the production of instruments of destruction and war, leading to the death of millions of working people, temporarily reduces unemployment is striking evidence of the rottenness and parasitism of modern capitalism.

The transition from war to peacetime in capitalist countries caused a drop in the level of production and an increase in unemployment. Unemployment grew primarily at the expense of millions of workers returning from the army.

The working class of capitalist countries, besides the sacrifices and hardships brought by the war, began to experience the disasters and burdens of the post-war period as well: the offensive of capital against its living standard and political rights, intensified exploitation, a further decline in real wages, and the growth of unemployment. US monopolies, with millions of people seeking work, once again, as before the war, established various obstacles, including age restrictions, when hiring labor: people over 35–40 years of age ceased to be accepted for work.

The end of the war led to a reduction in government military orders—this main stimulus for the expansion of capitalist industry in wartime. However, capitalist monopolies, while basically preserving large-scale military industry, shifted only a part of it to the output of civilian products. Many plants were closed, and workers were laid off. US industrial production by 1946 declined by more than one-third compared to 1943, when, fueled by huge military orders, it reached its maximum. The number of employed workers in US manufacturing alone

dropped from 17.4 million in 1943 to 14.5 million in 1946. Millions of workers were transferred to a shortened working day and a part-time work week. According to official, clearly understated data, in the USA in 1946 there were more than 2.3 million fully unemployed, and semi-unemployed—that is, working a part-time work week—numbered 5.4 million people.

The reduction in the number of employed workers and their total working time led to a drop in solvent demand on the domestic market of the country and created prerequisites for the further curtailment of production. At the same time, a number of reasons caused a relative slowdown in the rates of production decline and unemployment growth in the USA after the war. The production apparatus of American industry emerged from the war heavily worn out and largely obsolete. To capture new markets and strengthen its competitiveness, American monopolies found themselves forced to make considerable capital expenditures on renewing fixed capital, which caused a certain revival in the US economy. The decline in production was also slowed down by sharply increased US exports. Using for their predatory purposes the post-war devastation, the commodity, raw material, fuel, and food famine in Western Europe, as well as the weakening of the economic positions of European metropolises in colonies and dependent countries, American monopolies developed a rabid economic expansion, bringing US exports to $15 billion by 1947.

As a result of the Second World War, multi-million unemployment arose anew in the defeated fascist-imperialist states as well. Food and commodity shortages and economic

devastation raged in Western Germany, Japan, and Italy. Even in 1947, the volume of industrial production in Bizonia did not reach 40%, and in Japan 25% of the pre-war level. Despite the fact that about 12 million foreign workers and prisoners of war left Germany after the war, in the Western occupation zones of Germany alone there were many hundreds of thousands of fully unemployed people. In Japan, the number of unemployed already reached 5 million people by mid-1946, and in Italy it exceeded 2 million people, i.e., it was greater than in any other Western European country.

The growth of mass unemployment in these countries is facilitated by the expansionist policy of American imperialism and the reactionary regime established in them (American-Anglo-French occupation of Western Germany, American-British occupation of Italy, American occupation of Japan). The capitalist monopolies of the USA, as partially also their English "junior partners," penetrating the economy of the defeated countries, plundered them and seized dominant positions in them; they deprived these states of their former markets, which were of enormous importance for them (for example, for Japan). The restoration of the economy and the overcoming of economic devastation and chaos in Bizonia, Italy, and Japan are not at all part of the calculations of the Anglo-American occupiers, and they intentionally prevent the revival of peaceful production in these countries, striving to destroy the very possibility of their competition on the world market. As a result of the expansionist policy of the capitalist monopolies of the USA, millions of people in these countries were left without work.

In England, in mid-1946, there were 1.5 million fully unemployed people. The partial modernization of the damaged, obsolete, and heavily worn-out production apparatus during the war, as well as increased production for export—which right-wing Labour leaders view as a panacea for all the troubles and evils of British economic parasitism—somewhat limited the post-war growth of unemployment in England. But along with the lengthened work week in some branches of British industry, in other branches, especially in the so-called "depressed areas," there were hundreds of thousands of unemployed and homeless people.

In France, as long as communist ministers were in the government—that is, until May 1947—and as long as the proletariat waged the "battle for production" at the call of the communist party, the economic restoration of the country proceeded at a relatively rapid pace. The general index of industrial production (1937 = 100) rose from 39 in 1945 to 73 in 1946. Labor was attracted to factories and plants. A major role was also played by the fact that the country lost more than one million foreign workers, who always, even in the best years for French industry, constituted a significant stratum of the labor force. After representatives of the communist party were removed from the French cabinet to please American imperialists, the restoration of production slowed down sharply. France, like England, increasingly began to fall under the American dollar yoke, turning into an appendage to the US economy, into a colony of American imperialism. In France, as in England, unemployment began to grow.

The growth of unemployment in capitalist states in the post-war years slowed down somewhat due to the fact that the ruling circles of the USA and England shifted to an openly expansionist course—a course toward unleashing an aggressive war against the USSR, the countries of people's democracy, and the international communist movement, for the establishment of their domination in the world. The Second World War had barely ended when the warmongers from the camp of the Anglo-Saxon countries began to stoke a new "military psychosis" and create an atmosphere of uncertainty about the durability of the post-war peace. This noise "about a new war" was used by the capitalists, as Comrade Stalin pointed out, to "slow down the demobilization of troops and thereby prevent the rapid growth of unemployment in their countries"[83]. The strength of the American army by the end of 1943 exceeded 1.5 million people, i.e., it was approximately 4 times greater than before the war; the British army numbered 1 million, and the French 700 thousand people.[84]

In England, more than half a million workers are currently employed in the military industry. Military production is organized on an incomparably larger scale in the USA. American monopolies, using the state apparatus subordinate to them, preserved large government military orders after the war, bringing them fabulous profits, and are striving for their even

---

[83] *Pravda*, September 25, 1946

[84] In the draft US state budget for the 1949/50 fiscal year, direct military expenditures alone constitute 62% of all budget expenditures. Britain's military budget in 1948 was 3.5 times greater than in 1937, and was increased again in 1949.

greater expansion. The United States has become the largest militarist power, the arsenal of international reaction, supplying weapons to various fascist and semi-fascist regimes.

The military-inflationary conjuncture, the arms race, the growth of military budgets, 6 the preservation of huge armies and large military industry in the main aggressive imperialist states, the creation of colossal reserves of military-strategic raw materials and materials in the USA, the transformation of Western European countries and their colonial empires into suppliers of cannon fodder for American warmongers, and the waging of colonial wars by imperialists against the peoples of Indonesia, Vietnam, etc.—all this artificially restrains the post-war growth of unemployment in the capitalist world.

The apologists of imperialism and reaction, including the right-socialist traitors, following Keynes, advocate for war, repeating that only "military conditions" can ensure "full employment". Such is the fascist-cannibalistic "philosophy" and the corresponding imperialist practice of monopoly capital.

The burdens of the military preparations of the imperialists fall as a new burden on the shoulders of the working masses, increasing their impoverishment. The crediting of military expenditures and military programs is carried out at the expense of the state treasury, i.e., taxpayers—workers and peasants.

Even Truman was forced to admit that every seventh person is starving in American cities, and that the nutritional level of the US population is constantly declining. One of the US Senate committees as early as the end of 1947 determined that at least

7 million urban and rural type homes in the country are subject to demolition due to their complete unsuitability. A third of the population lives in slums, in appalling poverty. Another Senate committee acknowledged that diseases are spreading extremely rapidly in the country and crime is growing. Despite the spread of such diseases as scurvy, pellagra, malignant anemia, rickets in children, etc., three-quarters of the American population are completely deprived of medical care.[85]

Need and the impoverishment of working people are also growing in other capitalist countries. Four years of rule by the right-Labour servants of big capital in England have brought a further deterioration in the material position of the working class. The ration system for basic food products has been preserved in the country to this day, and food distribution norms are extremely low. British workers lead a semi-starvation existence. The housing crisis has worsened. Under the pretext of combating the payment and trade balance deficits, the Labour government is carrying out a further reduction in the consumption level of the masses, while expenditures on the armed forces make up huge sums. Up to one and a half million workers are distracted from the production of prime necessity goods, serving in the army and employed in military factories. The socialist lackeys of the Anglo-American warmongers zealously preach the slogans: "guns instead of butter," "guns instead of housing".

The growth of military budgets, especially in connection with the adoption of the Western and North Atlantic Pacts, means an

---

[85] *Labor and Capital in the USA*, Collection of Facts, Gospolitizdat, 1949, p. 67

ever greater intensification of the tax plunder of working people. Only income taxes collected from US workers and employees, even according to official data, rose from $686 million in the 1942/43 fiscal year to $11,534 million in 1947/48. In England, indirect taxes, over 75% of which are paid by workers, increased from £397 million in the 1938/39 fiscal year to £1,127 million in 1944/45, and to £1,678 million in 1948/49.[86]

The working class of capitalist countries has to pay a high price for the imperialist methods of somewhat artificially slowing down the growth of unemployment.

The years 1948 and 1949 were marked in capitalist countries by a sharp deterioration of the economic situation, an unprecedented rampage of imperialist reaction, a new rabid offensive by big capital and the social-traitors acting in concert with it against the working class, a further unleashing of the inflationary element, and an increase in mass unemployment.

The curve of unemployment growth in these years turned sharply upward in the overwhelming majority of capitalist countries. Two main circumstances played a decisive role in this: the "Marshall Plan" and the economic crisis that has begun.

The enslaving and aggressive "Marshall Plan" only worsened the economic situation of Western European countries, tied their economy with artificial bonds to the American chariot, and placed them on the brink of economic catastrophe. The

---

[86] *Records and Statistics*, April 16, 1949, p. 386

"Marshall Plan" could not save the United States from crisis; it did not even prevent the decline in American exports that began in May 1947. In 1948, US commodity exports declined by 23% (in constant prices) compared to 1947, and continue to fall in 1949. The calculations of American monopolists that they would manage to overcome the threat of crisis by maintaining a militarized economy—a war economy—on a large scale also failed.

Comrade Stalin teaches that to transfer the country's economy onto the rails of a war economy means "to give industry a one-sided, military direction, to expand in every possible way the production of items necessary for war that is not connected with the consumption of the population, to narrow in every possible way the production and especially the output on the market of consumer goods—consequently, to reduce the consumption of the population and place the country before an economic crisis"[87].

The crisis in the USA began in late 1948. The general index of US industrial production fell from 176 in October 1948 to 144 in July 1949 (1937 = 100). Capital and housing construction is being curtailed—the level of capital investments by July 1949 decreased by 26% compared to 1948; the order portfolios of major companies are diminishing. Commodity inventories in production and distribution channels have increased sharply. The volume of retail trade is shrinking; industrial share prices are falling on stock exchanges. Along with the unfolding of the industrial crisis in the USA, cultivated areas under major crops

---

87 J. V. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, 11th ed., p. 567

are shrinking. Facts indicate the approach of an agrarian crisis in the USA.

Capitalist associations continue the struggle to maintain monopolistically high prices despite the "overproduction" of goods. But this means a new drop in the real wages of workers, a further growth in the impoverishment of working people, onto whom monopolies strive to shift the entire burden of the crisis in order to make them pay for their adventurist foreign policy programs, such as the "Marshall Plan," programs for supplying weapons to other states, the militarization of the country, etc. All this cannot but lead to the protraction of the crisis and make it especially painful for the working masses.

The crisis in the USA is developing in an atmosphere of the arms race, broad foreign economic expansion of American monopolies, and the "Marshall Plan," which is still continuing its action but has suffered complete bankruptcy. These "extraordinary measures," which proved powerless to prevent the crisis, only somewhat delayed its onset and partly slowed down its unfolding.

The crisis in the USA is developing under conditions of the increasing enslavement of other capitalist countries, primarily Western European ones, by American monopoly capital. The policy of Marshallization means an offensive of international big capital against the working class of Western Europe, further impoverishment, ruin, hunger, and disasters for workers. This means that American monopolies want to shift the burdens of the crisis not only onto the American proletariat, but onto the Western European proletariat as well. Thereby, they undermine not only their domestic markets, but their

foreign markets too—i.e., they make the crisis even deeper, more prolonged, and more painful for many tens of millions of working people in capitalist countries.

In Western European countries, the crisis of overproduction is currently beginning under conditions of incomplete post-war economic restoration, despite the fact that industrial production as a whole has barely reached the level of 1937, and the agricultural production of most of them has not even reached the pre-war level.

The Marshallization of these countries led to the curtailment and gradual partial liquidation in them of branches competing with the industry of the United States: shipbuilding (in England, France, Denmark, Norway, Sweden), aviation (in France), coal (in Belgium), textile and footwear (in Belgium and Holland), automotive (in France and Italy), electrotechnical and silk (in Italy), and a number of others. Marshallized countries are flooded with second-rate and expensive American goods, while they themselves are deprived of the opportunity to sell their goods in the USA and other dollar-currency countries. The foreign trade deficit of Western European countries with the USA amounted to a huge sum in 1948—$3.2 billion. This leads to an intensification of the dollar famine in Marshallized countries, especially in England and the sterling area states, and to the deepening of the currency and financial chaos in the capitalist world. The devaluation of the pound sterling, the franc, and the currencies of many other capitalist countries, carried out under the pressure of the ruling circles of the USA, contributes to increasing the dependence of these countries' economies on

American imperialism, exacerbating competition on foreign markets, and further stepping up the offensive against the living standard of working people. All this leads to a further sharp deterioration of the economic situation in capitalist countries. The expansion of the sphere of operations of American monopolies in the economy of Western European and other capitalist states (for example, Latin American ones), and the strengthening of their dependence on the US economy, which is already experiencing a crisis, inevitably accelerate the onset of the crisis in these countries as well, contributing to its acquiring an all-encompassing character.

The current crisis of overproduction is unfolding its destructive action in new historical conditions. It strikes countries weakened by the war and its consequences. It unfolds in an atmosphere where the field of capitalist exploitation has narrowed even further due to the defection of the countries of people's democracy from the imperialist system and continues to narrow due to the irrepressible growth of the national liberation movement in the colonial world. The current crisis takes place in an atmosphere of the further unfolding of US imperialist aggression, the arms race, the intensification of competition among imperialist states for sales markets, sources of raw materials, and spheres of profitable capital investment, and under conditions of the aggravation of contradictions between the main countries of the imperialist camp, first of all between the USA and England.

The economic crisis in 1949 is developing unevenly, not simultaneously covering different countries. This also

determines the uneven growth of the armies of the unemployed in capitalist countries.

The largest number of unemployed is in the United States of America. In August 1949, there were approximately 6 million fully unemployed and over 12 million semi-unemployed, whose wages were reduced in accordance with the decreased number of working hours per week. Taking into account the category of "temporarily unemployed," behind which American bourgeois statistics also mask the growth of unemployment, one can come to the conclusion that in the USA in mid-1949 the army of fully unemployed amounted to up to 14 million people, or approximately 30% of all workers employed in industry. At the same time, in US agriculture, the number of workers in 1948 alone decreased by almost 2 million. Unemployment affected female workers, Negroes, and older men first of all. In just two months (December 1948 — January 1949), 885 thousand women lost their jobs in the USA. According to official data, in the USA over the past 6 months the number of unemployed increased by approximately 40%, and over the year (from August 1948 to August 1949)—by 2.5 times (excluding unemployed agricultural workers).

American capitalist monopolies, along with the crisis and their "surplus" products, "export" unemployment to Western Europe as well. This is precisely what the flooding of Marshallized countries with American goods and the closing of a multitude of factories and plants in them in connection therewith means. Even according to heavily understated data from the UN statistical bulletin, which do not reflect the true state of affairs and do not take into account the semi-unemployed, during the

first year of the "Marshall Plan" (April 1948 — March 1949) the number of unemployed in the majority of Marshallized countries increased by 80–200%. It increased in France by 192%, in Austria by 184%, in Belgium by 150%, in Bizonia by 146%, in Denmark by 90%, in Holland by 89%, in Norway by 30%. Only in the first quarter of 1949 did unemployment increase in Switzerland almost threefold, in Holland—doubled, in Norway and Bizonia—almost doubled, in France (registered unemployed only)—one and a half times.

Unemployment is also raging in Japan. The number of fully unemployed, semi-unemployed, and persons without permanent earnings was estimated here by the bourgeois journal *Journal of Finance and Commerce* (October 15, 1948) at approximately 5 million, and according to trade union data, it exceeds 6 million.

In third place in terms of the number of unemployed is Italy, where with a population of 45 million people, the number of fully unemployed, according to the General Italian Confederation of Labor, is about 3 million, and in addition there is a large number of workers employed only partially.

In the American and British occupation zones of Germany, according to data cited by W. Pieck, the number of unemployed exceeded 1.3 million people, and semi-unemployed—1 million people. The growth of unemployment in Bizonia continues, since the occupation authorities here have not stopped the dismantling of enterprises of civilian manufacturing industries, and in the military plants they are reviving they pursue a course toward the maximum intensification of labor and toward "rationalization," i.e.,

cutting production costs by laying off ever new contingents of workers.

In England, the number of unemployed, together with demobilized persons who have not yet found work, according to data that does not cover all workers, reaches half a million and, like the number of workers employed part-time, continues to grow. In some regions of the country, unemployment has reached significant proportions. Thus, as early as 1948, there were 73 thousand unemployed in Scotland, and up to 50 thousand in Wales, with many of them having no work for one to three years. Partial unemployment is especially great among female workers.

In Belgium, there are over 300 thousand unemployed. This means that out of every seven workers, one has no work. The number of unemployed is calculated in the hundreds of thousands in France, Holland, Denmark, and other capitalist countries as well.

In France, as the newspaper *Ce Soir* noted in August 1949, the number of unemployed in the Seine department alone reached 100 thousand people, i.e., it exceeded the official figure of unemployed by more than 4 times. In the Paris region, at least 200 thousand people are deprived of work. Unemployment has embraced almost all branches of French industry. Thus, as early as May 1949, there were 40 thousand unemployed in the furniture industry (25% of all employed in this branch). Unemployment, full and partial, is also great in shipbuilding, automotive, textile, and other branches of industry. Over July and August 1949, in enterprises of the "nationalized" aviation industry of France that are being closed or curtailing

production alone, 12.5 thousand workers were laid off who cannot find work in other branches of French industry either. According to *L'Humanité*, 450 thousand French working people currently work less than 40 hours a week and lead a miserable existence.

In a number of capitalist countries, unemployment statistics are organized so poorly (or even completely absent) that it is impossible to determine the true number of unemployed. Greece belongs to such countries. In fascist Spain, even the statistics of the Franco regime acknowledge that the number of unemployed in March 1949 increased by 34% and exceeded 147 thousand people. Of course, these data should also be considered greatly understated.

A colossal growth of unemployment is also observed in the colonial world. Imperialists, exporting their capitals and goods to colonies and dependent countries, predatorily exploiting cheap labor, and plundering natural resources, hinder the development of local productive forces in every possible way. The post-war aggravation of the imperialist struggle for "spheres of influence" led to a drop in industrial and agricultural production in the majority of colonial and dependent countries. In many states of the Near and Middle East (Turkey, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Syria, Palestine), industrial and agricultural production is shrinking, having failed to reach the pre-war level in a number of branches. Output is also falling in Latin American countries (Chile, Argentina, Mexico, Brazil, etc.) and in Africa. The number of registered unemployed reached approximately 1.5 million in

India (not counting the multi-million reserve army of the agricultural proletariat).

Everything indicates that unemployment in capitalist countries has currently assumed a mass character, and that the general tendency for all capitalist countries is the further rapid growth of armies of the unemployed. Economists who operate primarily with falsified data of bourgeois statistics and talk about how "the scale of unemployment does not yet reach the level of pre-war years here (in the main capitalist countries.—A. Sh.)" make a mistake.[88] Even bourgeois statisticians from the economic bodies of the United Nations are forced to acknowledge the enormous growth of unemployment in the capitalist world.

The table below compares the growth of the armies of the unemployed in a number of capitalist countries in 1949 with the corresponding indicators of 1921, the year of the first economic crisis after the world war of 1914–1918, with the highest point of unemployment in the crisis of 1929–1933, and with data for 1937, the year of the onset of the pre-war crisis in bourgeois-democratic countries, as well as the pre-war year of 1938, which was mainly crisis-ridden. At the same time, the table gives some idea of the falsification of unemployment data by bourgeois economic statistics, which intentionally ignores partial unemployment, hundreds of thousands of former military personnel who cannot find work for a long time, strikers, and workers of "temporarily" closed enterprises in its

---

[88] See, for example, Yu. Kuczynski's article "The Current State of Unemployment in the West" in the journal *Professionalnye Soyuzy*, No. 3, 1949, p. 35.

calculations. Of course, the data for the years between the two world wars are also understated.

Growth of armies of the unemployed in capitalist countries (in thousands)[89]

Country	Accounting method	1921	Highest point of unemployment in 1929–1933 crisis	1937	1938	1 d
USA	AFL estimate	about 5,000	15,653	8,282	10,936	3

[89] Compiled from the collection *Impoverishment of the Proletariat in Capitalist Countries*, Profizdat, 1936, pp. 228–229; *World Economy*, Yearbook 1938/1939, Sotsekgiz, 1939, pp. 404–405, etc.; Yu. Kuczynski, *History of Working Conditions in the USA from 1789 to 1947*, Gosinoizdat, 1948, pp. 260–262; *World Economic Report, 1948, United Nations*, June, 1949, p. 227, and data of trade unions and various progressive organizations published in the newspaper *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy!* and other print organs

Country	Accounting method	1921	Highest point of unemployment in 1929–1933 crisis	1937	1938	1 d
England	Unemployed among insured	1,667	2,955 a)	1,482	1,803	3 u a te u
France	Registered unemployed	47	65	345	379	4
Germany	Registered unemployed	310	6,128 b)	912	429	1 (I
Italy	—	150	1,229	—	—	2
Belgium	Unemployed among insured	67	223	105	132	1
Holland	Registered	—	43	23	36	3

Country	Accounting method	1921	Highest point of unemployment in 1929–1933 crisis	1937	1938	1 d
	unemployed					
Denmark	Job seekers	—	43	69	54	5
Sweden	Unemployed among trade union members	126	107	112	48	1
Norway	—	14 g)	33	33	34 d)	3
Switzerland	—	59	124	223	297	1
Austria	Registered unemployed	—	480	139	—	—
Spain	—	43	5 f)	—	—	9
Finland	Registered unemployed	22	34	43	6	—

Country	Accounting method	1921	Highest point of unemployment in 1929–1933 crisis	1937	1938	1 d
Canada	—	94	89	105	208	—
Australia	Unemployed among trade union members	41	124	24	41	3
Japan	Official estimate	—	511	270	—	—
India	Registered unemployed	—	—	—	—	2

(Table Notes from source): a) 1922. b) Receiving benefits. c) Not counting 3.1 million unregistered unemployed. d) 1920. e) 1923. f) 1935. In addition, 263 thousand semi-unemployed. g) According to unofficial data, 1.5 million fully unemployed and 3.5 million semi-unemployed.

The data of this table indicate that the actual dimensions of unemployment in capitalist countries at present have not only already exceeded the level achieved after the First World War in the crisis of 1920–1921, but that they as a whole, and in

individual countries in particular, have left behind both the level of pre-war years and individual years of the deepest crisis of 1929–1933.

Calculations show that the total number of unemployed in the 20 capitalist countries (listed in the table, except India, but with Portugal and New Zealand) amounted to over 6 million in 1929, 25.4 million in 1932, 14.7 million in 1937, and 17.8 million people in 1938. Now, however, in 1949, even if one accepts the understated UN indicators for some countries, the number of unemployed in the indicated 20 capitalist countries has exceeded 26.5 million. As a whole, including India and other colonial and dependent countries, it can be considered that the number of fully and partially unemployed in the capitalist world is already approaching 30 million, i.e., slightly less than the highest level of unemployment in the crisis of 1929–1933 (30–40 million people).

But the capitalist world is currently only in the initial stage of the economic crisis. It is not difficult to foresee what colossal, hitherto unseen proportions the armies of the unemployed will reach with the further unfolding of the crisis.

Marx wrote that during crises capital, "like a noble barbarian slave owner... carries away with it to the grave the corpses of its slaves—entire hecatombs of workers..."[90]

During the current economic crisis, monopoly capital is going to carry away to the grave even more gigantic hecatombs of workers than ever before. It strives to shift all the burdens of

---

[90] K. Marx, *Wage Labor and Capital*, Gospolitizdat, 1945, p. 4

the crisis onto the working class, counting on climbing out of the economic catastrophe on its shoulders. The unprecedented growth of unemployment in capitalist countries is accompanied by a gigantic intensification of the absolute and relative impoverishment of the working class.

The periods of greatest unemployment are periods of the lowest wages. The presence of a large army of the unemployed enables capitalists to use it for increasing pressure on the labor market, for the progressive reduction of wages. It is not by chance, therefore, that in the post-war period, when the armies of the unemployed reached gigantic proportions, the level of workers' wages is at its lowest and is falling more and more, directly proportional to the increase in relative overpopulation. Nor is it by chance that right now right-wing socialists are most zealously insisting on workers refusing to fight for wage increases under the false pretext that it will "automatically" lead to a new rise in prices.

The venal apologists of capital, like the American Anderson and Labour ideologues, have once again dragged out into the light the long-ago exposed by Marx theory of the wage "fund," asserting that the standard of living of workers is determined by the size of the national product. Stating that raising wages allegedly leads to an increase in unemployment, the hardened reactionary Anderson and his ilk cynically demand that workers and trade unions abandon the struggle for wage increases.[91] The class meaning of such "concepts" is entirely clear. They are programs of an offensive against the living

---

[91] *Financing American Prosperity*. B. Anderson. *The Road Back to Full Employment*, 1945, p. 22

standard of the working class, designed for an even greater reduction of workers' earnings for the sake of a new increase in capitalist profits.

The entire post-war period in the capitalist world is a period of rampant inflation, rising prices and the cost of living, unceasing growth of profits, and falling wages. US corporation profits in 1948 amounted to $34.8 billion and were higher than in any preceding year. In 1949, despite the crisis, they continue to grow. In England, according to data cited by G. Pollitt, profits in 1949 also exceeded the record figure of 1948: in 467 major amalgamations, after tax payments, they increased by 14%.[92]

No machinations of bourgeois statistics can hide the fact that the position of the working class and all working people in capitalist states is worsening, and their living standard is falling. In all countries of capital, the real wages of workers have declined significantly. Even the UN statistical bulletin (No. 6 for 1949) acknowledges that as a result of rising dearness and the inflating of prices by monopolies, the real wages of an industrial worker in the USA in 1948 were 15.8–25.6% lower than in 1944; at the end of 1948, a reduction in nominal wages also began in America, which continued in 1949.

The policy of "freezing" nominal wages pursued by the Labour government of England, amidst continuously rising taxes and prices, led to a further decline in the real wages of the British

[92] See *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy!*, July 1, 1949

worker, to a decrease in his consumption, and a worsening of his nutrition. In France, real wages, according to data from *Cahiers du Communisme* (Nos. 4 and 7 for 1949), at the end of 1948 constituted only about 50% of the pre-war level, and in May 1949 were 11% lower than two years ago. Real wages in Western Germany, according to heavily overstated data, equaled only 65% of the 1938 level in December 1948, i.e., they were significantly lower than even in the times of the Hitlerite regime, and in Japan in October 1948 they constituted 54% of the beggarly level of 1934–1936.

Most of the data cited above does not take unemployment into account. One of the methods of falsifying data on the living standard of the working class by bourgeois statistics consists in the fact that alongside the fabrication of knowingly false "cost of living indices," it consciously ignores the armies of people finding no application for their labor. Meanwhile, the position of the working class and its living standard are determined by the position and living standard of not only its active, but also its reserve part.

State unemployment benefits exist in few capitalist countries, but even where they exist (for example, in the USA), only an insignificant number of workers receive them.[93] The intensified application of methods of capitalist rationalization in recent years leads to the fact that "the worker in middle age already turns out to be more or less decrepit" (Marx); it leads to a huge growth in industrial accidents. Thus, in the USA in 1946 alone,

---

[93] In the USA, agricultural workers, 2.7 million workers and employees of small enterprises, 3 million homeworkers, etc., are not insured against unemployment

over 2 million accidents occurred across all branches of the economy, of which 16.5 thousand were fatal.[94] Meanwhile, on the eve of the Second World War, 49 capitalist countries completely lacked state health insurance, 41 countries had no old-age insurance, and 53 had no disability insurance. The bulk of the unemployed live exclusively at the expense of the earnings of those who are working. This reduces the living standard of the working class of capitalist states even further.

At an accelerated pace occurs not only the relative impoverishment of the working class—i.e., the continuous decline of its share in the national income—but its absolute impoverishment as well. Now, more than ever before, the worker in capitalist countries "is becoming downright poorer than before, forced to live worse, eat more meagerly, go hungry more often, huddle in basements and attics"[95]. In the USA, workers are forced to give more than a third of their beggarly wages, which are insufficient to feed themselves anyhow, to landlords for wretched housing.

Penal servitude labor, a semi-starvation existence, unsecured old age, premature death—such is the lot of the worker under the rule of capital. And this cannot be hidden by the learned apologists of the bourgeoisie and social-traitors with any pseudo-scientific arguments about supposedly "free" labor in capitalist countries. "It is difficult for me," Comrade Stalin said in a conversation with Roy Howard, "to imagine what kind of

---

94 See *Labor and Capital in the USA*, p. 69.

95 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 18, p. 405

'personal liberty' can be enjoyed by an unemployed person who goes hungry and finds no employment for his labor"[96].

In the position of disfranchised slaves of American capital are 14 million Negroes, who are paid the lowest wages and are not admitted either to skilled labor or to intellectual labor. Disfranchised slaves in the USA are also immigrant workers, making up to 30% of the entire labor force in American industry; they perform the hardest work and are paid worse than Anglo-Saxons. The forced labor of tens of millions of colonial slaves of British and American capital in India, at the oil developments of Iran, Iraq, Venezuela, and other Near Eastern and Latin American states, at the uranium mines of the Belgian Congo, at the gold mines of the Union of South Africa, racial discrimination and compulsory, officially legalized slave labor on the plantations of Tanganyika, Kenya, Northern and Southern Rhodesia—all this exposes the false fables of the imperialists about "free labor" in their countries.

The barbarous system of selling children and adolescents to textile factories in present-day, Americanized Japan; the trade in living merchandise in the center of Europe, in the camps of so-called "displaced persons," whom American and British monopolies turn into their slaves;[97] the projected forced

---

[96] Conversation of Comrade Stalin with the Chairman of the American Newspaper Amalgamation "Scripps-Howard Newspapers," Mr. Roy Howard, March 1, 1936, Partizdat, 1936, p. 19

[97] Conversation of Comrade Stalin with the Chairman of the American Newspaper Amalgamation Scripps-Howard Newspapers, Mr. Roy Howard, March 1, 1936, p. 19

dispatch of the unemployed from England to countries of the British Empire or from Marshallized Europe to Latin America; discrimination against women, whose labor in capitalist countries is paid much lower than the labor of men; the monstrous exploitation of cheap child labor; the forced labor of prisoners; public floggings and corporal punishments in England—all this speaks of the fact that monopoly capital, with the help of the state machine, applies not only economic, but also extra-economic methods of coercion to labor of many tens of millions of people.

The vaunted "freedom of labor" in the kingdom of capital is freedom for monopolies to squeeze all the juices out of their white and colored slaves, it is "freedom" for workers to overstrain themselves from unbearable, compulsory labor, to die a death of starvation for the enrichment of the financial oligarchy. "True freedom," Comrade Stalin said, "exists only there where exploitation has been abolished, where there is no oppression of some people by others, where there is no unemployment and pauperism, where a person does not tremble for the fact that tomorrow he may lose his work, his dwelling, his bread. Only in such a society is real, and not paper, personal and any other freedom possible"[98]. This has been proved in practice in the USSR—the country of victorious socialism—and is reaffirmed once again by the experience of the countries of people's democracy.

---

[98] Conversation of Comrade Stalin with the Chairman of the American Newspaper Amalgamation Scripps-Howard Newspapers, Mr. Roy Howard, March 1, 1936, p. 19.

The colossal growth of chronic mass unemployment in capitalist countries after the Second World War has revealed the bankruptcy of the most diverse theories of "full employment" generated by bourgeois economic thought. All apologists of the capitalist system—both "stagnationists" and "anti-stagnationists," supporters of the notorious "regulation" and opponents thereof—believe that a significant percentage of the unemployed is absolutely necessary, as Keynes expressed it, for a "well-functioning economy". By "full employment," the American Keynesian Hansen means the presence of 2.5–3 million unemployed in the USA.[99] In Beveridge's book *Full Employment in a Free Society*, the minimally "necessary" unemployment for England is defined at 3%.

What do bourgeois economists need the "necessary percentage" of unemployment for? Keynes answers this question frankly: in order to avoid a "disorderly rise in wages". No less frank is American opponent of Keynes on the part of "state regulation" Anderson. He also proclaims the "useful function of unemployment": it contributes to the establishment of "true (read: understated!—A. Sh.) wages". This is how full employment is understood by reactionary economists, this is how it is formulated in the notorious "Havana Charter" of the imperialists in 1948.

All "theories" and projects of "full employment" are designed to deceive the masses. For this purpose, apologists of capital sometimes assume the pose of "critics" and even "denouncers" of capitalist orders and propose to "improve" capitalism, to

[99] A. Hansen, *Economic Policy and Full Employment*, 1947, pp. 107–108

"limit" it, to eliminate its evils and vices, among which unemployment is numbered. Chase, in his book *The Goals of America* published in 1942, called unemployment "the cancer of modern society," "one of the few disasters that the people cannot tolerate for an unlimited time". Disguising themselves with the popular slogan of the struggle against unemployment, Chase, Keynes, and their like-minded associates sowed false illusions about the possibility within the framework of capitalism, without affecting its foundations, of reducing unemployment to a "minimum". Covering up the deepest contradictions of the capitalist mode of production, bourgeois economists limit their "research" to the sphere of distribution, look for the roots of unemployment there, and declare insufficient consumption of the masses to be the direct cause of unemployment.

Among the numerous recipes for "salvation" from unemployment, bourgeois economists and politicians especially praise public works. In reality, these public works, as the practice of all capitalist countries shows, firstly, represent one of the forms of the merging of the state with monopolies. Their goal is the pumping of budget funds, squeezed out of ordinary taxpayers, into the pockets of monopolists who brutally exploit the unemployed engaged in public works. Secondly, these works are used by the most rabid imperialists to prepare for wars.

At the heart of all "theories" and projects for reducing unemployment lies a common goal—the further plunder of working people, the reduction of the real wages of workers. Supporters of state "regulation" of the economy and opponents

of "state intervention"—Fellner, who allows "state impact" during periods of "insufficient revival" of private investments and excludes this impact during periods of their "sufficient revival," and Beveridge, who puts forward "by way of experiment" a project combining "national planning" with the system of "private enterprise"—agree with Attlee, Bevin, Morrison, Cripps, Blum, and others on general demands addressed to workers: not to strive for wage increases, not to arrange strikes, "to tighten belts harder".

Now, when four years have already passed since the end of the war and the armies of the unemployed have reached unprecedented proportions, the worthlessness of all kinds of "theories" and projects of "full employment" and similar fabrications regarding the "recovery" and "improvement" of capitalism has once again been revealed to the entire world.

The servants of the bourgeoisie resurrect Malthusian ravings. Vogt, Pearson, Harper, Paalberg, and other preachers of Malthusianism assert that available wealth and amounts of land are not in a state to feed the population of the globe. Thus they try to relieve capitalism of responsibility for unemployment, poverty, and the disasters of millions of working people. At the same time, neo-Malthusianists go much further than their priestly teacher. If the reactionary Malthus advised working people to abstain from procreation in order to reduce population growth, their modern followers establish the "maximum population" of our planet as a whole and of each country individually, implying that the remaining, "superfluous" population should simply be destroyed. Among these cannibals there is only one "disagreement": how many

people should be "left" on earth—500, 700, or 900 million people. Such calculations are set forth with insolent frankness by Vogt in his *Road to Survival* and Guy Irving on the pages of *Population Bulletin*. It is entirely natural that these misanthropic, fascist ravings appeared first of all in the United States of America—the modern center of imperialist barbarism, obscurantism, and the blackest reaction.

All this strikingly testifies to the further degradation of corrupted bourgeois economic "science". All this exposes the marasmus of bourgeois political economy, which like a lackey fulfills any social order of its monopolistic masters, down to the cynically insolent preaching of the destruction of half of the globe's population by atomic bombs.

In the problem of chronic mass unemployment, as in a focus, are reflected the deepest contradictions of decaying, parasitic, and dying capitalism in the era of its general crisis. The development of these contradictions of the capitalist mode of production in the era of imperialism and the general crisis of capitalism leads the masses to an understanding of the necessity of a decisive storming of capital.

The existence of modern capitalism is unthinkable without constant multi-million armies of the unemployed. But this does not at all mean that under capitalism the working class must not struggle and cannot achieve a certain alleviation of unemployment, a relative improvement in its position. The working class can achieve this by strengthening its political, class consciousness and the organization of its ranks, by raising to the struggle and uniting all democratic, progressive forces, without forgetting the main and decisive task—the overthrow

of the rule of capital. That is why the rapid growth of the economic struggle of the working class into a political struggle, the conquest by the proletariat of hegemony in the national liberation movements of the peoples of colonial and dependent countries, which is taking place now in all capitalist countries, is of truly world-historic significance.

The struggle of the working class led by communist parties for the liquidation of unemployment is a struggle for peace and democracy, for the unity and rallying of the ranks of the working class, for the unity of the world trade union movement, against imperialism, for socialism. The general vital interests of the unemployed and employed workers—these two detachments of the working class—require the unity of their actions. Exposing and suppressing the insidious, traitorous policy of a split, the working class defends the unity of its ranks, protects its international body—the World Federation of Trade Unions—from the onslaughts of the imperialists and, with the joint forces of both its detachments, under the leadership of communist parties, wages a struggle against capital.

To destroy unemployment, it is necessary to destroy capitalism. It is necessary that capitalism be replaced by a higher social system—the socialist one. This is shown by the experience of the Soviet Union and the countries of people's democracy. Only in the USSR—the power of victorious socialism—and in countries that have embarked on the path of socialist development does the national economy not know crises and unemployment, and the material position and cultural standard of living of working people steadily improve.

The great example of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics shows the working class, all working humanity, the sure path to the liquidation of unemployment, poverty, starvation existence, the torments of slave labor, the path of liberation from the yoke of capital.

Questions of Economics, No.9, 1949.

E. Zhukov

QUESTIONS OF THE NATIONAL-COLONIAL STRUGGLE AFTER THE SECOND WORLD WAR[100]

The struggle of oppressed peoples for their liberation has unfolded across the vast expanses of the earth and on all the continents of the world.

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

Before our very eyes, Mongolia, once the most backward of backward countries, having bypassed the agonizing capitalist path of development, is laying the foundations for the transition to socialist construction.

The Korean people, who for long decades were the object of the harshest, most brutal exploitation by Japanese barons—a people who were zealously "Japanized" in order to stifle their culture and eradicate their sense of national dignity—have become the masters of their own destiny across a significant portion of their country's territory.

Finally, the great Chinese people, whose riches for over a century attracted the greedy gazes of foreign capitalists, preachers and colonizers, generals and businessmen,

---

[100] *Revised transcript of a report delivered on June 8, 1949, at a joint meeting of the Academic Councils of the Institute of Economics and the Pacific Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, dedicated to the problems of the national-colonial movement after the Second World War.*

missionaries and bankers—a people who experienced much grief and humiliation, a people whose land was torn and ripped to shreds by English, French, Japanese, and other predators, a people whom American interventionists were trying to strangle just yesterday with their so-called "assistance"—have already achieved a great victory of historical significance. The People's Republic of China has been proclaimed, and a Central People's Government has been created headed by the glorious leader of the Chinese communists, Mao Zedong. The banner of people's democracy triumphantly flutters over the most vital centers, over industrial cities—the cradle of the Chinese working class, which is leading the people.

Southeast Asia, that ancient preserve of colonial oppression and exploitation, has turned into an arena of stubborn, bloody struggle by insurgent peoples against imperialist slaveholders.

Imperialists and their native lackeys resort to frantic terror, to prisons and gallows, to the vilest provocations, in order to keep the peoples of India, the Middle East, Central and South America in obedience for the time being.

Africa—even the most backward continent—is already beginning to seriously worry its colonial masters with manifestations of a still weak, but irresistibly growing popular resistance to civilized oppressors. The heroic uprising of the Malagasy people in Madagascar—on this huge island located near the African coast, far from the centers of revolutionary life, cut off from truthful information about the life and struggle of other peoples, hidden behind the iron curtain of the French colonial empire—this heroic uprising, drowned in blood, like lightning illuminated the tense situation in the most

remote, most secluded corners of the gloomy kingdom of imperialist robbers. The peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies no longer want to live in the old way. It is not only that the chains of colonial slavery have become unbearable for them. It is that they have seen the possibility of breaking these chains, have acquired faith in their own strength and faith in the future.

Comrade Stalin pointed out that the First World War and the victory of the revolution in the USSR "shook the foundations of imperialism in colonial and dependent countries, that the authority of imperialism in these countries has been further undermined, that it is no longer able to rule in the old way in these countries". The Second World War, the defeat of the fascist aggressors, the world-historic victory of the USSR, and the defection from the capitalist system of a number of countries that have embarked on the path of socialist development have undermined the authority of imperialism in colonial and dependent countries to an even greater, unprecedented degree, deepening the crisis of the colonial system, which is a most important component part of the general crisis of capitalism.

The peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies have seen with their own eyes the might of the forces opposing imperialism, the collapse of fascist colonial empires, the weakness and cowardice of the English "race" of old colonial masters, and the fragility of the rule of their oppressors.

Can the peoples of Burma, for example, forget how shamefully the English "masters" behaved during the Second World War? Or did the peoples of the Philippines not have the opportunity

to observe manifestations of all the "qualities" of the vaunted General MacArthur—from cowardice to perfidy? Have not many peoples of Asia been convinced from their own experience that Japanese or American, French or Italian colonizers "differ" from one another just as a blue devil differs from a white devil?

Emboldened by the victories of the USSR, the defeat of fascism, the exposure of the barbaric ideology of racism, and the weakening of their former colonial "masters," whom they learned to truly despise precisely during the years of the Second World War, the peoples of the colonies with renewed energy and faith in their own strength unfurled the banner of the struggle for freedom and independence.

The armed struggle of the peoples of a number of colonial and dependent countries for their national independence and state autonomy testifies not only to an increase in the scope of the national liberation struggle, but also to an elevation of its qualitative level. The armed struggle for the creation of independent republics in Indonesia and Indo-China, the armed struggle in Malaya and Burma, the peasant uprisings in India and, finally, the victorious liberation war of the Chinese people are vivid evidence that the national liberation movement entered a new, higher stage of its development after the Second World War.

Of decisive importance in the national liberation movement in the most important colonial countries is the leading role of the working class and its vanguard—the communist parties. We can already note with complete certainty that in the majority of colonial countries, and first of all in those countries where the

struggle against imperialism has assumed the most acute character, the working class acts as the recognized hegemon in the colonial revolution, and the communist parties—directly or through broader mass organizations—lead the national liberation movement.

It is impossible, of course, to speak of the development of the national struggle in colonies and semi-colonies, of the character of this struggle, of its direction, of its tendencies, in isolation from the general international situation. It is not difficult to see that both the very upsurge and the successes of the national liberation movement after the Second World War were entirely the result of a change in the correlation of class forces on a world scale in favor of democracy and socialism, to the detriment of imperialism, and the result of the increase in the might of the USSR. This is confirmed by the entire course of post-war historical development.

The aggressive policy of the USA, the growth of American colonial expansion after the Second World War, the formation of the Anglo-American imperialist bloc directed against the USSR, against the countries of people's democracy, against national liberation movements, on the one hand, and the active support that the Soviet Union renders to peoples fighting for their liberation, on the other, have conditioned the strengthening of the natural gravitation of the peoples of colonial and dependent countries toward the anti-imperialist, democratic camp headed by the Soviet socialist state. In the strengthening of the democratic camp lies the guarantee of further successes of the national liberation movement of colonial peoples. The formation and struggle of the two camps

—the camp of democracy and the camp of imperialism—at the same time aggravated the class struggle in all countries, contributing to a faster and clearer demarcation of opposing class forces in colonial and dependent countries as well.

The scale and successes of popular movements in Asia seriously worry the imperialist camp. They cause special trouble to the American contenders for world domination, exposing the adventurism of their plans and calculations. American imperialism, which has headed the anti-democratic camp and claims world domination, has become the leader of the colonial powers, the chief gendarme trying to save the imperialists from progressive, democratic movements throughout the world, trying to suppress the national liberation movement in all colonies and semi-colonies. US monopolists view the colonial possessions of any imperialist power as potentially their own possessions and, using various levers of political, economic, and military pressure on the so-called Marshallized countries (England, France, Holland, Belgium), overcome the resistance of their competitors and force them to pursue a policy in most colonies that meets the interests of American monopoly capital.

This policy is dictated primarily by the strategic interests of the aggressive Anglo-American imperialist bloc. It is aimed at utilizing the human and material resources of colonies and semi-colonies, primarily at obtaining cheap or gratuitous labor power, cannon fodder, and military raw materials for the purpose of preparing a new world war. This policy sets itself the task of utilizing the territories of colonies and semi-colonies as military bridgeheads and bases for Anglo-American

armed forces. Finally, this policy presupposes the merciless suppression of popular liberation movements in the colonial world.

Truman and Bevin outline the joint strategic utilization of Africa as a giant bridgehead for a new world war and at the same time as a source of military raw materials and slave labor.

The victory of democracy in China causes the Anglo-American imperialists to strive to organize a kind of "screen" or "barrier" in order to protect the sphere of their colonial plunder in Southeast and South Asia. The imperialists are mortally afraid of the prospect of the establishment of direct contact between liberated China and Vietnam, Indonesia, Malaya, Burma, where the continuous struggle of peoples for liberation is also underway. Wall Street and the City have reason to fear India as well, whence the fresh wind from China cannot fail to blow.

If the aggressive North Atlantic Pact, directed against the USSR and the countries of people's democracy, contains articles obliging its participants to carry out joint police measures against democratic forces and primarily against the labor movement in the countries of Western Europe, then the Pacific and Mediterranean pacts being prepared by the imperialists, while having the same anti-Soviet orientation, are furthermore specially aimed against the national liberation movement of colonial peoples.

However, the correlation of forces between democracy and imperialism has now changed in favor of democracy to such an extent that imperialists fail more and more often where they try

to apply the methods of open military intervention in the struggle against democracy in the old-fashioned way. The deplorable "experience" of China and Vietnam is before everyone's eyes. Therefore, without abandoning the policy of war and intervention, the colonizers are trying in every way to mask this policy. More and more often, imperialist intervention is carried out under the guise of "assistance," "support," "protection," with pious references to the United Nations.

The unprecedented upsurge of the national liberation movement of the peoples of dependent and colonial countries after the Second World War, the high level of this movement, and, above all, the revolutionizing impact exerted on colonial countries by the continuously strengthening democratic, anti-imperialist camp compel imperialists to maneuver, to change the forms of their domination in the colonies, to resort to demagogic tricks for the purpose of deceiving enslaved peoples and driving a wedge into their national anti-imperialist front. Imperialists increasingly rely not only on feudal-landlord elements, but also on the big national bourgeoisie in colonies and semi-colonies. Fearing the national liberation movement of the peoples, which has now risen to a particularly high level and is being waged under the hegemony of the working class, in the face of the ever-growing revolutionary activity of the broad masses of the people, the big bourgeoisie of the colonies and semi-colonies finally crosses over to the camp of imperialist reaction, betraying the interests of its countries and peoples.

Worried by the scope of the national liberation movement, the growth of the political consciousness of the working people,

and the leading role of the working class and communist parties in revolutionary movements in colonies and semi-colonies, the imperialist colonizers, with the help of the big bourgeoisie, using religious, racial, and other prejudices, strive to poison the consciousness of the masses with the poison of bourgeois nationalism, trying to ignite chauvinistic sentiments.

Bourgeois nationalist propaganda plays the most essential role in the aggressive plans of the imperialists. It is not only called upon to split and disunite the peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies in the interests of imperialism, but also sets itself the task of neutralizing the national liberation movement, directing it along a false, nationalistic path under the leadership of the reactionary bourgeoisie and national-reformists, who distract the masses from revolutionary methods and goals of struggle.

Bourgeois nationalism in colonies and semi-colonies is called upon to keep the popular masses under the ideological and political leadership of the big bourgeoisie, which has already crossed over into the imperialist camp in the majority of colonial countries. Bourgeois nationalism is specially directed against the joining of popular liberation movements in colonial and dependent countries with the anti-imperialist, democratic camp. Bourgeois nationalism is a most important ideological weapon used by the Anglo-American aggressive bloc for the purpose of strengthening the shaky colonial system of imperialism.

That is why the merciless exposure of reactionary, bourgeois-nationalist ideology in its various forms—whether Kemalism or Gandhism, Zionism or Pan-Arabism—accelerates the process of national and social liberation of the peoples of

colonial and dependent countries, frustrating the provocative calculations of the imperialists and their agents.

Just as in developed capitalist countries right-socialist traitors of the working class try to spread the rotten idea about the possibility of a certain "third," middle path between communism and capitalism, while in fact they actively serve as forces of imperialist reaction plotting war against the USSR and the countries of people's democracy, so national-reformists in colonial and semi-colonial countries falsely harp on their desire to "remain aloof" from the struggle of the two camps, on their "neutrality" regarding, as they express it, the "ideological conflict" between the USSR and the USA, but in reality, blocbing with the reactionary bourgeoisie, they slander the USSR and actively help the imperialists.

Everyone knows the vile role played in Indonesia by Sutan Sjahrir, who sold out to American imperialists. There is no vile slander that the so-called Indian "socialists" do not spread against the USSR. The English puppet in Burma—Thakin Nu —also calls himself a "socialist."

The bloc of Anglo-American imperialist colonizers with the national bourgeoisie and its national-reformist minions in the majority of the most important colonial countries allows the imperialists to make broader use of bourgeois-democratic, reformist illusions to deceive the masses, allowing them to replace overt, crude forms and methods of colonial governance with more refined and hidden forms (granting dominion status, "independence," the establishment of "allied" treaty relations on the principles of formal equality of the parties).

In reality, however, the "equality" of the Philippines and the USA or of Iraq and England is a farce, just as the French bourgeoisie's attempts to mask colonial oppression in its overseas possessions under the signboard of the "French Union" are a farce.

As a result of the "new course" of the imperialists in the colonies and semi-colonies, the big national bourgeoisie is frequently admitted to power by them alongside landowners and other feudal elements. It uses this power for the most savage and merciless suppression of the mass liberation movement of workers, peasants, and progressive intelligentsia. The situation in India shows that the big national bourgeoisie is in no way inferior in cruelty and reactionariness either to the feudal lords or to the imperialist colonizers. This contributes to the fact that new bourgeois-democratic reformist forms and methods of administration intended to mask the preservation of imperialist domination in the colonies are quickly exposed and turn out to be low in effectiveness. Thus, the popular masses in the colonies and semi-colonies are brought at an accelerated pace to an understanding of the falsehood and hypocrisy of bourgeois pseudo-democracy. On the other hand, the mounting mass national liberation movement led by the proletariat causes ever greater fury among reactionary forces, which throw off the fig leaves of bourgeois democracy and increasingly resort to overtly fascist, terrorist means.

The example of India in this respect is particularly convincing. The Indian bourgeoisie now competes with the most reactionary forces in the suppression of the mass popular movement, in terror against progressive elements of the worker

and peasant movement. The metamorphosis of Nehru, who turned from a left-wing Congressite and denouncer of imperialism into an ally of Indian princes and landowners, a bloody strangler of progressive forces in India, a clever servant of two masters in England and the USA, clearly shows this. But such is the logic of the class struggle: there can be no "middle position" between imperialism and democracy.

Bourgeois-democratic institutions in colonial countries, as a rule, called into life by the post-war course of imperialists toward masking their rule, show their insolvency: they ensure neither the democratization of the country nor the weakening of imperialist oppression. Bourgeois democracy everywhere, including in the colonies, is incapable of carrying out even limited bourgeois reforms.

The demarcation of opposing class forces on a world scale, the formation of two camps and the struggle between them, and the world-historic role of the Soviet Union as the mainstay of all progressive forces contributed to a huge extent to the working class becoming the hegemon in the national liberation movement in the majority of colonial and dependent countries. The leading role of the proletariat in the anti-imperialist struggle, as well as the old and new—post-war—historical experience contributing to the further exposure of bourgeois democracy, which is incapable of ensuring the achievement of genuine independence and is not aimed at carrying out effective democratic transformations, have given the national liberation movement the character of a struggle not for bourgeois democracy, but for people's democracy.

People's democracy, as a special form of power corresponding to the transitional period from capitalism to socialism and made possible thanks to the victory of socialism in the USSR and the strengthening of democratic forces throughout the world, not only fully meets the interests of the broadest working masses of the colonies and semi-colonies, but is also easily understandable to them and practically feasible. People's democracy is in a position to ensure both liberation from the imperialist yoke and the implementation of genuinely democratic transformations creating the necessary prerequisites for the transition to socialist construction.

In the struggle for people's democracy in colonies and semi-colonies, not only workers, the peasantry, the urban petty bourgeoisie, and the intelligentsia unite, but even a certain part of the middle bourgeoisie interested in getting rid of ruinous foreign competition and imperialist oppression. Thus, the struggle for people's democracy is capable of uniting under the leadership of the working class the overwhelming majority of the people. This means that the people's democratic revolution can easily become the form of the national liberation struggle, the form of the colonial revolution.

The successful experience of people's democratic construction in North Korea and on the liberated territory of China, the popularity of the slogan of the struggle for people's democracy in the overwhelming majority of colonial and dependent countries fighting for their liberation, vividly confirm the correctness and feasibility of the people's democratic path of national and social liberation, the path of movement towards

socialism for formerly colonial countries lagging behind in their development.

All post-war development in the colonial world, proceeding under the banner of the exposure and weakening of reaction and the growth of revolutionary forces, under the banner of the strengthening and further intensification of the mighty camp of democracy and socialism, has led to the national liberation movement of the peoples of many countries naturally growing into the struggle for people's democracy.

At the same time, it would be wrong to ignore the essential features distinguishing people's democracy in colonial and dependent countries liberating themselves from imperialism from people's democracy in the countries of Central and Southeastern Europe. The first and main difference is that, insofar as it concerns colonial and dependent countries whose cultural and economic development was especially retarded and artificially hindered by imperialism, the scope of bourgeois-democratic tasks set before people's democracy in these countries will be significantly larger than in other, less backward and more developed countries that did not know or almost did not know colonial oppression.

It is quite understandable that the people's democratic revolution in colonies and semi-colonies cannot but bear primarily an anti-imperialist and anti-feudal character. From this it follows that the people's democratic revolution in colonies in its development must pass through a number of successive stages, and the terms of transition to the solution of socialist tasks, to the construction of socialist economy in these

countries may turn out to be more protracted than in other countries of people's democracy that were not colonies.

The stages of development of the people's democratic revolution in colonies and semi-colonies, essentially expressing the process of its growing over into a socialist revolution, will be determined in each country by the specific features of its historical path and the correlation of class forces inside the country and on a world scale.

The Common Program adopted by the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference shows that the People's Republic of China "exercises the dictatorship of people's democracy led by the working class, based on the alliance of workers and peasants and uniting all democratic classes and all national minorities of China."

The People's Republic wages a struggle against imperialism, feudalism, and bureaucratic capital and sets itself the task to "abolish all privileges of imperialist countries in China, confiscate bureaucratic capital and transfer it to the ownership of the people's state; systematically carry out the transformation of the feudal and semi-feudal system of landownership into a system of peasant landownership; safeguard the public property of the state and the property of cooperatives, protect the economic interests and private property of workers, peasants, the petty bourgeoisie, and the national bourgeoisie; develop the people's economy of the new democracy and steadily transform the country from an agricultural into an industrial one."

The Chairman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, Mao Zedong, wrote in the article "On the Dictatorship of People's Democracy," published in *Pravda* on July 6, 1949: "The experience of several decades accumulated by the Chinese people tells us of the necessity of establishing the dictatorship of people's democracy. This means that the reactionaries must be deprived of the right to express their opinion and only the people can have the right to vote, the right to express their opinion... The democratic system must be carried out among the people, granting them freedom of speech, assembly, and association. The right to vote is granted only to the people, but not to reactionaries. These two aspects, namely democracy among the people and dictatorship over reactionaries, constitute the dictatorship of people's democracy."

The political and economic program of Chinese people's democracy is calculated for the systematic increase of the specific gravity of public, state property, which is the foundation of further progressive development.

The general laws of social development of both Eastern and Western countries are the same. One can speak only of the difference in tempos or specific forms of this development. In this sense, people's democracy in the East in its main features does not differ from people's democracy in the West.

Lenin and Stalin teach that an unconditional requirement in assessing the revolutionary movement is taking into account its local features, the nationally specific, and a concrete approach in each country "to the solution of a single international task." Since the task itself is single and international, it is a question

of how best to apply general, single, international principles to particular, concrete, national conditions.

The development of the national liberation struggle in colonies and semi-colonies, the development of the struggle against imperialism has already been crowned with major successes, which testifies to the greatest aggravation of the general crisis of the capitalist system. The growing liberation movement of the peoples of colonial and dependent countries acts as a reliable ally and mighty reserve of the camp of democracy and socialism, opposing the forces of imperialism and reaction. The People's Republic of China is already an inseparable component part of the anti-imperialist camp fighting for peace and democracy headed by the Soviet Union.

The entire course of the national-colonial struggle, the major victories won by the forces of democracy in East Asia, are vivid confirmation of the correctness of the Leninist-Stalinist doctrine on the national-colonial question, a demonstration of the triumph of the all-conquering ideas of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin.

Questions of Economics, No.9, 1949.

V. Maslennikov

ON THE LEADING ROLE OF THE WORKING CLASS IN THE NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT OF COLONIAL PEOPLES

Revised transcript of a report delivered on June 8, 1949, at the joint meeting of the academic councils of the Institute of Economics and the Pacific Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, dedicated to the problems of the national-colonial movement after the second world war.

Lenin and Stalin developed a completed doctrine on socialist and national-colonial revolutions. One of its cornerstones is the doctrine of the leading role of the proletariat in these revolutions. "Only the proletariat can be a consistent fighter for democracy," Lenin wrote. "It can prove to be a victorious fighter for democracy only on condition that the mass of the peasantry joins its revolutionary struggle"[101].

The Great October Socialist Revolution won because it was headed by the revolutionary working class of Russia with its vanguard tested in political battles—the Bolshevik Party; it won because the working class of Russia had such a serious ally in the revolution as the peasant poor, who constituted the overwhelming majority of the peasant population of the country. The experience of the revolutionary struggle in Russia

[101] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. 9, p. 44

has had and has tremendous significance for the national liberation movement of the peoples of colonies, semi-colonies, and dependent countries. The successes of the national liberation movement in the post-war period and above all the historic victory of the Chinese people, who routed the Kuomintang clique and created the People's Republic of China, are the most vivid demonstration of the triumph of the Leninist-Stalinist doctrine on the national-colonial revolution, the doctrine on the leading role of the proletariat in this revolution.

Comrade Stalin pointed out that after the Great October, the era of serene exploitation and oppression of colonies and dependent countries has passed and that the era of liberation revolutions in colonies and dependent countries has arrived, the era of the awakening of the proletariat of these countries, the era of its hegemony in the revolution. "...The October Revolution opened a new era, the era of colonial revolutions carried out in the oppressed countries of the world in alliance with the proletariat, under the leadership of the proletariat"[102].

The Great October Socialist Revolution smashed the chains of national-colonial oppression in tsarist Russia and liberated from it all oppressed peoples of our state without exception. "Precisely because the national-colonial revolutions took place among us under the leadership of the proletariat and under the banner of internationalism, precisely for this reason, pariah peoples, slave peoples for the first time in the history of mankind rose to the position of peoples truly free and truly

---

[102] J. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, 11th ed., p. 178

equal, infecting with their example the oppressed peoples of the whole world"[103]. The oppressed peoples of colonial and semi-colonial countries received in the person of the Soviet Union a mainstay and a loyal friend in the struggle against imperialism.

After the Great October Socialist Revolution, the national liberation movement of oppressed peoples, growing ever stronger, continuously shakes the rear of imperialism. Giving his classical definition of the general crisis of capitalism, Comrade Stalin pointed out as one of its main features that "the imperialist war and the victory of the revolution in the USSR shattered the foundations of imperialism in colonial and dependent countries, that the authority of imperialism in these countries has already been undermined, that it is no longer able to rule in the old way in these countries"[104].

The struggle of the peoples of colonial and dependent countries of Eastern and Southeast Asia, the Middle East, and Africa for freedom and independence, against imperialist oppressors, is characterized by differences in forms and scope in different countries. This difference is determined by the correlation of class forces in these countries, the degree of their industrial development, the level of revolutionary consciousness and organization of the proletariat, and the successes of its struggle for hegemony in the national liberation movement, for allies,

---

[103] J. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, 11th ed., p. 178

[104] *Lenin and Stalin*, Collection of Works for the Study ofвича the History of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks). Partizdat, 1936, vol. III, p. 428

first of all for the peasantry, which constitutes the majority of the population of colonies and semi-colonies.

China occupied the leading place инвича the revolutionary movement of oppressed peoples in the period between the first and second world wars.

Comrade Stalin devoted great attention to the questions of the Chinese revolution. He showed that a characteristic feature of the Chinese revolution is the struggle between two paths: the path of the national bourgeoisie, which wants to crush the proletariat, enter into a deal with imperialism, and go together with it on a campaign against revolution in order to end it with the establishment of the domination of capitalism, and another path—the path of the proletariat, which pursues the goal of pushing the national bourgeoisie aside and consolidating its hegemony, leading behind itself the millions-strong masses of working people in town and country in order to overcome the resistance of the national bourgeoisie and achieve complete victory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution and then gradually transfer it onto the rails of the socialist revolution.

The implementation of tasks on winning and consolidating the hegemony of the proletariat, carrying out the democratic revolution, and creating conditions for socialist construction requires a prolonged and stubborn struggle.

In this struggle, the Communist Party of China relied on the great teaching of Marx - Engels - Lenin - Stalin, on the great historical experience of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks). In the article "On the Dictatorship of People's Democracy", written in connection with the 28th anniversary

of the Chinese Communist Party celebrated on July 1, 1949, the Chairman ofвича the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China Mao Zedong wrote: "We had to fight with enemies inside the country and abroad, inside the party and outside it. We are grateful to Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, who gave us weapons. This weapon is not machine guns, but Marxism-Leninism... The Chinese found Marxism as a result of its application by the Russians. Before the October Revolution, the Chinese not only did not know Lenin and Stalin, they also did not know Marx and Engels. The cannon salvos of the October Revolution brought Marxism-Leninism to us. The October Revolution helped progressive elements of the world and China to apply the proletarian worldview to determine the fate of the country and review their own problems. To follow the path of the Russians—such was the conclusion"[105].

The main mainstay of foreign imperialism in China was the feudal-militarist groupings. Foreign imperialists, using one or another militarist clique, waged a struggle to expand their spheres of influence in China. Feudal remnants, aggravated by the yoke of militarism and the arbitrariness of bureaucracy, dominated the country. The reactionary government, to please foreign capital, strangled national industry. The Chinese industrial bourgeoisie, which significantly multiplied its capitals and increased production during the First World War, was in opposition to foreign imperialists, who preferred at that time to use comprador trade capital for their operations. In these conditions, the national bourgeoisie joined the ranks of

---

[105] *Pravda*, July 6, 1949

the united front to fight for its interests, against imperialism and feudal-militarist cliques.

The revolutionary struggle of workers and peasants against feudal-official yoke, against militarism and imperialism, began in China immediately after the October Revolution in Russia and after the end of the First World War. In 1921, the Communist Party was formalized in China, and already in the following year it led the strike struggle of workers. This struggle had tremendous political significance. The hegemony of the proletariat in the Chinese revolution would have been impossible if the Communist Party of China had not created powerful mass proletarian organizations from the very first steps of its activity, if these organizations and above all trade unions had not been under the leadership of the Communist Party, if the Communist Party had not managed to head the labor movement and lead it along the revolutionary path, along the path of its connection with socialism. In June 1923, at the Third Congress ofвича the Communist Party, a decision was adopted on the party's entry into the Kuomintang. By this time, the Communist Party already possessed solid experience of revolutionary leadership of the labor movement. After the Kuomintang congress in 1924 adopted the resolution proposed by Sun Yat-sen on admitting peasants and workers as members of the Kuomintang, a basis was created in China for the formation of a united front against foreign imperialism and reactionary militarists.

Comrade Stalin points out that a united front with the national bourgeoisie at the first stage of the colonial revolution does not at all mean that communists should not sharpen the struggle of

workers and peasants against landlords and the national bourgeoisie, that the proletariat should sacrifice its independence even to the slightest degree, even for a single minute. "The united front can have revolutionary significance only in the case and only under the condition that it does not prevent the Communist Party from conducting its independent political and organizational work, organizing the proletariat into an independent political force, raising the peasantry against landlords, organizing an open revolution of workers and peasants, and thus preparing the conditions for the hegemony of the proletariat"[106].

The Chinese proletariat, strengthening its ranks and hardening itself in the strike struggle against foreign capital, fought at the same time to expand its influence among the broad working masses. The party of the proletariat—its advanced and organized detachment—grew and strengthened. If in 1925 the Communist Party of China numbered 2 thousand members, already by 1927 the number of members of the Chinese Communist Party increased to 60 thousand people. In these years, the Communist Party led major strike battles; it managed to significantly increase the number of trade unions. If at the First Congress of Trade Unions of China, convened in 1925 on the initiative of the Communist Party, representatives from 230 thousand organized workers of China were present, in 1927 the number of workers organized in trade unions reached 3 million people. The revolutionary movement embraced tens of millions of toiling peasants of China. Finally, the Communist Party managed to attract entire regiments and divisions of national

---

[106] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 10, pp. 16–17

troops to its side. "...The Chinese Communist Party managed during this time to turn the idea of the hegemony of the proletariat from a wish into a fact...", Comrade Stalin wrote[107].

The achievement of successes by the Communist Party in the struggle for the hegemony of the proletariat in the national liberation movement was significantly facilitated by the fact that the bourgeoisie in China was weak and unorganized. The big national bourgeoisie, fearing the scope of the revolutionary movement of working people, went over to the camp of counter-revolution. Relying on the help of foreign imperialists, the bourgeoisie strove to stop the revolution at the "first step" in order to subsequently strangle it. However, the bourgeois nationalists who seized state power in China with the help of foreign imperialists failed to stop the Chinese revolution.

"If the first stage was distinguished by the fact that the edge of the revolution was directed mainly against foreign imperialism, the characteristic feature of the second stage is the fact that the revolution directs its edge mainly against internal enemies and above all against feudals, against the feudal regime"[108].

The exposure of the big comprador national bourgeoisie as the agency of English and American imperialism and the merciless struggle against it were the most important task of the working class of China at the second stage of the revolution. The Chinese revolution entered the higher phase of its development, the phase ofвича the agrarian revolution. The agrarian revolution assumed wide proportions and seriously

---

107 J. V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 10, p. 36

108 *Ibid.*, p. 25

frightened the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia as well, which in the person of the Wuhan leadership of the Kuomintang also went over to the camp of counter-revolution. This meant that the revolution suffered a temporary defeat. "But on the other hand," as Comrade Stalin pointed out, "it more closely rallied around the proletariat the broad masses of the peasantry and urban poor, thereby creating the soil for proletarian hegemony"[109].

On the basis of the peasant partisan movement led by the Communist Party of China, a many-thousand-strong Red Army was created, and the first hotbeds of democratic power arose in the country. At the First All-Chinese Congress of Soviets, representing up to 60 million people, the new democratic power of China—the Soviet power—was formalized in November 1931.

The new organs of revolutionary power were organs of uprising against the existing Kuomintang power, organs of struggle for a new, democratic power. At the same time, they were organs of carrying out the agrarian bourgeois-democratic revolution in China, which was far from completed. The new, democratic power became a powerful attractive revolutionary center for all progressive elements of the country in their struggle against the counter-revolutionary Kuomintang.

After Japan's attack on China, the Chinese Red Army, for the purpose of creating and strengthening a united national front, was reorganized into the People's Liberation Army and turned

---

[109] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 9, p. 344

into the main force of the struggle against the Japanese invaders.

The democratic power that was created in the areas liberated from the Japanese invaders by the People's Liberation Army and partisan detachments of China during the Sino-Japanese war of 1937–1945 was all-people's power. It enjoyed the trust and support of the population not only of the democratic regions, but of all China.

Industrial enterprises in the liberated areas passed into all-people ownership; peasants received land; the power of capitalists, landlords, and foreign capital was liquidated; the block of working strata of the population headed by the working class, under the leadership of the Communist Party, became the main leading force. For the first time, the Chinese people had the opportunity to verify from their own experience what truly popular, democratic power represents.

By the end of the Second World War, the leading influence of the Communist Party of China extended to 18 liberated areas with a population of 140 million people. The Communist Party won enormous authority and respect of the majority of the population of the entire country. The hegemony of the working class of China and its leading influence on the peasantry was thus not only won, but passed the test of historical experience.

In the course of the agrarian revolution that unfolded under the leadership of the Communist Party on a significant territory of China, the leading role of the proletariat in the national liberation struggle rose, and its influence in the peasant masses grew. At this stage of the Chinese revolution, the Communist

Party attracted not only the proletariat and peasantry, but also the democratic strata of the national bourgeoisie to the struggle for the democratization of the country.

China occupied a vanguard position in the revolutionary movement of the peoples of colonies and semi-colonies in the period between the first and second world wars. But on the colonial front in that period, many other weak links of the imperialist chain were formed, in which a serious threat to the domination of imperialists arose. The national liberation movement of the Indian people rose to a great height in this period.

India occupies one of the first places among colonial countries in terms of the numerical strength of the proletariat. If the total number of factory-and-plant workers in China in 1927, according to the Chinese census, did not exceed 1,500 thousand people, in India in the same year the urban proletariat exceeded 3.5 million people. In India, as in China, not only the factory-and-plant proletariat participated in the revolutionary national liberation movement. Active participants in the mass revolutionary struggle—the forerunners of which were undoubtedly the most organized and disciplined factory-and-plant workers—were also tens of millions of peasants, millions of artisans working in small manufacturing enterprises, port workers, coolies, rickshaws, and other urban poor.

The Indian proletariat, already from the end of the 19th century —i.e., significantly earlier than the Chinese—began to actively participate in the strike struggle, which frequently grew into political struggle. In 1905, India's textile workers conducted a strike directed against attempts by capitalists to lengthen the

working day. In 1906, a general political strike of Bengal railwaymen broke out; in May 1907, Punjab railwaymen refused to transport troops sent by British imperialists to suppress the peasant uprising. In 1908, in connection with the general political strike of Indian textile workers, Lenin wrote: "The proletariat in India has also matured for a conscious political mass struggle"[110].

The labor movement in India acquired a wide scope in 1918–1922. Along with powerful strikes, unprecedented in the history of India, mass demonstrations and meetings of working people took place. After the bloody shootings of a workers' demonstration in Amritsar in 1919, the national liberation movement engulfed the entire country. During the revolutionary upsurge of 1930–1932, as well as on the eve of the Second World War, the proletariat of India for the first time acted as an independent political force. The peasant movement also assumed wide proportions in India, which both in 1919–1922 and in 1930–1932 resulted in a number of places in armed uprisings, pogroms of landlord estates, and confiscation of landlord grain. The Indian people struck powerful blows at the rears of the capitalist system; its struggle helped the international proletariat, shaking the positions of imperialism.

Still, the revolutionary movement in India in its scope and results lagged far behind the revolutionary movement in China. The struggle of the working class of India for hegemony in the national liberation movement was not crowned with such successes as in China. In the struggle for its hegemony in the

---

[110] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. 15, p. 161

revolutionary movement, the Indian working class encountered a very strong adversary in the person of British imperialism, which suppressed and disunited the national liberation movement by all means at its disposal.

British imperialism, applying merciless and bloody terror and all kinds of repressive measures against the national liberation movement of the peoples of colonies and semi-colonies, at the same time widely used bourgeois national-reformism. National-reformism, the bearer of which in colonies and semi-colonies is the national bourgeoisie, like any reformism, rejects the revolutionary path of liberating the country from the yoke of imperialism. National-reformists, deceiving working people, reiterate that it is possible to achieve freedom and independence through the gradual implementation of reforms.

The Communist Party of China managed in the course of many years of struggle to smash national reformism and isolate its bearers—the national bourgeoisie and urban petty bourgeoisie—from the broad masses of the working class and peasantry. "...the national bourgeoisie," Mao Zedong said in the article cited above, "cannot be the leader in the revolution, nor should it occupy a leading position in the state, because the social and economic position of the national bourgeoisie determines its weakness, its lack of foresight, lack of courage, and also determines in many of its representatives fear of the masses. Sun Yat-sen called for the 'awakening of the masses' or for 'rendering assistance to peasants and workers.' Who is going to awaken them and help them? According to Sun Yat-sen, these are the petty bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie. However, in reality this is unrealizable. Sun Yat-sen's 40 years

of revolutionary work ended in failure. Why? Because in the era of imperialism the petty bourgeoisie and national bourgeoisie cannot successfully lead any genuine revolution. Our 28-year experience is completely different. We have received precious experience, and the main thing in this experience is the following three factors: A party possessing discipline, armed with the theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, utilizing the method of self-criticism and closely connected with the masses; an army led by this party; a united front of various revolutionary strata of society and groups led by this party. This distinguishes us from our predecessors. Relying on these three factors, we won the main victory, passed a difficult path, and waged a struggle against right and left opportunist tendencies in the party"[111].

In China, national reformism never had such strong influence as in India. The influence of the big Chinese bourgeoisie increased during the Northern Expedition and the cooperation of the Kuomintang with the Communist Party of China. But it quickly lost this influence after it betrayed the national revolution and openly turned into the counter-revolutionary agency of Anglo-American imperialists. At the same time, significant strata of the petty and middle bourgeoisie of China, oppressed by foreign imperialism and big bureaucratic capital, were more and more closely connected with the united revolutionary front led by the Communist Party of China.

National reformism began to strengthen and spread its influence in India after the founding of the National Congress

---

[111] *Pravda*, July 6, 1949

in 1885. The Indian bourgeoisie, blocking with the liberal part of landlords, strove through gradual reforms within the framework of the colonial oppression regime to strengthen its economic positions and convince the masses of the "inexpediency" of revolutionary struggle. Spreading illusions about the possibility of achieving independence through reformist means and about "decolonization by the hands of imperialists", the national bourgeoisie of India retained influence in the masses of Indian working people.

Comrade Stalin as early as 1925 pointed out that the national bourgeoisie of India split into revolutionary and conciliationist parties and that the conciliationist part of this bourgeoisie had already managed to come to terms in the main with imperialism. Comrade Stalin emphasized at the same time that the conciliationist part of the Indian bourgeoisie concludes a bloc with imperialism against the workers and peasants of its own country. "It is impossible to achieve the victory of the revolution without smashing this bloc. But to smash this bloc, it is necessary to concentrate fire against the conciliationist national bourgeoisie, exposing its betrayal, freeing the working masses from its influence, and systematically preparing the conditions necessary for the hegemony of the proletariat. In other words, the point is to prepare the proletariat in such colonies as India for the role of leader of the liberation movement, step by step pushing the bourgeoisie and its mouthpieces off this honorable post. To create a revolutionary anti-imperialist bloc and ensure the hegemony of the proletariat in this bloc—such is the task"[112].

---

[112] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 7, p. 148

Comrade Stalin teaches that the independence of the communist party "must be the main slogan of the advanced elements of communism, for the hegemony of the proletariat can be prepared and carried out only by the communist party"[113]. In India, however, there was still no organized communist party at that time. The Workers' and Peasants' Party, formalized in November 1925, was the first organization that united disparate communist groups in the country, but it also included representatives of the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia, among whom there were left social-reformists. Social-reformists penetrate into the environment of the working class as agents of the national bourgeoisie and, putting democratic and socialist phraseology into play, strive to subordinate it to the influence of the national bourgeoisie. The influence of social-reformism affected the activity of communist organizations of India, the formation of trade unions, and the policy of their leadership. In individual groups that were part of the Workers' and Peasants' Party, factional struggle took place. The expulsion in 1928 of the renegade Roy, who stoked factional struggle in the party, improved the situation. But remnants of social-reformism still made themselves felt in the future.

Trade union organizations of India immediately after their founding in 1918–1920 were headed by bourgeois elements and among them social-reformists who pursued a conciliationist policy. In 1929, a split of the Indian trade union movement occurred, and by 1931 three leading professional centers had formed in the country: the All-Indian Federation of

---

113 *Ibid.*

Trade Unions, headed by right-wing reformists; the All-Indian Trade Union Congress under the leadership of "leftists"; and the Red Trade Union Congress, uniting revolutionary organizations of the Indian proletariat. The split of the labor movement of India negatively affected the further development of the anti-imperialist struggle of Indian working people, which bore an insufficiently organized character.

At the end of 1933, an organizational unification of previously disparate communist groups into a single communist party took place in India. From this time on, the working class of India, under the leadership of the Communist Party, began to appear on the political arena of the country as an independent force and, essentially for the first time, waged a struggle against the bourgeoisie for hegemony in the national liberation movement. In 1935, through the merger of the Red and All-Indian Trade Union Congresses, the United Trade Union Congress of India was formed, and the strength and scope of the professional movement in the country sharply increased. The growth of the Communist Party's influence in the masses alarmed British imperialists and their stooges from among the Indian bourgeoisie. In 1934, the Communist Party of India was declared illegal.

On the eve of the Second World War, the revolutionary struggle in India intensified anew. The strike movement embraced huge masses of workers, and capitalists were frequently forced to make concessions. Workers of the jute industry of Bengal, textile workers in Kanpur, railwaymen, etc., went on strike. The working class, hardening itself in struggle, became the most organized and powerful detachment

of the anti-imperialist forces of India. The communists' idea of creating a united anti-imperialist front in India found wide response and approval from the overwhelming majority of working people. In 1936, new peasant unions arose, which were mainly led by communists.

In 1942, after eight years of underground existence, the Communist Party was legalized. The emergence of the Communist Party from the underground and the strengthening of its ties with the masses led to the growth and organizational strengthening of the party. Numerical strength grew from 4 thousand members in 1942 to 16 thousand members in 1943. In June 1943, the First Congress of the Communist Party of India took place, which stated that the party's influence had significantly increased not only among workers, but also among peasants and the intelligentsia.

However, the old leadership of the Communist Party still did not rid itself of reformist influence, which affected the party's policy during the Second World War. The "Mountbatten Plan" on the partition of India and on granting dominion status to India and Pakistan, which was nothing other than a deal of British imperialism with the Indian bourgeois apex, a new form of economic and political dependence of these dominions on British imperialism, was evaluated by the previous leadership of the Indian Communist Party as a certain "step forward", and not as a new form of offensive by British imperialism against the people of India. After the partition of India into two dominions, the leadership of the Communist Party issued a decision on supporting Nehru's bourgeois government and on the "expediency" of forming a united national front from

"Gandhi to the communists". This reformist line was subjected to decisive criticism and condemned at the Second Congress of the Indian Communist Party, held in February–March 1948.

Thus developed the struggle of the working class of the two largest countries of the East for the leading role in the national liberation movement in the period between the first world war and the end of the second world war. Guided by the teaching of Lenin and Stalin on the national-colonial revolution, the working class, headed by communist parties, became the main force in China and India in the struggle for national independence and freedom of the multi-million peoples of these countries.

After the Second World War, the might and international authority of the Soviet Union increased immeasurably. The great victory of the Soviet people in the Patriotic War demonstrated with new force before the whole world the advantages of socialism over capitalism.

As a result of the war and the victory of the Soviet Army, the breach in the world system of imperialism widened; a number of countries of Central and Southeast Europe dropped away from it—the countries of people's democracy, which embarked on the path of building the foundations of socialism. The revolutionary anti-imperialist front of oppressed peoples acquired a more powerful mainstay than before.

For the successful unfolding of the popular liberation movement in colonial and dependent countries, the help and support of the Soviet Union, which exposes the aggressive

policy and criminal actions of the Anglo-American bloc before the whole world, are of inestimable significance.

The Soviet Army, which drove the Japanese occupiers out of Manchuria and Northern Korea, prevented the intervention of imperialists in these regions and prevented counter-revolutionary forces from seizing power there. The Soviet people thus not only liberated the peoples of China and Korea from the yoke of Japanese occupiers, but also created conditions in China and Northern Korea favorable for the organization and strengthening of the popular-democratic regime.

"If the Soviet Union did not exist," Mao Zedong wrote, "if there were no victory in the anti-fascist Second World War, if —what is especially important for us—Japanese imperialism were not defeated, if countries of new democracy did not appear in Europe, if there were no growing struggle of the oppressed countries of the East, if there were no struggle of the popular masses in the United States, England, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, and other capitalist countries against the ruling reactionary clique, if all these factors did not exist, then the pressure of international reactionary forces, of course, would be much stronger than it is now. Could we have achieved victory under such circumstances? Of course not. Just as it would be impossible to consolidate victory after its achievement"[114].

A sharp increase in the unevenness of development of imperialist countries, inevitably leading to the emergence of

---

[114] *Pravda*, July 6, 1949

new acute contradictions, disagreements, and conflicts between them, is of tremendous significance for the national liberation movement in colonies and semi-colonies after the Second World War. American imperialism, fattened on the war and on people's blood, is trying after the Second World War to redivide the world in accordance with the changed correlation of imperialist forces. In the struggle to establish its world domination, American monopoly capital constantly comes into contradiction with the interests of imperialist predators who weakened after the war. The main contradiction in the imperialist camp—the Anglo-American contradiction—sharpened sharply.

England during the war weakened ties with its colonies; it turned out to be in military-economic dependence on American food and manufactured goods supplies. Although after the war English imperialists returned their colonies, they encountered the intensified influence of the USA there. American capital is penetrating ever more broadly into the countries of the British Empire; in their trade it now occupies almost the same place as English capital. The USA does not release England from the pincers of financial-economic dependence and gradually takes away control over colonies from it, ousts it from former "spheres of influence", and reduces it to the position of its vassal. The positions of France, Belgium, and Holland in their colonial empires are being undermined more and more. The "Marshallization" of the main European imperialist metropolises increasingly turns them into satellites of the USA. Despite this, English, French, Dutch, and Belgian imperialists resist the growing penetration of American capital into their

colonies and try to strengthen their own positions in them. All this causes extreme instability and extreme fragility of the general front of imperialism in colonies.

At the same time, imperialists of various countries under the aegis of American imperialists act jointly when it comes to suppressing the national liberation movement of oppressed peoples.

The Second World War gave an impetus to the development of national industry in colonial, semi-colonial, and dependent countries. The expansion of industrial production in the colonial world during the war was conditioned, on the one hand, by the cessation of the import of necessary food and consumer goods from metropolises, and on the other hand, by the increase in the metropolises' needs for military-strategic raw materials and various other materials necessary for conducting military operations. This contributed to the development of mining and raw-material industry in colonies, the construction of military plants and factories belonging to imperialists on the local raw-material base, as well as an increase in the number of small manufacturing-type industrial enterprises, the growth of domestic industry and crafts.

However, despite a certain industrial development of a number of colonies and dependent countries, they remained in a colonial position as before. "This is a special method of imperialism—to develop industry in colonies in such a way that it is tethered to the metropolis, to imperialism"[115].

---

[115] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 8, p. 121

The development of industry in colonies and semi-colonies bore deformed forms and a one-sided character. At the same time, it led to the growth of the national proletariat. The Indian proletariat increased by almost 1 million people. Simultaneously, a process of intensified differentiation of the peasantry took place in the colonies, and the agricultural proletariat increased.

During the war, imperialists pumped out valuables from colonies and semi-colonies in enormous quantities; the colonial population was doomed to famine and extinction.

The intensification of plunder and exploitation of colonies by imperialist metropolis-powers extremely aggravated contradictions in the colonies and semi-colonies themselves. Imperialists tried to expand their social base in colonial countries, intensively drawing over to their side the big national bourgeoisie, which served as their tool for pumping out valuables and for the even greater enslavement of colonial peoples. With the help of imperialists, the ruling groups of the local big bourgeoisie became centers of anti-democratic struggle in colonies and semi-colonies. These groups of the national bourgeoisie in some countries, as for example in India and China, turned into large monopolistic-comprador amalgamations with the support of imperialists.

The "Four Families" in China—Chiang Kai-shek, Chen Li-fu, T. V. Soong, and H. H. Kung—provided a vivid example of such monopolistic alliances. All political and economic power in Kuomintang China belonged to them. With the help of American imperialists, they concentrated huge capitals and natural wealth of the country in their hands. They applied not

only capitalist, but also pre-capitalist methods of exploitation, acting as the most typical representatives of big financial capital closely merged with both the state apparatus and foreign capital.

Indian monopolistic amalgamations, like Chinese ones, received huge profits during the war, which significantly increased their economic strength. The leaders of the Birla, Tata, Dalmia, and other companies did not object to the adoption of anti-English resolutions by the congress. But essentially they remained and remain agents and allies of English capital in India. The domination of foreign imperialists in the country is profitable for the Indian big bourgeoisie. It is interested in the help of British imperialism to fight against the popular movement. For the sake of its class interests, it betrayed the national liberation struggle. The Indian bourgeoisie helped British imperialists establish a regime in India after the war which, under the external form of "independence", left colonial exploitation of the population by English monopoly capital untouched.

The close merging of the national big bourgeoisie with foreign imperialism also took place in other colonial and dependent countries. Groups of conciliationist bourgeoisie are enemies and stranglers of the national liberation movement of oppressed peoples; together with imperialists, they organize civil wars against progressive democratic forces of their countries.

After the Second World War, the proletariat of many colonies and semi-colonies became the recognized hegemon of the national liberation movement. The emancipation of the

working peasantry and urban petty bourgeoisie from the influence of the big bourgeoisie went and is going at rapid paces in colonies and dependent countries. At present, communist parties in many semi-colonial and colonial countries—Vietnam, Burma, Malaya, Indonesia, etc.—have united broad strata of the people into a democratic, anti-imperialist front under their leadership.

In the front ranks of the revolutionary national liberation movement in the East marches the multi-million Chinese people—the victorious people. The reactionary, feudal-bourgeois clique of Chiang Kai-shek, supported by American imperialists, plunged China into a bloody civil war shortly after the end of the Second World War. Rejecting the people's demands for the democratization of China put forward by the Chinese Communist Party and other democratic organizations representing the interests of the proletariat, toiling peasantry, and patriotic groups of the petty and middle national bourgeoisie, the Kuomintang government launched an offensive against the working class, against its leader—the Communist Party, against the defender of its interests—the People's Liberation Army of China. In 1946, Kuomintang troops equipped by Americans exceeded the People's Liberation Army threefold in numerical strength. But less than two years passed before the main forces of Chiang Kai-shek were routed, and by June 1949 Kuomintang troops had lost more than 5.5 million people; almost 60% of China's population was liberated from the power of the feudal-bourgeois-reactionary Kuomintang government. By October 1949, the overwhelming part of China's territory was liberated,

and the Central People's Government was elected under the leadership of the leader of the Communist Party, Mao Zedong. The many years of struggle of the Chinese people under the leadership of the working class culminated in a great historical victory. Another 475 million people of the globe, having freed themselves from imperialist yoke, embarked on the path of movement toward socialism.

The decisive factor in these victories of the Chinese people is the leading role of the combat-hardened Communist Party of China, which, following the great teaching of Marx - Engels - Lenin - Stalin, achieved the rallying of the Chinese people around the working class, around the revolutionary people's liberation army, and exposed the anti-people, anti-national, treacherous policy of the Kuomintang clique.

The Communist Party of China and the People's Liberation Army of China have earned all-people respect, recognition, and love. A united national front, unprecedented in its breadth and depth, uniting workers, peasants, the urban petty bourgeoisie, national minorities, and some strata of the middle industrial and commercial bourgeoisie, was created in the country. The petty and middle bourgeoisie in China suffered from oppression and harassment on the part of the big reactionary bourgeoisie, the landlord class, and the Kuomintang power located in the hands of monopoly capital. The petty and middle bourgeoisie is not connected or is little connected with imperialism. That is why this bourgeoisie, being, according to Mao Zedong's definition, "the real national bourgeoisie", enters into the united front of struggle against internal reaction and foreign imperialism. The basis of the united national front is

the alliance of the working class with the toiling peasantry under the leading role of the working class.

"Imperialism and the Kuomintang reactionary clique," Mao Zedong writes, "were overthrown mainly by the force of the working class and peasantry. The transition from new democracy to socialism mainly depends on the alliance of these two classes. The dictatorship of people's democracy must be led by the working class, for only the working class is the most far-sighted, just, unselfish, and revolutionarily consistent. The history of the entire revolution shows that without the leadership of the working class the revolution is doomed to failure. But under the leadership of the working class the revolution will win. In the era of imperialism, no other class in any country can lead a genuine revolution to victory. This was clearly proved by the fact that the Chinese petty bourgeoisie and national bourgeoisie have led the revolution many times and have always suffered failure"[116].

The victory of the Chinese revolution once again confirmed the genius of the teaching of Lenin and Stalin on the national-colonial revolution and on the necessity of the hegemony of the proletariat in this revolution.

The upsurge of the national liberation movement in India in the post-war period also occurs on the basis of the proletariat's increasingly winning the leading role in the popular national liberation movement.

---

[116] *Pravda*, July 6, 1949

After the Second World War, the influence of the national bourgeoisie on the masses in India dropped sharply, while the strength and influence of the working class increased significantly. The number of members of the Communist Party of India increased to 90 thousand people; communists strengthened their positions and their authority among workers, peasants, and the urban petty bourgeoisie. The All-Indian Trade Union Congress, numbering about 800 thousand members, the All-Indian Peasant Organization with a membership of also approximately 800 thousand people, the All-Indian Student Federation, and many other progressive unions and organizations of the country are under the influence of communists.

During 1948 in India, more than 1,600 strikes took place, a significant part of which bore a political character. Strikes and mass actions of workers are directed against the bourgeoisie's offensive on the living standard and political rights of the working class, against anti-worker legislation, against the law on abolishing price controls and the law on granting emergency powers to the government, against the persecution of the Communist Party of India, etc.

Thanks to the leading role of the working class and its leader—the communist party—successes have also been achieved in the national liberation movement in Vietnam, whose people are waging a heroic war against French imperialism, instigated and supported by the ruling circles of the USA. A numerous partisan army also operates in Burma, partisan war against American colonizers is underway in the Philippines, and the armed struggle for independence of the peoples of Indonesia

and Malaya continues. All these are not accidental, spontaneous outbreaks, but the organized, conscious struggle of the popular masses, led by the working class and communist parties, against imperialism and internal reaction.

The national liberation struggle in Indonesia proceeds under complex conditions. Under the leadership of the communist party, a stubborn armed struggle of Indonesian partisans against Dutch troops is underway in the country not only on Java and Sumatra, but also on other islands of Indonesia.

The strengthening of the leading role of the proletariat in the national liberation movement of the peoples of colonies and semi-colonies during the war and after its conclusion was the factor that determined the gigantic scope of this movement and its decisive victories.

In all countries of the colonial world, the proletariat rallies around itself the peasantry, the intelligentsia, the urban petty bourgeoisie, and that part of the national bourgeoisie that opposes imperialism, for liberation from colonial yoke, for national freedom and independence. At the same time, communist parties are waging a decisive and irreconcilable struggle against the national-reformist agency of imperialists, who try to drive a wedge between individual detachments of the national liberation movement of different countries, as well as between the national liberation movement of colonies and semi-colonies, on the one hand, and the international camp of democracy and socialism as a whole, on the other. The lackeys of American imperialism—Bevin and Blum—for the sake of saving colonial empires from final destruction, try to poison the consciousness of the struggling peoples of colonies by

spreading the treacherous slogan of the "third path". Communist parties of colonial and semi-colonial countries expose these attempts and wage an irreconcilable struggle against them. "Not only in China," Mao Zedong writes, "but throughout the world without exception, one can adhere either to imperialism or to socialism. Neutrality is camouflage, and a third path does not exist"[117].

In the process of many years of struggle, the Chinese people came to the conclusion that the most important condition for success is "unity in common struggle with the countries of the world treating us as an equal nation, and with the peoples of all countries. This means an alliance with the USSR, an alliance with the countries of new democracy in Europe, and an alliance with the proletariat and popular masses of the remaining countries to form an international united front"[118].

True to the traditions of internationalism, the Communist Party of China and the communist parties of other colonial, semi-colonial, and dependent countries branded with shame the fascist clique of Tito—the gang of provocateurs and paid spies of foreign imperialist intelligence services, which established a regime of terror, espionage, and sabotage in the country.

The Soviet people see in the greatest victories of Chinese democracy the triumph of the all-conquering power of Marxism-Leninism. It welcomes the formation of the People's Republic of China as the historical outcome of the great and prolonged struggle of the Chinese people under the leadership

---

117 *Pravda*, July 6, 1949

118 *Ibid.*

of the working class. The Soviet Government was the first to recognize the new government of democratic China.

The further rallying of the peoples of colonies and semi-colonies around the working class, led by communist parties and acting under the banner of Lenin and Stalin, is the pledge of success in the struggle for the liquidation of the imperialist system of colonial slavery and oppression.

Questions of Economics, No.9, 1949.

REPORTS AND DISCUSSIONS

THE NATIONAL LIBERATION STRUGGLE IN COLONIAL AND SEMI-COLONIAL COUNTRIES AFTER THE SECOND WORLD WAR

In June 1949, a joint session of the academic councils of the Institute of Economics and the Pacific Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences was held, dedicated to the issues of the national liberation movement of the peoples of colonies, semi-colonies, and dependent countries after the Second World War.

Opening the meeting, the Director of the Institute of Economics, K. V. Ostrovityanov, noted that the unprecedented upsurge in the national liberation movement of oppressed peoples after the Second World War is a striking indicator of the deepening crisis of the colonial system, which in turn is one of the most important manifestations of the aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism.

The world is split into two camps: the camp of reaction, imperialism, and war, headed by the United States of America, and the camp of peace, democracy, and socialism, headed by the USSR. The imperialist camp is trying to suppress the powerful national liberation movement in colonial and dependent countries. The Anglo-American imperialist bloc, while preparing an aggressive war against the Soviet Union and the countries of people's democracy, seeks to use colonies as sources of military-strategic raw materials and cheap labor,

as suppliers of cannon fodder, and their territory as military bridgeheads and bases. This policy of imperialist aggression is opposed by the camp of peace, democracy, and socialism, which advocates for the freedom and independence of colonial peoples and actively supports their national liberation struggle.

The path traversed by the Soviet state, the historical experience of the party of Lenin and Stalin in solving the national question, which is now followed by the countries of people's democracy, where the great principles of the Leninist-Stalinist national policy—the principles of complete equality and friendship of all nationalities—are also being implemented in life, serves as a guiding star for oppressed peoples fighting for freedom, against imperialist slavery. The national liberation movement of colonial peoples is increasingly taking on the character of a struggle for people's democracy, waged under the hegemony of the working class and under the leadership of communist parties.

14 reports were discussed at the session. The introductory report "Issues of the National-Colonial Struggle after the Second World War" was delivered by the Director of the Pacific Institute, E. M. Zhukov. A report on the topic "The Hegemony of the Working Class in the National Liberation Movement" was delivered by Comrade V. A. Maslennikov[119].

Next, reports were heard from Comrade V. Y. Avarin "The People's Liberation Struggle in China", Comrade V. V.

---

[119] For the revised reports by E. M. Zhukov and V. A. Maslennikov, see the journal *Voprosy Ekonomiki*, No. 9, 1949

Balabushevich "The New Stage of the National Liberation Struggle of the Peoples of India"[120], Comrade V. Y. Vasilyeva "The Struggle of the Peoples of Indo-China", Comrade A. A. Guber "The National Liberation Struggle in Indonesia", Comrade A. M. Dyakov "The National Liberation Movement in Burma", Comrade M. V. Danilevich "The Working Class of Latin America in the Struggle for Independence and Democracy"[121], Comrade O. I. Zabozlaeva "The National Liberation Movement in the Philippines", Comrade G. L. Bondarevsky "The Struggle of the Peoples of Malaya for Their Liberation", Comrade V. B. Lutsky "The National Liberation Movement in the Middle and Near East", Comrade L. N. Vatolina on the same topic, Comrade F. I. Shabshina "The Struggle of the Korean People for Independence and Democracy", and Comrade D. T. Yakimov "The Mongolian People's Republic".

The following spoke in the debates on the heard reports: Comrades A. I. Kogan, Yang Hing-shun, G. V. Astafev, N. I. Shvetsov, S. M. Melman, F. D. Gapchenko, N. D. Grodko, G. G. Kocharyants, A. M. Dyakov, and V. M. Fedorenko.

Below is a brief summary of the reports and speeches.

Comrade V. Y. Vasilyeva (Institute of Economics), in her report on the struggle of the peoples of Indo-China, showed that in the post-war period Indo-China, like other countries of

---

[120] For the revised report by V. V. Balabushevich, see the journal *Voprosy Ekonomiki*, No. 8, 1949.

[121] For the revised report by M. V. Danilevich, see No. 11 of the journal.

Southeast Asia, turned into a hotbed of a powerful national liberation movement. The peoples of Southeast Asia, inspired by the successes of communist construction in the USSR and the heroic struggle and victories of the Chinese people, rose with arms in hand to win their freedom and independence. Tempered in the struggle against the Japanese invaders, the peoples of Indo-China, Indonesia, Burma, Malaya, and the Philippines turned their weapons against their age-old oppressors—French, Dutch, English, and American imperialists.

The Republic of Vietnam, bordering on China, stands in the front ranks of the struggling peoples of Southeast Asia. The three years of the republic's existence have been years of severe trials for it and at the same time years of major victories on the path to liberation from the imperialist yoke.

The independent Democratic Republic of Vietnam arose as a result of the rout of imperialist Japan by the Soviet Army. It was proclaimed on August 17, 1945. It included Tonkin, Annam, and Cochin-China. The territory of the republic at the time of its creation was equal to 328 thousand square kilometers (the territory of all French Indo-China is 750 thousand square kilometers); its population is 22 million people (out of the 26 million population of all Indo-China). French imperialists did not recognize the Republic of Vietnam and opened military operations against it. Already during the war with the Japanese occupiers, a resistance army began to take shape in the republic, which has now turned into a fairly large military force. The regular army of Vietnam numbers 150 thousand soldiers and officers; in addition, 300 thousand

fighters are fighting in partisan detachments. Republican troops are armed with modern firearms captured in battles with the enemy. The own production of weapons and ammunition has also been organized in Vietnam. The regular army of the Republic of Vietnam relies on the support of the absolute majority of the country's population.

The basis of the new state system of Vietnam are people's committees created in all villages, districts, regions, and provinces. Members of the committees perform their duties gratuitously. The activity of the people's committees is primarily subordinated to the tasks of the republic's defense. They also render enormous assistance to the government in carrying out all socio-economic and cultural measures.

The foundations of a new, democratic state are being laid in Vietnam. The liberation struggle and democratic construction are carried out by a united anti-imperialist national front, in which the majority of Vietnam's working people are united under the leadership of the working class. Already during the years of resistance to the Japanese occupiers, the political organization Vietminh took shape, uniting all progressive political parties, including the communist one. Communists became the leading force of the Vietminh; they also lead trade unions and other mass organizations of working people.

The President of Vietnam is the oldest and most popular leader of the Indo-Chinese people, the founder of the Indo-Chinese Communist Party Ho Chi Minh, who heads the republican government and the Vietminh. Many other prominent communists are also members of the republic's government. In the general elections to the National Assembly held in January

1946, 80% of all voters of the republic participated. These elections brought a complete victory to the Vietminh, which received 230 out of 300 seats.

The government of Ho Chi Minh sets as its goal a decisive struggle for the complete independence and territorial integrity of the republic, for the strengthening of national unity, the expansion of democratic freedoms, the improvement of the material and cultural living conditions of working people, labor conditions, and the development of all branches of the national economy. This program of action unites the broadest strata of the population of Vietnam.

The National Front of Vietnam encompasses workers, peasants, the urban poor, artisans, the intelligentsia, and the petty and middle urban bourgeoisie. The leading force of the national front is the working class, which has rich revolutionary traditions and is led by communists.

The struggle of the peoples of Vietnam is directed at the present stage primarily against the French interventionists. The Indo-Chinese big bourgeoisie broke away from the general national front and embarked on the path of cooperation with imperialists, on the path of betraying the interests of the people. The exploiting, anti-popular classes and strata collaborated with the Japanese during the years of Japanese occupation. Now they actively collaborate with the French interventionists; using the difficult economic situation of the republic, they continue to increase their profits through all kinds of swindles and speculations. Acting in concert with the French occupiers are those groups of the comprador bourgeoisie that were previously closely connected with French imperialism, as well

as strata of the big national industrial bourgeoisie and all kinds of financiers and dealers grouped around the Bank of Indo-China. The native landlords, who are strongest in Cochin-China, also occupy positions hostile to the people's liberation struggle.

In their policy aimed at suppressing the Republic of Vietnam, the French colonizers rely on the bourgeois-landlord apex, which is the mainstay of the colonial regime in Indo-China. From these strata, the imperialists form puppet "governments" on the territory of Vietnam. With their help, they try to deceive the people. Using the right-wing leaders of nationalist parties and groupings, the French imperialists want to split the united national front of Vietnam. The reactionary leadership of the Kuok Zand Dang party, which did not enter the Vietminh, as well as the pro-Chiang Kai-shek leadership of the Dong Minh Hoi party, formed in 1942 in the territory of South China from Annamite emigrants, actively assists the French colonizers in carrying out this provocative policy. Although the leaders of both these parties spoke out against French imperialism in words, in reality, together with the former emperor Bao Dai, they created in January 1947 in Nanking the so-called United National Front of Vietnam, grouping around itself all treacherous, anti-popular elements. It was precisely from here that all actions hostile to the Republic of Vietnam, aimed at its liquidation and at undermining the unity of the people of Vietnam, were organized. With the help of this center, American imperialists dispatched their agents into the republic.

French imperialists are stoking national enmity among the peoples of Indo-China. Through their long-standing agency—the monarchist and feudal elements of Laos and Cambodia—they managed to tear these regions away from the republic and preserve them as kingdoms subordinate to French imperialism. French imperialism, acting by the most diverse methods—diplomatic machinations, the use of puppets like Emperor Bao Dai or the traitor General Nguyen Xuu An, the use of armed force—tries to deprive the people of Vietnam of independence and doom them to colonial slavery. However, the broad and solid front of national unity existing in the republic ensures the stability of Ho Chi Minh's government, supported by the majority of the people.

The construction of the Republic of Vietnam is currently taking place under conditions of imperialist intervention and an unceasing colonial war. This hinders the constructive work of the people's government and limits the scope and depth of democratic transformations in the republic. The economic situation of the country continues to remain difficult as before.

The government of Vietnam has begun restoring transport and strengthening the financial system; it has reorganized the tax system and abolished the poll tax. It pays great attention to the rise of agriculture. The agrarian question is one of the most acute in Indo-China. The government of the Republic of Vietnam has begun carrying out agrarian reform. Communal lands have been divided among working peasants. Rent, which previously in many regions of the country reached 2/3 of the harvest, has been reduced by 50%; usury has been banned.

By the Labor Code adopted by the National Assembly of Vietnam, a forty-hour work week, paid vacations, sickness benefits, labor protection for women and adolescents, and social insurance have been introduced. Trade unions control the implementation of labor laws through workers' committees existing at each plant and employees' committees in institutions. The General Confederation of Labor of Vietnam unites 250 thousand organized workers. A patriotic competition of working people for the rise of production has unfolded in the republic.

The democratic public of France warmly supports the struggle of the people of Vietnam for freedom. It demands the immediate cessation of the colonial war against Vietnam and a peaceful settlement of Franco-Annamite relations with the people's elected, legitimate government of Ho Chi Minh. The people of Vietnam believe in their victory; they are full of determination to continue the struggle for freedom and independence.

A report on the topic "The National Liberation Struggle in Indonesia" was delivered by Comrade A. A. Guber (Pacific Institute). In Indonesia, by the time of the collapse of Japanese imperialism, objective prerequisites had taken shape for the creation of a broad anti-imperialist front on democratic principles. These objectively favorable circumstances were predetermined by the entire socio-economic system of Indonesia and the entire historical development of this colony under Dutch rule. The relative weakness of the big Indonesian bourgeoisie and the comparative numerousness of the proletariat and its concentration in the labor centers of Java

favorably affected the development of the national liberation struggle in Indonesia already after the First World War. However, by the time of the collapse of Japan under the blows of the Soviet Army and the proclamation of independence of Indonesia in August 1945, there was neither a strong communist party nor mass organizations connected with it in the country. This reflected the terror of the Dutch imperialists that had not ceased since 1925 and the persecution by the Japanese occupiers of the communists—the only force that stood at the head of the popular, anti-Japanese resistance movement. Sharifuddin, one of the most militant leaders of the resistance movement, was thrown into prison by the Japanese invaders, subjected to torture, and accidentally escaped execution. The leader of the Indonesian communists, Sardjono, spent 18 years in a penal camp; other figures of the Indonesian Communist Party were also in prisons, served penal servitude, or were taken away by the Dutch to Australia during the war and received the opportunity to return to their homeland only after the proclamation of independence of Indonesia.

Under these conditions, independence and the republic were proclaimed by the representative of bourgeois nationalism, Sukarno, who had collaborated with the Japanese occupiers. The provisional constitution endowed Sukarno, as president of the republic, with unlimited powers. The provisional parliament created after the proclamation of the republic initially consisted entirely of persons proposed by Sukarno. The first ministerial cabinet included people who had been in legal status during the Japanese occupation and actively collaborated with the Japanese imperialists.

However, the experience of the Second World War and the growing influence among the masses of the Indonesian communists created conditions very favorable for the communist party to be able to wage a decisive struggle after the proclamation of the republic for leadership of the national liberation struggle of the Indonesian people. The Communist Party was re-created in October 1945, immediately after the defeat of the Japanese occupation army, earlier than the party of Sukarno-Hatta (National) was re-created. The Masyumi party arose on the basis of the unification of various Muslim organizations. The growth of the communist party at the expense of tens of thousands of workers and peasants testifies to the fact that by their leadership in the struggle for national independence during the war, the Indonesian communists won well-deserved authority among the people.

Already by the end of 1945, as a result of the consolidation of democratic forces, the order ensuring the unlimited control of President Sukarno was effectively abolished in the republic. In 1946, parties of the socialist block began to play an increasingly important role in the parliament of the expanded Indonesian Republic. The socialist block was formed by the communist party, the socialist party—where a strong left wing headed by Sharifuddin predominated—and the labor party created in December 1945 headed by the old leader of the labor movement, the communist Satiadjid. By the end of 1946 and especially at the beginning of 1947, this socialist block commanded at least half of the mandates in the provisional parliament. The left block enjoyed the support of workers' and peasants' organizations, and the socialist Youth League. It

could also count on the support of a significant part of the rank-and-file members of the Muslim party Masyumi and the National Party, because the main mass of these parties consisted of peasants, artisans, and the petty urban bourgeoisie. However, the Indonesian communist party did not wage a sufficiently consistent struggle for democratic transformations, and did not expose those bourgeois and petty-bourgeois leaders who pushed the Indonesian Republic onto the path of agreements with imperialists, onto the path of bourgeois nationalism.

At the same time, events in the Indonesian Republic after the war were determined not only by the correlation of class forces inside the country, but also by the offensive of external reaction against the republic. The Linggadjati Agreement, signed in March 1946, was a temporary concession by Dutch imperialism, which it was forced to make because it was not yet strong enough to openly crush the republic. The communists' support for this agreement was a correct step on their part, since this agreement ensured the recognition of the republic by Holland and could have served as a breathing spell for the republic. Later on, however, when it turned out that for Holland and the other imperialist powers standing behind it the Linggadjati Agreement was merely a screen for preparing a new offensive against the republic, and when it became clear that the propertied classes of Indonesia were ready to compromise with the imperialists and give up even what had been recognized by the imperialists under the Linggadjati Agreement, the communist party failed to clearly define its

attitude toward the policy of the bourgeois elements in the leadership of the Indonesian Republic.

During Holland's resumption of the colonial war against Indonesia in July 1947, the activity of the Indonesian people sharply increased. President Sukarno was forced under pressure from the popular masses to agree to the appointment of a coalition cabinet of Sharifuddin, in which the vice-president was the communist Satiadjid, representing the labor party. A representative of the communist party also entered this coalition government. The coalition government failed to use the broad opportunities that opened up before it. It abandoned the plan for the economic reorganization of Indonesia drawn up by the socialist block and agreed to the so-called "ten-year plan" of the bourgeois leadership of the national party, which essentially meant abandoning the line toward the country's industrialization and toward utilizing Indonesia's rich resources for the development of national industry. This "plan" also did not provide for decisive transformations of agrarian relations.

The republican government placed great hopes on the intervention of the United Nations organization in the Indonesian conflict. However, the discussion of the Indonesian question in the Security Council showed that the consistent defenders of the interests of the Indonesian people are only the Soviet Union and the countries of people's democracy, and that Soviet policy on this issue encounters the rabid resistance of the colonial powers. The bourgeois elements of the Indonesian Republic showed readiness to compromise with the imperialists. The representative of the republic, Sutan Sjahrir, withdrew his proposal on the ways of resolving the Dutch-

Indonesian conflict and not only failed to support the proposals of the Soviet Union—which alone met the aspirations of the people of Indonesia—but, following the lead of the colonial powers, accepted their proposal to create the so-called "Good Offices Committee". This committee, hiding behind the United Nations organization, pursued the goal of protecting the colonial interests of the Dutch and American imperialists. The USA used this committee for the purposes of its imperialist expansion.

In the course of the work of the notorious "Good Offices Committee", the United States negotiated with the right-wing circles of Indonesia on turning the weakened republic into a submissive tool of the imperialist plans of American monopolies. These negotiations ended with the signing of the Renville Agreement. The parties of the socialist block failed to unravel and expose either these plans of American imperialism or the betrayal of the bourgeois elements in the republic's leadership. They did not expose the imperialist essence of the Renville Agreement, which signified a deal between the Indonesian reactionaries and the USA.

The policy of the new government that came to power as a result of the Renville Agreement, consisting predominantly of American stooges headed by Hatta, was characterized by betrayal of the republic. But even during this period, the socialist block did not expose the joint offensive of the American imperialists and Hatta's government against the democratic camp of Indonesia. The communists did not conduct explanatory work in the mass organizations under their

leadership, and still tried at all costs to preserve the united front, which by that time had already become a fiction.

Only in September 1948 did the merger of the socialist and labor parties with the communist party take place into a single communist party, which the socialist youth league also joined. But Hatta's betrayal was not sufficiently explained to the broad popular masses, organizational changes had not yet been firmly consolidated, and a favorable environment was created for Hatta and his American patrons to unfold a further offensive against the democratic camp. At the beginning of September 1948, raids were carried out on democratic organizations, Trotskyites were released from prison, and clashes with the popular-democratic front were provoked.

Only in this situation, after the first open blows of reaction against the democratic camp, did a break occur between the popular-democratic forces and Hatta's government. On September 17, a popular-democratic government headed by Sharifuddin was created in Madiun, which put forward a broad program of democratic transformations and proclaimed the necessity of a decisive struggle against Dutch and American imperialism and the overthrow of Hatta's treacherous government. But all these slogans were not prepared by preceding work among the masses. Hatta's government resorted to a fraudulent trick, demonstratively interrupting negotiations with the Dutch imperialists and announcing the unacceptability of the Dutch conditions, which even more disoriented the popular masses.

By virtue of these reasons, the popular-democratic government did not find proper support. Hatta's government succeeded in suppressing the initial sparks of the popular uprising in a short time. The blow dealt to the revolutionary forces in the capital of Yogyakarta at the moment when the popular-democratic government in Madiun was just being created largely weakened the positions of the democratic camp. On the fourteenth day of the struggle, the reactionaries managed to capture Madiun. The most prominent leaders of the united communist party and other popular-democratic organizations were thrown into the prisons of Yogyakarta.

But the traitors prematurely triumphed victory. Despite the temporary defeat, the popular movement continued to develop, and its new hotbeds appeared. The partisan struggle intensified. It became obvious to Hatta's government and its American masters that this growing popular movement could not be broken by the forces of internal reaction alone. Then the American imperialists sanctioned a new offensive by Dutch troops armed with American and British weapons. With unprecedented tortures and terror, they tried to liquidate the national liberation movement in Indonesia. Dutch parachute landing forces seized the capital of the republic and shot political prisoners who had been thrown into prison and had survived the reprisals of Hatta's government. At the same time, Hatta and other traitors, also captured by the Dutch, were created fairly comfortable conditions on Banka Island, where negotiations were conducted with them for the purpose of achieving complete capitulation of the bourgeois nationalists. These negotiations culminated in the signing of an agreement

intended to turn the Indonesian Republic into a powerless puppet of the imperialist powers, a disenfranchised participant in the fake "United States of Indonesia".

Under the difficult conditions of imperialist terror, executions, and medieval tortures, the revolutionary camp of Indonesia, the communist party, continues its struggle. The national liberation struggle of the Indonesian people continues. It relies on the growing national liberation movement in the countries of Southeast Asia, on the world-historic victories of the Chinese people, on the ever-increasing might of the democratic camp headed by the great socialist power—the Soviet Union. The Indonesian people are not alone in their struggle, and in this lies the pledge of their future victory.

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

Over the past decades, British financial capital has shown enormous interest in England's colony, Malaya. England's capital investments in Malayan rubber plantations alone reach £200 million. Two British firms—British Tin Investment Corporation and London Tin Corporation—rule supreme in Malaya's tin industry.

In the post-war period, the United States of America has increasingly been capturing the export of strategic raw materials from Malaya. Thus, in 1947, the USA exported 457 thousand tons of rubber and over 20 thousand tons of tin from Malaya. Malayan exports to the USA consist predominantly of strategic raw materials and in 1947 amounted to $346 million,

which is $166 million more than the value of all of England's exports to the USA in that same year.

The colonial authorities in the pre-war period hindered the creation of workers' organizations in every possible way. It was only in 1940 that trade unions were successfully organized in Malaya for the first time. During the period of Japanese occupation, trade unions were partly crushed, and those that survived went underground. The Japanese occupiers carried out brutal terror against the Malayan people. But the labor movement assumed a wide scope already during the period of occupation.

Enriched by the experience of the liberation movement against the Japanese, the working masses of Malaya, headed by the Malayan Communist Party, are waging a struggle against British imperialism, for freedom and independence. Such mass organizations as the People's Anti-Japanese Army, uniting participants in the struggle against the Japanese occupiers, the Democratic Youth League, the Malayan Youth League, and the Pan-Malayan Federation of Trade Unions—which numbers about 500 thousand members and belongs to the World Federation of Trade Unions—have deployed their activities in Malaya. Malayan youth organizations belong to the World Federation of Democratic Youth.

The proletariat of Malaya, led by the Communist Party, is increasingly winning leading positions in the national liberation movement of the peoples of its country. Its numerical strength, unlike some other countries of Southeast Asia, is significant and reaches (together with rubber plantation workers) 10–12% of the country's entire population. The

cohesion and organization of the Malayan proletariat, especially mining industry workers, and the enormous authority and popularity in the country of the Communist Party —which managed not only to rally the proletariat, but also to unite around itself tens of thousands of farm laborers and seasonal plantation workers—determine the success of the struggle of the peoples of Malaya, who enjoy the sympathy and support of the democratic forces of the entire world.

British colonizers, supported by American imperialists, strive by all measures to suppress the growing national liberation movement of the Malayan people. The main base of the British Far Eastern Squadron was transferred from Hong Kong to Singapore, where military units began to accumulate, which it was intended to use to suppress the struggle of the Malayan people. The English bourgeois press raised a hysterical campaign about the "communist threat" to Malaya, about "foreign interference" in Malayan affairs, and so on. In June 1948, on a signal from London, round-ups of communists, the rout of trade union organizations, arrests, and murders of leaders of democratic organizations were carried out across the entire country. However, the attempts of the Anglo-American imperialists to crush the Malayan Communist Party and trade unions in a few days proved unsuccessful.

In response to the provocations of the British imperialists, the working people of Malaya rose with arms in hand to defend their rights. Partisan detachments began to arise across the entire country, and the liberation war began. On June 22, a state of siege was declared in four main rubber-producing districts of Malaya, and two days later it was extended to

Singapore—the center of Malaya's national liberation movement. During five days, from June 20 to 24, even according to official English data, over 800 members of the Malayan Communist Party were arrested in major centers of Malaya. The police shot and tortured hundreds of workers.

But despite these repressions, the upsurge of the national liberation movement continued. It embraced the regions adjacent to Kuala Lumpur. Partisan detachments operated throughout the country.

Troops arrived in Malaya by sea and air from England, the Middle East, Malta, Ceylon, and Hong Kong, and were thrown against the partisans. In these punitive operations, the English made wide use of aviation, for which fighters and bombers were redeployed from Ceylon to Singapore and Kuala Lumpur. In the second half of July, major battles were underway across Malaya between partisan detachments and regular English troops. The most serious battles were in Central Kedah, in the Balitong region, as well as in Selangor, Perak, and Negri Sembilan. In the princely state of Johore (near Singapore), the partisan struggle was supported by rubber plantation workers who declared a strike.

On June 23, British Colonial Secretary Creech Jones stated in the House of Commons that the British government had approved the decision of the Malayan colonial authorities on the immediate ban of the Malayan Communist Party. Communist deputy Gallacher, who spoke next, exposed the slanderous attacks of the conservatives and right-wing Labourites directed against the Malayan working class and Communist Party. Gallacher stated that the events in Malaya

are an expression of the open and legitimate demand of the peoples of this country to be granted freedom and independence.

The English authorities banned not only the Malayan Communist Party, but also other democratic organizations: the Pan-Malayan Federation of Trade Unions, the Democratic Youth League, the Ex-Servicemen's Association, the People's Anti-Japanese Army, and the Youth League for the National Independence of Malaya. Operating underground, the Malayan Communist Party led the armed struggle against the British colonizers.

By the autumn of 1948, the partisan war had engulfed almost the entire country. Two British Guards brigades, two squadrons of new jet fighters, tanks, and heavy artillery were sent to Malaya. The question of transferring Australian occupation troops from Japan to Malaya was raised. To work out concrete measures for suppressing the national liberation movement in Malaya, a meeting of British military and civilian authorities in Southeast Asia took place in Singapore on August 6, 1948. The British Labour government delivered by air to Singapore, to fight against the Malayan partisans hiding in the jungles, wild inhabitants of Borneo—Dayaks armed with poisoned arrows. The British colonial authorities began carrying out mass public executions of captured partisans. In the struggle against the partisans, the English made wide use of Malayan feudal reaction and the reactionary Muslim clergy, who incited Muslim Malays against the Chinese.

According to English data, by the end of 1948, an English army of more than 50 thousand was operating against 5

thousand Malayan partisans. And yet the English imperialists failed to suppress the national liberation movement of the peoples of Malaya. At the cost of great sacrifices, they were only able to push back the combat detachments of Malayan patriots in the southern part of the country, mainly in Johore. In February 1949, the conservative Lord Sankfort admitted in the House of Lords: "It is difficult to understand what is happening in Malaya now. One thing is clear—we are winning." At the same time, the English conservative newspaper *Yorkshire Post*, noting that the number of English troops and police in Malaya had grown to 70 thousand people, was forced to acknowledge that victory over the partisans had not been achieved.

Having failed to achieve desired results through military actions against the partisans, the English colonizers are resorting to brutal terror against the unarmed population as well. According to data from the bulletin *Malayan Monitor*, from the beginning of military operations until the end of 1948, 75 patriots were hanged and over 300 shot in Malaya; about 7 thousand Malays are languishing in concentration camps; 2,300 Malays and Chinese have been expelled from the country on suspicion of sympathizing with the partisans. Applying fascist methods, the English burned 11 large villages solely because their inhabitants were suspected of sympathizing with the partisans.

But neither executions nor tortures can break the will of the Malayan people for the struggle for freedom and independence. A manifesto of three organizations participating in the struggle for the national liberation of Malaya—the Youth Combat Organization, the Peasant Union, and the Women's Federation

—states: "British imperialism has completely exposed its fascist character by the extermination of the rural population, the bombing of villages, and the expulsion of people from villages... Although the struggle against the imperialists will be protracted, victory will be ours, because British imperialism is weakening and becoming ever more isolated, whereas we are growing stronger, because our struggle is a revolutionary war for the liberation of our country, our people."

British imperialists are now placing their stake on splitting the national liberation movement in Malaya. They have undertaken an attempt to split the trade union movement of Malaya by creating yellow trade unions and affixing "reformist English trade union advisers" to them. Traitors to the people, such as the leader of Malayan feudal reaction Dato Onn bin Jaafar, who received the post of Prime Minister of Johore from the hands of the British imperialists, have also been drawn into participation in this provocative scissionist activity.

Malayan workers are boycotting the yellow trade unions. The Pan-Malayan Federation of Trade Unions, driven underground by the British colonial authorities, continues to enjoy enormous authority and popularity. Trying to destroy this militant organization of Malayan workers, the British authorities, despite the protest of the democratic forces of the entire world, hanged the former chairman of the Pan-Malayan Federation of Trade Unions, Ganapathy, in May 1949, and shortly thereafter shot his successor, Virasenan.

The armed struggle of the peoples of Malaya continues. By the beginning of June 1949, over 40% of the country's territory was the arena of stubborn battles of partisan detachments with

English troops. And although the partisans have not yet succeeded in achieving the liberation of large regions and uniting them into a continuous territory, it can be stated that English troops equipped with the newest armaments are powerless against the growing liberation movement of the Malayan people.

Comrade O. I. Zabozlaeva (Pacific Institute) highlighted the issues of the national liberation movement in the Philippines. For the national liberation movement of the Filipino people after the Second World War, it is characteristic that for the first time the working class is acting as its leader. This became possible first of all thanks to that great work which the Philippine Communist Party carried out already in the pre-war period, fighting to win over the working and peasant masses from the influence of reformist trade unions and the bourgeois-landlord Nacionalista Party.

During the period of war and Japanese occupation, the bourgeois-landlord Nacionalista Party, which claimed the role of leader of the popular masses in the struggle for national independence, compromised itself by open collaboration with the Japanese and suppression of popular resistance to the occupiers.

The only political party in the Philippines that, having gone underground under conditions of Japanese occupation, strengthened its organization and even further strengthened its ties with the masses was the Communist Party. It organized and led armed resistance to the Japanese invaders, linking the struggle against the occupiers with the general political and class interests of the working masses of the Philippines. It

united all progressive forces of the country around itself. The "United Front" organization created on the initiative of the communist party also included the socialist party, the Civil Liberties Union, the Chinese Communist Association, the Chinese Anti-Japanese Association, workers' and peasant unions, youth and other organizations. At the end of March 1942, separate partisan detachments were merged into a single resistance army, which was named the People's Anti-Japanese Army (Hukbalahap).

The popular resistance organizations set themselves the task of cooperating with the United Nations in the anti-fascist struggle, defeating the Japanese invaders, creating an independent Philippine state, liquidating the operations of American imperialism in the Philippines, overthrowing the power of the anti-patriotic bourgeois-landlord Nacionalista Party, and carrying out land and other democratic reforms. After the liberation of individual regions, the Hukbalahap helped working people organize new, popular-democratic authorities and carry out democratic transformations. In a number of cities and villages in Pampanga and Nueva Ecija provinces, even during the Japanese occupation, people's councils elected by the population existed and exercised power locally. The population did not recognize the authorities appointed by the Japanese. The lands of rich collaborator-landlords who fled under the protection of Japanese bayonets to Manila were confiscated and distributed among landless peasants, and peasant debts to landlords and usurers were annulled. Landlords who did not collaborate with the Japanese had their landownership left to them, but the share of the harvest paid by

tenants was significantly reduced. Various feudal duties of sharecropper tenants were abolished. Non-collaborator landlords, who initially sought an alliance with the Hukbalahap, saw a threat to their class interests in these democratic transformations and broke away from the national liberation movement.

After the war, the struggle of the Filipino people for freedom and independence proceeds in a complex environment. To restore their domination, the American ruling circles used the fact that US troops entered the Philippines at a time when the war in Europe was not yet finished. Fascism was the main danger, and the Hukbalahap regarded the USA as an ally in the world anti-fascist war, cooperating with American troops in the war against the Japanese invaders. The leadership of the Hukbalahap demanded that the USA treat the Philippine people as an equal ally, and offered energetic resistance to the attempts of the American command to turn the army of Philippine patriots into a mercenary colonial army of the USA. The restoration by the Americans of Osmeña's pre-war bourgeois government met with opposition among the population of central Luzon.

American imperialists counted on quickly suppressing the national liberation movement in the Philippines. In February–March 1945, American counterintelligence arrested a number of movement leaders, including Luis Taruc and Castor Alejandrino. However, the popular movement was not decapitated, because the fighters for freedom were well organized and enjoyed the active support of the majority of the people. Then the American imperialists granted power to the

most reactionary stratum of the Philippine bourgeoisie, closely connected with the largest feudal landownership. MacArthur's headquarters released the former Japanese stooge Roxas from prison. In June 1945, the senate and parliament, in which collaborators predominated, were already functioning in the Philippines. Roxas was placed in the post of senate president and as such headed the commission on appointments to responsible administrative posts. He appointed his collaborator stooges to all major positions in the government, court, and army.

The return to power of the Japanese puppets was marked by a new wave of arrests of political and military leaders of the Hukbalahap, workers' and peasant unions, and the rout and liquidation of local popular government bodies.

The ruling classes of the Philippines—the big bourgeoisie and landlords, both collaborators and non-collaborators—unreservedly supported the imperialist policy of the USA in the Philippines. However, the division of the bourgeois camp into collaborators and "loyal" nationalists, which persisted until Roxas's election as president, initially glossed over the reactionary essence of both groups. The communist party tried to use temporary disagreements in the ranks of the national bourgeoisie to strengthen the democratic camp. During the preparations for the presidential elections in 1946, the communist party organized the Democratic Alliance—an association of mass workers' and peasant organizations and partisan detachments. This Democratic Alliance blocked in the elections with the part of the Nacionalista Party that broke away from the collaborators, headed by Osmeña, and, despite

all the inconsistency of its policy, supported his candidacy for president. At the same time, the Democratic Alliance demanded that the national party adopt its electoral platform and promise in case of victory in the elections to create a coalition government.

However, already in the course of the elections, the bourgeois nationalists showed that they were against the victory of democratic forces and that they went into a bloc with the Democratic Alliance only in the expectation that with its help they could secure victory for themselves. A significant part of the members of the national party betrayed the Democratic Alliance even during the election process and even their leader Osmeña, and went over to the side of the collaborators.

The elections exposed to the popular masses the imperialist essence of American policy in the Philippines, the close connection of bourgeois nationalism with American imperialism, the inability of the national bourgeoisie and landlords to fight for national interests and deep democratic transformations. Roxas's victory in the elections, the establishment in the country with the support of the American military of an openly fascist dictatorship, unbridled terror against supporters of the democratic movement, and the adoption of anti-national laws dictated by the USA sharply aggravated the struggle in the Philippines and made the demarcation of the country's political forces into two opposing camps even clearer: the anti-imperialist, proletarian-peasant camp of the struggle for democracy and agrarian revolution, and the reactionary, anti-democratic bourgeois-landlord camp of stooges of American imperialism.

The forces of the democratic camp in the Philippines are growing, and the influence of the communist party is increasing. Over the post-war years, the number of communist party members has grown sixfold; the number of members of the National Peasant Union has increased from 250 thousand to 1 million; the Hukbalahap, which numbered 70 thousand people in the first period after the liberation of the Philippines, consisted of 200 thousand fighters by August 1948. If by the end of the war the influence of the Hukbalahap extended to 5 provinces, recently it has extended to 10 provinces and goes far beyond the limits of central Luzon.

The Filipino people are increasingly convinced that both Roxas's government and the current Quirino government are the agency of American imperialism. Repeated attempts by the ruling circles of the Philippines to liquidate the Hukbalahap have led to nothing. The Hukbalahap invariably refuses to surrender weapons and demands the fulfillment of the main points of its program. In August 1946, Roxas appealed to the Hukbalahap with a proposal to cease armed resistance. The Hukbalahap and the National Peasant Union put forward the following conditions on which they agreed only to a truce: firstly, the cessation of persecution of partisans and members of the National Peasant Union; secondly, the admission of democratic deputies to parliament and senate; thirdly, the dismissal of all local reactionary officials and their replacement by representatives of democratic organizations, and in those cities and provinces where the Democratic Alliance received a majority in the parliamentary elections, the appointment of local authorities according to the instructions of the Democratic

Alliance. Similar conditions were proposed by the democratic forces of the Philippines to the new president Quirino in May 1948 for an armed truce "for an indefinite period, until such time comes when a truly democratic state is created by peaceful, constitutional means, if this is still possible, or by revolutionary path, if this is the only remaining way." "The enemies of the Filipino people—landlords and Wall Street monopolists—are still in power, and they must be removed," Taruc stated on behalf of the Hukbalahap and the National Peasant Union. He demanded the repeal of the American trade law, the abolition of "equality of rights" of Americans with Filipino citizens, the liquidation of American bases, and the withdrawal of American troops from the country.

Quirino and other American puppets calculated on deceiving the Filipino people with a false promise to carry out democratic reforms, amnesty partisans, and grant freedom to all organizations declared "outlaw" by Roxas, on condition of registration and surrender of weapons by the partisans. They hoped that in this way they would manage to liquidate the Hukbalahap, and along with it the entire national liberation movement in the country. However, all these plans failed. Despite the fact that the weapons registration period was extended two times, the reactionaries succeeded in taking away weapons from only 10 people. After this failure, Quirino went over to an open offensive against democratic forces and resumed the armed struggle against the Hukbalahap and the National Peasant Union on an unprecedented scale. By his order, police troops armed with American guns and airplanes were put into action. At the same time, the Philippine

government intensified its offensive against the working class. By a supreme court ruling, the rights of workers to strike were curtailed. Congress proceeded to discuss a bill on depriving state employees of the right to strike. Following the American model, a "Committee on Un-Philippine Activities" has been created in the Philippines, which accuses defenders of true national freedom and democracy of "anti-patriotic activity".

American imperialists are trying to intimidate the Filipino people with the false version that the Soviet Union is threatening the Philippines. However, this provocative propaganda is not having success. In the person of the peoples of the USSR, Filipino working people see a reliable ally in the struggle for the liquidation of colonial slavery. In the achievements of the Soviet Union, Filipino working people see the pledge of their liberation. They justly consider the USSR a reliable stronghold of the national independence of all peoples, small and large. "We have seen," said the leader of the Hukbalahap Luis Taruc, "what Soviet policy is regarding other Asian peoples. The USSR is the only country that has consistently fought for the interests of the Indonesian People's Republic, Vietnam, and other colonial peoples." General Secretary of the Philippine Communist Party Mariano Balgos stated: "In the event of war, the communists of the Philippines will be on the side of the Soviet Union. We will support the Soviet Union, because we consider that it is the leader of world democracy and the struggle for peace, as well as a fighter for the interests of plain people throughout the world." In the struggle, the forces of the democratic camp grow and strengthen, and the political influence of the communist party

expands and consolidates. Ever broader strata of the Filipino people are becoming an active force of the anti-imperialist, democratic camp. The struggle against the American imperialists operating in the country and their Philippine puppets is acquiring an ever wider scope.

Reports on the national liberation movement in the Middle and Near East were delivered by Comrades V. B. Lutsky and L. N. Vatolina.

Comrade V. B. Lutsky (Moscow State University) noted that by the end of the Second World War, the countries of the Arab East continued to remain under the colonial yoke of English and, in part, French imperialism. England retained mandates for Palestine and Transjordan at that time, bound Egypt and Iraq with unequal treaties, and tried to squeeze out French imperialists in Syria and Lebanon. These Arab countries were occupied by English troops. The key positions of their economy were concentrated in the hands of English and partly French monopolies.

As a result of the Second World War, the national liberation movement of the peoples of Arab countries unfolded with new force. Class and national self-awareness of the Arab popular masses grew sharply. The influence of communist parties in Arab countries, especially in Syria, Lebanon, Egypt, and Iraq, intensified.

A major role in awakening the peoples of the Middle East was played by the defeat of the Axis powers by the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union, the liberation of the peoples of Europe from the yoke of Hitlerite fascism, and the deliverance of the

peoples of the East from the yoke of Japanese imperialism. The new stage into which the national liberation movement of the Arab peoples entered after the war is characterized by the fact that working people increasingly put forward political demands; the strike and agrarian movement is widening. The working class, having grown numerically and strengthened organizationally, constitutes the core of the movement and in the majority of cases leads it. The national bourgeoisie is increasingly pushed away from leadership of the national liberation movement. The old bourgeois national-reformist parties that led the movement in the past, such as, for example, the Wafd and Hizb al-Watan in Egypt, the Kutla Wataniya in Syria, and so on, are losing their authority and breaking away from the movement. The national liberation struggle is led by communist parties, trade unions, and organizations of the united front of anti-imperialist forces.

Feudals and the big bourgeoisie of Arab countries betrayed the national liberation movement and went over to the camp of imperialism and reaction: they wage a struggle against the popular liberation movement, organize shootings of popular demonstrations and executions of democratic figures, persecute the communist party and other progressive organizations, ban strikes, and issue emergency laws against trade unions. They unreservedly support the aggressive foreign policy of the ringleaders of the Anglo-American imperialist bloc.

The national liberation struggle in Egypt assumed enormous scope. The popular masses of Egypt are fighting for the withdrawal of English troops from the Nile Valley—i.e., from Egypt and the Sudan—as well as for the unification of these

two countries on democratic principles, for the abrogation of the unequal Anglo-Egyptian treaty of 1936. Under these slogans, mass demonstrations of Egyptian working people took place in 1945–1947 during Anglo-Egyptian negotiations and the discussion of the Egyptian question in the Security Council.

Despite government terror in Egypt, the forces of true democracy are growing and strengthening. A new progressive organization, the "Democratic Movement for the National Liberation of Egypt", operating underground, has been created. In its program manifesto, this organization calls the Egyptian people to an armed struggle against the imperialists, to the liquidation of the domination of landlords and capitalists—traitors to the people—and to the establishment of a popular-democratic system in the country.

The national liberation movement assumed major proportions in the so-called Anglo-Egyptian Sudan. The popular masses here awakened for the first time to political life, an active struggle for freedom and independence. National organizations and political parties arose in the Sudan that lead popular resistance to the colonial policy of British imperialism. Currently, the Sudanese liberation movement is headed by the national-revolutionary organization "Progressive National Liberation Movement of the Sudan", relying on the support of workers, farm laborers, and advanced student youth, and the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia organization "Sudanese National Congress". Grouping around the congress are the main political parties of the Sudan waging a struggle for the liquidation of the colonial oppression regime: the "Unionist Party", the "People's Party", the "Party of Freedom Supporters", and the "Party of

Brothers" (Hizb al-Ashiqa). These parties are supporters of the joint struggle of the peoples of Egypt and Sudan against the domination of imperialists.

Counterposed to democratic forces, the feudal-comprador agency of imperialism in the Sudan, forming the so-called "National Party" (Hizb al-Umma), supports English policy aimed at separating Sudan from Egypt and granting Sudan fictitious independence while preserving the English colonial regime in it.

Sudanese working people organize demonstrations and strikes. They boycotted the elections to the so-called "legislative assembly" conducted by the English in November 1948; over 80% of voters did not take part in the voting. During the elections, and then the opening of the "legislative assembly", multi-thousand demonstrations under the slogans "Down with elections!", "Down with English imperialists!", "Out with the English from Sudan!" were held in the Sudan. In a number of cities, demonstrators were fired upon by English troops, and many of them were arrested.

In Syria and Lebanon, by the end of the Second World War, a popular struggle unfolded for the final abolition of the mandate and for the withdrawal of Anglo-French troops from the country. This struggle was crowned with success mainly thanks to the support given by the Soviet Union to Syria and Lebanon during the discussion of the Syrian-Lebanese question in the Security Council.

By the beginning of 1947, foreign troops were withdrawn from Syria and Lebanon. But capitalist monopolies preserved their

enterprises and concessions there; American and English monopolists received a number of new concessions. Syria and Lebanon were flooded with foreign, predominantly English, political and military advisers. The ruling cliques of Syria and Lebanon went into a deal with English and American imperialists. At their promptings, the Communist Party of Syria was banned at the end of 1947, and the Communist Party of Lebanon at the beginning of 1948; societies of friendship with the Soviet Union and progressive print organs were closed; trade unions were also subjected to repressions.

In 1948, British imperialists dragged Syria and Lebanon into the Palestinian provocation and, striving to turn these states into their colonies, tried to impose unequal treaties on them.

The USA and England are drawing Syria and Lebanon into various aggressive blocs they are hammering together in the Middle East. The popular masses of Syria and Lebanon oppose the deal of the ruling cliques of these countries with the Anglo-American bloc and demand the liquidation of imperialist concessions.

In December 1948, mass demonstrations took place in Syria. The government of Jamil Mardam, which oriented toward England, was overthrown. However, American and French imperialists, taking advantage of the events in Syria, pushed their stooge Khalid al-Azm to power. Khalid al-Azm's policy caused sharp discontent among the popular masses. In March 1949, a powerful wave of anti-government demonstrations swept through Damascus and across the country. Khalid al-Azm's government found itself under threat. On March 30 in Damascus, a military clique headed by the commander of the

Syrian army, Colonel Husni al-Za'im, carried out a military coup and seized power into its own hands.

Husni al-Za'im established a fascist dictatorship regime in Syria. Military courts operated in the country, concentration camps were overflowing with progressive figures, primarily communists, left-wing newspapers were closed, political parties were banned, and popular demonstrations, meetings, and gatherings were dispersed. By means of fascist terror, Husni al-Za'im tried to suppress the national liberation movement of the Syrian people.

To stay in power, the new dictator of Syria resorted to demagogy. He declared himself a champion of national independence, and the carried-out military-fascist coup a "national revolution". In reality, however, Husni al-Za'im sold the country out to foreign imperialists. Contrary to the will of the people, he concluded a enslaving currency agreement with France for Syria and granted the American oil company the right to construct an oil pipeline on Syrian territory. The influx of American goods into Syria led to the closing of a number of industrial enterprises[122].

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

Great successes were achieved by the forces of democracy in Lebanon. But the Lebanese government intensified repressions.

---

[122] In August 1949, Husni al-Za'im was overthrown and shot by English agency

In 1948, hundreds of progressive Lebanese figures were confined to a concentration camp in Baalbek. However, under pressure from the mass protest movement that arose in the country against these repressions, the Lebanese government was forced to release the Baalbek prisoners. The government's attempt to close the Lebanese Federation of Trade Unions also failed as a result of the resistance of the proletarian masses of Lebanon.

In February 1949, numerous popular demonstrations took place in the country in protest against the execution of Iraqi communists. The progressive Lebanese public took an active part in the World Congress of Partisans of Peace. In Lebanon, as well as in Syria, old bourgeois parties went bankrupt and exposed themselves in the eyes of the masses as the agency of imperialism. The leading role in the popular-democratic movement belongs to Lebanese communists.

The working class of Lebanon has now become the leading force of the national liberation movement, in which democratic trade unions and such progressive united front organizations as the League for the Struggle against Fascism and Nazism, the Lebanese National Congress, the Lebanese Committee of Partisans of Peace, and others take an active part.

The leader of the liberation movement of the Iraqi people is also the working class, which possesses the experience of the revolutionary struggle of 1948–1949. No terror and no repressions by the executioners from the camp of Nuri as-Said and his Labour imperialist patrons can break the will of the people of Iraq for the struggle for freedom, independence, and democracy.

British imperialism during its 30-year domination in Palestine stoked national enmity between the native Arab population and the Jewish population, whose numbers increased as a result of immigration from 55 thousand people in 1919 to 600 thousand people in 1948 (about a third of the entire population of Palestine). English provocateurs and their agents used anti-Arab chauvinism of the Jews and anti-Jewish hatred of the Arabs to maintain their domination. Arab-Jewish enmity assumed particularly acute forms after the Second World War, retarding the upsurge of the national liberation movement in Palestine.

For the purpose of ending inter-communal strife and liquidating the colonial regime, the Soviet Union proposed creating two independent democratic states on the territory of Palestine: an Arab one and a Jewish one. The UN General Assembly on November 30, 1947, adopted a corresponding resolution on this issue on the basis of Soviet proposals.

However, American and English imperialists, striving to preserve the colonial regime in Palestine, took measures to wreck this UN decision. The Zionist bourgeoisie serves as the mainstay for the implementation of Anglo-American imperialist plans.

Until 1939, the Zionist bourgeoisie, including its right-wing socialist grouping Mapai—which currently occupies a dominant position in the State of Israel—was entirely satisfied with the English mandate and the colonial status of the country. However, in 1939 England, striving to secure Arab support in the war, made concessions to the Arab feudal-bourgeois apex and partly restricted the activity of the Zionists. This caused

friction between British imperialism and the Zionist bourgeoisie. The Zionist bourgeoisie began to demand the abolition of the English mandate and the formation of an independent state. But it could not imagine its existence without the support of one or another imperialist power. It was easy for the USA to turn the Zionist leaders into its agents. It is precisely on such a basis that the Zionist bourgeois state of Israel is currently built. Its leaders began their state activity by agreeing to the enslaving conditions of an American loan, which were hidden even from the Constituent Assembly. The Government of Israel is henceforth obligated to report to the US Export-Import Bank and provide it with all information requested by it, which is incompatible with the concept of state sovereignty. The Government of the State of Israel can spend funds received under this loan only on the purchase of American goods or on the construction of various facilities indicated by the Americans, primarily military-strategic communications (for example, the construction of the Tel Aviv port under the guidance of American specialists). The ruling circles of Israel wide opened the doors of the country to foreign capital, primarily American, granting it all kinds of privileges.

The leaders of the State of Israel express readiness to join the aggressive Mediterranean bloc being hammered together by Anglo-American imperialists. The leaders of the Mapai party openly spoke out against the World Congress of Partisans of Peace and are seeking the withdrawal of Israeli trade unions from the World Federation of Trade Unions. Delegates of the State of Israel act as lackeys before the Anglo-American imperialist bloc in the UN. Thus, the UN decision on the

creation of an independent democratic Jewish state in Palestine has essentially not been translated into life. The UN decision on the creation of an independent democratic Arab state has not been implemented either. Along with the Anglo-American imperialists, the Arab feudal-bourgeois leaders who follow the lead of the English imperialists are to blame for this. Neither the Zionist nor the Arab bourgeoisie is interested in liquidating colonial oppression in Palestine.

Advanced workers of Palestine, both Jews and Arabs, are increasingly realizing the necessity of intensifying the struggle for independence and democracy under the leadership of the communist party. The programs of the Communist Party of the State of Israel and the Arab League of National Liberation—which is a communist organization of the Arab part of Palestine—outline ways of resolving the main tasks of the national liberation movement.

In Arab countries, there are currently all objective conditions for a new upsurge of the popular liberation movement. The Palestine war aggravated the crisis of the colonial system in the Middle East, showed the Arab popular masses the rottenness and reactionariness of the ruling cliques of Arab countries, and exposed their close connection with English and American imperialism. It worsened the already difficult economic situation of the Arab peoples, brought them to the brink of economic catastrophe, and brought incalculable disasters to the popular masses, onto whose shoulders all the burdens of the war were shifted.

Comrade L. N. Vatolina (Institute of Economics) noted in her report that the national liberation movement, which intensified

under the influence of the historic victories of the Soviet Union in the Second World War, the strengthening of the democratic camp, and the grandiose successes of the USSR in building communism, and which has embraced the countries of the Arab East, is distinguished by mass participation, a comparatively high organizational and ideological-political level. The varying level and features of historical and socio-economic development of Arab countries—among which there are countries with relatively developed capitalist relations and a bourgeois-parliamentary system (Egypt) and countries with a patriarchal-clan system and a monarchical-feudal system of government (Yemen and Arabia)—determine the varying level of the national liberation movement and a large variety of its forms in each of these countries.

Leadership of the national liberation movement in the Arab East is increasingly passing to the working class, which grew quantitatively during the war. In Egypt (total population 20 million people), there are up to 700 thousand workers, and together with agricultural workers over 1 million people. In Arab Palestine there are 25 thousand industrial workers, in the State of Israel 50 thousand workers. In Syria and Lebanon, the number of the working class has grown to 150 thousand people (total population 4.5 million people).

Recently, in connection with the creation of the oil-extracting industry in Saudi Arabia, a young proletariat has also begun to form there.

The working class of Arab countries has created its mass organizations. Even according to official data, in 1946 there

were 465 trade unions in Egypt, and 11 trade unions in the State of Israel.

The position of the working class in Arab countries is extremely difficult. It is subjected to capitalist and semi-feudal exploitation; labor legislation is absent. In Egypt before the war, according to sample data, children accounted for up to 12% of the entire labor force in some branches; on more than 37% of enterprises, the working day lasted over 12 hours. Egypt ranks first in the world in the infant mortality rate. At American oil fields in Saudi Arabia, almost slave-owning methods of exploiting labor are applied.

In its struggle for freedom and independence, for the liquidation of the system of colonial slavery, the proletariat of Arab states has a mass ally in the person of the destitute peasantry. The main mass of the peasantry in all Arab countries is deprived of land, which belongs here to local feudals and landlords, as well as religious communities and foreign companies. Poor people, farm laborers, and fellahin tenants are crushed by the semi-feudal exploitation of landlords and kulaks, the arbitrariness of local authorities, the bondage of usurers, foreign companies, and banks. The peasants of Arab countries are fighting both against imperialist oppression and against feudal-landlord landownership. The successes of socialist construction in the USSR, as well as agrarian reforms and the transfer of land into the hands of the peasantry in the countries of people's democracy, inspire the colonial peasantry to struggle.

The communist parties of Arab countries have significantly activated their activity. They have grown stronger politically,

organizationally, and numerically. Industrial workers, the urban poor, student youth, teachers, and other strata of the population of these countries are increasingly actively joining the communist parties. The communist movement has acquired a particularly large scope in Syria and Lebanon, where it existed legally until 1947–1948. The Communist Parties of Syria and Lebanon play a leading role in the revolutionary movement in the Arab East.

Frightened by the scope of the national liberation movement of the Arab peoples, the growing role in it of the working class and communist parties, as well as the activity of numerous and constantly growing democratic organizations, the big national bourgeoisie of the countries of the Arab East, instigated and supported by its imperialist masters, tries in every way to retard the upsurge of the national liberation struggle, resorting to terror and social demagogy.

In the post-war years, the ruling circles of Arab countries have been applying particularly brutal repressions against participants in the labor movement. They have repeatedly declared a state of siege in Egypt, Iraq, and other Arab countries, banned demonstrations, meetings, and various organized actions of working people. To decapitate and suppress the labor movement, the big bourgeoisie tries to push it onto the path of trade unionism, to tear economic struggle away from political, limit the movement to narrow professional tasks, and place it under government control. Trade unions of the "Zubatov" type are known in the history of Egypt's labor movement. After the Second World War, the Egyptian government has been trying to plant similar organizations

anew. The ruling circles of other Arab countries resort to the same policy.

Anglo-American imperialists, preparing an aggressive war against the Soviet Union and countries of people's democracy, are using the Arab East as one of their bridgeheads. They try to cover up their military preparations with slanderous anti-Soviet propaganda, intimidation by the "threat of communism". But the peoples of the Arab East do not believe the false fabrications of the imperialists and are offering growing resistance to the offensive policy of the imperialist ringleaders and their agency in Arab countries. A characteristic feature of this resistance is the solidarity of working people, embracing ever broader masses.

The close connection of the national liberation movement of the Arab peoples with the international democratic movement, the growing international solidarity of working people, the activation of the activity of representatives of Arab countries in international democratic organizations and congresses, the transfer of leadership of the national liberation struggle into the hands of the working class and communist parties—its vanguard—all this testifies to the fact that the national liberation struggle in the countries of the Arab East is rising to a new, higher stage.

In the debates on the reports about the national liberation movement in the countries of the Arab East, Comrade V. M. Fedorenko (Institute of Economics) spoke. He noted that although Syria (in 1945, 3,052,500 people) and Lebanon (in 1949, 1,227,000 people) are significantly inferior in population to other countries of the Middle East, the communist parties

and trade unions of these two small Arab countries are the most numerous and cohesive. This is explained by the fact that the peoples of Syria and Lebanon, under the leadership of the communist party, waged a prolonged struggle against French imperialists, German-Italian fascism, and are currently continuing to wage a struggle against Anglo-American imperialists and internal reaction.

The Great October Socialist Revolution pointed out to colonial peoples, including the peoples of Syria and Lebanon, the path to freedom and independence. The Communist Party of Syria and Lebanon arose in 1923 and actively participated in the general uprising of the Syrian people against the French colonizers in 1925–1927, leading the labor movement that originated in the country at that time. Soon it was forced to go underground. Only in 1937, thanks to the successes of the popular anti-fascist front in France and the upsurge of the national liberation movement in Syria, was the communist party legalized. It became one of the most influential political organizations in the country. Its newspaper *Saut ash-Shaab* ("Voice of the People") played an important role in the development of the labor movement in Syria and Lebanon.

In July 1939, French reactionaries, dissolving the national government of Syria, abolished the republican constitution and drove the communist party underground once again. Under difficult underground conditions for two years, communists continued the struggle against fascism and reaction. After the expulsion of the fascists from the countries of the Levant, the Communist Party of Syria and Lebanon once again emerged from the underground onto the broad political arena.

Communists carried out active work in mass non-partisan democratic organizations and came to the head of the movement for national independence and democratization of Syria and Lebanon.

In January 1944, the program of the Communist Party of Syria and Lebanon was adopted, set forth in the National Charter, which put forward the main demands for the democratization of the country and ensuring its independence.

This same year was marked by the strengthening of Syria and Lebanon as sovereign states, which was facilitated by the support given to them by the Soviet Union. The united Communist Party of Syria and Lebanon split into two communist parties: the Communist Party of Lebanon headed by Farajallah Helou and Nicolas Chaoui, and the Communist Party of Syria headed by Khaled Bagdash and Rashad Issa. This led to an improvement in organizational work in the parties, in particular to an improvement in their leadership of trade unions and the labor movement.

Trade unions of Syria and Lebanon for more than fifteen years waged a struggle for their rights under semi-legal conditions. In 1945, they joined the World Federation of Trade Unions. In 1949, the number of members of democratic trade unions in Lebanon and Syria reached 45 thousand people, united in 110 trade unions; they waged an organized struggle for the interests of working people, whose living conditions were and continue to remain very difficult. Entrepreneurs, taking advantage of unemployment, widely exploiting child labor, are lowering wages, especially for unskilled workers. Thus, a common laborer for a 10-hour working day receives from 1.5 to 3 liras;

farm laborers even less—1.5 liras. And for the meager nourishment of a family of 4–5 people, at least 7–8 liras per day is necessary. The indignation of the working masses often poured out into strikes led by trade unions. Thus, under the leadership of trade unions, several general and over 50 major local strikes were successfully conducted. In 1946, after a prolonged and stubborn struggle, the workers of Syria and Lebanon achieved a major victory. The parliaments of Syria and Lebanon, for the first time in the history of these countries, adopted labor laws, although significantly curtailed in comparison with the draft of the trade unions.

In December 1947, internal reaction in Syria and Lebanon, by order of Anglo-American masters, went on the offensive against democratic organizations. Both communist parties were once again forced to go underground. But even under difficult underground conditions, they continue to lead the struggle of the working class, distribute leaflets, and organize strikes. In the summer of 1948, the communist parties appealed to their peoples with a call to intensify the anti-imperialist struggle for the independence and sovereignty of Syria and Lebanon, to fight against the machinations of imperialists, against the English project of creating "Greater Syria". In November, major strikes broke out in Aleppo and Beirut.

By the end of 1948, the already difficult material position of working people worsened even more in connection with drought. Famine set in in Syria.

Despite the rampage of reaction in Syria and especially in Lebanon, the movement for peace is widening. In April, a Lebanese delegation headed by a prominent Lebanese public

figure, architect Antoine Tabet, arrived in Paris for the World Congress of Partisans of Peace. On behalf of the Lebanese people, Tabet stated at the congress that the people of Lebanon will not fight against the Soviet Union, but will fight against the forces of imperialism. Tabet and the chairman of the Federation of Trade Unions of Lebanon, Mustafa el-Ariss, were elected members of the Permanent Committee of Partisans of Peace. During the war years, the communist parties of Lebanon and Syria grew significantly. Consistently fighting for the interests of working people, they strengthened their influence among the broad popular masses. Under the leadership of the communist parties, the peoples of Syria and Lebanon achieved some democratization of the electoral law, replacing two-stage elections with direct ones.

The parliamentary elections of 1947, despite the atmosphere of terror, demonstrated the strengthening ties of the party with the masses. Workers, peasants, the intelligentsia, contributing 1 lira and less, in a short time collected about 20 thousand liras for the fund of candidates nominated by the communist party. Pre-election meetings at which candidates of the communist parties of Syria and Lebanon spoke were crowded. Only by falsifying election results did reaction prevent communist party candidates from entering the parliaments of Syria and Lebanon, although, for example, the leader of the Communist Party of Syria, Khaled Bagdash, received a sufficient number of votes to become a member of parliament.

The public of Syria and Lebanon, like all Arab countries, harbors deep sympathy for the USSR. Thanks to the support given by the Soviet Union to the demands of Syria and

Lebanon, foreign troops were withdrawn from their territory at the beginning of 1946.

Democratic publications *At-Tariq*, *Saut ash-Shaab*, the bulletin of the Society for Cultural Relations of Syria and Lebanon with the USSR systematically published articles dedicated to the Soviet Union. Cultural figures of Syria and Lebanon who visited the Soviet Union in the spring of 1947 spoke in their articles about the advantages of the socialist economic system, about the achievements of Soviet science, culture, and art.

The offensive of reaction extremely complicated the political situation in Syria and Lebanon. The popular masses are continuing the struggle against Anglo-American imperialists, who with the help of native agency strive to use Syria and Lebanon in their imperialist plans.

In the debates on Comrade V. V. Balabushevich's report on the national liberation movement in India, Comrade S. M. Melman (Institute of Economics) spoke. She noted that the partition of India into two dominions did not bring the country national independence, did not resolve contradictions between the Indian people and English imperialism, and did not resolve any of the socio-economic problems. No socio-economic transformations in the interests of the popular masses were carried out either in the Indian Union or in Pakistan. Contradictions between the working masses and exploiting classes of India have become even more aggravated and deepened.

The agrarian question—the fundamental question for India—cannot be resolved under the domination in the country of the

block of imperialists, big bourgeoisie, and landlords. The growth of the mass movement forced the provincial governments of the Indian Union to proceed to drafting agrarian legislation; but the draft laws now existing in almost all provinces are directed against feudal remnants in India's economy and in no way meet the interests of the popular masses.

The position of the peasantry after the partition of India continues to worsen. Debt slavery, in the chains of which millions of toiling peasants find themselves, has not been liquidated. Famine after the war is also a scourge of the population of a number of regions of the country, especially southern ones. The volume of agricultural production after the partition of India has not yet reached even the extremely low pre-war level. Indian agriculture continues to degrade.

Over the years of the Second World War, India's industrial production developed somewhat. However, after the end of the war, the level of industrial production is falling again. Thus, the general index of production in value terms (1938/39 = 100) fell from 126.8 in 1943/44 to 106 in 1947/48. In India's cotton industry in 1947/48, production amounted to only 77.3% of the wartime maximum; in the jute industry, production was also below the wartime maximum; pig iron smelting amounted to 76.7%; output in other branches of India's industry is also shrinking.

By the end of the war, the fixed capital of Indian industry and railway transport turned out to be heavily worn out. Thus, for example, in the textile industry, it is necessary to renew fixed capital by at least 50%. However, the renewal of fixed capital

is carried out at extremely slow paces. This is conditioned first of all by the features of India's colonial economy, which has no machine-building of its own, as well as by the policy of Anglo-American imperialists hindering the country's industrialization. Indian industry continues to remain tethered to English and, in part, also American imperialism. During the war years, in view of England's constrained financial position, shares of a number of English enterprises passed to Indian capitalists. However, after the end of the war and after the country's partition, as a result of the treacherous, capitulationist policy of the Indian big bourgeoisie, the positions of English capital in India's industry are strengthening once again. Not a single English enterprise has been nationalized to this day; "English managing agencies" controlling a significant part of India's industry and trade continue to function as before. One of the forms of the further penetration of English capital into India is the organization of a number of mixed Anglo-Indian companies. American capital is also increasingly rushing into Indian industry.

The fate of the so-called English sterling debt of India also testifies to the fact that the country is still enslaved by British imperialism. After the partition of India in 1948, a financial agreement was concluded between the English government and Nehru's government, according to which a significant part of England's sterling debt was essentially annulled. £275 million —i.e., over 20% of the debt—are officially written off, of which £100 million are attributed to covering the cost of military materials imposed on India by England, and £175.5 million are "reserved" for pensions to officials who served in England. Over three years, it is planned to unfreeze a mere

£160.5 million. As for the remaining £850 million of the debt, they are not even mentioned in the agreement—this sum continues to remain essentially blocked in England. Thus, the imperialist essence of the Labour government of England and the capitulationist policy of India's big capital manifested themselves anew in this agreement.

By the beginning of the Second World War, as a result of Japan's penetration into the Indian market, England had lost a significant part of its foreign trade positions in India. Thus, if on the eve of the First World War it imported approximately 3 billion yards of fabric into India, on the eve of the Second World War it imported only 270 million yards. By the end of the war, ousted by American and increased Indian industry, the English textile industry lost the Indian market, and the import of English fabrics dropped to 1–2 million yards. In 1947/48, England brought the import of textiles into India and Pakistan to only 50 million yards; it is hardly likely to succeed in restoring its former positions. In the post-war period, besides Indian and American competitors, England is once again threatened by Japanese competition encouraged by US imperialists. The competitive struggle between English and American imperialism for the markets of India and Pakistan is intensifying. Already in 1947, the shares of England and the USA in India's foreign trade, especially in its imports, almost equaled.

Now the aspiration of American imperialism to turn India into its colonial appendage, to use it as one of the military-strategic bases of the USA in the East, as a bridgehead for suppressing the national liberation movement of the peoples of East and

Southeast Asia, has clearly manifested itself. American capital is rushing particularly actively into industry having military significance. American imperialists are trying to enslave India with the help of loans as well.

The government of India is currently in the position of a "servant of two masters"—English and American imperialism. A certain part of the Indian big bourgeoisie clearly orients toward the USA. Thus, the magazine *The Eastern Economist*—the organ of the Birla group—demands the establishment of "business ties" with American monopolies and "substantiates" the expediency of obtaining loans in the USA.

The strengthening of democratic forces in India under the leading role of the working class leads to a further upsurge in the national liberation struggle of the Indian people against English and American imperialism and the Indian big bourgeoisie acting in a bloc with it.

The Indian liberation movement is closely linked with the world revolutionary movement, and along with it, it marches toward victory. V. I. Lenin pointed out in his time: "The outcome of the struggle depends, in the final analysis, on the fact that Russia, India, China, etc., constitute the gigantic majority of the population. It is precisely this majority of population that is being drawn with extraordinary rapidity in recent years into the struggle for its emancipation, so that in this sense there cannot be a shadow of doubt as to what the final outcome of the world struggle will be. In this sense, the

final victory of socialism is fully and unconditionally assured."[123]

Comrade F. D. Gapchenko in her speech dwelt on the problem of agrarian relations in India and on the special significance of this issue for the national liberation movement after the country's partition. She illuminated the character and significance of the peasant armed uprising in the princely state of Hyderabad. This uprising dealt a blow to British imperialism and feudal reaction in the very center of India. Although the uprising has unfolded so far on a limited part of the country's territory, it is of extremely great importance.

Hyderabad is one of the largest Indian princely states with a population of 17 million people; its territory is larger than the territory of England. The British rulers in India always used this artificially created princely state to suppress the national liberation movement of the Indian people. During the partition of India, Hyderabad did not become part of either of the dominions. British imperialists calculated that this feudal princely state would continue to be their obedient tool in the struggle against the national liberation movement in the countries of Southeast Asia.

After the partition of India, Hyderabad received a loan from English capitalists in the amount of £60 million. The Americans obligated themselves to equip three military plants in Hyderabad. American advisers flooded in here. With the help of American and British imperialism, the reactionary authorities of Hyderabad armed a hundred-thousand-strong

---

[123] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XXVII, pp. 416–417

army, which was used primarily to suppress the uprising in Telangana. But these troops failed to crush the democratic movement of the Hyderabad peasantry. The peasants of Hyderabad, having seized the land of the feudals, are continuing their heroic struggle. They rejected the proposal to carry out a new "redistribution" of all lands put forward by the Hyderabad organization of the National Congress, which is the agency of the bourgeoisie and sets as its goal the return of lands to the Hyderabad feudals.

In Hyderabad, the peasants created a democratic authority, drove out the landlords, and proceeded to organize a economy freed from the fetters of slavery. Sown areas are expanding, including at the expense of virgin land. Health-improving measures—mass vaccinations against epidemic diseases, and so on—are being carried out in the villages. The intelligentsia also takes an active part in democratic transformations. The fruitful constructive work begun in Telangana contrasts with the degradation of agriculture, famine, poverty, and oppression of working people in the rest of India.

In Hyderabad, the influence of communists is exceptionally great. They head the struggle of the peasant masses. When terror against communists became particularly unbridled, many Hyderabad villages rose to defend the communists. The movement of solidarity with Telangana is widening across all of India. Peasant uprisings in different regions of India are increasingly merging with the labor movement. The historical example of Hyderabad and Telangana inspires the progressive forces of India to struggle for the true national independence of the country, for a democratic path of development.

Comrade N. D. Grodko (Moscow Financial Institute) highlighted the issue of the penetration of foreign capital into India. The Indian ruling big bourgeoisie wide opened the road to India for English and American monopolies. Already in February 1947, in the Legislative Assembly of the Indian Union, Nehru stated about the "desirability of the inflow of foreign capital into India", and the Australian economist Colin Clark, invited to India as an expert, tried to lay a "scientific basis" for the treacherous, anti-national policy of the apex of the Indian bourgeoisie and feudals and justify the alliance of India's big capital with English and American imperialists. In this alliance, English and American capital occupies the dominant position, striving to turn India into the eastern bridgehead of the aggressive Anglo-American bloc directed against the USSR and the national liberation movement of the peoples of the East.

In mixed Anglo-Indian enterprises, English capital dominates, determining all their activity. In the interests of the magnates of English financial capital, nationalization of industry is not being carried out in India, which the figures of the National Congress demagogically promised during election agitation. Not daring to abandon the nationalization of India's industry immediately after the Punjab tragedy, the wave of mass strikes and uprisings, the government of the Indian Union organized a "discussion" in the bourgeois press on the "pluses and minuses" of nationalization. And already in 1948, it announced its decision to postpone nationalization as "untimely" for 10 years —i.e., essentially acknowledged that it was merely deceiving the people.

Nehru's government's program bypasses the vital interests of the working people of India; it is cluttered only with secondary details, as well as beaten demagogic recipes, like proposals on "cooperating producers", on strengthening small landholdings and drafting a "scheme" of debt relief, wishes for carrying out land tax reform, and so on. Quite a bit of place is given to "plans" drawn up in a Gandhian spirit for the development on "non-capitalist principles" of handicraft and light industry. The decentralization of industry is propagated, the absurd "idea" of creating in each region with a population of 1 million people a "complex economy satisfying all needs of the region" is put forward.

The Indian people lead a beggarly existence. Their difficult situation is aggravated by inflation, about which the Indian bourgeois press is silent. The abolition of certain price controls and the ration system (at the beginning of 1948) scandalously failed, causing only a new rise in prices and aggravation of inflation. The frightened government is forced to restore the ration system at least for a certain contingent. The supply norm is from 6 to 12 ounces of grain per person per day, and actually even lower. Except for grain, the population receives nothing at fixed prices. Government officials, like chairman of the All-Indian Agricultural Conference Nanavati, proposed a program unsurpassed in hypocrisy and cynicism to "fight hunger": 1) improvement of the "human factor", 2) improvement of statistical-economic research, 3) intensification of "cooperation".

Comrade Grodko reminds that as a result of the Indo-Muslim slaughter provoked by British imperialism after the partition of

India, over 10 million people were left homeless, since they were forced to flee (Muslims to Pakistan, Hindus to the Indian Union). To this day, the question of the labor placement of these people has not been resolved; they are starving, they have no housing. Responsibility for the tragic fate of millions of destitute people rests not only on British imperialism, but also on the ruling apex of the Indian bourgeoisie.

The results of the three-day work of the session were summed up by Comrade E. M. Zhukov. He noted that a wide range of problems of the national liberation movement of the peoples of colonial and dependent countries was touched upon in the reports and speeches. Of course, not all issues were successfully analyzed thoroughly. Lack of time did not allow presenting a report on the struggle of the peoples of the African continent, although these peoples are already joining political life and, undoubtedly, will throw off the imperialist yoke.

The working class of colonies and dependent countries has become the recognized leader, hegemon of the national-colonial revolution. This means that the national bourgeoisie has been pushed away from leadership of the national liberation movement in almost all countries of the colonial East. Thanks to this, the colonial revolution in many countries has acquired the form of a popular-democratic revolution, the form of the struggle for people's democracy.

Whichever country is spoken of: the countries of the Middle or Far East or the countries of Latin America—everywhere the main enemy of the popular liberation movement is American imperialism. It is precisely for this reason that the national liberation movement in each individual country of the colonial

world cannot be considered outside of connection with the struggle of the two camps, with the struggle of the forces of democracy and socialism against the forces of imperialism and reaction.

The progressiveness of one or another social movement, the revolutionariness or reactionariness of one or another party is currently determined by their attitude toward the Soviet Union, toward the camp of democracy and socialism. Therefore, the dispute over at which stage the colonial bourgeoisie begins to play a reactionary role can be resolved only under the condition that an answer is given to this main question.

A number of new issues were put forward at the session, in particular related to the activity of the communist parties of the countries of the colonial East. The reports showed the necessity of conducting scientific discussions on problems concerning the national liberation struggle in colonies and semi-colonies.

Questions of Economics, No.10, 1949.

N. Pukhlov

THE REORGANIZATION OF AGRICULTURE IN THE COUNTRIES OF PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY

At present, intense work is underway in all countries of people's democracy to build the foundations of socialism. Socialist industrialization is being successfully implemented. At the same time, all countries of people's democracy face one of the most difficult tasks of the proletarian dictatorship—the task of the socialist transformation of agriculture. The countries of people's democracy, having embarked on the path of socialist development, make wide use of the richest experience of the Soviet Union, where the working people, under the leadership of the party of Lenin and Stalin, have basically built socialism and are successfully advancing toward communism. The Polish, Bulgarian, Czechoslovak, Romanian, Hungarian, and Albanian peoples have achieved remarkable successes in building a new life. These successes are inextricably linked with the selfless fraternal support and comprehensive assistance provided to the countries of people's democracy by the first socialist power—the great Soviet Union. The building of socialism in the countries of people's democracy is also facilitated by the fact that, rallying around the USSR, they render fraternal mutual assistance to one another. The Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, which includes the USSR, Poland, Romania, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Albania, plays an exceptionally important role.

In the agriculture of the countries of people's democracy, huge socio-economic transformations have been carried out over a

short historical period since their liberation by the Soviet Army from the fascist-imperialist invaders. Now, as the restoration of the national economy is successfully completed in the countries of people's democracy and they embark on the implementation of plans designed to build the foundations of socialism, life acutely poses the question of the paths of socialist restructuring of agriculture in these countries.

The historic changes in the life of the working peasantry of the countries of people's democracy and the first steps of these countries in the socialist transformation of the countryside serve as fresh confirmation of the vitality and strength of the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin.

Between the two world wars, the percentage of the active population engaged in agriculture was: in Bulgaria, 79.8%; in Romania, 78.2%; in Poland, 72.3%; in Hungary, 51.8%; in Albania, over 80%; and in Czechoslovakia, 33% (including 24% in the Czech lands and 57% in Slovakia), while in a number of countries, agrarian relations were characterized by feudal remnants and pronounced differentiation of the peasantry.

In Hungary, 16 thousand landowner and kulak households owned 4.7 million hectares of land (44.8%), while 2.1 million peasant households accounted for 5.7 million hectares. A handful of major magnates, making up 0.1% of landowners, owned 22.4% of the land, while at the same time 1.6 million of the poorest peasant households had on average less than 3 hectares of land each. In addition, there were 1.8 million landless peasants and agricultural workers in the country.

In Poland, 30 thousand landowners (0.9% of all households) owned 47.3% of all land, while 64.6% of peasant households had less than 5 hectares each. There were over 5.5 million "surplus" working hands in the Polish countryside.

In Romania, landowners (2.6% of all households) owned 40% of the land, while small peasant households (74.9% of households) with allotments of up to 15 hectares each accounted for 28% of the land. In the Romanian countryside, over 700 thousand peasant families were completely deprived of land and livestock.

In Czechoslovakia, large landowners, accounting for 4.7% of households, owned 54.4% of the land area, while 70.5% of small peasant households (each up to 5 hectares in size) owned 15.7% of the land. There were more than 413 thousand agricultural workers in the country who had no land at all.

In Bulgaria, 10.7% of large farms (each over 10 hectares in size) owned 33.2% of the cultivated land area, while 63.1% of farms (up to 5 hectares in size) owned only 30% of the land.

In Albania, prior to its liberation in 1945 from the fascist yoke, large feudal landownership predominated. The bulk of the peasantry had no land. The predominant form of land tenure was sharecropping with payment in kind.

After World War I, so-called agrarian reforms were carried out in a number of countries of Central and Southeastern Europe to "pacify" the peasants. These "reforms," like the Stolypin reform in tsarist Russia, preserved landowner landownership and led to the strengthening of the kulaks' position, as well as

to the even greater ruin and impoverishment of the working peasantry.

As a result of the plunder of the working peasantry by landowners, capitalist monopolies, kulaks, and the bourgeois state, their position steadily worsened; a process of enrichment of a handful of exploiters and impoverishment of the working peasants was underway in the countryside. The impoverishment of the working peasants intensified even further during World War II. The Hitlerite invaders sought to turn the countries of Central and Southeastern Europe into an agrarian appendage of the "Reich" and suppliers of slaves for imperialist Germany. They plundered the population, made wide use of forced labor, predatory exploited and destroyed productive forces, and exported food and raw materials from these countries on a massive scale. The best lands were taken away from local peasants and given to German colonists. The "native" bourgeoisie, kulaks, and landowners collaborating with the occupiers helped them plunder and exploit workers and peasants. Both in the countryside and in the city, the number of able-bodied population sharply decreased, cultivated areas shrank, crop yields dropped, and livestock numbers declined (in Poland, for example, by 75%). Shortages of draft power, agricultural equipment, seeds, and fertilizers were felt everywhere. Agriculture fell into extreme decay. The differentiation of the peasantry intensified even further, as did the economic positions of the kulaks, who played the role of direct agents of the German-fascist occupiers in the countryside.

After the Soviet Army liberated a number of countries of Central and Southeastern Europe from the Hitlerite yoke, the working class of these countries, leading the working peasantry, carried out radical political and socio-economic transformations.

Along with the nationalization of industry and banks, agrarian reforms were among the first and most important measures of the people's democratic governments. These reforms were carried out by the working class in a revolutionary way, on the initiative and under the leadership of communist and workers' parties, with the direct and active participation of the broad masses of the working peasantry.

Agrarian reforms showed the working peasants that the working class was their only friend and reliable defender; the reforms contributed to strengthening the political alliance of the working class and the working peasantry.

In each of the countries of people's democracy, agrarian reforms were carried out on varying scales and at different paces, depending on the specific historical, political, and socio-economic situation. But everywhere agrarian reforms led to the liquidation of large landowner landownership, the transfer of landowner land into the hands of those who till it—the poor and middle peasants—and thereby strengthened the economic foundation of the people's democratic power.

In Poland, on the basis of the decree on agrarian reform of September 6, 1944, and the decree on the implementation of agrarian reform in the Recovered Territories of September 6, 1946, all landowner estates with an area of over 50 hectares, as

well as all landed property (regardless of size) belonging to Germans and their accomplices, were confiscated without compensation. At the same time, buildings, livestock, and equipment on these estates were confiscated. The peasant poor and multi-family middle peasants received about 7 million hectares of land. As a result of the reform, over one million new small and medium peasant households were created, including about half a million in the old regions of Poland and 600 thousand in the Recovered Territories. The total number of peasant households increased to 3.3 million. The state provided enormous material assistance to the newly created peasant households. Peasants who received land were issued state land ownership deeds without the right to sell, rent, divide, donate, etc.

The greater part of the forests (about 7 million hectares), mineral resources and waters, as well as 2.3 million hectares (more than 10%) of arable land used to organize large state farms, passed into state ownership. Over 40 thousand hectares of land, together with landowner manors, orchards, ponds, apiaries, and subsidiary enterprises, were transferred to the Peasant Mutual Aid Union and are used as subsidiary farms of the agricultural cooperative "Samopomoc Chłopska".

In Romania, under the law of March 20, 1946, all lands of Germans and enemies of the people, as well as all landed property exceeding 50 hectares in size (except for church, monastic, and royal property), were confiscated without compensation. In January 1948, following the liquidation of the monarchy, all royal estates were also confiscated. In March 1949, on the basis of a new decree, the remaining landowner

estates passed into state ownership, on the basis of which state farms and enterprises are organized. In total, 1.4 million hectares of land were confiscated in Romania, of which 1.1 million hectares were distributed among peasants and 385 thousand hectares passed into the state land fund. Land was received by 796 thousand landless and land-poor peasants and agricultural workers.

In Hungary, on the basis of the decree of March 15, 1945, all land and equipment belonging to fascists and traitors to the homeland, as well as the entire land area of landowners possessing more than 100 holds (57 hectares) each, were confiscated. A total of 2.5 million hectares of land was confiscated, part of which was distributed among 650 thousand indigent peasants, while another part was nationalized and used to create state farms. Peasants do not have the right to sell, rent, donate, or divide among heirs the land received through agrarian reform.

In Czechoslovakia, the agrarian reform was carried out in three stages. Under the decree of June 21, 1945, the lands and property of Germans, Hungarians, and enemies of the homeland were confiscated. The confiscated lands went into the National Land Fund established under the Ministry of Agriculture. According to the decree of July 11, 1947, on the revision of the "agrarian reform" of 1919, additional land area was transferred to this fund. The third stage of the agrarian reform was marked by the decree of March 21, 1948, according to which the maximum size of landed property could not exceed 50 hectares. All surplus above this norm was divided among the working peasants. In total, the state and working

peasants in Czechoslovakia received 4,326 thousand hectares of land, of which more than 2.5 million hectares were distributed among peasants.

In Albania, during 1945–1946, large landowner estates were confiscated along with buildings, equipment, and livestock. The upper limit of landownership was set at 20 hectares for persons working the land with their personal labor and 7 hectares for others. A total of 320 thousand hectares of land was confiscated, the bulk of which was distributed among land-poor peasants and agricultural workers. At the same time, agricultural workers received a large amount of livestock and olive trees.

In Bulgaria, the agrarian reform affected a relatively small number of farms. This peculiarity of the land reform was due to the fact that there was no landowner landownership in Bulgaria. Under the law of March 12, 1946, the maximum size of landed property for persons independently running agriculture was set at 20 hectares (up to 30 hectares for Southern Dobruja) and at 5 hectares for other categories. The surplus land above this norm, as well as a part of state land belonging to various public organizations, was transferred to the state land fund. Landowners from whom land was expropriated receive compensation in the form of specially issued state 3-percent bonds. A total of 165 thousand hectares of land was transferred to peasants, state farms, and cooperatives. Land (on average about 1 hectare per farm) was received by 127 thousand peasants.

In all countries of people's democracy, small plots of land (up to 0.5 hectares) were granted to workers, employees, and

artisans for housing construction, gardens, and vegetable plots. Large plots were allocated for organizing subsidiary farms of state and cooperative enterprises and institutions, as well as land tracts for state agricultural farms and enterprises, agronomical institutions, and experimental stations.

As a result of agrarian reforms in the countries of people's democracy, working peasants received about 14 million hectares of land. Along with other state measures, these reforms ensured a substantial improvement in the material situation of the working peasantry and contributed to the rapid restoration of agriculture. The liquidation of the landowner class and the nationalization of banks were accompanied by the destruction of huge mortgage and other debts of millions of peasant households. In Poland, for example, land allocation during the agrarian reform increased the profitability of peasant farms by 60 billion zlotys per year. The political consciousness of broad strata of the working peasantry increased significantly. Hundreds of thousands of poor and middle peasants took part in the division of landowner estates and in the work of land commissions. Mass organizations of the poorest and middle peasantry (for example, the Peasant Mutual Aid Union in Poland, which currently has over 1.5 million members), democratic organizations of peasant women and peasant youth, and various forms of agricultural cooperation emerged.

The implementation of the agrarian policy of the people's democratic states led to an increase in the number of small and medium peasant households.

Agrarian reforms met with the approval and active support of the broad masses of the working peasantry and caused fierce resistance from the capitalist elements of the countryside. Kulaks and other reactionary elements tried by all means to disrupt the implementation of the reforms. Thanks to the correct leadership of the working class over the working peasantry, and the mobilization of its forces for the struggle against capitalist reaction, the resistance of the latter was broken. Agrarian reforms were carried out successfully and in a short time. But these reforms were only the first stage of the transformation of agriculture in the countries of people's democracy. They did not ensure the complete liberation of the working peasantry from exploitation and poverty. Following the reforms, about 60% of peasants have low-capacity poor farms. Kulak farms still continue to own a significant part of the land, equipment, agricultural implements, draft power, livestock, etc., and account for a relatively large share of marketable agricultural produce. Agrarian reforms could not eliminate all obstacles to the development of agriculture or resolve the question of "who will win" in the countryside of the countries of people's democracy. The most important consequence of the land reforms is the liquidation of the landowner class, the strengthening of the alliance between the working class and the working peasantry, and the development of the peasants' political activity. Thanks to land reforms (and in Poland and Czechoslovakia, also the settlement and development of new lands), the economic situation of poor and middle peasants has significantly improved: land hunger has been largely satisfied, hundreds of thousands of landless

peasants and agricultural workers have received land, and the stratum of middle peasants in the countryside has increased.

Following the agrarian reforms, the people's democratic states, relying on the assistance of the Soviet Union and implementing the policy of socialist industrialization, were able to provide large financial and material support to agriculture. Credits were provided to small peasant farms, especially those created as a result of agrarian reform; working peasants are supplied on preferential terms with agricultural machinery, draft power, livestock, equipment, seeds, mineral fertilizers, etc.; prices for industrial goods have been reduced while maintaining prices for agricultural products; the tax burden on poor farms has been sharply reduced and increased for kulak farms. Various benefits and credits have been granted to agricultural cooperation; agronomical and veterinary assistance is provided to poor and middle peasant farms; state and cooperative machine and tractor stations and cooperative machine-rental points have been created; and large land reclamation and land management works are being carried out.

Thus, for example, in Poland, the state provided peasants and state estates with credits and subsidies amounting to about 60 billion zlotys from 1945 to 1948. Over 100 thousand head of horses and cattle were purchased abroad and distributed among peasants at low prices. Over 600 thousand tons of grain and 330 thousand tons of potatoes for seeds were issued to needy peasant farms during 1945–1948. More than 12 billion zlotys were spent on land reclamation works from the state budget over the past five years. Agriculture received 2,500 domestically produced tractors. The output of agricultural

machinery and implements tripled the pre-war level. Over four years, Polish agriculture received about 3 million tons of artificial fertilizers, 85% of which were provided to peasant farms.

Similar measures were carried out in other countries of people's democracy. This made it possible to achieve serious successes in the restoration of agriculture. Already in 1948, agricultural production reached the pre-war level in Czechoslovakia, 90% in Hungary, and 80% of this level in Poland (in per capita terms, the pre-war level was exceeded by 10%). Production of industrial crops increased sharply. Livestock numbers are rapidly recovering, and livestock productivity is increasing. All this made it possible to abolish ration cards for bread and other products in Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, and to increase food supply norms for the population in other countries.

Despite the successes achieved, agriculture in the countries of people's democracy seriously lags behind the level and pace of industrial development in its growth. Thus, industrial production in Czechoslovakia in 1948 exceeded the pre-war level by 10%, in Poland by 50%, in Hungary by 27%, in Bulgaria by 71%, and in Albania by 88%. In Romania, the pre-war level of production has also been exceeded in major industrial sectors. The reasons for the lag of agriculture in the countries of people's democracy lie mainly in the fact that small-commodity production dominates in it, serving as a source for the growth of capitalist elements. At the same time,

many small peasant farms lack the ability to carry out even simple reproduction.[124]

Comrade Stalin's instruction that it is impossible for a more or less long period of time to base "socialist construction on two different foundations—on the basis of the largest and united socialist industry and on the basis of the most scattered and backward small-commodity peasant economy" fully applies to the countries of people's democracy at the present stage.

The most important task of socialist construction—the transfer of small-commodity production to the rails of large socialist agriculture—looms in full stature in the countries of people's democracy.

Lenin and Stalin created the theory of agricultural development along the path to socialism, which has been fully confirmed by the practice of socialist construction in the USSR and is of international significance.

At the heart of this theory lies Lenin's cooperative plan. Developing Lenin's doctrine on cooperation, Comrade Stalin elaborated the theory of the collectivization of agriculture, which under his leadership was successfully implemented in the USSR. The socialist path of development of the countryside, as Comrade Stalin points out, "is the path of mass cooperation of millions of peasant households across all lines of cooperation, the path of uniting scattered peasant households around socialist industry, the path of instilling the principles of collectivism among the peasantry, first along the line of

---

[124] J. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, 11th ed., pp. 277–278

marketing agricultural produce and supplying peasant farms with urban goods, and then along the line of agricultural production".[125]

Comrade Stalin teaches that "it is impossible to build socialism only in industry, leaving agriculture to the mercy of spontaneous development, proceeding from the assumption that the countryside will 'follow' the city by itself".[126]

True, socialist industry in the city is the main factor in the socialist transformation of the countryside, but despite this, the peasant economy cannot "spontaneously" follow the socialist city, because it is not of the same type as the city. "There is no doubt," Comrade Stalin pointed out, "that the leading role of the socialist city in relation to the small-peasant countryside is great and invaluable. It is precisely on this that the transforming role of industry in relation to agriculture is built. But is this factor sufficient for the small-peasant countryside to follow the city by itself in the matter of socialist construction? No, it is not sufficient. Under capitalism, the countryside spontaneously followed the city because the capitalist economy of the city and the small-commodity economy of the peasant are basically of the same type. Of course, the small-peasant commodity economy is not yet a capitalist economy. But it is basically of the same type as the capitalist economy, since it rests on private ownership of the means of production".[127]

---

125 Ibid., p. 149

126 Ibid., p. 207

127 J. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, 11th ed., p. 279

In order for the socialist city to lead the small-peasant countryside, Lenin and Stalin teach, it is necessary to transfer the country's economy, including agriculture, to a new technical base—the technical base of modern large-scale production.

These guiding guidelines of Marxism-Leninism were emphasized with renewed force in the well-known resolution of the Information Bureau of Communist Parties in June 1948. Following the publication of this resolution, the communist and workers' parties of the countries of people's democracy smashed the anti-marxist theories of the "third path," "equilibrium," "the golden mean," and "the growing of capitalism into socialism," which had been openly propagated until recently in various versions and with various reservations by opportunistic and national-opportunist elements in a number of countries of people's democracy.

A most harmful breeding ground for these "theories" was the agency of American imperialists—the fascist Tito-Djilas-Ranković gang. These vile restorers of capitalism, covering themselves with "socialist" phrases, preached and practically implemented in Yugoslavia one of the variants of capitalist development of the countryside based on all-out support for kulak farms.

While the propagandists of Tito's fascist clique paint glowing pictures of the "successes" of the allegedly socialist development of the Yugoslav countryside, the kulak reigns and strengthens there—the most vile type of exploiter, the irreconcilable enemy of the working class and working peasantry, while the working peasantry is doomed to

pauperization. Ranković's janissaries plunder working peasants, taking away their grain and livestock, while kulaks grow fat on the people's misfortunes. The supply of urban workers is steadily worsening, and prices are rising uncontrollably.

Lenin and Stalin teach that the kulak class—the last and most numerous capitalist class—is the irreconcilable enemy of the working class and working peasantry. "If the kulaks managed to win," Lenin said in 1918, "we know very well that they would mercilessly slaughter hundreds of thousands of workers, entering into an alliance with landowners and capitalists, restoring hard labor for workers, abolishing the 8-hour workday, and returning factories and plants under the yoke of capitalists. So it was in all previous European revolutions, when kulaks, due to the weakness of workers, succeeded in turning back from the republic to the monarchy again, from the power of the working people to the absolute rule of exploiters, the rich, idlers... Everywhere the greedy, bloated, bestial kulak element united with landowners and capitalists against workers and against the poor in general... Everywhere it entered into an alliance with foreign capitalists against the workers of its own country... There can be no middle ground here. There can be no peace: the kulak can and easily can be reconciled with the landowner, the tsar, and the priest, even if they quarreled, but never with the working class". [128]

It is no accident that at present Anglo-American imperialists and their agency link their plans for undermining the people's

---

[128] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XXIII, p. 206

democratic regime with the policy of all-out support for the kulaks. It is precisely the kulaks in the countries of people's democracy who are waging a fierce counterrevolutionary struggle against the people's democratic system and socialist transformations. Kulaks spread provocative rumors among peasants, sabotage state deliveries, try through various machinations to shift taxes onto working peasants, and fraudulently intercept state credits and other material assistance. They try to penetrate cooperatives and local government bodies to conduct subversive work there, use terror against rural activists, participate in fascist underground gangs, etc.

The stake placed by imperialists and their hirelings on the kulak element in the countries of people's democracy was once again exposed at the trial of the vile Anglo-American and Yugoslav spy László Rajk in Budapest, who was preparing a fascist coup in Hungary. The bloody executioner Ranković gave Rajk instructions: "Orient yourselves toward the nationalist, chauvinistic elements in the army, police, state apparatus, toward petty-bourgeois forces in the city and especially in the countryside". He demanded that Rajk rely on the supporters of Horthy and Szálasi, on the Catholic reaction, and on kulaks, and ordered them to follow the example of Yugoslavia, where, by Ranković's own admission, "Tito is not waging a struggle against the kulaks".[129]

---

[129] Quoted from *Pravda*, Sept 12, 1949. Indictment of the Hungarian State Prosecutor's Office in the case of Rajk and his accomplices

The communist and workers' parties of the countries of people's democracy, thanks to the assistance of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) [VKP(b)] and Comrade Stalin's instructions, timely exposed the nationalist deviation, the bourgeois essence of Tito's cooperation, and the restorationist-imperialist policy of relying on the kulak.

The Cominform resolution states: "The experience of the CPSU(B) shows that only on the basis of mass collectivization of agriculture is it possible to liquidate the last and most numerous exploiting class—the kulak class, and that the liquidation of the kulaks as a class constitutes an organic component part of the collectivization of agriculture".

Marxism-Leninism teaches that for the socialist restructuring of the countryside, certain political conditions and an appropriate material base are necessary. First of all, this requires the dictatorship of the proletariat and the Leninist-Stalinist policy of the party on questions of the socialist restructuring of the countryside; the party leadership must convince party members and the broad masses of the working class of the correctness of such a policy; it is necessary that the peasantry see from its own experience the advantages of large-scale collective farming over small-scale individual farming and that on this basis a broad movement arise and strengthen among the peasant masses for voluntary entry into collective farms; it is necessary that the state allocate large material and monetary resources to support collective farms; and finally, it is necessary that the state possess a developed industry. The Cominform resolution points out: "In order to successfully carry out the liquidation of the kulaks as a class, and

consequently the liquidation of capitalist elements in the countryside, the party is required to carry out preliminary and lengthy preparatory work to restrict capitalist elements in the countryside, strengthen the alliance between the working class and the peasantry under the leadership of the working class, and develop socialist industry capable of organizing the production of machines for collective farming. Haste in this matter can bring only irreparable harm. Only on the basis of these measures, carefully prepared and consistently implemented, is the transition from restricting capitalist elements in the countryside to their liquidation possible".

In the countries of people's democracy, the necessary political and economic prerequisites are being created to tackle the implementation of the great program of socialist restructuring of agriculture head-on. The people's democratic regime is one of the forms of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The communist and workers' parties of the countries of people's democracy have firmly embarked on the path of creatively utilizing the experience of the CPSU(B) and, guided by the instructions of the June Cominform resolution, have developed clear programs for the socialist restructuring of the countryside.

The people's democratic states are taking necessary measures to restrict and squeeze out the kulaks, protect the working peasantry from kulak exploitation, and prepare conditions for the liquidation of the kulaks as a class on the basis of total collectivization.

Thus, in Hungary in 1948, a kulak owning 40 holds of land was obliged to deliver three and a half times more wheat per hold than a small peasant holding 5 holds of land. In accordance

with the size of landownership, deliveries from each hold of land progress and increase. In addition, kulaks must contribute a certain part of the harvest in kind to the state agricultural development fund. Another important measure is the new decree on land tenure, according to which the greater part of the land previously rented by kulaks is taken away from them and transferred at low rental rates to agricultural workers and poor peasants. A new contracting system was also a serious blow to the kulaks. Until the autumn of 1948, the state concluded contracts for the contracting of seeds and industrial crops predominantly with larger farms, as a result of which kulaks reaped the greatest economic benefits from it. Now contracting agreements are concluded with agricultural cooperatives; contracting does not extend to kulak farms.

In Romania, the government has adopted and is implementing a number of decisions to restrict the kulaks and increase assistance to poor and middle peasants. Long-term loans are issued to working peasants, 50% of tax arrears of the poorest peasants have been written off, and they have been granted a postponement in tax payments. The burden of taxes now falls mainly on the kulaks. The government forced the kulaks to return land bought by them for a song from the peasant poor during the drought of 1946–1947. Working peasants are provided on credit with high-grade seeds and mineral fertilizers; they have been granted the right to use tractors and agricultural machines belonging to the state on preferential terms.

In Poland in 1948 and 1949, a number of decisions in the field of tax and credit policy were adopted and are being

implemented to restrict capitalist elements and protect the interests of the poor and middle peasants. The government pursues a policy of fixed bread prices that are sufficiently high and profitable for small peasants; kulak speculation is suppressed, and real assistance is rendered to poor and middle peasants. 900 thousand of the poorest peasants in the autumn of 1948 were completely exempted from paying half of the land tax. Measures were adopted to ensure a differentiated class approach in crediting, so that state credits go toward strengthening small and medium peasant farms. The state provides great material assistance to the agricultural cooperative "Samopomoc Chłopska". The network of cooperative machine-rental points is expanding, the number of which will exceed 3 thousand by the end of 1949.

State industry is a powerful economic base for the successful struggle of socialism against capitalism in the city and countryside. Therefore, the main part of state capital investments in the countries of people's democracy is directed toward the development of industry. Socialist industry, primarily heavy industry, is vitally necessary to create a solid material base for the socialist restructuring of agriculture. A powerful industry will make it possible to technically re-equip agriculture, supplying it with tractors, automobiles, agricultural machines, and mineral fertilizers.

At present, the provision of agriculture with machines in the countries of people's democracy is relatively small, but it is growing rapidly. There are 27 thousand tractors in Czechoslovakia; in Hungary, by the end of 1949, the number of Machine and Tractor Stations (MTS) is planned to be brought

to 200, and the tractor fleet to 3,500. In Bulgaria, 86 MTS with 4,960 tractors have been created. In Poland, about 14 thousand tractors are concentrated in state farms, and 2 thousand have been transferred to cooperative machine-rental points to serve production cooperatives and individual peasant farms. The first MTS have been created in Albania. The industry of the USSR, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria will ensure the mechanization of agriculture in the countries of people's democracy in the coming years and make it possible to widely use mineral fertilizers.

In Hungary, according to the five-year plan, 500 MTS with 20 thousand tractors are to be created. In Czechoslovakia, under the five-year plan, by 1953 there will be about 45 thousand tractors. Polish agriculture will receive 55 thousand tractors by 1955. In Bulgaria, by 1953, 150 MTS with 10 thousand tractors will be created. In Romania, by the end of 1955, the tractor fleet will increase to 25 thousand tractors.

Lower supply and marketing forms of cooperation have already received wide development in the countries of people's democracy. Thus, for example, in Bulgaria there are 4 thousand cooperatives uniting more than 1 million members. In Czechoslovakia, 6 thousand cooperatives for the joint operation of agricultural machinery have been created. Members of these cooperatives comprise 155 thousand peasant households. In Hungary, there are over 3.5 thousand rural cooperatives. Their membership grew from 425 thousand in 1948 to 870 thousand in August 1949; it is expected that by the end of the year their number will reach 1,200 thousand. In Romania, 6,732 cooperatives unite about 5 million people. In Poland, the volost

and supply-marketing cooperatives of the Peasant Mutual Aid Union (more than 3 thousand cooperatives), numbering over 2 million members, cover about half of the peasant households. The development of these lower forms of cooperation creates favorable prerequisites for the emergence of production cooperatives.

Under the leadership of the working class, the peasant masses are drawn into socialist construction through cooperation. In the mass cooperation of the peasantry under the dictatorship of the proletariat, Leninism teaches, has been found that "degree of combination of private interest, private trade interest, verification and control over it by the state, the degree of its subordination to common interests" (Lenin) which is acceptable and profitable for the peasantry and which provides the proletariat with the opportunity to draw the main mass of the peasantry into the cause of socialist construction. Precisely because it is profitable for the peasantry to organize the sale of its goods and the supply of its farm with machinery through cooperation, precisely for this reason it must go, and it will go, along the path of mass cooperation.[130] Therefore, in the countries of people's democracy at present, great attention is paid in the countryside to the development of such cooperation, which should embrace all branches of agriculture and draw broad strata of the peasantry into the sphere of its activity.

V. I. Lenin wrote in 1923: "Now we must realize and put into practice the fact that at present the social system that we must support beyond the ordinary is the cooperative system. But it

---

[130] J. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, 11th ed., p. 150

must be supported in the true sense of this word, i.e., by this support it is not enough to understand support for any cooperative turnover—under this support we must understand support for such a cooperative turnover in which the actual masses of the population truly participate".[131] The development of all types of cooperation, the drawing of the broad masses of the working peasantry into active participation in it, create the material and psychological prerequisites for peasants to organize production cooperatives in the countryside—collective agricultural farms of the agricultural artel (kolkhoz) type.

The process of creating production labor cooperative agricultural farms in the countries of people's democracy is only just beginning to unfold. Nevertheless, individual countries already have very serious achievements in this field.

In Bulgaria, in September 1948, there were 714 labor cooperative agricultural farms (TKZH). They united 49,699 peasant households possessing a sown area of 204 thousand hectares. In September 1949, there were already 1,600 TKZH, uniting 147 thousand members and cultivating 546,800 hectares of land. In many TKZH, crop yields are 25–30% higher than in individual farms, and in some even 50–100%. In modern Bulgarian TKZH, each cooperative member retains the right of private ownership of land and receives upon the distribution of the TKZH net annual income a part according to labor-days and a part (up to 40%) in the form of rent. Thus, in the distribution of cooperative income, private land ownership

[131] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XXVII, p. 393

is a source of unearned income. The peasant's labor participation in the TKZH within the established minimum (100 labor-days) often yields less income than the contribution of a "land share" of 3–4 hectares to the cooperative. Despite these remnants of capitalism in their economy, TKZH contribute to drawing the broad masses of the working peasantry into the building of socialism in the countryside. While until 1948 poor peasants predominated in the TKZH (65% of the total number of members), from late 1948 middle peasants also began joining agricultural cooperatives in increasing numbers. In 1953, according to the five-year plan, there should be 4 thousand TKZH in Bulgaria possessing 3 million hectares, or 60% of all cultivated land.

In Poland, as of April 1, 1949, 40 agricultural production cooperatives were registered, of which 31 were in the territory of the Recovered Territories. All these cooperatives arose on the land of former landowner estates received by peasants through agrarian reform. On average, the land area of each cooperative was 216 hectares. Currently, Poland has 122 production cooperatives operating on the basis of the model charter. These are, firstly, associations for the joint cultivation of land, secondly, agricultural production cooperatives, and thirdly, agricultural cooperative associations. What is common to the first two types of agricultural production cooperatives is the following: they provide for a mandatory minimum of joint labor for each cooperative member (100 labor-days); for overfulfilling norms, bonuses are issued in the amount of up to 10% of worked labor-days; kulaks are not accepted as members; the use of hired labor is prohibited; upon joining the

cooperative, peasants retain the right of private ownership of land and have homestead plots. In the distribution of income, public funds for cultural purposes, social security, etc., are allocated. In the bulk of cooperatives, 60–70% of income is distributed among cooperative members according to labor-days, 20–25% in proportion to the land transferred to the cooperative, and 10–15% in proportion to the value of equipment contributed to the cooperative. Complete voluntariness of membership is ensured; the principle of electivity of cooperative management is established; the highest governing body of the cooperative is the general meeting; all production cooperatives are members of the agricultural cooperative "Samopomoc Chłopska," whose bodies exercise instruction and control over their activities; in the relations of agricultural production cooperatives with the state, the principle of commodity exchange is observed. The state has reduced taxes levied on production agricultural cooperatives; their members are exempt from payments for land received through agrarian reform.

In the agricultural cooperative associations of Poland (the third, highest type of agricultural production cooperation), all land and the most important means of production are socialized, and only homestead plots ranging from 0.3 to 1 hectare remain in private ownership. In addition to seed, fodder, reserve, and depreciation funds, an indivisible fund amounting to 30% of the cooperative's income is allocated. In these cooperatives, incomes are distributed among cooperative members exclusively according to labor-days. However, here too, in the event of withdrawal from the cooperative, equipment and a plot

of land equal in size to that transferred to the cooperative upon joining are subject to return (equipment can be bought out by the cooperative). Two cows, small livestock, and certain buildings remain in the personal use of the artel member.

In Hungary, in 1945, during the period of agrarian reform, about 100 associations for the joint cultivation of land emerged. Currently, there are already 587 production agricultural cooperatives cultivating about 84 thousand holds of land.

In Romania, 100 thousand peasants are united in associations for the joint cultivation of land. In July 1949, the first 5 collective agricultural farms were organized here, and about 300 families joined them. According to the charter, peasants transferred their land, livestock, and agricultural implements to the collective farm. At the same time, plots of land from the state land fund were allocated to the collective agricultural farms, and the state exempted these farms from tax payments during the first two years. Now there are 55 collective agricultural farms in Romania. All land in these collective farms is consolidated into one or several tracts, divided into plots in accordance with the approved crop rotation plan. The size of the homestead plot remaining in the personal use of the peasant is set at 0.25 to 0.50 hectares. In the event of withdrawal from the collective, the peasant receives a plot of land equal in size to that surrendered by him upon joining, but allocated outside the boundaries of the collective farm's land tract. Draft animals, main agricultural equipment, stocks of seeds and fodder, and major farm buildings are socialized. Residential buildings, domestic livestock, poultry, beehives,

homestead farm buildings, and small equipment are not socialized. Members of the collective farm may have in personal use one cow, no more than two heads of young cattle, one breeding sow with offspring, up to 10 sheep and goats, an unlimited number of poultry and rabbits, and 15 beehives.

Collective farms, according to the charter, undertake to manage their farm according to a plan drawn up in accordance with the national economic plan, increase crop yields, carry out sowing with high-grade seeds, make full use of draft animals and equipment, create livestock farms, construct farm buildings, raise the labor qualifications and cultural level of their members, and draw women into production and public life. Kulaks and speculators are not accepted into collective farms. Exclusion from the cooperative is carried out by a general meeting. The entry fee is set at 1,000 lei; for the poor, it is reduced to 250–500 lei. In addition to the entry fee, from 25 to 50% of the value of the socialized property of artel members (draft animals, equipment, buildings, etc.) is credited to the indivisible fund, and the rest is considered a share contribution subject to return in the event of withdrawal from the cooperative. Incomes remaining after payments to the state, filling seed and insurance funds, allocating part of the income to the disabled support fund, etc., are distributed among members of the collective farm exclusively according to labor-days. The main production unit is the brigade, assigned to a specific plot for the entire crop rotation period and working on a piece-rate basis. For overfulfilling norms, bonuses are awarded in the amount of 10–20% of the total number of worked labor-days. The highest body of the collective farm is

the general meeting of its members, which elects the chairman, governing board, and revision commission.

In Albania, there are 56 agricultural cooperatives. They unite about 2.5 thousand families. In 1947/48, agricultural cooperatives received a credit of 11.5 million leks from the state, and in the first quarter of 1949, 7 million leks. The model charter of Albanian collective farms is similar to the charter of Romanian collective farms.

The process of development of agricultural production cooperatives in the countries of people's democracy proceeds in a peculiar concrete historical setting. Due to historical reasons and the specific features of the development of the countries of people's democracy, the nationalization of all land has not yet been carried out in them. Private ownership of land in the countries of people's democracy nourishes the peasants' attachment to small-commodity farming and hinders their transition to socialist forms of farming. "Indeed," points out J. Stalin, "what has bound, binds, and will continue to bind the small peasant in Western Europe to his small-commodity economy? First of all and mainly, the presence of his own small plot of land, the presence of private ownership of land. He saved money for years in order to buy a small plot of land, he bought it and, naturally, he does not want to part with it, preferring to endure all sorts of hardships, preferring to fall into savagery, just to defend his small plot of land—the basis of his individual economy".[132]

---

[132] J. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, 11th ed., p. 281

The nationalization of land in the course of the socialist revolution, Leninism teaches, ensures "the land system that is most flexible in terms of transition to socialism",[133] facilitating the transition of the small-peasant economy to the rails of collective farms. But this does not mean, as Comrade Stalin showed in his speech "On the Program of the Comintern" at the July Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU(B) in 1928, that the demand for the nationalization of all land must be mandatory for every country on the very first day of the proletarian revolution.

"Those comrades are wrong," Comrade Stalin pointed out, "who think that the more capitalistically developed a country is, the easier it is to carry out the nationalization of all land there. On the contrary, the more capitalistically developed a country is, the more difficult it is to carry out the nationalization of all land, because the traditions of private property in land are stronger there and, consequently, it is more difficult to fight against these traditions".[134]

"I also disagree," Comrade Stalin said, "with those comrades who propose to remain completely silent about the nationalization of all land in capitalistically developed countries. In my opinion, it would be better to speak of the subsequent nationalization of all land, as is stated in the draft program, with the addition about ensuring the right to land use for small and middle peasants".[135]

---

133 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XXIII, p. 402

134 J. Stalin, *Works*, Vol. 11, p. 149

Comrade Stalin reminded us that in 1919 at the Second Congress of the Comintern, Lenin "warned the communist parties of capitalistically developed countries not to immediately put forward the slogan of nationalization of all land, since the peasantry of these countries, imbued with a proprietary instinct, would not digest this slogan right away".[136]

These theoretical instructions of the brilliant leaders of the proletarian revolution, V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin, formed the basis of the agrarian program of the communist and workers' parties of the countries of people's democracy. In the course of agrarian reforms in the countries of people's democracy, only partial nationalization of land was carried out, while the greater part of the land is in the private ownership of peasants. Thus, compared to the USSR, where the nationalization of all land was carried out immediately, the collectivization of peasant farms in these countries is a more complex matter. The existence of private ownership of land undoubtedly hinders the cooperation of agriculture in the countries of people's democracy and delays cooperation at its lower forms with the retention of elements of unearned income.

The peculiarity of the paths of socialist transformation of agriculture in the countries of people's democracy is that the nationalization of all land is not a prerequisite for the production cooperation of peasants. Characterizing the paths of socialist restructuring in the countries of people's democracy, G. M. Dimitrov at the 5th Congress of the Bulgarian

---

135 Ibid.

136 Ibid., p. 150

Communist Party in December 1948 said: "...gradually drawing the poorest and middle peasants into labor cooperative agricultural farms, increasing the number of MTS, prohibiting the leasing of land, restricting and prohibiting the purchase and sale of land, we will thereby create conditions where the question of the nationalization of land will be solved practically, and all land will be transferred to the eternal use of the working peasants. Thus, working peasants, who are slaves to their small piece of land, will be able to make wide use of the fruits of the land, the quantity of which will increase significantly as a result of the modernization and mechanization of large agricultural cooperative farms".[137]

The people's democratic power has substantially restricted private ownership of land and the right to dispose of this property, and is currently implementing decisive measures to protect the working peasantry from kulak exploitation, pursuing a policy of restricting and squeezing out the kulak, prohibiting the purchase, sale, and lease of land, developing all types of cooperation in agriculture, and rendering it comprehensive support and assistance. In the process of the socialist restructuring of the countryside in these countries, collective farms will be guaranteed eternal use of all land belonging to these farms. Thus, the question of the transition of land to public property and the question of the socialist transformation of the countryside will be solved.

State agricultural farms are called upon to play an important role in the socialist restructuring of the small-peasant economy

---

[137] *Pravda*, Dec 27, 1948

and in strengthening the food and raw material base in the countries of people's democracy. They have been created on the basis of partial nationalization of land in the countries of people's democracy and, along with state machine and tractor stations, represent enterprises of a consistently socialist type.

Comrade Stalin teaches that state socialist enterprises in agriculture, with their new technology, with their assistance to surrounding peasants, with their unprecedented economic scale, are that leading force which facilitates the turning of the peasant masses and moves them onto the path of collectivization. State farms in the countries of people's democracy must become model farms, convincing small peasants by their example of the advantages of large-scale socialist farming—which applies the latest achievements of agricultural technology and agronomical science—over small and fragmented peasant farming, as well as over large capitalist farming, and stimulating the transition of small peasant farms to the path of collectivization. At the same time, state farms must provide the state with increasingly high-quality agricultural produce, contributing to improving the food supply for cities and the raw material supply for industry, and creating state food and raw material reserves. These farms must improve the supply of high-grade seeds, breeding livestock, etc., to small peasant farms and production cooperatives.

The construction of state agricultural farms in Poland is being carried out on a wider scale compared to other countries of people's democracy. Already in the course of agrarian reform, 5,650 state farms of three types were created there: for the production of grain and industrial crops, seed-growing, and

livestock-breeding. The predominant part of state farms (over 4 thousand) was created in the Recovered Territories on the site of former estates of German junkers and landowners. Large funds were provided by the state to these farms to establish agricultural production.

The primary task, which the state farms managed basically successfully, was the reclamation of abandoned lands and the cultivation of numerous tracts of wasteland. True, in the beginning, due to the sabotage of reactionary elements (former landowners, their managers), henchmen of the enemy of the people Mikołajczyk, who at one time held the post of minister of agriculture, who penetrated with his support into leading administrative positions in state farms, some state farms worked unsatisfactorily and were in a difficult position. In other farms, a shortage of labor, draft power, and equipment was felt. Following the reorganization carried out, the consolidation of small state farms into larger ones, and the unification of all three types of estates under the single leadership of the State Farms Management, there are currently 4,802 state agricultural enterprises. They have at their disposal 2.3 million hectares of land, including over 1.5 million hectares of arable land, about 14 thousand tractors, a large number of agricultural machines, and over 200 thousand head of livestock. State farms have now been largely purged of reactionary and bureaucratic elements. Many state farms are managed by promoted individuals from among agricultural workers. Workers' representatives actively participate in the work of estate councils. The Agricultural Workers' Union of Poland, uniting over 200 thousand members, mainly employed

in state farms, initiated the labor emulation that has spread widely among working peasants. Already in 1948, Polish state farms produced about 10% of all marketable grain, over 30 thousand tons of high-grade seed material to supply peasant farms, and transferred hundreds of head of pedigree livestock to working peasants. Thanks to the application of advanced modern agrotechnical methods and mechanized soil cultivation, crop yields in state farms increased by 85% in 1948 compared to the previous year, and oilseed yields by 200%. In 1949, state estates obtained high grain yields exceeding the yield in individual peasant farms by 4–5 centners per hectare. According to the developed plan, over the next two years Polish state farms must become model large socialist farms yielding 15–20% of all marketable grain and 7–10% of all marketable meat production in the country. Polish peasants, seeing from the experience of state farms the advantages of large-scale socialist agriculture, are setting about the organization of production cooperatives more boldly.

In other countries of people's democracy, state farms are still developed insignificantly, but their role in the national economy is continuously growing. In Romania, 632 state agricultural farms have been created, possessing 662 thousand hectares of land, including about 380 thousand hectares of arable land, with the rest being pastures, orchards, and vineyards. In Czechoslovakia, state estates own more than 7.1% of the country's entire land area. In Hungary, state estates occupy an area of 120 thousand holds, and the five-year plan projects their reclamation of another 500 thousand holds of land. In Bulgaria, in 1948 there were 80 state farms and 1,393

state livestock farms. In 1949, the number of state farms increased to 91 (they possess 85 thousand hectares of land), and the number of farms increased to 2,100.

The mass patronage of factory and plant worker collectives over peasant production cooperatives, MTS, machine-rental points, villages, and settlements contributes to the production alliance of the working class with the peasantry, and the city with the countryside in the countries of people's democracy. Worker brigades, traveling to the countryside, render great production assistance to peasants: they participate in agricultural work, repair and restore agricultural machines, manufacture spare parts for them, and help electrify villages. They carry out extensive political and cultural-educational work among peasants, assist in the organization of production cooperatives, purge agricultural cooperation of kulak elements, and help the work of rural party and public organizations.

In Poland, over the past year alone, patronage over the countryside, launched on the initiative of workers at the "Ursus" tractor plant, has been undertaken by more than 1,600 factories and plants across the country. Hundreds of worker brigades have established permanent ties with patronized villages and machine-rental points. Workers' patronage assistance to working peasants is also widely practiced in Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria, and is developing in other countries of people's democracy.

Detailed familiarization of peasants in these countries with the socialist agriculture of the USSR exerts a great influence on the course of agricultural cooperation in the countries of people's democracy. In 1949, delegations of working peasants from

Poland, Hungary, Romania, and Albania visited various regions of the USSR, familiarized themselves with the work of kolkhozes, MTS, and sovkhozes, scientific agricultural institutions and experimental stations, and the life and everyday routines of the Soviet kolkhoz peasantry. Representatives of peasants from the countries of people's democracy speak with admiration about the successes of the Soviet kolkhoz system. They unanimously declare their firm determination to follow the path of agricultural collectivization.

At a reception for a delegation of Hungarian peasants at the USSR Ministry of Agriculture on June 29, 1949, Hungarian parliament deputy and peasant Seregey József spoke about the fact that farming on small patches of land does not give Hungarian peasants the opportunity to use machinery and introduce grass-arable crop rotation. "We have only one path—the path of socialist restructuring of farming. Many thanks to the Soviet Government for giving us the opportunity to visit the Soviet Union and learn how to reorganize agriculture on socialist lines," he stated.[138]

Another participant in the Hungarian delegation, peasant Nagy Gábor, said: "We placed great hopes on the trip to the USSR. But what we saw here exceeded expectations. We saw cheerful people heading to the fields in kolkhoz trucks with songs. We learned how state machine and tractor stations ease the labor of kolkhozniks. We became convinced that only large-scale

[138] *Pravda*, June 30, 1949

public farming is capable of leading fragmented peasant farming onto the path of prosperity".[139]

A participant in the Polish peasant delegation, peasant Bronisława Chałaj from the village of Majdan, Lublin Voivodeship, after visiting the Molotov Kolkhoz in Kremenchuk District of Poltava Region, stated: "We inspected all your farming with admiration. It is truly wonderful. We will try to build the same farms in Poland, where peasants work lovingly and live well".

Upon returning from the USSR to their homeland, members of peasant delegations urge peasants to follow the example of Soviet kolkhozniks. In many villages whose delegates visited the Soviet Union, initiative groups have been created to organize collective farms.

Return visits by Soviet kolkhozniks to the countries of people's democracy and the organization of international exhibitions strengthen the unbreakable friendship between the peoples of the USSR and the working people of the countries of people's democracy, and contribute to the dissemination of the experience of socialist construction.

The process of socialist restructuring of agriculture in the countries of people's democracy unfolds in an atmosphere of sharpening class struggle. Kulaks do not surrender their positions without resistance. They try to disrupt grain procurements and state plans for agricultural development, violate laws prohibiting the purchase and sale of land and

---

[139] *Pravda*, June 26, 1949

restricting the use of hired labor, and penetrate cooperatives, attempting to undermine them from within.

One of the forms of subversion of rural production cooperatives from within by kulaks is the incorrect distribution of income in collective farms, the practice of a low minimum of peasant labor participation in collective labor, and the application of high rent norms. State bodies of the people's democratic power successfully expose and suppress these and other hostile actions of the kulaks.

The working class, relying on the poor peasants and strengthening the alliance with the middle peasantry, wages a decisive struggle against the kulaks. The communist parties, which are the leading force in the countries of people's democracy, are in the vanguard of this struggle. Armed with the teachings of Lenin and Stalin, utilizing the rich experience of kolkhoz construction in the USSR, and relying on the comprehensive support and assistance of the Soviet Union, the peoples of the countries of people's democracy are boldly and confidently marching forward along the path to socialism.

Questions of Economics, No.10, 1949.

M. Danilevich

THE WORKING CLASS OF LATIN AMERICA IN THE STRUGGLE FOR INDEPENDENCE AND DEMOCRACY

Marxism-Leninism teaches that in the era of imperialism and the general crisis of capitalism, the peoples of colonial and dependent countries can achieve victory in their anti-imperialist, anti-feudal struggle and win freedom and independence only under the leadership of the working class. V. I. Lenin pointed out at the Second Congress of the Comintern: "At first the revolution in the colonies will not be communist, but if from the very beginning the communist vanguard stands at its head, the revolutionary masses will be led onto the right path to achieving the set goal through the gradual acquisition of revolutionary experience".[140]

The national liberation movement in Latin America is currently developing in conditions of a further aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism and the deepening of the crisis of the colonial system.

As a result of the Second World War, a further aggravation of class contradictions occurred in Latin American countries, along with a sharp increase in the absolute and relative impoverishment of the working class and a profound demarcation of political forces into two camps: the camp of democracy, fighting for national independence and a lasting peace, and the camp of reaction, traitors to their homeland,

---

[140] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XXV, p. 575

lackeys of American imperialism, preparing a new war and fighting against socialism and democracy.

The democratic, progressive camp in the countries of Latin America unites the proletariat, the peasant masses, farm laborers, a significant part of the urban petty bourgeoisie, the advanced intelligentsia, and the oppressed Negro and Indian populations. The leading force of this camp, rallying the working masses around itself, is the proletariat headed by communist parties.

During the Second World War, the communist parties in the countries of Latin America grew numerically, grew stronger ideologically and organizationally, expanded their ties with the broad masses of working people, and strengthened their authority among the people. They head the struggle of the peoples of these countries for independence and a democratic regime, against imperialism and the remnants of feudalism, and for improving the conditions of the working people.

The post-war years in the majority of Latin American countries have been marked by an unprecedented scale of economic and political strikes taking on an anti-imperialist character (Cuba, Argentina, Colombia, Ecuador, Bolivia, Chile, Peru, etc.), major general strikes and solidarity strikes (Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Bolivia, Argentina), demonstrations, and protest movements against the offensive of American imperialism and internal reaction (Cuba, Mexico, Ecuador, Panama, Brazil). In individual countries, the struggle resulted in armed actions and uprisings of the masses (Ecuador, Paraguay, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica).

The forces of internal reaction—large landowners, the big industrial and commercial bourgeoisie—form a bloc with the imperialists. They oppose the elimination of semi-feudal relations and landowner latifundia, hinder the development of national industry, betray the national interests of their peoples, fight against the worker and peasant movements and against the democratization of the socio-political system of Latin American countries, and strive for the preservation and expansion of the system of colonial slavery and exploitation. In the international arena, they play the role of servants and agents of American imperialism.

Latin America is not a single entity. The 20 Latin American countries differ greatly from one another in the level of development of capitalism and national industry, and in the degree of dependence on North American or British capital; the specific weight and organization of the proletariat in various countries, as well as the role of the communist parties in the national liberation struggle, are also unequal.

The main group of countries—Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, and Chile—represents semi-colonial yet capitalistically most developed countries of Latin America. About 90 million people, or 65% of the entire population of Latin America, live in them. In these agrarian countries, there is a more or less numerous industrial and agricultural proletariat and significant strata of the big national bourgeoisie.

A special group of Latin American countries consists of Colombia, Cuba, Venezuela, Peru, Ecuador, Paraguay, Uruguay, and Bolivia. Their total population is about 35 million people. These are typical semi-colonial countries in

whose economy and domestic political life American capital dominates, increasingly squeezing out its rival, British capital.

Into the third group can be included the formally "independent" republics: Honduras, Haiti, the Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Panama, and Guatemala, as well as the US possession of Puerto Rico. All these countries, being under the heel of American imperialism, are colonies of the USA in the full sense of the word.

The countries of the first group (Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, and Chile) are agrarian countries with a multi-million landless and land-poor peasantry crushed by the remnants of semi-feudal relations and the domination of large landownership and foreign monopolies. Only in Mexico, as a result of the bourgeois-democratic revolution—which, however, was not completed—was a blow dealt to large landownership and a significant amount of land transferred to the peasants. However, the national bourgeoisie, which headed the movement, contributed to the rout of the peasant movement and did not allow the liquidation of large landownership. As a result, about 10 thousand large landowners (owning huge land areas) remained in Mexico, alongside whom there are about 1 million peasant families lacking land.

The main branches of the national economy in the countries of this group are in the hands of foreign capital. Between the two world wars, these countries were objects of the sharpest competitive struggle between American and British capital, and directly in the pre-war years, German capital also participated in it. The struggle among the ruling classes and their main parties in Latin American countries, frequent changes of

governments, and state coups in Brazil, Argentina, etc., reflected the rivalry of imperialist states. Before the Second World War, British capital predominated in Argentina and Brazil. Argentina was the citadel of British imperialism in Latin America, considered "the weakest link in the Pan-American front," "the leader of the Latin American opposition" to US policy, and often, at the behest of British imperialism, took a "special" line, opposing American imperialism.

As a result of the Second World War, Britain's economic positions and political influence throughout the world and, in particular, in Latin America sharply weakened. But British imperialism continues to defend its positions in Latin America and is trying to fight against the magnates of US financial capital. The most intense struggle between Britain and the USA in Latin America revolves around Argentina. The five-year trade agreement concluded between Britain and Argentina in June 1949, as well as Britain's negotiations on concluding similar agreements with Uruguay and Mexico, provoked stormy protests and threats against Britain in the USA. The Anglo-American struggle for markets and "spheres of influence" in Latin America is one of the expressions of the increasingly acute Anglo-American contradictions.

In Chile, as in Brazil, the bourgeois-landlord bloc in power is entirely in the service of American imperialists. Under the dictation of US financial capital, it openly pursues an anti-people, reactionary domestic and foreign policy.

In these countries, pro-fascist, anti-working-class laws have been adopted in recent years, strikes have been banned, communist parties and independent trade unions have been

dissolved and banned, and progressive newspapers have been closed. In Brazil, communist deputies were stripped of their parliamentary immunity. The big bourgeoisie of Chile and Brazil, acting in a bloc with large landowners, fully supports all expansionist, aggressive measures of the USA. These countries unconditionally accepted the American aggressive plan for the "defense" of the Western Hemisphere, and signed the anti-communist pact and other resolutions of the 1948 conference in Bogotá. In the United Nations, the governments of these countries blindly execute US orders. At the command of American magnates, the fascist governments of Brazil and Chile, to the detriment of their national interests and contrary to the will of the popular masses, severed diplomatic relations with the USSR.

The big bourgeoisie of Chile and Brazil has long since concluded a bloc with American imperialists against workers and peasants and has moved into the camp of irreconcilable enemies of the national liberation movement, into the camp of reaction and imperialism. This, however, does not mean that the national bourgeoisie has refused to use the aggravated contradictions between the USA and Britain (for example, in Argentina and Brazil) in its own interests. Some strata of the middle and petty industrial bourgeoisie, striving to win concessions from imperialists, support individual anti-imperialist demands of workers. At the same time, foreign capital, fearing the further growth of the national liberation movement of the peoples of these countries, bribes the national bourgeoisie with various handouts (participation in "mixed companies," attracting individual representatives of the

national bourgeoisie to posts of directors, managers, etc.) in order to establish its complete domination here with its help.

In Mexico, the big national bourgeoisie, rallying around itself all anti-people and anti-national forces of the country, including the fascist parties of the Sinarquistas and National Action, also blocaded with American imperialism against workers, peasants, and the petty bourgeoisie. Disguising itself with false, demagogic slogans of the struggle against the "communist threat," the big bourgeoisie supports the expansionist policy of American imperialists, their plans for unleashing an aggressive war against the USSR, and demands the abolition of agrarian reform and the application of decisive measures to suppress the worker movement.

The petty and middle industrial bourgeoisie of Mexico strives for the creation of a national industry and demands that the government pursue a policy contributing to the strengthening of the national economy, the expansion of the domestic market, and some restriction of foreign capital. These strata of the national bourgeoisie, albeit inconsistently, nevertheless support the anti-imperialist struggle of the masses.

In Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, and Chile, the industrial proletariat and its class organizations began to take shape earlier than in other Latin American countries.

Currently, there are about 2 million industrial workers in Brazil, over 1 million in Argentina, approximately 800 thousand in Mexico, and more than 300 thousand in Chile. In Brazil, there are more agricultural workers than industrial ones;

a numerous agricultural proletariat also exists in Argentina, Chile, and Mexico.

Of special significance for the growth of the class consciousness of the proletariat of these countries, as well as of all Latin America, was the Great October Socialist Revolution, under the influence of which the revolutionary movement unfolded and communist parties were created in Latin American countries. In the countries of Latin America, the first communist parties arose in Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, and Chile. The Communist Party of Brazil, founded in 1922, was in an illegal position until 1945. By the time it emerged from underground, it had only 4 thousand members in its ranks; over two years of legal existence, its membership grew to 200 thousand people. The Communist Party of Argentina, organized in 1918, has 35 thousand members; the Communist Party of Chile, founded in 1921, has over 50 thousand people. These communist parties are the largest and most influential compared to the communist parties of other Latin American countries. The Communist Party of Mexico, which was created in 1918, has 36 thousand people.

The experience of many years of struggle by the working people of these countries against the yoke of foreign capital and internal reaction has clearly shown the peoples of Latin American countries the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist teaching that only the proletariat can be that single force capable of heading the anti-imperialist and agrarian movement of the masses, achieving complete independence for their countries and freedom from the yoke of capital, and giving land to the peasantry and farm laborers.

The Communist Party of Brazil has considerable experience in leading the national liberation movement and the class struggle of the proletariat. It headed the mass movement against the Vargas dictatorship, against the fascist constitution of 1937, and for the adoption of a new constitution; it led the struggle of the working people for the withdrawal of American troops from military bases located on Brazilian territory; it has fought and fights for improving the conditions of the working class and all working people, for the development of national industry, and against high prices and speculation. Under the influence of the Brazilian communist party, the free trade union movement was organized and grew, and the Confederation of Workers of Brazil was created, uniting the majority of the industrial proletariat.

During the last presidential elections in 1945, the communist party received 10% of all votes cast and for the first time put its representatives into parliament (15 deputies and one senator). At the end of 1947, even after the communist party, the communist youth organization, free trade unions, and other progressive organizations were driven underground by the Brazilian ruling circles, the communist party developed a municipal minimum program and, thanks to a flexible policy that allowed it to enter into agreements with grassroots organizations of other parties, elected 250 of its candidates to municipalities. A few months later, communist deputies of parliament and members of municipalities were stripped of their parliamentary immunity. But the work carried out earlier by the communist party played a major organizing and

propagandistic role and strengthened the ties of communists with the masses.

The Brazilian communist party, despite successes in its work and the growth of its authority among the masses, was unable over two years of its legal existence to lead the majority of the proletariat and tear the masses of the petty bourgeoisie away from the influence of bourgeois parties. The ideological education of party cadres lagged behind the numerical growth of the party and the scope of the democratic movement. The communist party did not develop sufficient work in the countryside, it did not put forward the demand for the liquidation of large landownership and the granting of land to peasants and farm laborers, and it did not rouse the peasantry to struggle. The activity of the Brazilian communist party was not free from serious opportunist errors. Analyzing these errors, General Secretary of the Communist Party Luiz Carlos Prestes wrote: "This opportunist tendency was characterized by the systematic braking of the struggle of the proletarian masses in the name of worker cooperation with entrepreneurs and an alliance with the 'progressive bourgeoisie,' and our insufficient attention to the struggle of agricultural workers against large landownership, which in practice meant an underestimate of reliance on the peasant masses as the main ally of the proletariat".[141]

Now, in the difficult conditions of the underground and terrorist regime, the Communist Party of Brazil is reorganizing its work.

---

[141] "Cahiers du Communisme", XI. 1948, p. 1265

The bourgeois-landlord bloc ruling the country tried at the dictation of American imperialism to strangle the mass popular movement through arrests of democratic figures, reprisals against them, shootings of demonstrators, dispersal of meetings, banning of mass progressive organizations, closing of left-wing newspapers, etc. But no "emergency laws," no bans on strikes could break the struggle of Brazilian workers or suppress the strike movement. In 1948, 300 thousand people participated in strikes.[142] Solidarity strikes became more frequent. Strikes are acquiring a mass, organized character.

The working class of Brazil is increasingly actively drawing its main ally—the working peasantry—into the anti-imperialist movement. The struggle of peasants, sharecroppers, tenants, and farm laborers against landowners and planters is growing. This struggle often turns into bloody clashes. The organization of the peasant masses is growing; they are beginning to put forward demands for the division of landowner land and the implementation of democratic agrarian reform. Since a significant part of the land in Brazil has been seized by imperialists for plantations, the struggle of peasants for land is simultaneously becoming an anti-imperialist struggle.

The working class, led by the communist party, is the initiator of the mass movement in defense of Brazilian oil from encroachments by American instigators of a new war. This movement embraced all strata of the Brazilian population striving for the development of an independent national economy, for independence and peace. Workers, intelligentsia,

---

142 "Noticiero de la CTAL", 23.V.1949

youth, women, merchants, small and medium industrialists, and even individual representatives of the big bourgeoisie, as well as representatives of the army—247 officers signed a declaration of protest against the transfer of Brazilian oil to American monopolies. At the end of 1948, a national congress "in defense of oil" was convened in the country. The convocation of this congress was a powerful demonstration of protest against the increasing penetration of American capital into the Brazilian economy. "Committees of the movement in defense of oil," springing up across the country in factories and mines, in institutions, urban neighborhoods, schools, clubs, etc., are turning into grassroots organizations of the mass movement of the popular-democratic front. In connection with the preparation of continental and international congresses of the struggle for peace in Brazil, the movement against the war danger has acquired a large scope.

The Communist Party of Argentina plays an active role in the political life of the country. The reactionary ruling circles of Argentina, after the military-fascist coup carried out by them on June 4, 1943, directed all efforts to rout democratic, progressive parties and organizations, break the fighting spirit of the proletariat, limit its activity within the framework of dependent state trade unions, and win over the petty-bourgeois masses. With the help of social, anti-imperialist demagogy, reactionaries, supporters of President Perón, succeeded in 1943 –1947 in spreading their influence to the petty-bourgeois masses and even a certain part of the working class and creating official trade unions (CGT) under their control. But in Argentina too, foreign monopolists and their local minions

could not suppress the worker movement. Workers began to understand the true essence of the Peronist party, and its influence began to fall rapidly. Despite the fact that the leadership of the CGT and federations is in the hands of Peronists and under the strict control of the Ministry of Labor, despite the ban on strikes and repressions, mass actions of the working class in Argentina have reached huge proportions. Workers resolutely demand that the government fulfill the promises made by Perón during election campaigns. According to incomplete data, 334 thousand people participated in the strike movement in 1946, 540 thousand in 1947, and 1,250 thousand people in several recent months of 1948.[143] In 1949, the strike movement in Argentina, as in other Latin American countries, continues to develop in connection with the mounting economic crisis. Agricultural workers of sugar and cotton plantations, and farm laborers of large cattle-raising and grain farms are striking. The Argentine communist party, persecuted by the authorities, exposes the demagogy of the Peronist party, fights to win over the majority of the working class and to expand its influence among the peasantry. Rank-and-file members of Peronist trade unions have repeatedly elected communists to local trade union leadership bodies, rebuffing attempts by the Department of Labor and the CGT leadership to remove communists from elective posts. The gradual withdrawal of the masses from the Peronist movement is a vivid indicator of the growth of class consciousness of the Argentine proletariat.

---

143 "La Hora", 16.I.1949

In Mexico, the working class has acted over the past 25 years as a major militant force in the political life of the country, as a fighter against the dominance of foreign capital, for the democratization of the socio-political system, agrarian transformations, and the nationalization of concessions belonging to Anglo-American capital.

The working class of Mexico has achieved major successes in the struggle for the unity of its ranks. The Confederation of Workers of Mexico (CTM), created in 1936, numbered over 1 million people and united the overwhelming majority of the Mexican proletariat. However, due to the weak work of the Mexican communist party in trade unions, internal reaction forces and the American Federation of Labor (AFL) managed to split the CTM and subordinate one part of it to the reactionary government party. The process of uniting free trade unions is intensifying. The process of merging free trade unions and peasant organizations into the ranks of the progressive General Workers' and Peasants' Union is underway. Striving to strengthen the governmental CTM, the Ministry of Labor refused to register the new organization. Significant strata of the working class of Mexico are still under the strong influence of the national bourgeoisie, having not outlived illusions about the allegedly progressive role of the bourgeoisie. This complicates the communist party's struggle to win over the Mexican proletariat.

Comrade Stalin in his speech at a meeting of KUTV students in May 1925, exposing two deviations in the practice of active workers of the colonial East, pointed out that the first deviation "consists in underestimating the revolutionary possibilities of

the liberation movement and overestimating the idea of a single all-embracing national front in colonies and dependent countries, regardless of the state and degree of development of these countries".[144] Under the current alignment of class forces in Mexico, the main danger consists precisely in belittling the mass revolutionary movement, in unlived illusions regarding the "progressiveness" and "revolutionariness" of the national bourgeoisie, and the possibilities of an agreement between worker organizations and the so-called "progressive" bourgeoisie in the interests of developing national industry.

The Mexican Communist Party exposes the reactionary domestic and foreign policy of the Alemán bourgeois government. In an appeal by the communist party (in August 1948), it was noted that President Alemán had lost the trust of the people, worsened the difficult situation of the working people through his policy, and caused discontent among them. The appeal also indicated that American imperialism, taking advantage of the absence in Mexico of a broad democratic, anti-imperialist front of national unity and relying on reactionary elements, is intensifying its expansion and striving for the complete subordination of Mexico.

Among the main slogans of the 80-thousand-strong popular demonstration that took place on August 21, 1948, in the Mexican capital, Mexico City, was the demand for a radical change in government policy and the "purging of the cabinet of thieves, speculators, and traitors". This demonstration is one of

---

144 J. Stalin, *Works*, Vol. 7, p. 151

the vivid testimonies of the strengthening of democratic forces in Mexico.

The Latin American countries of the second group (Colombia, Cuba, Bolivia, Peru, Venezuela, Paraguay, etc.) are less developed industrially than the countries of the first group, and the proletariat in them is organized more weakly. Reactionary and fascist elements, bribed by Anglo-American imperialists, dominate the political and economic life of these countries.

In these countries, the usual means of removing presidents and governments unpleasing to imperialists and planting dictators of a fascist type are plots and military coups (for example, coups in Bolivia in 1943 and 1946, coups in Peru and Venezuela at the end of 1948, coups in Paraguay, etc.).

The economy of the countries of this group is distinguished by a one-sided, semi-colonial character. There is predominantly mining industry and monoculture agriculture. Raw materials are not processed locally, but exported by foreign companies. These countries are suppliers of oil, tin, silver, copper, as well as coffee, cocoa, cotton, bananas, and sugar. Minerals make up 99% of Bolivia's exports, minerals and oil 65% of Peru's exports, oil 95% of Venezuela's total commodity exports, sugar 80% of Cuba's exports, etc.

Agriculture in the majority of these countries (Venezuela, Peru, Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador) does not provide the population even with basic food products (bread, sugar, meat, butter). American monopolies, interested in exporting their agricultural products to the markets of these countries, in every way hinder the increase of cultivated areas under food crops for local

consumption. The extreme backwardness of agriculture and the beggarly condition of working people in these countries are the consequence of the preservation of large semi-feudal landownership and semi-feudal, semi-slave relations in the countryside.

The industrial proletariat here is small. The main mass of the population is the multi-million landless and land-poor peasantry, farm laborers, and agricultural proletariat. In the total population of these countries, the specific weight of the Negro and Indian populations is very significant. Indians make up 70% in Ecuador, and over half of the entire population in Peru and Bolivia; Negroes and mulattoes make up 35% in Colombia, 25% in Cuba, and 10% of the entire population in Venezuela.

Indians and Negroes are doomed to terrible poverty. Working in penal servitude conditions, they are subjected to the most cruel exploitation and racial discrimination by the foreign capitalists lording it here.

The communist parties of this group of countries are relatively young and still have little experience in the political leadership of the struggle of the working class and all working people. They took shape here significantly later than in the countries of the first group, mainly during the world economic crisis of 1929–1933, which sharply worsened the position of the working class and caused an upsurge in the revolutionary struggle. The communist parties of Ecuador, Paraguay, Peru, and Venezuela were forced to conduct their work underground almost all the time; only toward the end of the war did they

achieve legalization, but soon the communist parties of Ecuador, Paraguay, and Peru were banned again.

The largest party among them is the Communist Party of Cuba, created in 1925 and now called the Popular-Socialist Party. It numbered 50 thousand members and over 150 thousand sympathizers in 1948. The Communist Party of Colombia has 15 thousand members, Venezuela 20 thousand, Peru 35–40 thousand, Ecuador about 6 thousand, Paraguay 6 thousand people.

A major role in the political life of all these countries is played by the petty bourgeoisie. It tries to subordinate workers and peasants to its influence and constitutes the main mass of members of extremely heterogeneous political parties (the left wing of the Liberal Party of Colombia, the Venezuelan party Acción Democrática, the so-called "Cuban Revolutionary Party," the "People's" Party of Peru, the Febrerista Party in Paraguay, etc.), in which, with the aggravation of class struggle, the process of demarcation of political forces is taking place. In the majority of countries of this group, the petty bourgeoisie is mainly under the influence of the conciliatory national bourgeoisie.

After the Second World War, Latin American countries were flooded with industrial goods brought from the USA. This caused and continues to cause major damage to the interests of the petty and middle industrial bourgeoisie of these countries and strengthens its anti-imperialist sentiments. Events that occurred in Colombia and Venezuela are extremely indicative in this regard.

The 9th Inter-American Conference, held in Bogotá in April 1948, took place under the dictation of Wall Street. The increased US pressure on Latin American countries caused a feeling of legitimate indignation and protests of the popular masses throughout Latin America. In Colombia and its capital Bogotá, a mass anti-imperialist movement arose. At the behest of American imperialists and internal reaction, Gaitán, the leader of the left wing of the Liberal Party who headed this movement, was killed. The organizers of this murder pursued the goal of removing the leader of the revolutionarily inclined strata of the petty bourgeoisie, who enjoyed great influence, and at the same time provocatively accusing communists of the murder and intimidating delegates of the conference with the "threat of communism". Immediately after Gaitán's murder, the entire leadership of the Communist Party of Colombia was arrested.

Gaitán's murder caused a spontaneous action of the masses. The Confederation of Workers of Colombia (CTC), the majority of whose leadership consisted of the left wing of liberals, called the masses to a general strike, which then engulfed not only the capital of Colombia, but also the main regions of the country. This movement of the masses lasted several days, but having neither leadership nor a concrete plan of action, it was drowned in blood. The leaders of the Liberal Party, frightened by the scope of the mass movement and its fighting spirit, under the pressure of American imperialism, made a compromise with the government of conservative Ospina Pérez. Thus, the mass actions in Colombia, taking place under the leadership of petty-bourgeois parties, once again

showed the extreme inconsistency and instability of these parties in the struggle for democracy. Nevertheless, these actions contributed to the growth of class consciousness of the proletariat and led to an increase in the influence of the communist party in the worker and trade union movement of Colombia. Thus, the 6th National Congress of Colombian Trade Unions passed under the sign of supporting the slogans of communists. The congress noted that the causes that gave rise to the mass popular action are rooted "in poverty, hunger, unemployment, lack of freedoms for the broad working masses, and in the government policy of encouraging foreign capital and latifundists". The congress demanded that the government of Colombia move from a policy of servility before American capital to a policy of defending the national, including economic, interests of its country, to a revision of agreements with American monopolies and to a restriction of their activity in Colombia. The CTC congress also demanded freedom of worker organization, improvement of their working conditions, abolition of anti-working-class legislation, and implementation of agrarian reform. The working class of Colombia, among which the influence of the communist party is increasingly strengthening, is becoming the largest, most consistent, and organized force in the progressive, democratic movement in the country.

The Venezuelan party Acción Democrática proved to be just as cowardly and inconsistent as the left liberals of Colombia. Instead of raising the broad popular masses to fight reaction and relying on them in connection with the threat of a coup prepared by the military clique in November 1948, the party

and its leader President Gallegos got frightened of the activity of working people and embarked on the path of behind-the-scenes negotiations with the military clique, this creature of American imperialism. Gallegos's government capitulated to the military and rejected the proposals of trade union federations (uniting up to 300 thousand people) and the peasant federation (uniting 60 thousand people) on declaring a general strike of protest against the machinations of internal reaction and imperialists. The fighting spirit of the worker-peasant masses was weakened by the betrayal of Acción Democrática leaders. As a result of the military coup, the government was overthrown and a terrorist regime was established in the country. Strikes started by individual trade unions, in particular the oil industry workers' union in which the communist party has great influence, continued for several weeks, but gave no tangible results. The Confederation of Workers and trade union federations, as well as Gallegos's party, were dissolved.

The forces of the working class of Venezuela, as well as Colombia, were weakened by the fact that in the leadership of trade unions the absolute majority belonged to members of government parties, who pursued a scissionist policy. The communist parties of Colombia and Venezuela have yet to do much to liberate the proletarian masses from the influence of the national bourgeoisie and lead the working class and all working people onto the path of national liberation.

In this group of countries, the working class of Cuba is distinguished by high organization, fighting spirit, and cohesion. The Confederation of Workers of Cuba, led by Negro communist Lázaro Peña (vice-chairman of the World

Federation of Trade Unions), while being declared illegal, remains an active acting center. The mass Popular-Socialist Party enjoys great influence and authority among working people of the city and countryside. In the post-war period, despite unbridled terror and persecution of its leaders, the Popular-Socialist Party is unfolding the struggle for improving the condition of the working class, against the forces of imperialism and reaction.

In the countries of Central America—these genuine colonies of the USA—the basis of the economy is plantation farming (cocoa, coffee, sugarcane); there are only rudiments of industry here. The urban proletariat (on railways, in ports, in construction, in public utility enterprises, in the mines of Nicaragua, Costa Rica) in the countries of this group is extremely small.

The working class of the majority of these countries has not yet taken shape as a class that is politically conscious of itself, has not freed itself from craftism, group, national-racial, religious prejudices, from petty-bourgeois ideology and anarchism.

There is no big national bourgeoisie in these countries, and the middle and petty industrial bourgeoisie is extremely insignificant, since American capital does not allow the development of manufacturing industry here at all and considers these countries exclusively as markets for its industrial products. Agricultural workers and farm laborers, closely connected with the peasantry, are under the yoke of foreign companies and large landowners. The agricultural proletariat—mainly Indians and Negroes—is organized very weakly due to cruel economic and political oppression, lack of

rights, and discrimination. In such countries as El Salvador, Honduras, Haiti, organizations of the working class began to emerge only in recent years, and even now they are in an illegal position.

The dominance of foreign monopolies, terror on the part of the government apparatus, as well as subversive, scissionist activity of small reformist, Catholic, and other trade union groupings created by the AFL prevent the organization of independent trade unions.

But the working masses of these countries too are moving from spontaneous forms of economic struggle to demands for national independence and democratization of the political system. The most stable and strong trade union organizations in the third group of countries are the confederations of workers of Costa Rica, Guatemala, Panama, and Puerto Rico. Due to cruel persecutions and repeated routs, communist parties do not exist in all of these countries. However, even where they exist, they work illegally (with the exception of Panama, Guatemala, and Puerto Rico). Nevertheless, communists in these countries are also winning increasing authority and trust among working people.

In the difficult conditions of dictatorial regimes and the unhindered lording of foreign planters, workers are waging a strike struggle and achieving some successes. Thus, in Guatemala, a new labor code has been introduced establishing a mandatory minimum wage, leaves, and the duration of the working day. 12 thousand workers of the textile industry of Guatemala achieved a wage increase. In Puerto Rico, 140 thousand sugar industry workers managed to conclude a new

agreement providing for wage increases and the expansion of the social insurance law.

Democratic forces of Guatemala prevented an attempted military coup at the end of 1948, prepared with the direct participation of the American United Fruit Company. After the failure of the military coup, American monopolies began to apply economic sanctions against Guatemala, which caused a wave of protest in all Latin American countries.

In Panama, a popular protest movement arose against the extension by the United States of the lease term of military bases located on the territory of the country. Under the pressure of broad popular masses, parliament refused to approve the decision of the Panama government on extending the lease term. In Puerto Rico, a mass organization, the Congress for Independence, was created, holding demonstrations and protest meetings against the lording of American imperialists. In Costa Rica in the summer of 1948, popular masses led by the working class defended their constitutional rights and democratic freedoms with arms in hand against military rebels headed by the US creature Figueres. Although the rebels won, the struggle in the country continues. The Communist Party and the Confederation of Workers of Costa Rica organized people's militia detachments.

The movement for the unity of the forces of the working class is widening in Latin American countries. In 1938, on the initiative of single trade union centers of Mexico, Chile, Cuba, and Argentina, the Confederation of Workers of Latin America (CTAL) was created. During the war years, its national trade union centers were organized in almost all Latin American

countries; in Chile, Argentina, Venezuela, Ecuador, and a number of other countries, farm laborers' federations were formed.

The CTAL is a militant organization uniting over 6 million people belonging to trade union centers of 18 countries; it plays a major role in the labor movement of Latin America. The CTAL program states that the main task of the working people of Latin America is the struggle for freedom and independence from American and British imperialism, for the liquidation of semi-feudal remnants and large landownership, for the development of national industry and the democratization of the socio-political system. The CTAL declared an energetic protest against the traitorous actions of the General Council of British Trade Unions and the right-wing leadership of the American Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO), aimed at splitting the international labor movement. The CTAL fully supports the World Federation of Trade Unions. It is a member of the WFTU, in the leadership of which there are three representatives of trade unions of Latin American countries.

Trade unions united by the CTAL resolutely oppose the so-called "Clayton Plan" on economic relations between the USA and Latin American countries. This program of enslaving Latin American peoples by big capital of the USA, masking its aggression under the slogans of "equal opportunities," "free access to sources of raw materials," "freedom of trade," is regarded by the CTAL as an attempt to establish "economic fascism". Trade unions are fighting against the notorious plan of "joint defense" of the Western Hemisphere, leading to the subordination of the armed forces of Latin America to the US

General Staff, to the turning of Latin American peoples into cannon fodder for North American instigators of a new war striving to establish world domination. They also oppose the "Marshall Plan," which is regarded by them as a plan of enslaving not only Western Europe, but Latin America as well. They are waging a struggle against the North Atlantic Pact, this main weapon of the Anglo-American imperialist bloc aimed at unleashing a war against the USSR and countries of people's democracy. Thus, the positions occupied by trade unions belonging to the CTAL reflect the genuine interests of the working class and broad popular masses of Latin America.

The reactionary leaders of the American Federation of Labor, relying in Latin American countries on the forces of reaction and the help of the government apparatus, on right-wing socialists and various corrupted officials and trade union bureaucrats, conduct subversive, scissionist work among the workers of Latin America.

The reactionary leaders of the false-worker Inter-American Confederation of Workers, knocked together in 1948 with AFL funds, just like the bourgeois top strata of the AFL and CIO, are the paid agency of American imperialism. Contrary to the will of the working class, they unconditionally support the aggressive measures of the US ruling circles—the plan for the "defense" of the Western Hemisphere, the "Marshall Plan," the North Atlantic Pact—and contribute to the fanning of a new war by imperialists. They oppose the unity of the world trade union movement, conduct a scissionist policy, seeking the destruction of the World Federation of Trade Unions and the

subordination of the international trade union movement to the interests of Wall Street.

The decomposed US trade union bureaucracy, which has grown together with capitalist monopolies and the government apparatus, tries in every way to hinder, and where possible, disrupt the solidarity movement of working masses of the Western Hemisphere in the struggle against American imperialism. But the aggravation of class struggle in the USA, expressed in particular in the huge upsurge of the strike movement, the strengthening and activation of advanced, progressive forces in the US labor movement are indicators of the further growth of class consciousness of the North American proletariat. The traitors to the cause of the working class from the AFL and its agency in Latin American countries have failed to detach a single national center from the CTAL. The Inter-American Confederation of Workers includes only small trade union groups headed by right-wing socialists or representatives of other anti-working-class parties.

Comrade Stalin teaches that "the interests of the proletarian movement in developed countries and the national liberation movement in colonies require the combination of these two types of revolutionary movement into a common front against a common enemy, against imperialism;... the victory of the working class in developed countries and the liberation of oppressed peoples from the yoke of imperialism are impossible without the formation and strengthening of a common revolutionary front".[145]

---

[145] J. Stalin, *Works*, Vol. 6, p. 145

Solidarity between Latin American workers and the US proletariat is growing stronger. The leader of the US oil workers' union belonging to the CIO came out with decisive support for the demands of Latin American oil workers put forward at the first Latin American congress of oil industry workers held in September 1948. Latin American trade unions supported the struggle of maritime transport workers and dockers of the Pacific coast of the USA. Having won victory after a protracted struggle, US workers sent a letter to Latin American workers expressing gratitude for their assistance and noted that Latin American workers are also participants in this victory.

The trade union movement in the majority of Latin American countries is now led by communists. The influence of communists has strengthened not only in the leadership of national trade union centers, but also in the CTAL.

To please Wall Street, the right-wing socialists of Latin America conduct subversive work, seeking a split in worker organizations; they have unfolded slanderous, anti-Soviet, anti-communist propaganda. Disguising themselves with false slogans of "intercontinental solidarity," "intercontinental citizenship," "defense of the Western Hemisphere," etc., the right-wing socialists of Chile, Uruguay, Argentina, and other Latin American countries preach Pan-Americanism—that reactionary ideology of US imperialism—and call on peoples to abandon their national independence and sovereignty, to create in the Western Hemisphere a certain "superstate" under the aegis of the United States. Exposing the betrayal of right-wing socialists, communists seek the purging of the governing

bodies of the CTAL and national trade union centers of bourgeois agents, which leads to the strengthening of the trade union movement in Latin American countries. Numerous mass women's and youth democratic organizations belonging to international democratic organizations have been created in Latin America. These organizations wage a struggle against warmongers, for a lasting peace and the development of their countries along the path of democracy and progress, for the expansion of political rights of women and youth, and the improvement of the economic condition of working people; they demand recognition and implementation of the principle of equal pay for equal work regardless of sex, age, and racial affiliation.

The successes achieved by Latin American communist parties are still only first steps on the path of winning over the majority of the working class of Latin America. The communist parties of these countries have ahead of them major work in exposing the betrayal of the national bourgeoisie, in overcoming the harmful influences of hostile ideology on the working class.

One of the most important tasks facing the communist parties is winning over the multi-million masses of the peasantry, creating a solid alliance of the proletariat and peasantry. The work of communist parties in the countryside, despite some achievements, still remains the weakest link of their activity.

Latin American democratic organizations took an active part in the movement for peace and democracy. In September 1949, the American Continental Congress of Partisans of Peace was held in Mexico City. This congress expressed the firm will of

300 million people inhabiting the Western Hemisphere to disrupt the imperialist designs of Anglo-American warmongers.

In all Latin American countries, in regions and districts of each individual Latin American country, committees of the struggle for peace are being created from representatives of mass organizations. In many of these countries, committees of the struggle for peace are forced to work illegally.

Expressing the will and feelings of the Latin American peoples, Chairman of the Popular-Socialist Party of Cuba Juan Marinello stated at the American Congress in Defense of Peace: "Latin American peoples will never fight on the side of their exploiters against the Soviet Union, which is the hope of all humanity". The communist newspaper *La voz de México* wrote: "The defense of the USSR is the defense of our own sovereignty".

Questions or Economics, No.11, 1949.

I. Dudinsky

CAPITALIST FINANCES — A WEAPON OF IMPERIALIST AGGRESSION

A. M. ALEKSEEV, *Military Finances of Capitalist States. (Sources and Methods of Financing the Second World War.)* Gospolitizdat, 1949, 182 pp.

The deepening and intensification of the general crisis of capitalism as a result of the Second World War has found its reflection in the finances, monetary circulation, and credit system of capitalist countries.

As a result of this war and in the course of the imperialists' preparation for a new war, the parasitic character of the financial and credit-monetary relations of capitalist countries continues to intensify; the sums of national debt reach astronomical figures, the budget deficits that long ago became chronic have grown monstrously; budgets have completely turned into an instrument of state-monopoly capital for the implementation of an unbridled arms race, ensuring a handful of monopolists fabulous profits at the expense of severe exploitation of the working masses; the inflationary press presses upon the working people more strongly than ever before. The discrepancy between the accumulation of loan capital and the requirement for it for the slowed-down process of expanded reproduction is growing; the bulk of the national

income, which is accumulated and redistributed in the interests of monopolies through the financial and credit system, is spent unproductively—on the arms race, the suppression of the revolutionary democratic movement, the support of all kinds of reaction, from right-wing "socialism" to fascism inclusive, on the overt and covert enrichment of monopolistic magnates and their minions in the state apparatus.

An urgent task of Soviet economists is the investigation of new facts and phenomena in the field of capitalist finances, the uncovering of the mechanics of war financing.

The classics of Marxism-Leninism, paying great attention to the exposure of militarism and the analysis of the war economy of capitalist countries, laid bare the essence of military finances as well, uncovered the methods used by the bourgeoisie to finance its wars, and showed the role of finances, credit, and money in the enslavement and oppression of peoples by imperialist predators.

Lenin and Stalin repeatedly noted that the yoke of direct and indirect taxes, internal and external loans, and the emission of paper money became especially unbearable for the working masses of bourgeois countries during the wars of the epoch of imperialism and the general crisis of capitalism. "A handful of bankers, who hold the whole world in their hands, profit from the war,"[146] said Lenin. Already during the First World War, Vladimir Ilyich, analyzing data "...on this bacchanalia of profiteering, that is, on prices and profits,"[147] uncovered the true

---

146 1 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. 24, p. 96.

147 *Ibid.*, p. 484.

inwardness of the entire system of capitalist military finances today.

The governments of capitalist states, formed on the principle "Minister today—banker tomorrow; banker today—minister tomorrow,"[148] build the entire financial system at the bidding of the monopolists in such a way that the working masses, receiving a negligible share of the national income, pay 9/10 of all taxes, while the magnates of financial capital are taxed with "toy" taxes. At the same time, parallel to the growth of the tax burden, "the immeasurable issue of paper money encourages speculation, allows capitalists to make millions on it..."[149] and the colossal growth of state loans leads to the fact that workers "must work off hundreds of billions of the state debt through 'honest labor'..."[150], the incomes from which end up in the pockets of monopolists.

The Lenin-Stalin theory of imperialism and the general crisis of capitalism and the analysis by Lenin and Stalin of the essence of military finances are the foundation upon which the analysis of the methods of financing wars in capitalist states and the exposure of bourgeois-apologetic literature devoted to this issue must be built.

The hacks of imperialism and reaction bend over backwards, trying by shameless juggling of facts and figures to justify the

---

148 *Ibid.*, p. 96.

149 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. 25, p. 328.

150 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. 23, p. 263.

offensive of monopolistic capital against the living standard of the working class and the working peasantry.

In all works of bourgeois economists, there glimmers the desire to veil the mechanics of financing imperialist war and present the matter as if war "smoothes over class contradictions," "unites all classes of society for the common task of defeating the enemy".

The apologists of capitalism try to portray the governments of capitalist countries as "supra-class" institutions guided by the principle of "justice" in distributing the costs of war among all classes of society. Bourgeois authors strive to prove that military budgets were a factor contributing to the development of productive forces, and the monstrously bloated state debt is a pledge of social and economic progress.

Many Soviet economists investigating the issues of finances of foreign states do not yet stand at the level of the party's requirements for exposing modern bourgeois "theories" in the service of imperialist reaction, and for generalizing the economic processes taking place in capitalist countries. A small group of cosmopolitans who until recently operated in the field of scientific work on the economics of capitalist countries dragged Soviet economists backward in these issues and hindered the fulfillment of the party's requirements.

In light of what has been said, the interest presented by A. M. Alekseev's recently published book *Military Finances of Capitalist States*, designed for a wide circle of the public, is quite understandable 6.

In the preface, the author writes that he set himself the task "on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist method to investigate the finances of capitalist countries during the Second World War and show as a single whole the mechanism of financing the war by Britain and the USA, on the one hand, and fascist Germany and Japan, on the other"[151].

The introduction and first three chapters of the reviewed book are devoted to an analysis of the financial costs of the Second World War, the examination of wartime state budgets and the material sources of war financing[152].

This is followed by three chapters devoted to the methods of financing war by imperialist states at the expense of internal sources—the intensification of the tax burden, state loans as the main method of war financing, and the inflationary issue of paper money. Although the book is devoted to the military finances of capitalist countries, it contains a brief coverage of how the Soviet Union, thanks to the advantages of the socialist system, emerged from the war with a strong economy capable in the shortest possible terms not only of restoring but also of surpassing the pre-war level of production.

The continuous growth and strengthening of the Soviet war economy during the war ensured the stability of the Soviet

---

[151] 6 A. M. Alekseev, *Military Finances of Capitalist States*, Gospolitizdat, 1949, p. 3. Hereinafter, pages of the reviewed book are indicated in the text.

[152] The second chapter on wartime state budgets should have been placed after the third chapter on the material sources of war financing, since budgets are a superstructure over the production basis.

financial system. In turn, the financial system found vast resources that fully ensured the needs of the Soviet Army and expanded socialist reproduction.

The Soviet financial system successfully overcame the difficulties of wartime and vividly showed its immense advantages over the financial systems of capitalist states. The reactionary circles of the USA and England cruelly miscalculated, believing that the Soviet Union would weaken as a result of the exhausting war and turn out to be dependent on the Anglo-American imperialist bloc.

Examining the problem of the cost of war, the author correctly emphasizes that it cannot be reduced to budgetary expenditures, for these expenditures are only one of the components of the cost of war. Along with budgetary expenditures, the cost of war includes damage and losses caused by the war. By damage is meant the cost of material values destroyed during the war; by losses—losses associated with the disruption of the reproduction process as a result of the war (evacuations and re-evacuations, loss of national income, etc.).

The author cites a number of data showing how much the Second World War surpassed the first in its scale. The number of states involved in the war increased almost twofold (from 36 to 61). The number of mobilized into active armies also increased almost twofold—from 66.2 million people to 110 million people. The number of dead as a result of military operations during the Second World War amounted to 50 million people (approximately 5 times more than in the First World War). Already from these figures it is clear how the

destructive action of modern wars unleashed by imperialists is growing.

The seventh and subsequent chapters characterize the role of external resources in financing the war and the methods of financing war at the expense of these resources: these chapters investigate Lend-Lease as a weapon of American imperialism, the issue of military money as a method of financial aggression of imperialist states, and the role of gold in financing the war. The final, 11th chapter highlights the growth of military expenditures of capitalist states in the post-war period and examines issues of war financing in connection with modern trends in the development of capitalist finances.

The author traces with a number of examples the steady increase in the cost of wars, especially intensive during the period of imperialism and the general crisis of capitalism, when a handful of exploiters directs the greater part of the national income toward the extermination of mankind. Already the First World War cost mankind almost as much as all the wars of the 19th century. The financial costs of capitalist countries in the Second World War, even according to approximate data, exceeded the financial costs of the First World War by almost 5 times.

The greatest hardships in the past war fell to the lot of the Soviet Union, which played the decisive role in the defeat of the fascist-imperialist aggressors. Direct military and additional expenditures of the USSR caused by the war, and direct damage inflicted on our state and the Soviet population (destruction and plunder of property), amount to a huge sum of 2,569 billion rubles, or 485 billion dollars (p. 25).

At the same time, the USA, boasting of the figure of its military expenditures, spent only 275 billion dollars on the Second World War, and only an insignificant part of this amount was directly connected with combat operations of American troops, while the greater part went to the militarization of the country, the enrichment of monopolies, and the suppression of the liberation movement that unfolded during the Second World War and after it.

What are the reasons for the giant growth of the cost of wars in the epoch of imperialism and the general crisis of capitalism and, in particular, what are the reasons for the unusually high level of financial costs of the Second World War? The author indicates among these reasons the following: "...the truly universal character of the war; the huge territorial scope of military operations; the colossal size of the armed forces that took and did not take direct part in military activities; the mass application of new, expensive military equipment and the unprecedented power of its destructive action in past wars; the barbaric methods of waging war by fascist states, their policy of conscious and planned extermination of the population and destruction of the productive forces of occupied regions. A large role in increasing the financial costs of the Second World War was also played by the financial policy of monopolistic capital aimed at ensuring maximum profit from military orders" (p. 21). A. M. Alekseev also emphasizes the significance of the duration of the Second World War, which dragged on as a result of the criminal policy of Anglo-American reactionaries headed by Churchill and his overseas

friends, who tried in every way to disrupt the opening of the second front in Europe (see p. 22).

Investigating the military expenditures of individual countries, the author, on the basis of a critical analysis of a large number of sources and, in particular, data from the archive of the former German Ministry of Economics, shows that the Hitlerites mobilized a huge sum for waging war—620 billion marks in current prices, or 584 billion marks in 1939 prices (table on p. 36), which is 8 times higher than Germany's expenditures on the First World War. These data once again emphasize that in the Second World War the Soviet Union was faced not with an exhausted Germany, as E. Varga tried to portray in his works, but with a strong enemy possessing a powerful financial system and mobilizing the material resources of a number of countries.

A. M. Alekseev further exposes the attempts of bourgeois economists to downplay Germany's actual expenditures on the war in order to belittle the significance of the Soviet Union's victory and "prove" the impossibility for Germany to satisfy the fair reparation claims of the Soviet people.

The striving to downplay data on Germany's military expenditures is characteristic both of the lackeys of science of the bourgeoisie and of imperialist diplomats. Already in his speech at the Moscow Conference of Ministers of Foreign Affairs on March 31, 1947, V. M. Molotov exposed the untenability of the attempts of representatives of the USA, England, and France to "prove" the "weakness" of Germany's economic potential and its "inability" to pay reparations. "Germany," V. M. Molotov said, "which in the years of war

alone spent 620 billion marks for its military needs and in addition spent many billions of marks on the preparation of war, is now free from these colossal expenditures"[153].

Unfortunately, touching upon this issue, the author bypasses the fact that, while furiously objecting to the fair claims of the USSR, the governments of the USA, England, and France received huge reparations from Germany by seizing German property, gold, and patents, buying up industrial enterprises for a song, and making direct extractions from current production.

The shortcomings of the first chapter should also include the absence of a quantitative analysis of the influence of monopoly policy on the inflation of military expenditures of capitalist countries. Meanwhile, data published in the press on the amounts of military orders, military profits of monopolies, etc., provide a full opportunity for such analysis.

For some reason, A. M. Alekseev also lacks an analysis of Italy's military expenditures, although this country was the main ally of Hitlerite Germany in Europe and actively participated in the war against the USSR. One should also note a regrettable discrepancy in figures: on page 28 it is indicated that Germany's state expenditures for the period from April 1, 1933, to March 31, 1939, amounted to 103 billion marks, while in the table on page 30 expenditures for the same period are shown as 150.2 billion marks. It can be assumed that the latter figure along with the imperial budget includes the budgets of

---

153 V. M. Molotov, *Foreign Policy Issues*, Gospolitizdat, 1948, p. 409.

lands, provinces, and communes, but nothing is said about this in the text.

In the second chapter, "Wartime State Budgets," it is shown that during the Second World War as a result of the intensified development of state-monopoly tendencies, financial capital subordinated all financial resources of capitalist countries to its influence more than ever before, and this found its expression first of all in an extraordinary concentration of financial resources in the hands of central authorities.

Both in the "Axis" countries and in the capitalist countries adjoining the anti-Hitler coalition, the financing of the war was carried out almost exclusively through the state budget. Local budgets were deprived of a revenue base, and the rights of local authorities were severely curtailed. The role of state budgets as an instrument for redistributing national income in the interests of financial capital magnates at the expense of the impoverishment of the broad working masses sharply increased. The volume and structure of budgets changed. The volume of budgets increased severalfold; in the revenue side, the significance of internal state loans and the carefully masked issue of paper money increased sharply. Military expenditures grew gigantically, and as a consequence of this, despite the growth of the tax burden, the budget deficit in the main imperialist countries exceeded their pre-war budget by 3–5 times.

On the basis of a large body of factual material, A. M. Alekseev shows the strengthening of the interconnection and interdependence between the state budget, monetary circulation, and the credit system of capitalist countries. The

top crust of financial capital through the state budget gained the opportunity to dispose of the resources of emission and commercial banks, savings banks, and other credit institutions. Bank portfolios were quickly filled with government securities, which inevitably led to an increase in the amount of paper money in circulation and generated inflation with all its hardships for the working masses. Huge funds mobilized through the financial and credit systems were for the most part directed to pay for military orders and to finance private firms fulfilling these orders. In the USA for these purposes in 1944, 62% of the funds of the military budget was spent, and in Germany—up to 65% of the budget (p. 57). This was a genuine golden rain pouring into the pockets of monopolists.

In the third chapter, "Material Sources of War Financing," the author gives a demarcation of the sources and methods of war financing. By sources of war financing are understood the material values created in the production process—national income, national wealth, and resources received from abroad (as a credit or gratis). By methods of war financing the author understands the techniques of mobilizing material values for military purposes. The author distinguishes methods of war financing at the expense of internal sources (taxes, internal loans, issue of paper money) and at the expense of external sources (external loans, issue of military money, lend-lease, etc.).

The author illuminates the characteristic features of military production in the principal capitalist countries. One of them is the significant growth of production in military branches at the expense of the colossal intensification of the exploitation of the

working class, and the reduction of civilian production. The gigantic growth of monopoly profits—the most important feature of capitalist military production—was achieved through the inflation of prices on government orders, excessively high depreciation rates, investment policy by means of which new investments were financed at the expense of broad masses of taxpayers, through the freezing of wages under conditions of inflationary price growth, etc.

Contrary to the assertions of bourgeois authors, the war led neither to the complete liquidation of unemployment nor to the full utilization of the production apparatus of capitalist countries. Unemployment decreased, but was not liquidated. In none of the capitalist countries, even at the height of the war, was the production apparatus fully utilized. A significant part of the equipment in civilian branches was idle, despite the acute shortage of consumer goods. Even in military branches—and the closer to the end of the war, the more so—incomplete utilization of production capacities was observed. In the USA, after the maximum reached in 1943, a noticeable drop in production began, although the war ended only in 1945.

Examining the problem of military production by countries, the author, on the basis of data from the archives of the former German Ministry of Economics, refutes the false assertions of E. Varga and some other staff members of the former Institute of World Economy and World Politics about the allegedly taking place exhaustion of Germany's production resources. The following data are revealing in this regard: the output of gross industrial production of Germany amounted (in 1939 prices) in 1939 to 78.9 billion marks, and in 1944 to 87.4

billion marks, i.e., increased by 10.7%. In branches of the military industry, the growth was significantly larger and reached, for example, in the metalworking industry 87% (pp. 67–68).

Interesting are the data characterizing for individual countries the growth of the share of national income diverted to military purposes and the fall of the share of national income going to personal consumption.

The fourth chapter, "Intensification of the Tax Burden During the War," the author begins with the assertion that "in peacetime in all capitalist countries taxes are the main source of state revenues...", while "state loans and the issue of paper money serve as an extraordinary source of budget revenues..." (p. 74). This proposition, correct for the epoch of industrial capitalism, should not be applied in such a categorical form for the epoch of imperialism and even more so for the epoch of the general crisis of capitalism. The decay of the financial system of capitalism has long since led to the chronic deficits of the budgets of capitalist states. As a consequence of this, state loans and the issue of various treasury obligations turned from an extraordinary source of budget revenues of capitalist countries into their ordinary source and along with taxes are a means of mobilizing resources for the intensified arms race, the maintenance of the bloated police apparatus, subsidies to monopolies, etc.

The author shows the colossal growth of the tax burden that took place both in the First and in the Second World War. At the same time, the growth of taxes during the Second World War was significantly greater than in the first. As a result, the

significance of taxes in covering military expenditures increased. In 1939–1944 in Germany, 26.6% of all military expenditures was covered at the expense of taxes instead of 10 –12% in 1914–1918, in England respectively 48.5% and about 20%, in the USA—43% and 31.5% (pp. 74–75).

The author managed to show convincingly with facts and figures that the entire burden of the gigantically increased tax burden fell entirely on the shoulders of working people, and the taxation of monopoly profits was a bluff. Even those relatively small sums of direct taxes that financial capital magnates had to pay from their profits, the data on which were artificially understated, they easily shifted onto broad strata of taxpayers.

The author also shows with examples of the principal capitalist countries the continuous growth of taxes directly paid by the working population, which was achieved by raising direct tax rates, lowering the tax-exempt minimum, increasing excise taxation, introducing new taxes, reducing tax exemptions, etc.

However, taxes, as the author correctly shows, despite their growth, still could not ensure the financing of the war. The fact is that even before the war the tax press was screwed down very tightly; with the extraordinarily low income level of the overwhelming part of the population, the intensification of the tax burden turned out to be insufficient to cover colossal military costs. Of course, the situation would have changed substantially upon the establishment of truly high taxes on capitalists, but bourgeois governments in the service of monopolies did not even think of going for this.

Therefore, the main method of financing wars in the epoch of the general crisis of capitalism is state loans, the question of which is investigated by the author in the fifth chapter.

Already the First World War led to a huge increase in the state debt. The Second World War, the gigantic costs of which were 50–70% covered by state loans, caused an even greater growth of state indebtedness. Compared to the pre-war period, the state debt by the end of the war increased in England from 8.4 billion pounds sterling to 23.1 billion pounds sterling, in the USA—from 57.9 billion dollars to 263.0 billion dollars, in Germany—from 37.1 billion marks to 376.1 billion marks (pp. 94–95). In a number of countries by the time the war ended, the state debt exceeded not only the national income, but also the national wealth. The colossal burden of state debts is used by monopolists in their own interests. The author correctly points out that the issue of loans serves the ruling classes, along with the emission of paper money, as a convenient way of covering military costs. The issue of loans allows the rulers of capitalist countries to quickly mobilize monetary funds and shift the burdens of military financing onto the working class and peasantry, since loans in the course of time necessitate an increase in taxes paid by the exploited classes. For the financial oligarchy, state loans are an extremely profitable form of capital investment: interest guaranteed by the state is paid on loans at the expense of the broad masses of taxpayers. In addition, funds collected by the state through loans return to capitalists upon payment of military orders at monopoly prices. The issue of state loans leads to an increase in the amount of paper money in circulation and, consequently, inevitably leads

to inflation. Thus, the emission of loans lies as a heavy burden on the main mass of the population both in the present (inflation) and in the future (growth of taxes).

In the review by countries, A. M. Alekseev cites interesting data on the dynamics of long-term and short-term debt, on methods of placing loans, on the influence of loan issues on bank balances and on the monetary circulation of the principal capitalist countries during the war.

However, the author did not avoid erroneous formulations in this, on the whole very valuable chapter. Speaking about the fact that upon issue, loans push away the onset of inflation for a time, he asserts that in this sense "state loans can be regarded as an anti-inflationary method of war financing" (p. 96). This assertion is completely incorrect and is in explicit contradiction with the entire context of the chapter. A serious shortcoming is also the absence of criticism of the "theories" widespread in capitalist countries about the "beneficial influence of the state debt on social and economic progress" (Moulton, Hansen, Keynes, and others).

The growth of the state debt was, of course, not the only cause of the growth of inflation during the Second World War and after its completion. A significant role was played by the issue of paper money, carried out to one degree or another by all capitalist countries that participated in the past war. The author devotes a special chapter to the problem of the inflationary issue of paper money, in which he shows that inflation inevitably leads to a colossal growth of prices, a fall in exchange rates, and the disruption of the credit-monetary and financial systems. The author correctly notes that, despite the

negative influence of inflation on the war economy, capitalist countries widely used the issue of paper money to finance the war. Inflation is the easiest way for the ruling classes to mobilize funds. During inflation, prices grow significantly faster than wages rise, and consequently, the capitalists' profit increases, while the living standard of working people declines. Inflation always causes a redistribution of national income in favor of the exploiting classes. Besides, the issue of paper money brings the state immediate income, whereas the collection of taxes and even the placement of loans require a more or less long period.

Using the example of individual countries, the author shows the methods of inflationary issue of paper money and the scale of devaluation of this money. He also cites data on the sharp discrepancy between wage growth and the rates of devaluation of paper money and thereby visually shows the process of impoverishment of working people as a result of inflation.

The author examines the development of inflation in the post-war period, evaluating this fact as one of the manifestations of the aggravation of contradictions of the capitalist system in the period of imperialism and the general crisis of capitalism.

The author criticizes bourgeois "theories" of inflation, but the effectiveness of the criticism is significantly reduced by the fact that it is given too fleetingly, and besides, the author allows inaccuracy in a number of formulations. He notes that identifying any devaluation of paper money with inflation is incorrect, and gives his own definition of the concept of inflation. "Inflation," he says, "is called only such devaluation of paper money which is caused by an excess of it in

circulation compared to the needs of circulation in cash. Under these conditions, the excess of paper money causes a decrease in its real value in relation to the nominal one" (p. 117). It is quite obvious that this definition is of a purely formal character: it does not reveal the class meaning of inflation as an instrument of financial capital for robbing the working masses. Incidentally, the author himself notes the class meaning of inflation in subsequent exposition.

In the same chapter there are other imprecise formulations (pp. 117 and 118) that can create the impression for the reader as if inflation is generated only by wars, although this does not follow at all from the entire text of the chapter. The author should have said more clearly that the crisis of the monetary system characteristic of the period of the general crisis of capitalism finds its expression, in particular, in almost chronic inflation; during periods of wars, inflation is only aggravated.

Following the analysis of methods of war financing at the expense of internal sources, the author moves on to investigate the role of external resources in war financing and methods of mobilizing external resources. In the years of the Second World War, imperialist countries widely used the resources of other countries to strengthen their military-economic potential and to enrich monopolies. At the same time, methods of attracting external resources differed significantly from the methods used during the First World War: "The change in the role of gold in financing the war; the wide application of direct and reverse Lend-Lease; the decrease in the specific weight of intergovernmental loans in covering military costs; the huge significance of the system of compulsory currency clearings,

under which fascist Germany received material resources of enslaved countries gratis; the seizure and use of so-called trophy currency; the issue of military money on foreign territory; the collection of occupation tribute; the system of sterling balances, which gave England the opportunity to use the resources of colonial and dependent countries in exchange for blocked pounds sterling—such is the list of main changes in attracting external resources to finance the war" (p. 132).

The author correctly emphasizes that these changes are a consequence of the further merging of monopolies with the state, the transition of monopolistic capitalism to open forms of military, economic, and political domination both inside the country and in the international arena.

The press of the monopolies worked hard to "prove" the allegedly decisive role of Lend-Lease deliveries in the military defeat of the powers of the Hitlerite block. The fabrications of financial capital's minions were also reproduced by cosmopolitans who operated in Soviet economic science[154]. Therefore, special attention is deserved by Chapter VIII of the reviewed work, titled "Lend-Lease as a Weapon of American Imperialism". Using figures and facts taken mainly from official reports, the author shows the imperialist orientation of

---

[154] See L. I. Frey, *Foreign Trade Policy Issues of Foreign Countries*, V/O "International Book", Moscow 1946, p. 163. The issue of lend-lease is also treated objectivistically in the textbook *Currency Circulation and Credit of the USSR*, compiled under the guidance of Prof. Z. V. Atlas and published by Gosfinizdat in 1947 under the editorship of Prof. E. Ya. Bregel (see pp. 415–416).

Lend-Lease and exposes the legend about the large role of Lend-Lease created by the "scholarly" lackeys of imperialism. The specific weight of US expenditures on Lend-Lease operations in the total sum of military expenditures of the anti-Hitler coalition countries did not even reach 7%. All the more ludicrous are the assertions about the "decisive" role of Lend-Lease in the war of the Soviet people against the fascist-militarist states, since the specific weight of all import resources (and not only Lend-Lease deliveries) in the material provision of the USSR's victory in the Patriotic War amounted to only about 4% in relation to the output of Soviet industry produced during the war years.

Lend-Lease was a weapon in the hands of American monopolies, used primarily to market American products in foreign markets and to seize these markets. At the expense of Lend-Lease deliveries, American monopolists received large profits and supported reactionaries in territories liberated from Italo-German and Japanese occupiers. In the post-war period, Lend-Lease served as one of the means of the policy of armaments standardization implemented by US imperialists in marshallized and other dependent countries of the USA.

Among the characteristic features of financing the Second World War is the wide use of special "military money" both by the troops of England and the USA, and by the troops of Germany, Japan, and Italy to cover military and occupation expenses and to enslave the peoples of occupied countries. The author devotes a chapter titled "The Issue of Military Money—a Method of Financial Aggression of Imperialist States" to the analysis of military money. Here the author shows the specific

traits and features of military money as a special variety of paper money generated by the wars of the epoch of imperialism and the general crisis of capitalism.

In the years of the Second World War, imperialist states widely used the issue of paper money in foreign territories to strengthen their military-economic potential and to enrich monopolies. In particular, Hitlerite Germany issued 9.1 billion occupation marks in the countries occupied by it—an amount one and a half times exceeding the amount of money in circulation in Germany itself on the eve of Hitler's seizure of power.

The practice of issuing military money is relatively poorly covered in Soviet economic literature. In 1948, the State Publishing House of Financial Literature published A. M. Alekseev's brochure titled *Military Currency*, in which material on the issue of paper money in foreign territories during the wars of the 18th–20th centuries was collected and systematized. However, this brochure suffered from a number of very significant shortcomings, for which not only the author is to blame, but also the editor, Prof. Bregel.

In a number of places in the brochure *Military Currency*, there was no clear class approach, and here and there the fabrications of apologists of capitalism were uncritically reproduced. Besides, a number of correct propositions remained unsystematized, and as a result, the specific traits and features of military currency as a special variety of paper money generated by wars were not fully enough revealed.

Saying that the issue of military money by capitalist countries is a burden for occupied states, the author did not emphasize that this burden falls entirely and mainly on the working masses. The brochure lacked a clear answer to the question of why during the wars of the epoch of imperialism and the general crisis of capitalism the emission of military currency by capitalist countries became a typical phenomenon, while during the wars of pre-monopoly capitalism the use of military currency had an episodic character.

The wide application of special military money in the First and especially the Second World Wars is organically connected with the development of the general crisis of capitalism, which left its stamp on the state of monetary circulation of capitalist countries. As is known, the world war of 1914–1918 led to the collapse of the gold standard in its gold-coin form and opened the first round of world inflations. The huge issue of military money reflects the general tendency of the collapse of financial and monetary systems of capitalist countries, being at the same time a factor in the further intensification of the parasitism and decay of capitalism. This idea should have permeated the whole brochure. Meanwhile, in many cases the author merely stated facts showing changes in the monetary circulation of capitalist countries in the period of imperialism, without giving a proper explanation to these facts.

In the reviewed book, the errors made in the brochure *Military Currency* have been corrected to a significant extent. A. M. Alekseev clearly and lucidly shows the imperialist orientation of using special military money. In the section dedicated to the issue of paper money by the Hitlerites in the temporarily

occupied territory of the Soviet Union, the author emphasizes the fact that Soviet patriots did not accept the occupation marks issued by the fascist invaders, considering them predatory.

However, even in the chapter on military money of the reviewed book, the author permits erroneous assertions. Thus, from his reasoning it turns out as if the Anglo-American authorities issued military money in North Africa because, allegedly, "the Germans could flood this territory with dollars and pounds sterling and cause popular discontent" (p. 163).

In the next, tenth chapter, the author cites a number of interesting facts and figures showing the role of gold during wars of the epoch of the general crisis of capitalism and the concentration of gold reserves in the hands of US imperialists. It is characteristic that as a result of the war, the gold reserves of capitalists increased in other countries as well. In particular, "at the beginning of 1947, the gold reserves at the disposal of private individuals in France amounted to about 3,400 million dollars, which is almost five times higher than the gold reserve of the Bank of France. There is no doubt," A. M. Alekseev concludes, "that a significant part of this gold was obtained by the French bourgeoisie as a result of cooperation with the Hitlerite invaders" (p. 176).

The final chapter is devoted to an analysis of the state finances of imperialist states in the post-war period. As is known, American imperialism, fattened on the war, strives for world domination. The governments of the USA, England, and other imperialist states, whose foreign and domestic policy is built at the bidding of American monopolies, spend colossal funds on preparing a new world war directed against the Soviet Union

and the countries of people's democracy, as well as against the liberation movement in colonial and dependent countries.

The author shows that the Second World War left a heavy financial legacy in capitalist countries. Colossal state loans in their dimensions, the heavy burden of direct and indirect taxes, ever-increasing and debilitating inflation—such are the consequences of the financial policy of imperialist states.

In the post-war period, imperialist countries spend a significantly larger share of national income on military purposes than on the eve of the Second World War. As correctly noted in the book, this reflects the intensification of the parasitic character of modern capitalism, the further deepening and aggravation of the general crisis of the capitalist system of economy.

Unfortunately, the final chapter does not find room for a number of important generalizations that should have been made on the basis of the material of previous chapters, as well as the latest data on the arms race in capitalist countries. Finally, the author completely bypassed the growth of resistance of working people, headed by communist and workers' parties, to the criminal policy of unleashing a new world war.

A general shortcoming of the book should be considered the fact that the author builds the analysis of military finances of capitalist countries only on the example of financing the Second World War and does not always give a consistent analysis of the finances of capitalist countries during the First World War. Therefore, the reader cannot form a clear idea of

those significant changes that occurred in the methods of financing the Second World War by capitalist countries compared to the First World War. Meanwhile, it is precisely with the help of such a comparison that the progressive decay of the entire financial system of capitalism can be shown most vividly. Insufficient attention is paid by the author to the criticism of modern bourgeois "theories" in the field of military financing.

Yet, on the whole, the reviewed book is a positive phenomenon in our economic literature. Gospolitizdat has published an interesting work on a topical theme.

The book is written in a clear, lucid, accessible language, is based on a large, critically analyzed material, and is imbued with the spirit of hatred for capitalism.

A. M. Alekseev's book will help broad strata of the Soviet intelligentsia to better understand the financial reality of imperialist countries and see the reverse side of the financial mechanism of war.

Questions or Economics, No.11, 1949.

G. Grigoryev

THE FORMATION OF THE GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC IS A TURNING POINT IN EUROPEAN HISTORY

On October 7, 1949, the German Democratic Republic was proclaimed in Berlin. Expressing the will of the overwhelming majority of the German people, the 9th session of the German People's Council adopted a decision to create a provisional parliament and form the Provisional Government of the German Democratic Republic. The People's Council, elected by the German People's Congress, was transformed into a provisional People's Chamber. The Landtags elected the Provisional Chamber of the States of the German Parliament. A constitution was put into effect, the draft of which was discussed and approved by broad sections of the German democratic public. Wilhelm Pieck, an outstanding figure in the labor movement and an untiring fighter for the unity of Germany and its transformation into a democratic, peace-loving state, was unanimously elected President of the German Democratic Republic. A Provisional Government of the republic was created, headed by Prime Minister Otto Grotewohl.

The formation of the German Democratic Republic meets the persistent demands of the entire German people. The unfolding popular movement for the creation of a German democratic government demonstrated the desire of the German people to

unite their forces to fight for a single peace-loving democratic state, for the speediest conclusion of a peace treaty, and for ensuring the free, independent development of Germany along a democratic path.

The creation of the German Democratic Republic is of huge significance, first and foremost, for the German people themselves. Being an expression of their firm will to take their destiny into their own hands, the formation of the republic testifies at the same time to the fact that the strengthened and grown democratic forces of Germany are entering a new phase of the struggle against the division of their country, against the enslavement of its western regions by Anglo-American imperialists. The proclamation of the German Democratic Republic shows that the German people do not want to be landsknechts for Anglo-American warmongers, and that they do not intend to reconcile themselves with the criminal imperialist policy of the Anglo-American bloc, which destroys their sovereignty and jeopardizes their national existence.

The National Front of Democratic Germany, created on the initiative of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, put forward the following main program demands in accordance with the decisions of the Potsdam Conference:

restoration of the political and economic unity of Germany, formation of an all-German government, liquidation of the separate West German state, repeal of the Occupation Statute, annulment of the Ruhr Statute, and prevention of attempts to use the Ruhr as a basis for the revival of German militarism;

the speediest conclusion of a fair peace treaty with Germany based on unconditional recognition of the Potsdam decisions on the democratization and demilitarization of Germany and its obligations toward other nations; withdrawal of occupation troops from Germany within a strictly established short timeframe after the signing of the Peace Treaty;

> restoration of the full sovereignty of the German nation with recognition of its right to an independent foreign policy and independent foreign trade; free and independent development of the democratic German state and the German people after the conclusion of the peace treaty; cooperation and friendship of the German people with all peace-loving peoples and countries that recognize the national interests of democratic Germany;
>
> irreconcilable, active struggle of the German people for peace against the instigators of a new war; prohibition of all activities aimed at dragging Germany into aggressive military blocs, the European Union, and the North Atlantic Treaty; peace for Germany and for the entire world; full and unrestricted support for forces throughout the world advocating peace, equality, and friendship among nations.

The broad popular movement that led to the proclamation of the German Democratic Republic conclusively showed that the aspirations and hopes of the vast majority of the German people are directed toward active support of the camp of peace and democracy.

The government program of the German Democratic Republic provides for the need to develop a peaceful and free republic based on the planned management of the national economy and a steady rise in the living standards of the population. The government program establishes the necessity of implementing concrete measures to introduce and consolidate democratic order and legality in the country, protect the rights of German citizens, and develop culture, science, and art put at the service of the people.

The Soviet Union, which consistently pursues a policy of peace, has always provided and continues to provide immense assistance to the German people in the rebirth and consolidation of their national independence and sovereignty. The Soviet Union immediately and firmly defined its positive attitude toward the German Democratic Republic. In a statement by the Soviet Government, it is pointed out that one cannot fail to recognize as "legitimate the desire of German democratic circles to take into their own hands the restoration of the unity of Germany and its rebirth on democratic and peace-loving foundations. It is precisely in this that the Soviet Government sees the meaning of the decisions of the German People's Council on putting into effect the Constitution of the German Democratic Republic and on forming the Provisional Government of the German Democratic Republic in Berlin." The Soviet Government decided to transfer to the Provisional Government of the German Democratic Republic the administration functions that previously belonged to the Soviet Military Administration. Instead of the Soviet Military Administration operating in Germany until now, a Soviet

Control Commission has been established, which will supervise the implementation of the Potsdam and other joint decisions of the four powers regarding Germany.

The Soviet Union enabled the German people to conduct their own independent, national foreign policy and establish peaceful cooperation with other nations. Unconditional recognition of the Potsdam decisions and solemn recognition of the East German border along the Oder–Neisse line by the German democratic government gives it the opportunity to establish close friendly relations with the Polish people and the peoples of other countries of popular democracy. The decision of the Soviet Government and the governments of the popular democracies to exchange diplomatic missions with the German Democratic Republic is immense moral and political support for the German people. Friendship with the Soviet Union, with the countries of popular democracy, and with all other peace-loving peoples is the foundation of the government's foreign policy, stated Prime Minister of the German Democratic Republic Otto Grotewohl in his government declaration. The formation of the German Democratic Republic and the establishment of friendly relations between it, the Soviet Union, and the popular-democratic states are of immense international significance for consolidating peace and security in Europe.

Comrade Stalin characterized the formation of the peace-loving German Democratic Republic as a turning point in the history of Europe. "There can be no doubt," Comrade Stalin pointed out, "that the existence of a peace-loving, democratic Germany alongside the existence of the peace-loving Soviet Union

excludes the possibility of new wars in Europe, puts an end to bloodshed in Europe, and makes impossible the enslavement of European countries by world imperialists."[155]

The emergence of a peace-loving democratic Germany means a radical turning point in the relations between the Soviet and German peoples, and puts an end to the enmity that previously existed between the peoples of Germany and its neighboring states, which was persistently stoked for decades not only by German imperialists, but also by the imperialists of the USA, Britain, and France, who pursued their own selfish goals. "The experience of the last war showed," writes Comrade Stalin, "that the German and Soviet peoples suffered the greatest sacrifices in this war, and that these two peoples possess the greatest potential in Europe for accomplishing great actions of world significance. If these two peoples display the determination to fight for peace withшель the same exertion of effort with which they waged war, then peace in Europe can be considered assured."[156]

In their reply to J. V. Stalin, President of the German Democratic Republic V. Pieck and Prime Minister of the Provisional Government O. Grotewohl expressed gratitude to the Soviet Government for transferring administration functions to the Provisional Government of the German Democratic Republic and solemnly promised "to do everything henceforth to mobilize with even greater determination the

---

155 *Pravda*, October 14, 1949.

156 Ibid.

significant forces embodied in the German Democratic Republic for the preservation and strengthening of peace."

The formation of the peace-loving German Democratic Republic is a severe blow to the reactionary, imperialist camp of warmongers. The aggressive, reactionary camp headed by US imperialists is trying by all means and resources to hinder the democratic development of Germany. However, as Comrade Stalin pointed out, the German people, having embarked on the path of struggle for democracy and peace, meet "great sympathy and active support from all peoples of the world, including the American, British, French, Polish, Czechoslovak, and Italian peoples, not to mention the peace-loving Soviet people."[157]

It is well known that as a result of the adventurous policy of German imperialism, the peoples of the world were twice plunged into bloody wars within a short historical period, and the German people into a national catastrophe of enormous magnitude.

German imperialism appeared on the world stage when almost the entire world had already been divided among the major capitalist powers. It came "to the table of capitalist feasts when the seats were already taken."[158] As Comrade Stalin pointed out, Germany "needed merely some two decades to begin

---

157 Ibid.

158 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XXX, p. 336.

overtaking Britain..."[159]; it exhibited the most aggressive, predatory traits compared to the old colonial powers.

World War I, unleashed by German imperialism to redistribute the world in its favor, brought military defeat to Germany. However, German capitalist monopolies managed to profit from this defeat by shifting the entire burden of the defeat and the consequences of the war onto the shoulders of the working people. Having suppressed the revolutionary movement in the country with the active assistance of reactionary Social Democracy and placed fascism in power, German imperialists began feverishly preparing for World War II in order to establish their world domination.

During the period of preparation for World War II, German financial and industrial monopolies received enormous assistance from American, British, and French imperialists, who built plans aimed at inciting a war between Germany and the USSR. "A golden rain of American dollars fertilized the heavy industry of Hitlerite Germany and, in particular, its war industry. These billions of American dollars invested by overseas monopolies in the war economy of Hitlerite Germany reconstructed German military potential and placed in the hands of the Hitler regime the weapons necessary for carrying out its aggression."[160] The close ties between German, American, British, and French monopolies, along with the treacherous "Munich" policy of the ruling circles of Britain and

---

[159] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, Vol. 8, p. 315.

[160] *Falsifiers of History* (Historical Note). Gospolitizdat, 1948, p. 12.

France conducted with the full consent of the USA, contributed to unleashing Hitlerite Germany's aggressive war.

World War II ended in the total military defeat and surrender of fascist Germany. Under the powerful blows of the heroic Soviet Army, fascist-imperialist Germany collapsed and fell, and the fascist regime—which had brought untold suffering to the peoples of Europe and led Germany to a catastrophe of unprecedented proportions—was crushed. The Armed Forces of the Soviet Union liberated the German people from the horrors of fascism.

The defeat of Hitlerite Germany by the Soviet Army created favorable prerequisites for transforming Germany into a peaceful, democratic state, for the complete restructuring of its economic and political life on democratic foundations. Implementation of the Potsdam Agreement, under which the USSR, USA, Great Britain, and France undertook the obligation to treat Germany as a single whole and facilitate its transformation, would have enabled Germany to become a united, independent, democratic, and peaceful state.

The Soviet Union never equated Hitler's clique with the German people. "Historical experience says," stated Comrade Stalin in 1942, "that Hitlers come and go, but the German people and the German state remain."[161]

The Soviet Union always resolutely opposed Anglo-American plans to dismember Germany. The Soviet Union rejected the

---

[161] J. Stalin, *On the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union*. Gospolitizdat, 1947, p. 46.

proposal presented by the United States at the Tehran Conference in 1943 to divide post-war Germany into five parts. The Soviet Union also resolutely rejected the plan put forward by Churchill and Eden in October 1944 to dismember Germany into three separate states. The Soviet Government consistently advocated preserving the political and economic unity of Germany within the framework of a peaceful democratic state. Pursuing the goal of destroying Hitler's predatory empire, the Soviet Union simultaneously showed that it was alien to feelings of revenge. On Victory Day over Germany, May 9, 1945, Comrade Stalin noted in his address to the Soviet people: "The Soviet Union celebrates victory, although it has no intention of either dismembering or destroying Germany."[162]

The Soviet Union's desire for a fair, democratic solution to the German problem based on the Potsdam decisions and the speediest settlement of the peace treaty issue with Germany found warm approval and support from all sincere advocates of peace, primarily the countries of popular democracy. In the decisions of the Warsaw Conference of Foreign Ministers held in June 1948, the Soviet Union and the countries of popular democracy not only took a resolute stance against the divisive policy of the Western powers, favoring the early conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany and the withdrawal of occupation forces from its territory within a year after the conclusion of the peace treaty, but also, in accordance with the Potsdam Agreement, outlined a program for a democratic resolution of the German problem.

---

[162] Ibid., p. 193.

Steadfastly and consistently adhering to the historical decisions of the Potsdam Conference, the Soviet Government invariably implemented them in the eastern zone of Germany.

In Eastern Germany, from the very first days following the entry into force of the Potsdam Agreement, the free operation of anti-fascist parties was permitted and encouraged. Demilitarization and democratization of all socio-political and economic life were carried out here; state administrations and economic bodies were purged of active Nazis and war criminals. Democratic reforms were implemented in the fields of public education and justice. Monopolistic organizations were liquidated in the eastern zone of Germany, agrarian reform was carried out, and the dominance and arbitrariness of financial and industrial magnates, landowners, and Junkers were broken. All of this made it possible to establish an anti-fascist, democratic regime in which the leading role belongs to the working class, led by the Socialist Unity Party of Germany. Thanks to the expropriation of property belonging to war criminals and active Nazis, command economic positions passed into the hands of the people. Socialized factories, plants, and mines accounted for about 40% of all industrial production in the eastern zone of Germany in 1949.

Despite the huge difficulties of economic recovery associated with colossal war destruction and the necessity to liquidate the war industry, Eastern Germany's economy achieved significant success. The Soviet Military Administration provided all-around assistance to the economic recovery of the Soviet occupation zone, contributed to the rise of the peaceful economy, and supported deep democratic transformations.

The policy of dividing and dismembering Germany pursued from day one of the country's occupation by American, British, and French authorities, their refusal to establish central economic departments and organize an all-German democratic government, their separate currency reform in the western zones, the disruption of inter-zonal trade, and the cessation of supplies to Eastern Germany of coal, coke, metal, and other raw materials seriously hampered and continue to hamper the rapid recovery and rise of Eastern Germany's peaceful economy. Nevertheless, the level of industrial production in this part of Germany is significantly higher than in Western Germany. While industrial production in Bizonia stood at only 70–75% of the 1936 level at the beginning of 1949 according to exaggerated official figures, industrial output in Eastern Germany reached 96.6% of the 1936 level in March 1949.

The implementation of measures to democratize economic life, the transition of basic means of production to public ownership, the execution of agrarian reform, and the involvement of the broad working masses in building a new, democratic Germany made it possible to transition in the eastern zone of Germany to the recovery and development of a peaceful economy on a planned basis. A national economic plan for the second half of 1948 was developed first, followed by a two-year plan for 1949–1950.

In developing these national economic plans, the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and other democratic organizations of Eastern Germany proceeded from the fact that the division of Germany carried out by the US and Britain and the inclusion of its western part into the system of the "Marshall Plan" did not

make it possible to elaborate a single economic recovery plan for Germany as a whole. The program of the German People's Congress stated: "The goal of all economic activity in Germany must be to ensure a better life for the population... These efforts must be guaranteed by a democratic system, the creation of an all-German independent peaceful economy having normal economic relations with all other democratic states."

The adoption of the two-year plan, stemming from the interests of the people and aimed at economic development and raising the living standards of the working people of Eastern Germany, sparked a surge of labor enthusiasm among workers in people's enterprises. The production activist movement, broadly supported by the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and the Free German Trade Union Federation, became a vital, organic part of the working class's struggle to restore and develop a peaceful economy, and for the fundamental democratic restructuring of Eastern Germany. This production activist movement demonstrated a new attitude toward labor among German workers, and the desire of German working people to actively participate in building a new, democratic Germany.

The main industrial branches of the eastern zone not only fulfill but significantly exceed planned targets. Thus, in the first half of 1949, the hard coal mining plan was fulfilled by 103.2%, briquette production by 106.6%, electric power by 104.8%, pig iron smelting by 103.4%, steel by 109.7%, sulfuric acid production by 107.3%, lime by 125.4%, potash fertilizers by 109.5%, synthetic wool by 107.3%, and rayon by 104.5%. Production growth in the first half of 1949 compared to the second half of 1948 was: for hard coal — 6%, brown coal —

7%, briquettes — 9%, steel — 65%, pig iron — 13%, rolled steel — 60%, cement — 9%, window glass — 30%, synthetic wool — 66%, and rayon — 106%.

In a published report by the Ministry of Planning of the German Democratic Republic on the implementation of the national economic plan for the third quarter of 1949, compiled while still under the German Economic Commission of the Soviet Occupation Zone, it is indicated that in key industrial sectors, the plan was fulfilled by 109%. The steel smelting plan was fulfilled by 122%, electric power production by 114%, cement by 111%, and wood fiber by 121%. Overall, by the end of 1949, industrial output will increase by 16% compared to 1948, and in 1950, gross industrial production, according to the plan, should reach the 1936 level. As Prime Minister Otto Grotewohl stated in his government declaration, the main industrial sectors of Eastern Germany are in a position to complete the two-year plan as early as the summer of 1950.

Democratic land reform was successfully carried out in Eastern Germany. About 530,000 peasant households received land, including 121.5 thousand landless peasants and 88 thousand resettlers. The land reform laid the foundation in the Soviet occupation zone for a firm alliance between the working class and working peasantry, thereby creating a solid guarantee for the development and strengthening of German democracy. The land reform led to a significant rise in Eastern Germany's agriculture.

Created on the initiative of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and with the assistance of working peasants during the land reform, the Peasant Mutual Aid Associations are

contributing to the democratization of the German countryside. These associations comprise 556,000 peasants, which constitutes the overwhelming majority of the working peasantry of Eastern Germany. The Peasant Mutual Aid Associations provide peasants with great practical assistance in machinery, agricultural equipment, transport vehicles, etc. At the same time, the cultivation of land by machine-rental stations established under the peasant associations is conducted on terms favorable to working peasants: a 30% discount is established for poor peasants, and a 15% discount for needy middle peasants off the general tariff.

In 1949, the production of tractors began to be established in Eastern Germany.

The rise of agriculture and, in particular, the growth of livestock productivity made it possible to properly resolve the complex food issue in Eastern Germany, and allowed for an improvement in the supply of food products to the population. Since the end of May 1949, free sales of potatoes were introduced here, food rationing quotas were raised, prices in the commercial retail network were significantly reduced, and thus prerequisites were created for the gradual abolition of rationed food supplies.

At the end of October 1949, the Politburo of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany adopted a decision on measures to further improve the material well-being of the population of the German Democratic Republic. The proposals developed by the SED provide for an increase in food and industrial goods rationing quotas for workers engaged in the mining and metallurgical industries, persons performing heavy physical

labor, as well as the intelligentsia. In addition, improvements in the food supply for housewives, the majority of office workers, etc., are also provided for. The Politburo of the SED sets the task, based on raising labor productivity in industry and crop yields in agriculture to the 1936 level, of achieving the abolition of the food rationing system and for a larger amount of consumer goods by the end of 1950. The Politburo of the SED noted that one of the main conditions for improving supplies to the population is the growth of trade turnover with the Soviet Union and the countries of popular democracy. On October 27, at a government meeting, the SED Politburo's proposal was heard and a decision was made to prepare a special bill on measures to further improve the material well-being of the population of the German Democratic Republic.

The democratic measures carried out in the Soviet occupation zone and the widely deployed competition among workers caused a significant increase in labor productivity, which in turn created realistic prerequisites for improving the material status of the working people. The introduction of a progressive wage system led to a significant increase in workers' wages. New collective agreements, as well as a reduction in the taxation of working people by more than 30%, implemented according to the tax reform put into effect from April 1, 1949, further raise the real wages of workers. The total income of Eastern Germany's working people from the reduction of direct taxes alone increased by 800 million marks per year. The real wages of workers in the eastern zone of Germany are also significantly increased thanks to the social security system, free medical care, free public education, etc.

The general rise of the peaceful economy, the implementation of democratic currency reform, and the successful execution of the budget in 1948 strengthened the financial and credit system of Eastern Germany. The growth of industrial production and trade turnover, and the strengthening of the financial system make it possible to mobilize the funds necessary for carrying out national economic tasks. The revenue part of the 1949 budget (from April 1 to December 31) exceeds its expenditure part by approximately 1,175 million marks, while in Bizonia the deficit of the total state budgets will amount to no less than 1 billion marks in 1949. It is important to note that the share of tax revenues in the revenue part of the eastern zone's budget is constantly falling: from about 80% before the war, it dropped to 60% in 1948 and to 48% in 1949.

The Eastern German budget for 1949 provided expenditures for the development of people's enterprises amounting to 800 million marks, including 421 million marks for investments; 11 million marks were allocated for the financing of machine-rental stations. Budget allocations for the development of healthcare were increased from 231 million marks in 1948 to 292 million marks in 1949, and for public education from 610 million to 908 million marks; for social security in 1949, it is planned to spend 558 million marks from budget sums and over 2 billion marks from social insurance funds.

The economic recovery of Eastern Germany is carried out at the expense of domestic resources, without enslaving foreign loans and capital, whereas Bizonia's foreign debt reached $5 billion by the autumn of 1949.

Attempts by the US, Britain, and France to disrupt the economic recovery of Eastern Germany failed completely. The disruption of inter-zonal trade by the Western powers[163] struck a severe blow to the economy of Western Germany and led to a new deterioration in the situation of the working people. Eastern Germany's efforts aimed at the maximum development of inter-zonal trade correspond to the interests of developing the entire German economy as a whole. "Striving for the development of inter-zonal trade," O. Grotewohl stated at a plenary session of the German Economic Commission on June 22, 1949, "we primarily sought to give work to West German workers and provide sales opportunities for West German industry." The development of inter-zonal trade would have been an important link for strengthening ties between individual German regions.

Democratic transformations, the growth and strengthening of the peaceful economy of Germany's eastern zone became possible thanks to the fact that the Soviet Union provided and continues to provide comprehensive, selfless assistance to the German people on a large scale. Politically, this assistance was expressed in the Soviet Union's promotion of democratic reforms in all spheres of life, the creation of a democratic order

---

[163] The volume of inter-zonal trade in 1946 equaled 176 million marks, in 1947 about 500 million marks, and for the first half of 1948 — 295 million marks, while before the war the trade turnover between the regions now entering the eastern zone and the western zones amounted to 4 billion marks. From mid-1948, the Anglo-American occupation authorities effectively disrupted the possibility of further inter-zonal commodity exchange.

in Eastern Germany, and the consistent struggle of Soviet diplomacy for a single, peace-loving Germany. Economically, the assistance of the Soviet Union was expressed in supplies of necessary food, machinery, and factory equipment, and in the transfer of the rich experience of the Soviet planned economy to German managers. In 1948, the USSR supplied Eastern Germany with over 136 thousand tons of grain and more than 10 thousand tons of fats, which significantly contributed to improving the food situation of the East German population.

Machine-rental stations in Eastern Germany received 1,000 tractors from the Soviet Union, a significant amount of trucks, and about 10 thousand tons of steel for the production of spare parts for tractors and agricultural machinery. The USSR supplies Eastern Germany with rolled steel and other types of materials and raw materials. The USSR and the countries of popular democracy stand in first place in the foreign trade turnover of Eastern Germany. In 1948, they accounted for 75% of imports and 75% of exports of the Soviet occupation zone.[164]

Root democratic transformations and the involvement of broad strata of working people in the construction of a new, democratic Germany resulted in the strengthening of democratic forces in Eastern Germany and the further development of their creative role.

The strengthening and further construction of the peaceful economy of Germany's eastern zone were a most important contribution to the all-national struggle of the German people.

---

[164] *Neues Deutschland*, March 16, February 22, April 6, 1949.

The successes achieved in the eastern part of Germany clearly showed the entire German people the path to escaping need, economic ruin, and a distressed situation by their own efforts, without enslavement by foreign capital. The National Front of Democratic Germany set before the eastern zone, alongside all-national tasks, also important internal political and economic tasks of "raising the peaceful economy of the zone, further expanding the rights of the people, raising the yield and productivity of agriculture, expanding the production of mass consumption goods, and raising the living standard of the population on the basis of growing labor productivity."

The ruling circles of the US and Britain have for a long time been pursuing a course against the Potsdam policy, aimed at disrupting the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany, its split and dismemberment, restoring the dominant position of reactionary-militaristic circles in its western zones, and consolidating the occupation regime. As a result of the reactionary, imperialist policy of the Western powers, Germany turned out to be torn into pieces, its western zones placed in the position of dependent, colonial regions, and the people under the yoke of imperialist occupation.

The popular masses of Western Germany—the working class, peasantry, intelligentsia, and middle strata—experience the weight of a double yoke: the yoke of Anglo-American and German capital. The imperialist policy of the US and Britain in Western Germany is a vivid confirmation of the fact that "imperialist capitalism has become the greatest oppressor of

nations."[165] The Plenum of the Central Board of the SED, in a resolution adopted on October 4, 1949, defined the following main features of the national yoke of imperialist powers in Western Germany:

> national oppression is carried out in the form of a protracted occupation used for the colonization of Western Germany by Anglo-American imperialists; simultaneously, the occupation is used by them to turn Western Germany into a military-strategic bridgehead for unleashing an aggressive war against the USSR, the countries of popular democracy, and democratic Germany; carrying out an anti-Potsdam policy, the Western powers split Germany and formed a separate West German state, which is turning into a base for the revival of German militarism and revanchism;
>
> the anti-popular, anti-democratic regime created in Western Germany leaves unlimited power in the hands of the occupation powers;
>
> the question of restoring unity and a national state in Germany is closely connected with the question of peace; the Anglo-American policy of prolonged occupation of Germany and its transformation into a military base for aggressors represents a constant threat of war; it contradicts the national interests and security of both the German and other peoples of Europe.

---

165 V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 21, p. 273.

The formation of the West German separate puppet state undermines the political unity of Germany, and threatens the independence and national sovereignty of the German nation. The American newspaper *New York Herald Tribune* wrote as early as March 16, 1949, about the West German government: "The projected West German government is reduced to the position of a colonial administrative body that will act under the leadership not of one, but of three viceroys—French, British, and American military governors or their civilian successors." Patronage of German reactionary forces, Hitlerites, German monopolies, and the refusal of demilitarization and democratization are the main features of Anglo-American policy in Western Germany. The conclusion in December 1946 of the agreement on the formation of Bizonia, the execution of a separate monetary reform, and separate meetings of representatives of the US, Britain, and France in London and Washington—such are the stages of the Anglo-American policy of splitting and dismembering Germany. The completion of the divisive policy of the Western powers was the formation of the bastard Bonn "government," consisting of such Wall Street and City mercenaries as Heuss, Adenauer, Erhard, etc., and the introduction of the Occupation Statute in the West German regions, designed to entrench the occupation regime for a long time and turn Western Germany into the patrimony of foreign imperialists.

The formation of the separate West German state, the creation of the Bonn "government" is a gross violation by the ruling circles of the western powers of the Yalta and Potsdam decisions regarding Germany. This testifies to the refusal of the

governments of the US, Britain, and France to return sovereign rights to the German people. The "Bonn Constitution" imposed on the population of Western Germany is merely a pathetic appendage to the Occupation Statute. Relying on the Occupation Statute, the high commissioners of the western powers retained the "right, acting on instructions of their governments, to assume full authority in whole or in part." The Soviet Government has repeatedly drawn the attention of the governments of the US, Britain, and France to the exceptionally serious responsibility they assume for the policy of splitting and dismembering Germany. In its note of October 1, the Soviet Government stated that since a separate government was formed in Bonn, "a new situation has now been created in Germany, which gives particularly great importance to fulfilling the tasks of restoring the unity of Germany as a democratic and peace-loving state and ensuring the fulfillment by Germany of obligations imposed on it by the Potsdam Agreement of the Four Powers."

As a result of the reactionary policy of the Anglo-American-French authorities, Trizonia's economy is in an even more difficult position than the economies of all other capitalist countries. Occupation has served in the hands of American monopolistic capital as an instrument of enslavement of Western Germany, a means of creating such political and economic conditions in it under which American imperialism expects to maintain and consolidate its rule for a long time.

American imperialism found allies in Western Germany in the person of the clique of German monopolists and landowners who brought Germany to the greatest national catastrophe. In

turn, German monopolists and landowners after the defeat and surrender of Germany realize that they cannot preserve wealth and keep power in their hands without the support of American imperialism. German financial-industrial monopolists, landowners, and militarists, for the sake of realizing their narrow class, selfish interests and reactionary goals, readily go to a new national betrayal, acting as conduits of the policy of turning Western Germany into an American colony and military bridgehead, as compradors, in the role of "junior partners" of American monopolistic capital.

Immediately after the end of World War II, German, American, and English monopolies began rapidly renewing their military ties, which did not cease even during the war. Representatives of German financial capital—Pferdmenges, Schacht, and others—openly propagate the attraction of American capital into the German economy, not at all embarrassed by the fact that nowadays the cooperation of German and American capitalist monopolies is conducted not on equal terms. If before the war German monopolistic associations were serious competitors of American trusts and concerns, conceded to no one the monopoly on the exploitation of their country's working people, and acted as inspirers of military adventures aimed at establishing their world domination, after the war the situation changed sharply. Striving to preserve their dominant position in the German economy, weakened German monopolies turned into junior partners of Wall Street, into its assistants in the implementation of the aggressive plans of American contenders for world domination.

In Western Germany, the fixed capital of heavy industry grown during the years of preparation and waging of war has been preserved. In connection with the mass repatriation of Germans, the population of Western Germany has increased compared to pre-war times by 6–7 million people, consequently, the number of hands has significantly increased. Thus, in Western Germany immediately after the war there were basic material prerequisites not only for rapid recovery, but also for the further development of the economy. There can be no doubt that the western regions of Germany, free from imperialist occupation, could have reached and significantly surpassed the pre-war level of peaceful production within 2–3 post-war years.

The power of imperialist occupiers for a long time entrenched the decline and ruin of the economy in the western regions of Germany. In depth and duration, in the severity of its consequences for the working classes, the economic chaos in Western Germany surpassed the deepest economic crises that ever befell any capitalist country. Four and a half years after the end of the war, the index of industrial production in Western Germany constituted, even according to exaggerated data, no more than 80–85% of the 1936 level, and production in the textile, wool, footwear, and other branches of light industry did not reach even half of the pre-war level.[166]

---

[166] The Stuttgart newspaper *Wirtschaftszeitung* (Jan 29, 1949), criticizing the West German industrial production index, writes that in Germany "doubts have arisen regarding the truthfulness of the officially published index. It is believed here that in the general calculation of the index, the output of individual branches of industry is overstated."

The spread of the enslaving "Marshall Plan" to Western Germany led to the curtailment of peaceful branches of production, mass unemployment, further impoverishment and ruin of the working class and all working people in this part of Germany. The economic development of Western Germany bears a one-sided, deformed character: American and British occupation authorities, forcing the production of military branches of industry, restrain in every way the recovery of peaceful branches of economy, as they fear the growth of German competition.

Western Germany's foreign trade is a source of huge profits for the American capitalist monopolies dominating the West German economy. The so-called four-year economic "plan" of the western occupation zones provides for export growth in 1952–1953 by 60% compared to 1936; the value of exports should amount to no less than $3 billion per year. Such projects are, of course, unreal. However, some growth of exports from Western Germany will inevitably cause a further aggravation of contradictions in the camp of capitalist countries, fearing that German monopolies in alliance with American ones will squeeze the monopolies of other countries out of world markets. British industrialists created special "action committees" and "fighting funds" to take measures against the expansion of German exports. The American newspaper *New York Herald Tribune* (Feb 3, 1949) published an interview with a senior British official in Düsseldorf, who stated: "It must be recognized that the slogan 'export or die' applies equally to Britain and Germany. But our point of view is that if someone

has to die in the future struggle for world markets, let it be the Germans, not us."

The devaluation of the mark carried out at the end of September 1949 has a pernicious effect on West German exports. The mark's exchange rate was lowered by 20.6%, while the British pound and French franc depreciated significantly more. Dictating the mark's rate at 23.8 cents and delaying its devaluation by 10 days, the high commissioners of the western powers sought to reduce Germany's competitiveness in foreign markets in this way.

The Association of West German Export Firms in Düsseldorf stated that the new mark rate dictated by the western powers "is a heavy blow to West German exports." The new mark rate will especially heavily affect the export of automobiles, textiles, leather goods, ceramics, glass, etc.

Simultaneously, devaluation leads to higher import costs and a rise in domestic prices in Western Germany. Consequently, devaluation causes a further decrease in the already extremely low living standard of working people.

The policy of the American authorities led to the foreign trade deficit of Bizonia amounting to $2.5–3 billion from the beginning of the occupation to the end of 1949. If one adds to this the debt on credits imposed on Western Germany for deliveries of so-called "surplus" American military equipment and gear and other types of deliveries, Bizonia's total debt exceeded $5 billion by the autumn of 1949.

The flooding of the West German market with American goods to the detriment of local production, the disruption of inter-

zonal trade with Eastern Germany, the rejection of trade ties with the USSR and countries of popular democracy, the mass dismantling of equipment of peaceful industry enterprises whose products can compete with American and British goods, led to a reduction of production in peaceful branches of industry, the closure of many plants and factories, bankruptcies, and mass layoffs of workers and employees. The West German newspaper *Allgemeine Zeitung* (May 23, 1949) wrote: "Stagnation in the West German economy threatens to gradually turn into a crisis. Since the beginning of the year, a sharp reduction in sales has been observed everywhere." In the three occupation zones of Western Germany by November 1949, there were over 1.5 million fully unemployed. In addition, in the western sectors of Berlin, there were about 250 thousand unemployed. Thus, in Western Germany and the western sectors of Berlin, there are about 1.75 million fully unemployed, not counting a significant number of workers employed part-time.

Workers who have jobs are also in an extremely difficult position in Western Germany. Even according to data from the Economic Research Institute under the Trade Union Federation of Bizonia, 4.6 million German families in Bizonia could not redeem the food and essential industrial goods due to them by cards. The real wages of workers constitute only about 60% of pre-war. Mass unemployment, poverty, hunger, and the distressed position of working people testify not only to the general deterioration of the economic position of Western Germany, but also to the bankruptcy of the "Marshall Plan" and

the failure of the economic policy of the western powers as a whole.

The ruling circles of the US, Britain, and France and the representatives of West German big capital in their service are primarily to blame for the collapse of Western Germany's economy and the distressed position of its population. In violation of all international agreements, the western powers from the very beginning of the establishment of the occupation regime took the path of reviving thoroughly reactionary forces in Western Germany; they completely preserved the monopolistic associations of these inspirers and initiators of Hitlerite aggression. In the past a reliable pillar of the fascist regime, they are now open accomplices of Anglo-American imperialists in the implementation of their aggressive policy, in the exploitation and oppression of the German people. American and British occupiers appointed major German imperialists—Dinkelbach, Frowein, Zangen, and others—to leadership posts in the economy of Western Germany.

Until recently, an order formally existed in Western Germany prohibiting foreign firms from participating in German enterprises. However, this order by no means prevented American capitalists from acquiring shares of German firms through dummy persons. Representatives of American big capital turned out to be part of the management boards and supervisory boards of many German joint-stock companies.

On September 6, 1949, a representative of the British Ministry of Foreign Affairs stated that an agreement was reached between the US, Great Britain, and France on the question of foreign capital investments in Western Germany, according to

which investments of foreign capital in the West German economy are officially permitted. At the same time, American companies and individual capitalists making investments in enterprises of Western Germany are granted exceptional privileges: the West German "federal government" is obliged to guarantee them a certain "minimum" of profits; American capitals invested in German industry are exempted from all taxes with which German enterprises are taxed in connection with Germany's obligations as a capitulated country. The high commissioners of the western powers also adopted a law on the return to foreign owners of all their pre-war property on the territory of Western Germany. Thus, this agreement is aimed at the complete seizure of West German industry by American capital.

Based on the notorious Law No. 75, issued on November 10, 1948, by American and British occupation authorities in Western Germany, all assets of the coal and metallurgical industry were transferred into the hands of German capitalists who collaborated with Hitler. In Bizonia, under US auspices, new German companies were created that took upon themselves the leadership of these industrial branches. Thus, German monopolists were again introduced into "ownership rights" over the property belonging to them in the years of Hitler's dictatorship, and American capital secured for itself the possibility of acquiring controlling shares of enterprises of the coal and metallurgical industry of Bizonia.

On September 1, 1949, the so-called "Trustee Council" over the Ruhr metallurgical industry was formed, under the jurisdiction of which the entire steel-smelting industry of

Western Germany was transferred. 12 members of this council are henchmen of German monopolies and will work under the control of the recently created Association of German Steel-Founding and Iron-Making Enterprises, which is built on the model of the American National Association of Manufacturers and its branch in Western Germany.

Having seized the commanding position in the economy of Western Germany and ensured for itself undivided rule in it, American monopolies pushed England into the background. They control a significant part of the coal, metallurgical, machine-building, chemical, and other branches of West German industry. Even Adenauer, the current chancellor of the West German separate "government," was forced to admit that about one-third of all Ruhr industry is already in the hands of foreign capital, mainly American. In the province of South Baden, 76% of industrial capital is controlled by foreign monopolies. Using production capacities that have significantly passed into their hands, and cheap labor of Western Germany, American monopolies (Ford, General Motors, DuPont, etc.) received the opportunity for even greater pressure on the economic policy of Marshallized countries.

In connection with the fact that American capital seized decisive positions in the West German economy and, relying on the Ruhr Statute, is squeezing the English and French out of the Ruhr, and in connection with the fact that American monopolies strive to subject to their absolute control also the Saar, the heavy industry of Northern France and Benelux countries in order to make the "international" body for the Ruhr redundant and establish pure American control—Anglo-

Franco-American contradictions on the German question sharply escalated.

American monopolists developed a project for restoring the international steel cartel that disintegrated at the beginning of World War II. A Belgian-Luxembourg steel cartel has already been created, which should be the basis of a future European, and possibly international, cartel with the participation of England, France, Western Germany under the direct leadership of American monopolies. A similar cartel and also under US auspices is planned to be created in the coal industry. In this way, the US intends to weaken England's positions not only in the Ruhr and Western Germany, but also in the remaining Western European capitalist countries.

As reported by the correspondent of the newspaper *Neues Deutschland*, the political advisor to the American military governor McCloy, Riddleberger, stated on September 10, 1949, to the chairman of the West German separate parliament, Arnold: "The US very much values its English ally, which managed 25 colonies, but at present the US is against England managing yet another colony. In Western Germany, the American line will be pursued and no other."

Having granted Western Germany priority in "assistance" under the "Marshall Plan" and established a new level of industrial production for it, American imperialism pursues the goal of turning Western Germany into its military-industrial base in Europe. For the sake of realizing this goal, the US, Britain, and France disrupted the demilitarization and democratization of Western Germany and its reparation deliveries to states that suffered most heavily from Hitlerite

aggression, first of all to the Soviet Union and countries of popular democracy.

The separate Washington decisions of the US, Britain, and France on the German question adopted in April 1949, as well as the London collusion of the six powers on the Ruhr, surrender this most important military-industrial region of Western Germany into complete subordination to American monopolies and are aimed at the revival of German aggression.

The growth of production that began from the second half of 1948 in the metallurgical, machine-building, chemical, and some other branches of heavy industry of Bizonia is also a consequence of the fact that Anglo-American authorities are pursuing a policy aimed at restoring the military-industrial potential and expanding military production in this zone. Steel smelting in Bizonia in 1948 amounted to 5.4 million tons against 3 million tons in 1947; in 1949, the steel-founding industry of Bizonia works at a level of approximately 9 million tons per year. Metallurgy receives coal and electricity at the expense of peaceful branches of industry, mainly light and construction, as well as at the expense of reducing the supply of coal and electricity to communal institutions and the population. Despite the growth of production in the steel industry, the supply of steel to peaceful branches is sharply cut. A significant amount of steel is used for military production.

Among the enterprises where military production was organized in 1948–1949 are aircraft manufacturing plants in Bavaria; plants under the observation of English military authorities in Cuxhaven and Kiel, where "V-1" and "V-2" shells are produced; Steingheil optical plants in Munich, which

produce periscopes for American submarines. At the military plant in Allach, the production of armor plates and parts for tanks continues. Military production was also organized at chemical plants in Mannheim, Ludwigshafen, Cologne, Recklinghausen, which produce explosives and ammunition. At the "Anorgana" plant belonging to the I.G. Farbenindustrie concern, only equipment for the production of artificial fertilizers was dismantled, and that part of the plant where poisonous substances used in Auschwitz and other concentration camps for the extermination of prisoners were produced was left untouched. The English Military Administration not only suspended the dismantling of three Krupp plants in Essen, but also made a decision on the restoration and organization of production at Krupp tank plant No. 2.

Simultaneously with the preservation of military plants and the organization of military production in Western Germany, major construction of new military objects is being carried out. By order of the English military administration, the construction of five new airfields costing about $20 million is scheduled. It is supposed to spend large sums on the construction of bomb shelters, on the modernization of automobile and tank plants "Hanomag," etc.

Noting military preparations in Western Germany, the organ of major industrialists, the Düsseldorf newspaper *Handelsblatt*, asked: "To what extent can the economy of Western Germany be burdened with armaments?" The answer to this question was recently given by American Senator Bridges, who in his letter to the administrator for the implementation of the "Marshall

Plan" Hoffman stated that the US intends to spend about $1 billion in one year on the development of heavy and military industry in Western Germany.

American and British occupation authorities are pursuing a policy not of demilitarization, but of remilitarization of Western Germany. They intend to include Western Germany in the system of the aggressive North Atlantic Pact and use the German people as cannon fodder for the implementation of their aggressive plans. In the western zones, old German military units are preserved and new ones are being manned, Hitlerite headquarters and officer cadres exist as before. Under the guise of "labor organizations," "labor battalions," "auxiliary units," etc., military units have been effectively preserved in Western Germany in which soldiers are raised in a revanchist, aggressive spirit. Special camps were created for the training of these units. Thus, former career officers receive special training in Münsterlager. Soldiers of technical troops undergo training here as well. Officer clubs are open in Stuttgart, Ulm, and other cities.

American militarists are creating a mercenary army in Western Germany. The chiefs of American military staffs during their trip across Western Europe did not hide that the mercenary army in Western Germany should be a component part of the American system of "strongholds" in Western Europe. The German population calls the soldiers and officers of this mercenary army "Bradley's recruits." The English military administration issued an order on the creation of "special police reserves," which should be the first step on the path of including Western Germany into the system of the North

Atlantic Pact. The German mercenary army took part in the autumn maneuvers of occupation troops in Western Germany. The Düsseldorf newspaper *Rheinische Post* recently came out with an obviously inspired project for creating a cadre army of 50–100 thousand people of the type of the former German Reichswehr so that a large army could subsequently be deployed on its basis.

Under the patronage of occupation authorities, militaristic organizations are being created in Bizonia. In 1948, a militaristic organization under the name "Union of Former German War Participants" was formed in Hamburg, which is the base for the revival of the notorious "Steel Helmet" and the former "Frontline Soldiers' Union"—semi-military organizations that contributed in their time to Hitler's seizure of power; moreover, the English military administration approved the admission of former SS men into this union.

American and English occupation authorities took all measures to preserve in a disguised form the highest bodies of the former Hitlerite army, its officer cadres, staff elite, and intelligence. In the city of Neustadt, the American authorities gathered 120 generals and officers of the former German general staff, whom they instructed to write the "history" of World War II. The bi-zonal administrations of Bizonia were turned into hotbeds of fascist command cadres. At the end of 1948, out of 8,600 German employees of the bi-zonal administration, 6,800 were in the past members of the fascist party, 1,600 served in Hitler's army in a rank higher than major, 76 — in SS troops. By order of the three western high commissioners, the West German "federal government" must pay career servicemen of

the former German army pensions of up to 1,500 marks per month. At the end of August 1949, 250 former officers of Hitler's army were sent to the United States of America to pass a two-year course of study in a specially created military school under the American general staff. In 1948, one such group of German officers consisting of 60 people already graduated from this school.

The intelligence staff created in the Anglo-American zone was instructed to gather all spy cadres of the former German intelligence and establish contact with underground fascist organizations in the western zones of Germany, in Italy, France, Austria, and other countries.

The presence of fascist and semi-fascist military formations in the western zones stimulates the activity of reactionary elements in Germany, encourages their militaristic and revanchist tendencies. Hitlerite military cadres, so carefully preserved and patronized by the occupation authorities of the US and England, represent an overt threat to the peace and security of the peoples of Europe. The creation of German military formations, naval bases, and other military objects, the refusal of Anglo-American authorities to liquidate the military industry, the fanning of war psychosis among the German population—all this is aimed at turning Western Germany into a military-strategic base of American imperialists.

The working masses of Western Germany, despite the repressions of occupation authorities, wage a stubborn struggle against the imperialist plans of the US and England. Across the entire English occupation zone, committees of struggle against the dismantling of peaceful industry are being created. Workers

and employees advocate for the development of trade between Western and Eastern Germany. The youth of Western Germany formed a "Youth Action Committee for a United Germany." Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the struggle of the working class of Western Germany against the reactionary policy of Anglo-American imperialists in Western Germany is intensifying.

Contrary to the treacherous social-democratic leadership of trade unions, workers in 1948 and 1949 carried out under the leadership of the Communist Party of Western Germany a number of strikes and other actions. The strike struggle of the workers of Western Germany keeps intensifying. In the winter of 1945/46, about 1 million people participated in strikes, in 1946/47 — twice as many; in the winter of 1947/48, about 4 million struck, and in November 1948, a general strike was carried out in the Anglo-American occupation zone, in which about 9 million people took part. As indicated in the statement of the Communist Party of Western Germany, this strike was directed against the "Marshall Plan" and its consequences for the working people of Western Germany, against the policy of splitting Germany and turning its western part into a dollar colony. The struggle of the working people of Western Germany for a peace-loving democratic German state intensified even more in 1949.

The formation of the German Democratic State promotes the consolidation of all democratic forces of the country in the struggle against fascism and militarism planted in Western Germany by Anglo-American imperialists and their German

lackeys, for the creation of a single peace-loving democratic German state.

The creation of the German Democratic Republic and J. V. Stalin's greeting to its president and prime minister caused immense enthusiasm and joy not only among parties, organizations, worker collectives, and the entire population in the eastern zone, but also among the working population of Western Germany, progressive democratic forces throughout the world.

In numerous resolutions and decisions of party and mass organizations, collectives of plants, factories, and machine-rental stations, the working people of the German Democratic Republic express deep gratitude to the Soviet Government and Generalissimo Stalin for the great trust shown to the democratic forces of Germany, and solemnly promise to wage an irreconcilable struggle for the cause of peace throughout the world. The collective of the metallurgical plant in the city of Riesa assures J. V. Stalin and the peoples of the Soviet Union that the working people of Germany will be on the side of the Soviet Union in its struggle against warmongers. "Victory will be ensured, as the cause of peace is a just cause," — it is said in the resolution of this collective. The Federation of Free German Trade Unions published a statement in which it is said: "In the words of the greatest statesman of our time, spoken on behalf of the peoples of the Soviet Union, the entire significance of a peaceful and democratic Germany as an important factor for preserving peace throughout the world is explained. Every phrase of this congratulatory message is a testimony to friendship and equality placed by the Soviet

Government as the basis of relations with the German Democratic Republic." The Association of Peasant Mutual Aid Committees of Saxony on behalf of 120 thousand peasants states that "Generalissimo Stalin's message once again proves that the Soviet Union is a true friend of democratic Germany."

Democratic parties and organizations, collectives of workers and employees, works councils of Western Germany state that the congratulatory telegram of J. V. Stalin represents not only proof of the friendship of the Soviet Union, but also places the population of Western Germany before new tasks. "It depends on us to prove that we know how to value a true friendly message and are ready, despite all obstacles, to stand up for peace," — stated the member of the works council of the ball-bearing plant association Eberhard. The head of the Stuttgart circle "For a United Germany" Kalkstein stated: "We have not doubted for a single moment the good will of the Soviet people and are confident that the path indicated in J. V. Stalin's telegram will lead to the unity of Germany and true peace." The Stuttgart newspaper *Volksstimme* issued a special number dedicated to Comrade Stalin's telegram. Workers of the Cologne plant "Bamag" sent a congratulatory telegram to Prime Minister Grotewohl, in which they write: "We, workers and employees, rejoice at the creation of the government of the German Democratic Republic in the capital of Germany, Berlin, and, welcoming this government, promise it our full support, as we want Germany to develop as an independent democratic state, free from occupation."

On October 9, 1949, a 35-thousand-strong rally convened by the Communist Party of Western Germany took place in

Hamburg, at which a resolution was adopted welcoming the proclamation of the German Democratic Republic and the creation of the Provisional German Government. In the resolution it is said: "Men, women, and youth of Hamburg approve the goals of the National Front of Democratic Germany, aimed at restoring the unity and sovereignty of the German Republic... The gazes of the population of Hamburg are directed not at New York, but at the government of the German Democratic Republic, which does not depend on the orders of the high commissioners."

The formation of the German Democratic Republic, laying the foundation for a single democratic and peace-loving Germany, determines the further development of the German nation along the path to democracy and progress. It marks an important contribution to the cause of peace and security of peoples and deals a crushing blow to the plans of Anglo-American imperialists — warmongers. The formation of the German peace-loving democratic republic is a defeat for the camp of imperialism and reaction and a victory for the camp of peace, democracy, and socialism.

Questions of Economics, No.11, 1949.

V. Maslennikov

THE HISTORIC VICTORY OF THE CHINESE PEOPLE

A new crushing blow has been dealt to the world system of imperialism. China, the most populous country in the world, having cast off the yoke of imperialist oppression, has transitioned to the camp of democracy and socialism. On October 1, 1949, the exultant people proclaimed the People's Republic of China. Expressing the will of the entire Chinese people, the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference approved the fundamental law of the republic and elected the Central People's Government headed by the leader of the Communist Party of China, Mao Zedong.

The creation of the People's Republic of China is an outstanding historic event. The formation of the new regime in China increases the power of the camp of peace and democracy and undermines the deep rear of imperialism. It signifies not only the defeat of one of the largest reactionary detachments of the Kuomintang, but also the collapse of American plans to turn China into a US colony, and the failure of the imperialists' attempts to turn the Chinese people into cannon fodder and Chinese territory into a springboard for Anglo-American adventures.

The great victory of the Chinese people is of immense international significance. It will influence the historical destinies of all other colonial and semicolonial peoples of the East. The victory of the Chinese revolution marks a further aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism and a major new

step forward in the development of the crisis of imperialism's colonial system; this system is collapsing, and its major links are being torn out of the general chain of imperialism.

The creation of the People's Republic of China sums up many years of struggle for the independence and freedom of a multi-million people and opens a new era in its history. Over the past hundred years, the Chinese people have repeatedly risen in struggle against the medieval feudal regime and foreign oppression. From 1850 to 1864, China was engulfed in the fire of the Taiping Rebellion, fought against the old feudal order and for the liberation of the country from foreign rule. With the help of Anglo-French troops, this uprising was suppressed. International imperialism also brutally suppressed the popular uprising in China in 1900 (the Boxer Rebellion). A characteristic feature of these popular uprisings was their spontaneity. At that time, China's working class was still weak and could not be the leading force of the revolution. The Chinese revolution of 1911–1912 bore a more organized character. But here too, the main driving force was the peasantry, acting in alliance with the liberal bourgeoisie. The guiding principles of the revolution were set forth in a program developed by Sun Yat-sen. Sun Yat-sen's program demanded: 1) the liberation of China from foreign bondage, 2) the overthrow of the monarchy and the establishment of people's rule, and 3) the creation of such a socio-economic system as would ensure prosperity for the people.

The Kuomintang party, formed in 1912, formally placed these three principles of Sun Yat-sen at the basis of its program, but it excluded the most crucial point of his program regarding

equal land tenure, which was directed against feudalism. By rejecting the demands for agrarian reform, the Kuomintang alienated the peasant masses and defended the interests of large landownership in the country.

Summing up the activities of the Kuomintang, the leader of the Chinese people, Mao Zedong, wrote: "Sun Yat-sen's 40 years of revolutionary work ended in failure. Why? Because in the era of imperialism, the petty bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie cannot successfully lead any genuine revolution."[167]

The Great October Socialist Revolution opened a new era—the era of colonial revolutions—and stirred up a new wave of the national liberation and labor movement in China. "The artillery salvos of the October Revolution," Mao Zedong said, "brought Marxism-Leninism to us. The October Revolution helped the progressive elements of the world and of China to apply the proletarian worldview in defining the destiny of the country and re-evaluating their own problems. To follow the path of the Russians—such was the conclusion."[168]

Chinese communists embraced the great ideas of Lenin and Stalin, the teachings of Lenin and Stalin on the national-colonial revolution in the era of imperialism; they became the vanguard detachment of the Chinese people who rose up in struggle against reaction and imperialism.

---

167 *Pravda*, July 6, 1949

168 Ibid.

By the 1920s, the domestic political situation in China had changed drastically. On the basis of factory-based industry, the working class grew stronger, acting ever more actively against the bourgeoisie and hardening in strike battles. In 1921, the Communist Party of China was organized.

The Chinese Revolution of 1925–1927 took place under complex conditions. The young Communist Party of China did not yet have much experience. As Comrade Stalin brilliantly pointed out, the Chinese revolution had three specific features: first, its spearhead was directed not only against the internal forces of reaction, but also against the dominance of foreign imperialism in China; second, the big national bourgeoisie in China was extremely weak; and third, alongside China exists and develops the Soviet Union, whose revolutionary experience cannot but facilitate the struggle of the Chinese proletariat against imperialism and against feudal-medieval remnants in China.[169]

Comrade Stalin provided a profound analysis of the character, features, and conditions for the victory of the Chinese anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution. His guiding instructions on the role and tasks of the proletariat, on the allies of the proletariat, and on the peasantry provided indispensable assistance to the Chinese people in their revolutionary struggle.

As a result of the 1925–1927 revolution, the Chinese proletariat, led by the Communist Party, became the leading force in the struggle of the Chinese people, and its influence and authority among the people increased. This was facilitated

---

[169] See J. V. Stalin, *Works*, Vol. 8, pp. 358, 359.

by the united revolutionary front policy pursued by the Communist Party. After the Kuomintang was reorganized in 1925 with the approval of Sun Yat-sen, cooperation was established between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party. This by no means meant that the Communist Party abandoned independent work among workers and peasants; it rallied the Chinese people to fight against internal reactionary forces and against the domination of foreign imperialism in the country, which relied on internal reactionary forces.

In 1927, the Chinese bourgeoisie colluded with the imperialists. The Kuomintang, led by Chiang Kai-shek, destroyed the united front and began persecuting communists and other revolutionaries. Having expelled worker and peasant representatives from its ranks, the Kuomintang turned into the counterrevolutionary party of the big bourgeoisie and landowners.

A period of reaction set in in China. During this period, the Communist Party of China continued to fight for the creation of a united popular anti-imperialist and anti-feudal front, rallying the peasantry and the progressive section of the national bourgeoisie around the proletariat.

In 1931, under the leadership of the Communist Party, a people's democratic power was created in southern China, uniting up to 60 million people. As Comrade Stalin brilliantly anticipated, this was "a power transitional to the non-capitalist, or more precisely, to the socialist development of China."[170] Since then, the Communist Party of China has traveled a long

---

[170] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, Vol. 8, p. 366.

path of hard and stubborn struggle against the forces of reaction and imperialism. Speaking of the factors that ensured the victory of the Chinese people in 1949, Mao Zedong wrote: "We have gained precious experience, and the main points of this experience are the following three:

A party possessing discipline, armed with the theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, employing the method of self-criticism, and closely linked with the masses; an army led by this party; a united front of various revolutionary strata of society and groups led by this party."[171]

When Japan launched a war against China in 1937, communists stood at the vanguard of the struggle against Japanese imperialism as advocates of a united anti-Japanese front. In contrast to the communists, Kuomintang reactionaries, instigated by Anglo-American imperialists, opposed the united front. The temporary agreement on joint actions between the Communist Party and the Kuomintang was soon disrupted by the Kuomintang. The Kuomintang members committed attacks on units of the 8th Eighth Route (People's Revolutionary) Army, blockaded the Border Region, and hindered military operations against Japanese occupation forces in every possible way. Ultimately, the policy of the Kuomintang served the interests of Japanese imperialism. Kuomintang generals engaged in profiteering, while their military units remained inactive.

---

[171] *Pravda*, July 6, 1949.

The Communist Party of China set an example of heroic struggle against Japanese imperialism for millions of masses. Faithful sons of the party fought in the front ranks of the 8th People's Revolutionary Army and in partisan detachments. The Japanese were forced to throw more than half of their occupation troops against the army and partisan units led by the Communist Party. It was precisely the troops led by the communists that dealt heavy blows to the Japanese army.

During the war against Japan, the membership of the Communist Party grew from 500,000 to 1,250,000 people. If at the beginning of the war the People's Liberation Army led by the Chinese Communist Party numbered only about 45,000 people in its ranks, by the time of Japan's surrender over 1.5 million soldiers and officers were already fighting in its ranks. In addition, about 2 million people participated in the partisan struggle. Under the leadership of the Communist Party of China, more than 2 million square kilometers with a population of about 100 million people were liberated from the Japanese invaders. A democratic regime was established in this territory, and radical democratic political, economic, and cultural reforms were carried out. The Communist Party of China thwarted numerous attempts by Kuomintang capitulationist and traitorous elements to conclude a shameful peace with Japan.

In the course of the anti-Japanese people's liberation war in China, the united front firmly led by the Communist Party grew stronger; it embraced increasingly broad masses of workers and peasants, artisans and traders, progressive strata of the intelligentsia, and the petty and middle bourgeoisie.

The successes of the People's Liberation Army and the influence of the communists among the people were so great that after the defeat of Japanese troops by the Soviet Army, the Kuomintang was forced to agree to an accord with the Communist Party. However, soon at the behest of American imperialists, Kuomintang reactionaries went on the offensive again. They trampled upon the agreement on the united front, disrupted the decisions of the Political Consultative Conference, and unleashed a new civil war on a nationwide scale. Chiang Kai-shek relied on the numerical and technical superiority of his army, which was equipped by US imperialists.

In July 1946, the Kuomintang armed forces numbered 4.5 million men, while the People's Liberation Army had only 1.2 million men. Kuomintang troops were well equipped and armed with American cannons, tanks, and aircraft. The Americans provided the Kuomintang government with huge loans and credits totaling $6 billion, transferred hundreds of airplanes and tanks for free or for a song, a large quantity of artillery, tens of thousands of motor vehicles, and a navy consisting of 271 vessels. American military advisers and instructors retrained and fully equipped 22 Kuomintang divisions totaling over 750,000 men with American weaponry. They took a direct part in drafting plans for an armed campaign against democratic forces. Using American aircraft and naval transports, the main forces of the Kuomintang army were transferred from South China to northern regions. Here they took up starting positions for an offensive against the democratic forces of China. By landing their troops in major

centers of the country (Shanghai, Nanjing, Tianjin, Beijing, Qingdao), US imperialists helped the Kuomintang government seize them.

American imperialists pursued the goal of enslaving the Chinese people. They imposed enslaving treaties on China and obtained broad opportunities to turn it into an American colony and a military springboard for the struggle against the Soviet Union and the national liberation movement in Southeast Asia. The US acquired military, naval, and air bases at its disposal on Chinese territory and on Formosa, along with control over airfields built by the Japanese on Chinese territory during the war. American aircraft flew unhindered over China, and American ships sailed freely in China's territorial waters. The Kuomintang armed forces, secret and overt police, state finances, and budget passed under American control. Foreign imperialists began to dictate China's foreign policy to it, subordinating it to their goal—preparing a new war in the Far East.

The Kuomintang government signed an agreement with the American headquarters in China under which American soldiers and officers who committed crimes were subject to an American court rather than a Chinese one. The Sino-American Arbitration Commission, which was actually run by Americans, was granted the right to resolve all disputes in the sphere of trade.

The Kuomintang government permitted American capitalists to develop their industrial and commercial activities without restriction throughout the territory of China—that is, to exploit the Chinese people without limit and conduct mineral

exploration. Together with the Americans, the Kuomintang even drafted a "plan" for Sino-American technical "cooperation" in agriculture. The Canton-Hankou and Sichuan-Yunnan railways were handed over by the Kuomintang to the operation of a joint American-Chinese company.

During 1946–1948, American firms opened over 300 offices in areas controlled by the Kuomintang. Based on an agreement with Kuomintang authorities, they set about utilizing China's natural wealth and building and operating gasoline, cement, glass, and other plants in a number of regions of the country. American firms concluded agreements for the exploitation of the natural resources of Hainan and Formosa islands and for capital investments in the aluminum, paper, chemical, food, and other industrial sectors. Thousands of representatives of American firms settled as official "advisers" and "experts" in the central apparatus of the Kuomintang government or in local provincial governments. These "advisers" patronized their own firms and hindered the commercial activities of firms from other countries, particularly Britain, in every possible way.

The ruling Kuomintang clique turned into an open agency of US imperialists, who unleashed wide expansion in China. But the American predators' design to turn China into their colony was thwarted by the heroic Chinese people.

Kuomintang troops suffered a series of serious defeats as early as the first stage of the civil war (1946–1947). In a year of fighting, they lost over 1.2 million soldiers and officers killed, wounded, or captured; more than 500,000 men deserted. This forced the Kuomintang army to halt offensive operations in mid-1947 and switch to defense along all sectors of the front.

While the forces of the Kuomintang army were melting away, the forces of the People's Liberation Army were growing continuously. Hundreds of thousands of Chinese patriots poured into its ranks. The number of regular troops grew to 2 million men in 1947. In battles against the enemy, the People's Liberation Army captured rich trophies and significantly improved its weaponry. It received increasing assistance from the industry of the liberated regions, especially Manchuria.

The strengthening and growth of the People's Liberation Army, alongside immense support and sympathy from the people, enabled it to transition from active defense to counteroffensive in August 1947. Its troops quickly seized the initiative and routed the enemy in stubborn battles.

The successes of the Chinese people were facilitated by the international situation that took shape after World War II. As a result of the Soviet Union's victory in the Patriotic War, German fascism and Japanese imperialism were crushed, the camp of imperialism was weakened, and the camp of democracy and socialism grew stronger. The defeat of imperialist Japan by the Soviet Army and the liberation of Manchuria—which transformed into a stronghold of the democratic forces of revolutionary China—were of immense significance for the historic victories of the Chinese people. "If the Soviet Union did not exist, if there had been no victory in the anti-fascist Second World War, if—what is especially important—Japanese imperialism had not been crushed, if the countries of the new democracy had not appeared in Europe... then the pressure of international reactionary forces, of course, would be much stronger than it is now. Could we have

achieved victory under such circumstances? Of course not,"—wrote Mao Zedong.[172]

Back during the inception of the Chinese revolutionary army in 1926, Comrade Stalin pointed out the immense role of a genuinely revolutionary army in the Chinese revolution. "First," Comrade Stalin said, "the Communists of China must maximally intensify political work in the army and ensure that the army becomes a real and exemplary bearer of the ideas of the Chinese revolution."[173] Chinese communists successfully coped with this task. The People's Liberation Army of China turned into a school of revolutionary education for millions of people; it enjoys the immense love and respect of the Chinese people.

"Second," Comrade Stalin pointed out, "Chinese revolutionaries, including the communists, must tackle the study of military affairs head-on. They must not look upon military matters as secondary, for military affairs are now the most important factor in the Chinese revolution."[174] Chinese communists successfully accomplished this task set by Comrade Stalin as well. Over 22 years of almost uninterrupted armed struggle against external and internal enemies, the heroic People's Liberation Army grew from a 45,000-strong armed group into a mighty 4-million-strong army. The Communist Party of China dispatched its best people to military work, training hundreds of thousands of peasants and

---

172 *Pravda*, July 6, 1949

173 J. V. Stalin, *Works*, Vol. 8, p. 363

174 J. V. Stalin, *Works*, Vol. 8, p. 364

workers in military affairs to form the backbone of the combat revolutionary army. Many communists received special military education in officer schools and military academies organized by the Communist Party. Talented generals and outstanding strategists of the people's liberation war were forged from the leadership corps of the army (Zhu De, Peng Dehuai, Lin Biao, He Long, Chen Yi, Liu Bocheng, and others). The actions of the People's Liberation Army demonstrated that its command staff had masterfully acquired the art of war, and that its rank-and-file fighters had passed through a school of political education in a revolutionary, patriotic spirit.

The final year of offensive battles by the People's Liberation Army was especially telling. From mid-1948 to mid-1949 alone, the People's Liberation Army in the course of its offensive routed more than 50 Kuomintang armies comprising over 3 million soldiers and officers, took prisoner over 30 armies with all their weaponry, and induced more than 20 enemy armies to rebel and come over to its side. Over that year, the People's Liberation Army completed the liberation of Manchuria, liberated Inner Mongolia and 13 provinces of North, Central, Northwest, and South China, and occupied 1,270 cities, major country centers, ports, railway junctions, and communications.

The People's Liberation Army of China defeated the superior forces of the Kuomintang and is smashing the remnants of their armed forces. It is steadily advancing to the southeast, south, southwest, and northwest. Having occupied the important

seaport of Amoy on October 17, 1949, the people's liberation troops are less than 150 miles by sea from Formosa; they have entered Guangdong and Xinjiang provinces and approached the borders of Guangxi, Guizhou, and Sichuan provinces. The overwhelming majority of the 475-million-strong Chinese people has already been liberated from imperialist rule.

After being expelled from Canton, the Kuomintang top leadership fled to Chongqing and Formosa and is feverishly cobbling together the remnants of its forces to continue the armed struggle in southern and southwestern China. Unable to offer serious resistance to the People's Liberation Army, demoralized units of the Kuomintang armies are retreating. The final liberation of China from Kuomintang reaction is a matter of the very near future.

The greatest victories have been achieved by the Chinese people primarily thanks to the correct policy of the Communist Party of China, which consistently defends the interests of the working people and has exposed the reactionary, antinational policy of the Kuomintang. It is now clear to the entire Chinese people that the Kuomintang defended the interests of the reactionary bloc of the big Chinese bourgeoisie, landowners, and American imperialism. The Chinese people have finally become convinced that the leadership of the Kuomintang sacrifices China's independence for personal, selfish ends and the preservation of its power, that it betrayed the country to American imperialists and, to please them, plunged China into the fire of civil war and condemned the people to hunger.

At the same time, the Communist Party of China, uniting over 3 million members in its ranks, has earned nationwide respect,

recognition, and love. A united revolutionary front, unprecedented in breadth and depth, has formed in the country. "We have a broad and solid revolutionary united front, so broad that it includes the working class, the peasantry, the petty bourgeoisie, and the national bourgeoisie; so solid that it possesses a firm will and inexhaustible capabilities to defeat all enemies and overcome all difficulties,"—Mao Zedong said at a session of the preparatory committee for convening the new Political Consultative Conference.[175]

The basis of the united front is the alliance of the working class with the working peasantry, under the leading role of the working class. This alliance was strengthened by the policy of the Communist Party pursued in recent years in the liberated areas of China, aimed at strengthening democracy and raising the well-being of the people.

Thanks to the policy of the Communist Party of China and the radical democratic reforms carried out in the liberated areas, the program of the Central People's Government of China, adopted by the Political Consultative Conference, stands as a vivid reflection of the revolutionary reality already existing in part of China's territory.

In previously liberated areas, village, district, county, and provincial organs of power were elected on the basis of universal, direct, and equal suffrage by secret ballot. In a number of fully liberated provinces of China, supreme

---

[175] *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy!*, July 1, 1949

provincial organs of power—people's assemblies—were created.

The Chinese people were guaranteed democratic freedoms—freedom of speech, assembly, press, association, etc. Women in the liberated areas of China began to enjoy full equality in political, public, and economic life; they take an active part in the work of local organs of power and hold responsible administrative posts.

National oppression was eliminated in the democratic areas, the property and capitals of the Kuomintang elite were confiscated, and the system of feudal and semi-feudal relations in agriculture was abolished through the confiscation of landlord lands. The confiscated land was transferred to the poor and farm laborers, while forest tracts, major irrigation structures, large pastures, and plots of wasteland were placed under the administration of the people's government. The main wealth and sources of the country's economic development became the property of the people.

At the same time, the policy of the Communist Party of China and the people's democratic authorities did not aim at the liquidation of enterprises belonging to the commercial and industrial bourgeoisie. The Communist Party of China condemned the ultra-left policy of excessively high taxation of income, which was carried out from 1931 to 1934 and hindered the activities of private industrial and commercial enterprises. The cessation of work at private enterprises contradicts the interests of the working class and peasantry of the liberated areas. Owners of privately owned enterprises who were loyal to the people's government were guaranteed the preservation of

private property and the receipt of profits. Alongside state and cooperative enterprises, private industrial and commercial enterprises continued and continue to exist in China.

The agrarian reform carried out in a number of regions by the democratic authorities played a huge role in the democratic and national liberation movement in China. The peasantry constitutes 80% of the country's population. Feudal and semi-feudal relations in their most crude form previously dominated the Chinese countryside. In old China, from 40 to 80% of all land was in the hands of landlords and kulaks, who made up less than 10% of the population. Middle-peasant households accounted for less than 20% of all peasant households. About 30% of peasant households had no land at all, and the overwhelming majority were land-poor. Therefore, peasants were forced either to rent land from landlords and kulaks or to hire themselves out as farm laborers. For renting land, the Chinese peasant paid the landowner 50–70% of the harvest. Out of the remaining part of the harvest, he paid state taxes and debts to usurers. Feudal relations doomed the Chinese peasantry to hunger and poverty. The big capital of the Kuomintang elite profited from the poverty and hunger of the peasants. Over 50% of all debt obligations of peasant households for loans issued to them were in the hands of the "four families". American imperialism supported feudal-usurious exploitation of the peasants in every way, striving to turn China's agriculture into a raw material appendage of American industry. Therefore, the agrarian problem is the most important of China's internal political and economic problems, and the peasantry, led by the working class, played the role of

one of the main driving forces of the Chinese people's national liberation struggle. Having taken a swing at imperialism, the Chinese revolution could not fail to simultaneously strike blows against feudalism and big comprador capital as the main agents of imperialism.

In the period from 1931 to 1934, the Communist Party of China pursued a policy of confiscating landlord lands and distributing them among peasants in areas liberated from the Kuomintang. During the war with Japan, the Communist Party changed this policy and began implementing a policy of reducing rent and interest on debts. Landowners were forbidden to evict peasants from the land upon the expiration of the lease term. Thus, the exploitation of peasants by landlords and kulaks was merely limited, not destroyed.

After the end of the war with Japan, the democratic authorities of the liberated areas, under the leadership of the Communist Party, carried out an additional series of measures that further weakened feudal oppression and land hunger in the countryside. The democratic authorities confiscated all lands of the Japanese and their minions where confiscation had not yet been carried out, and transferred them to landless and land-poor peasants. As a result, the peasants received a large amount of land. Suffice it to say that, for example, in Manchuria, about 50% of all land was in the hands of the Japanese and their puppets.

Along with land confiscation, a so-called "reckoning campaign" against landlords and kulaks was carried out in the liberated areas. Landlords and kulaks who during the war did not reduce rent and interest and continued to brutally exploit

the peasants had to pay them appropriate compensation. Practically, the "reckoning campaign" manifested itself in the confiscation of a portion of land from a significant number of large landowners, which was then transferred to the peasants.

After the Kuomintang, together with reactionary US circles, unleashed the civil war, the Communist Party of China transitioned in the liberated areas to a policy of a full-scale offensive against landlord-kulak elements. Under the banner of the agrarian revolution, it began to rouse the broad masses of the peasant population to fight for the complete and final abolition of feudal and semi-feudal exploitation. In September 1947, a nationwide agrarian conference convened by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China took place. On October 10, 1947, the Central Committee of the Communist Party adopted the "Draft Agrarian Law of China," which was submitted for review to local democratic governments, peasant congresses, and executive committees. These bodies were entrusted with developing specific methods for implementing the land law and carrying out radical democratic transformations of agrarian relations.

The agrarian law provided for the abolition of the feudal land tenure system, the annulment of land rights of landlords, monasteries, temples, schools, and various organizations, and the liquidation of all debts incurred by peasants prior to the reform. According to this law, confiscated lands were to be transferred to the peasants, providing for a complete redistribution of land and its per capita distribution regardless of sex and age. Large tracts of forests, irrigation facilities, vast pastures, lakes, and large plots of wasteland passed into the

hands of the state and became all-people property. Livestock, agricultural equipment, buildings, food, and other property of landlords and kulaks were confiscated and transferred to the peasants. Soldiers and officers of the People's Liberation Army, as well as workers of state, party, and public organizations whose families live in the countryside, received land and property on an equal footing with peasants. The same rights were granted to the families of former soldiers and officers of the Kuomintang army and Kuomintang officials who went over to the side of the democratic power and reside in the countryside. The only persons who did not receive land were those who actively collaborated with the Japanese occupiers and the puppet governments set up by them, reactionary landlords and representatives of monopolistic comprador capital, as well as those who actively participated in the civil war on the side of the reactionary camp.

In carrying out the agrarian reform, the Communist Party of China established the necessity of strictly adhering to the principle of equal distribution of land and property among all peasants. The implementation of the principle of equal land tenure was a radical measure of the land reform to liquidate feudalism and its remnants in China. Being a bourgeois-democratic measure, equal land tenure cannot close the path to the differentiation of the peasantry and the enrichment of its bourgeois-kulak strata. In his report at a meeting of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party on December 25, 1947, Mao Zedong defined the agrarian policy of the Communist Party as follows: "Our line is to rely on the poor peasantry, maintain a solid alliance with the middle peasant,

and destroy the system of feudal and semi-feudal exploitation created by the landlord class and rich peasants of the old type." Over the course of two years, more than 100 million Chinese peasants received land. In those areas where agrarian reform had not yet been implemented and landlord landownership had not been liquidated (provinces of Central and South China), democratic organs of power prohibited the collection of rent exceeding 33% of the gross crop harvest, as well as interest on peasant loans exceeding 10% per annum.

In areas where agrarian reform has been carried out, the majority of the rural population consists of middle peasants; a significant portion of them received land not so long ago. Poor peasants and farm laborers endowed with land receive means of production from the democratic authorities—seeds, agricultural implements, draft power, fertilizers, etc.—either at the expense of distributed landlord property or in the form of interest-free or preferential loans in kind or in money.

In many villages, voluntary labor mutual-aid teams began to be organized to collectively cultivate the plots of each team member. Army units provide assistance to such teams. Local organs of power also help peasants build and restore irrigation facilities, wells, etc.

In a significant territory of the newly liberated areas, agrarian reform is not yet being implemented. To carry it out in accordance with the instructions of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, it is necessary that:

people's power has been established in these areas and the leading role of the working class and its party is ensured;

military operations are not being conducted nearby;

the majority of the farm laborer and poor peasant population of the given area's countryside has voted voluntarily for the implementation of agrarian reform.

Agrarian reform encounters strong resistance from feudal-landlord and kulak elements who attempt to disrupt its implementation through conspiracies and murders, and by sending agents and provocateurs into reform areas. In the struggle against reactionary elements in the Chinese countryside, new production relations are taking shape that promote the rapid rise of the country's agriculture and the improvement of the material position of the peasantry. It is especially important that the Chinese peasant is freed from oppressive tenancy, which deprived him of 50 to 70% of the harvest, and from usurious loan interest. For the first time, he has begun to work for himself and physically feels the fruits of his labor.

Agrarian reform strengthened the alliance of the working class and peasantry, mobilizing the peasantry to fight for higher crop yields, the reclamation of virgin lands, the expansion of irrigated fields, and the growth of livestock herds. According to the Chinese press, in 1948 Manchurian peasants reclaimed about 500,000 hectares of virgin land and increased the area of irrigated land by 130,000 hectares. Food crop yields in Manchuria rose from 730,000 tons in 1947 to 11,870,000 tons

in 1948. However, in 1948 the harvest reached only 80% of the pre-war level. Seeking to increase yields, Manchurian peasants increased the sown area by 13% in 1949. According to local authorities' estimates, the additional food crop harvest this year will be at least 1,800,000 tons. Yield increases are facilitated by the work of demonstration stations that apply agricultural machinery and create experimental, model fields. The democratic authorities of Manchuria pay great attention to expanding crops of cotton, ramie, and other industrial crops.

In the liberated areas, industrial, transport, agricultural, and other enterprises belonging to the Kuomintang elite and Chinese monopolies have been confiscated for the benefit of the state. Workers enthusiastically restore destroyed industrial enterprises and transport, raising labor productivity. Overcoming immense difficulties (shortages of equipment, lack of qualified technical and working personnel), the democratic authorities are restoring industrial production. The work of industry, transport, and communications is being rapidly established in the liberated areas. The workers of liberated China perform labor feats. Thus, in Changsha, workers saved 32 locomotives, 240 railcars, and 100 trucks from destruction and removal by Kuomintang troops. At the large Benxihu coal mine, workers hid and later handed over 247,000 machine parts and various valuable materials to the new administration. In Jinan, the capital of Shandong province, as a result of widely deployed socialist labor emulation, workers achieved great successes in a short time. In the Mukden district, the production plan of seven state textile enterprises for the first quarter of 1949 was overfulfilled by

40%. The metallurgical plant in Benxihu produced more output in the first half of 1949 than in 1945, and rail production exceeded the 1945 level by two times. Mukden's machine-building and chemical plants are working successfully. The metallurgical industry in Anshan has been restored. The sugar refinery in Acheng, 100 km from Harbin, processed 49,000 tons of sugar beets in 1948 and continues to operate successfully in 1949. The Harbin sugar refinery, destroyed by Japanese invaders, has been restored. Out of 21,000 km of railway tracks in liberated China, more than 17,000 km had already been restored by October 1, 1949. Postal and telegraph communications have been established.

The Communist Party of China fights to raise the material standard of living of working people, for the correct organization of wages, and against wage leveling between workers and engineering-technical personnel. Trade unions carry out extensive educational work among workers. The Communist Party strives to make trade unions a political and production school of people's democracy. The All-China Conference of Trade Union Activists held in Beijing from July 23 to August 16, 1949, devoted all its attention to the tasks of economic construction in the new China.

Vivid evidence of China's economic upswing is the development of trade. In many cities, in connection with the increased peasant demand for industrial goods and the growth of state large-scale and private small-scale and handicraft industry, trade has noticeably revived. The democratic authorities assist the development of private and cooperative trade and issue loans to merchants; at the same time, they wage

a decisive struggle against speculators. Old, depreciated Kuomintang money was withdrawn from circulation throughout the territory of the liberated areas and replaced by new currency issued by the People's Bank of China.

The improvement in the material position of the working people of democratic China is already reflected in the everyday life of the Chinese people. In particular, forced marriages and the buying and selling of girls have been banned.

The democratic power pays special attention to public education. As is known, the overwhelming majority of China's population is illiterate. The problem of public education is inextricably linked with the training of personnel—political, administrative, technical, and skilled workers—and with the enlightenment of the broad masses, drawing them into political life and participation in the building of people's democracy. A broad network of primary, secondary, and higher educational institutions was deployed in the liberated areas of China. One primary school was created in each village, one junior secondary school in each county, and one secondary school in each district. At the same time, a broad network of literacy schools and evening schools for adults, as well as various courses at enterprises to train skilled workers and employees, was deployed.

Thus, even before the proclamation of the People's Republic of China, important democratic reforms had been carried out in the previously liberated areas, laying the foundation for the regime of people's democracy.

The creation of the People's Republic of China and the approval of its program and organic law by the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference open up further prospects for China's democratic development. The program defines the character of the state system, the principles of state power organization, and the economic, cultural, national, and foreign policy of the republic. It establishes that the People's Republic of China exercises a people's democratic dictatorship led by the working class and based on the worker-peasant alliance. The primary task of the new power of the Chinese Republic is to successfully complete the struggle against imperialism, feudalism, and financial capital cliques.

At the session of the preparatory committee for convening the new Political Consultative Conference, Mao Zedong said: "I believe it is necessary here to draw the people's attention to the fact that the imperialists and their running dogs—the Chinese reactionaries—will not reconcile themselves to their defeat in China. They will cooperate with each other and try to use all possible means to struggle against the Chinese people."[176] Numerous facts confirm these words. Chiang Kai-shek is attempting to save the reactionary bloc from final collapse. US ruling circles decided to grant the Chiang Kai-shek clique another $75 million. Plans for a new intervention in Chinese affairs are being drafted in MacArthur's headquarters. American imperialists are blockading the ports of the People's Republic of China. American missions and espionage nests of American intelligence show great activity in a number of

---

[176] *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy!*, July 1, 1949

Chinese cities. The Common Program of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference establishes that the Central People's Government must carry the people's liberation war through to complete victory, liberate the entire territory of the country, and finally unify China. The newspaper *Dongbei Ribao* (Sept 3, 1949) wrote: "The Chinese People's Liberation Army must liberate the entire territory of China, including Tibet, Xinjiang, Hainan Island, and Formosa, allowing not a single inch of Chinese soil to remain outside the sovereignty of the People's Republic of China."

According to the Common Program, all privileges of imperialist countries in China are annulled, big capital is confiscated, and the feudal and semi-feudal landownership systems are transformed into a system of peasant landownership. All democratic rights and freedoms are granted to the people. Only the people exercising the people's democratic dictatorship have the right to vote. Reactionaries—landlords, representatives of the monopoly capital of the "four families," and capitalists in general—are deprived of the right to vote.

The basis of Chiang Kai-shek's reactionary power was the monopoly capital of the "four families," which over twenty years of their rule concentrated in their hands $10–20 billion in capital, over 80% of all banking capital in the 15 provinces of Kuomintang China, forest tracts, major processing and mining enterprises, military industry, foreign and domestic trade, and insurance and savings operations. They thus monopolized the country's most important economic levers.

Being closely tied to foreign imperialism and the landlord class, monopoly capital strangled the petty and middle bourgeoisie. That is why the petty and middle bourgeoisie, being, in Mao Zedong's words, the real national bourgeoisie, can participate in the people's democratic revolution.

The Common Program grants women equal rights with men in political, economic, cultural, and social life, as well as in the sphere of education. The feudal system—which placed women in a slave-like position and created conditions for their brutal exploitation—and discrimination in all spheres of life are abolished.

The program proclaims the equality of all nationalities in China. There are up to 50 million non-Chinese nationalities in the country, living mainly in the borderlands of China. These include numerous ethnic groups inhabiting Xinjiang, Tibet, Inner Mongolia, Manchuria, and the provinces of Sikang, Qinghai, Yunnan, Guizhou, and others. The Kuomintang reactionary government pursued a policy of chauvinism, driving ethnic groups from their lands and ruthlessly exploiting them.

The Common Program establishes that the People's Republic of China must become a stronghold of brotherhood and cooperation among all nationalities inhabiting it, and declares a struggle against great-power nationalism and chauvinism, and against discrimination and sowing division among various nationalities. In areas where national minorities predominate, local autonomy is granted to them; they enjoy the freedom to develop their dialects and languages, and to preserve or change their customs, traditions, and religious beliefs.

The supreme organ of legislative state power is the All-China People's Assembly, elected through universal elections. Until the convocation of the All-China People's Assembly, its functions are exercised by the People's Political Consultative Conference, formed from representatives of parties and groups of the Chinese people belonging to China's united front. Local organs of state power will be elected through universal elections to local people's assemblies. Elections will be held after the cessation of military operations and the completion of agrarian reform. Until then, military control by the People's Liberation Army is exercised in all newly liberated areas following the liquidation of Kuomintang reactionary organs of power.

A special section of the program is devoted to military organization; it provides for strengthening the national defense of the People's Republic of China, the political education of commanders and fighters in a revolutionary, patriotic spirit, and preparations for introducing universal compulsory military service.

A prominent place in the program is occupied by the section on China's economic policy. The main economic task of the people's democratic revolution is the liquidation of the economic foundations of domination by landlords and big capital, which serve as the mainstay and allies of foreign capital. The confiscation of all property belonging to the Kuomintang elite and big capital in general constitutes an important revolutionary measure laying the foundations of socialist construction. The section on China's economic policy establishes that the main principle of the republic's economic

construction is the creation of an industrial, prosperous, and independent China. It is emphasized that the primary and necessary condition for developing the productive forces of city and countryside is the implementation of land reform in the country. The program formulates the general principle of land reform: "Land belongs to those who till it." The reform is carried out on the basis of a law drafted at a special agrarian conference in September 1948. The economic part of the Common Program outlines the development of democratic China along the path to socialism.

The main provisions of the program in the sphere of economic policy proceed from the existence of five main economic sectors in contemporary China: 1) state (socialist), 2) cooperative (semi-socialist), 3) private peasant and handicraft (small-commodity), 4) private capitalist, and 5) state-capitalist.

The basis of public economy, according to the Common Program, is the state economy sector, which has a socialist character. The development of this sector is the most important task of the People's Republic. All state-owned resources and enterprises "are the main material base of the People's Republic in developing production and creating a prosperous economy, and the leading force of the entire public economy." The small-property peasant and handicraft sector encompasses 80% of China's population. The private capitalist sector, although economically weak, nevertheless encompasses significant masses of the petty and middle bourgeoisie both in cities and in the villages of China. Thus, in Mukden there are 22,000 small and medium traders and industrialists, in Beijing 50,000, in Shanghai 100,000, in Harbin there are 15,000 small private

industrial and over 1,000 commercial enterprises, in Jilin about 4,000, etc. The state-capitalist sector presupposes the cooperation of private capital with state enterprises, joint management of enterprises with the state, and the leasing of state enterprises and state-owned resources to private entrepreneurs.

At present, China's industry is still very weakly developed. Industrial production does not even exceed 10% of China's total output. Therefore, the Chinese people face the problem of the country's industrialization. The program sets the people's government the task of rendering all-around assistance to the development of state, cooperative, and private enterprises alike that benefit the cause of national welfare and the well-being of the people.

Without industrialization, China will not be able to achieve economic independence and genuine sovereignty, nor will it be able to move along the path to socialism. The Common Program outlines that the central government must draw up a general plan in the shortest possible time for the restoration and development of the main branches of state and private economy, and determine the scope of both its own activities and those of local organs of power in the field of economic construction. The plan outlines the implementation of major measures in agriculture, in particular the restoration of irrigation facilities, an increase in fertilizer production, the improvement of agricultural implements, and the execution of preventive measures against flood and drought. In industry, attention is drawn to the restoration and development of heavy industry—mining, metallurgy, energy, machine building,

electrical engineering, and basic chemical industries. Further, the most important tasks in the fields of transport and communications, trade, and finance are outlined. The article on state finances states that "a balanced budget will be gradually achieved, and capital will be accumulated for the development of production in the country." A system of worker participation in enterprise management is being introduced at all state enterprises. A system of collective agreements, fulfilled under trade union control, is being established at private enterprises.

The people's government's policy in the sphere of culture and education, as well as on the national question, is formulated in special sections of the program. The basis of foreign policy is the defense of independence and sovereignty, freedom and integrity of the country, support for universal peace and friendly cooperation with the peoples of all countries and first of all with the USSR, and an irreconcilable struggle against the imperialist policy of aggression and war.

Of particularly vital importance for China are fraternal relations with the Soviet Union, which heads the camp of democracy and socialism. The Soviet people harbor warm feelings of friendship toward the Chinese people. They have proved this friendship in deeds. The USSR is the first power in the world to have concluded an equal treaty with China. Soviet troops crushed Japanese imperialists and thereby liberated the Chinese people from their most dangerous enemy.

"...truth and justice," Comrade Stalin said, "are entirely on the side of the Chinese revolution. That is why we sympathize and will sympathize with the Chinese revolution in its struggle to liberate the Chinese people from the yoke of the imperialists

and to unite China into a single state."[177] The USSR is the first state to recognize the People's Republic of China.

The formation of the People's Republic of China and the decision of the Soviet government on its recognition were met with enthusiasm not only by the multi-million working population of people's democratic China, not only by all democratic countries, but also by progressive people throughout the world. It is not for nothing that the imperialists and other reactionaries are raging. It is not for nothing that the hardened warmonger Churchill regarded the victories of the Chinese people as a catastrophe, as the greatest disaster since the end of the Second World War. The formation of the People's Republic of China is a disaster for the imperialists and a major victory in the struggle for peace, socialism, and democracy.

Questions of Economics, No.11, 1949.

[177] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, Vol. 7, pp. 293–294

V. Vasilyeva

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

The activities of the great leaders of the world proletarian revolution, V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin, are closely connected with the theoretical elaboration of the national-colonial question and the resolution of the problems of the national-colonial revolution. The foundations of the Leninist-Stalinist national policy are internationalism, international proletarian solidarity, the free and equal existence and development of nations, and the liberation of peoples oppressed by imperialism. Lenin and Stalin's elaboration of these crucial issues is a model of creative Marxism.

The Leninist-Stalinist doctrine of the national-colonial revolution represents immense ideological wealth and an invaluable contribution to Marxist theory, strategy, and tactics of the national-colonial movement. It served as an effective and most powerful weapon of Bolshevism in the struggle for the liberation of the peoples of Russia from national oppression. This mighty weapon was forged in the struggle against great-power chauvinism and bourgeois nationalism, against Russian and international opportunists, and above all against the Austrian Social Democrats, who separated the solution of the national question from the proletarian revolution.

The works of Lenin and Stalin on national-colonial questions are of world-historic significance. More than forty years have passed since the publication of some of these works, yet they

continue to remain vitally important and relevant today. They are of colossal significance for the peoples of those countries where the yoke of imperialism has not yet been overthrown, for the peoples of those countries that are breaking away or have already broken away from the capitalist system by revolutionary means, and for the peoples of all countries where the national question has not yet been resolved. The national policy of the Soviet State, which ensured the fraternal friendship of the peoples of the multinational Soviet Union, was and is based on the Leninist-Stalinist doctrine on the national question. Comrade Stalin also brilliantly developed the theory of the national question as applied to the conditions of the country of victorious socialism and the transition from socialism to communism.

The Leninist-Stalinist theory of the national-colonial question has struck and continues to strike a crushing blow against the ideology of bourgeois nationalism. The bourgeoisie and its right-socialist lackeys not only do not seek a solution to the national question, but further fan interethnic discord in order to strengthen the national-colonial yoke of imperialism. Based on the principles of proletarian internationalism, the Leninist-Stalinist theory has armed communist parties, all revolutionary fighters, and all working people of capitalist, colonial, and semi-colonial countries for the struggle to destroy imperialist oppression, for the freedom of peoples, and for their equal, independent, and sovereign existence and development.

The national-colonial question is an integral part of the general question of the working class's struggle for the overthrow of imperialism, for the proletarian revolution, for the dictatorship

of the proletariat, and for socialism. "Previously," said Comrade Stalin, "the national question was considered reformistically, as a separate, independent question, disconnected from the general question of capital power, of the overthrow of imperialism, of the proletarian revolution. It was tacitly assumed that the victory of the proletariat in Europe is possible without a direct alliance with the liberation movement in the colonies, that the resolution of the national-colonial question can be carried out quietly, 'spontaneously,' apart from the high road of the proletarian revolution, without a revolutionary struggle against imperialism. Now this anti-revolutionary point of view must be considered exposed. Leninism has proved, and the imperialist war and revolution in Russia have confirmed, that the national question can be resolved only in connection with and on the basis of the proletarian revolution, that the path of victory for the revolution in the West runs through a revolutionary alliance with the liberation movement of the colonies and dependent countries against imperialism. The national question is part of the general question of the proletarian revolution, part of the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat"[178].

The close dependence and interconnection between the struggle of the proletariat of capitalist countries and the national liberation movement in colonies impart strength and might to the entire revolutionary movement as a whole. The oppressed peoples of colonies, semi-colonies, and dependent countries, as well as the oppressed national minorities in capitalist countries, are a powerful, inexhaustible reserve and

---

[178] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 6, p. 141.

ally of the revolutionary proletariat. The interests of the international revolutionary movement demand that the advanced and battle-tested revolutionary proletariat of capitalist countries render aid and support to the national liberation movement of colonial peoples, striving to make the fullest possible use of this most important reserve of theirs.

Internationalism is the basis of the international proletarian movement and its constituent part—the national liberation struggle. Bonds of fraternal solidarity unite the struggling peoples of the colonies with the proletariat of the metropoles and with the entire international working movement in the struggle against capitalist exploitation, for the overthrow of the domination of imperialism, which is inevitably bound up with the consolidation and spread of the most barbaric forms of social, racial, and national oppression. The Bolshevik Party has always educated the working class in the spirit of class international solidarity. International Marxist-Leninist workers' organizations are a school of class solidarity: they educate workers and draw them into the single mainstream of the mighty revolutionary movement.

Comrade Stalin wrote: "...workers are interested in the complete amalgamation of all their comrades into a single international army, in their prompt and final liberation from the spiritual bondage of the bourgeoisie, in the full and free development of the spiritual forces of their brothers, to whatever nation they may belong.

Therefore, workers are fighting and will fight against the policy of national oppression in all its forms, from the most subtle to

the crudest, as well as against the policy of instigation in all its forms.

Therefore, the Social Democracy of all countries proclaims the right of nations to self-determination".

Lenin and Stalin always pointed to the revolutionary forces and possibilities of the peoples of colonies and semi-colonies awakening to political life. At the Second All-Russian Congress of Communist Organizations of the Peoples of the East, held in Moscow in November 1919, Lenin, characterizing the upsurge of the struggle of the working people of Western countries against imperialists and exploiters, said: "The same thing will happen in the East. We know that the masses of the East will rise as independent participants, as creators of a new life, because hundreds of millions of this population belong to dependent, disenfranchised nations that have hitherto been objects of international policy, that for capitalist culture and civilization existed only as fertilizer material"[179].

Lenin's brilliant foresight has been fully justified. A powerful national-liberation movement of unprecedented strength and scope engulfed the majority of peoples oppressed by imperialism after the Second World War. The colonial system of imperialism is experiencing an acute crisis. Colonial empires created over centuries are collapsing. A new world of free peoples of the East is being born. Following the peoples liberated by the Russian working class during the Great October Socialist Revolution and incorporated into the Soviet

[179] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. XXIV, p. 549.

Union, the Mongolian people, relying on the support of the world's first state of the victorious proletariat, created a People's Republic and, bypassing the capitalist path of development, entered the broad road of building the foundations of socialism. As a result of the world-historic victory of the Soviet Union in the Second World War, thanks to the defeat of imperialist Japan by the Soviet armed forces and the support of the USSR, the great Chinese people won their freedom and independence, creating a state of people's democracy. The Korean people, liberated by the Soviet Army from Japanese imperialism, created the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. All these countries belong to the mighty camp of peace, democracy, and socialism, headed by the great Soviet Union. They have embarked on the path of socialist reorganization of their lives. The peoples of the East who have liberated themselves or are liberating themselves from the yoke of imperialism are following the path of proletarian internationalism.

The peoples of Vietnam, Indonesia, Malaya, Burma, and other countries are fighting with weapons in hand for their national liberation. The Soviet Union is a powerful pillar and reliable ally of the working people of colonial countries in their struggle for the destruction of colonial slavery, a mighty stronghold of the national independence of all peoples, large and small. In the victories of the Soviet Union, the oppressed peoples see the guarantee of their liberation. Expressing the true feelings of the peoples of his country, Amir Sharifuddin, former Prime Minister of the Indonesian Republic, treacherously murdered by a clique of Indonesian bourgeois

nationalists, said: "The USSR is our hope." "We have seen," stated Luis Taruk, leader of the Hukbalahap Philippine partisan organization, "what Soviet policy is regarding the peoples of Asia. The USSR is the sole country that has consistently fought for the interests of the Indonesian People's Republic, Vietnam, and other colonial peoples... The Soviet Union is a friend of the Filipinos."

Agents of imperialism—bourgeois nationalists and other reactionaries and traitors of all stripes in capitalist, colonial, and dependent countries—want to turn the liberation struggle of the peoples onto the path of agreement with imperialism, onto the path of national treason and betrayal. The social-imperialism of the current so-called "socialist" governments of Western European countries is based on the system of bribing the labor aristocracy, the top crust of "socialist" parties and trade unions at the expense of colonial super-profits. The right-wing socialists of France, the English Labourites, "socialists" of other Western European countries who have attained power and become participants in the exploitation of colonial peoples are now the watchdogs of imperialism and act as gendarmes and stranglers of the freedom not only of "their own" but also of foreign, colonial peoples.

Just as the "socialist" Ramsay MacDonald, who twice headed the Labour government, ruthlessly suppressed the national liberation movement in the colonies, so now, by order of the "socialists" Bevin and Attlee, the blood of colonial peoples is flowing. The Labour leaders act as the most active agents of the imperialist policy of suppressing the national liberation movement, the policy of colonial exploitation of the peoples of

dependent and colonial countries. The criminal actions of the Labour government of England in Indonesia and Vietnam will forever enter the history of English Labourism as one of its blackest and most shameful pages. The French Minister of Colonies, "socialist" Moutet, and former French Premier "socialist" Ramadier ignited the colonial war against the Republic of Vietnam. It is they, the French social-traitors, who sent troops to suppress the Malagasy insurgents, to exterminate peaceful residents in Madagascar. Such is the current openly imperialist colonial policy of the social-traitors.

The national-reformists of the colonies and semi-colonies, exponents of the interests of the big national bourgeoisie who have crossed over to the camp of imperialism, are agents of the policy of American imperialism at the present stage, which is striving to establish its world domination, as well as of English imperialism.

Now, more than ever before, it has become obvious that the question of the progressive character of this or that movement, the question of the devotion of this or that party to the cause of the liberation of its country, is determined by its attitude towards the USSR. The path of the struggling colonial peoples is only together with the USSR, with the international working-class movement, together with the camp of democracy and socialism headed by the Soviet Union.

The Great October Socialist Revolution opened a new epoch in the history of all mankind—the epoch of proletarian revolutions in imperialist countries, the epoch of colonial revolutions carried out in the oppressed countries of the world in alliance with the proletariat, under the leadership of the

proletariat. The creation and consolidation of the USSR proved to be proof of the greatest strength and vitality of the Leninist-Stalinist doctrine on the socialist revolution. Having overthrown the landowners and capitalists, the October Revolution smashed the chains of national-colonial oppression and liberated from it all without exception the oppressed peoples of the vast state. "A characteristic feature of the October Revolution," pointed out Comrade Stalin, "is the fact that it carried out these national-colonial revolutions in the USSR not under the flag of national enmity and inter-ethnic clashes, but under the flag of mutual trust and fraternal rapprochement of the workers and peasants of the peoples of the USSR, not in the name of nationalism, but in the name of internationalism"[180].

The implementation of the Leninist-Stalinist theory of the national-colonial question was of immense importance for the victory of the October Revolution. It ensured the participation of many millions of peoples of various nationalities in the struggle on the side of the revolution. The Russian working class, led by the Bolshevik Party, rallied around itself all the peoples oppressed by tsarism, making them an effective revolutionary force in the struggle against autocracy and imperialism, for the creation of a durable multinational socialist state based on the indestructible friendship of the peoples constituting a single fraternal family.

The victory of the proletarian revolution and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia provided all the

---

[180] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 10, p. 243.

necessary prerequisites for the revolutionary resolution of the national question and at the same time put forward new tasks in the sphere of the national-colonial question. The "Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia," written by Comrade Stalin and published on November 16, 1917, under the signatures of Lenin and Stalin, proclaimed the equality and sovereignty of the peoples of Russia, as well as their right to free self-determination up to secession and the formation of independent states. This historic document was aimed above all at involving all the numerous peoples inhabiting our country in the struggle to retain and strengthen the power of the proletariat, to build socialism, and to eliminate the actual inequality of various nationalities that had developed as a result of their historical development and tsarist oppression. The work of the party and the leader of its national policy, Comrade Stalin, who headed the People's Commissariat for Nationalities until 1923, was directed toward fulfilling these tasks. Comrade Stalin put forward a broad program of measures aimed at eliminating the economic and cultural backwardness of the peoples oppressed by tsarism. In his report on the immediate tasks of the party on the national question at the 10th Congress of the RCP(b) in March 1921, Comrade Stalin said that "the essence of the national question in the RSFSR is to destroy that actual backwardness (economic, political, cultural) of certain nations which they inherited from the past, to enable the backward peoples to catch up with central Russia in state, cultural, and economic respects"[181].

---

[181] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 5, p. 39.

Extremely backward national republics embarked on the path of socialist construction, bypassing the capitalist stage. The October Revolution created the prerequisites for their successful economic development. The socialist national economy and the transformation of the means of production into public property made it possible to transition to the planning of the national economy of both the entire country as a whole and of each individual republic and region making up the Soviet Union. In his brilliant works, Comrade Stalin indicated the ways of building socialism in the Soviet national republics, the ways of incorporating them into the general plan of union construction, taking into account the specifics of the economy, culture, daily life, and historical development of these republics.

The Bolshevik Party, putting into practice the Leninist-Stalinist national policy, solved the national problem within the vast multinational country and transformed tsarist Russia—the prison of peoples—into a fraternal socialist family of free peoples. In the Soviet Union, in this voluntary union of republics, national and racial discrimination has been eliminated. The Stalin Constitution consolidated and guaranteed all the peoples of the Land of Soviets the opportunity for rapid development towards communism. Under the leadership and with the assistance of the great Russian people, the formerly oppressed peoples of the outskirts of tsarist Russia traversed the path from monstrous backwardness and ignorance to a socialist economy, to an unprecedented upsurge in the economy, and to the flourishing of culture, socialist in content, national in form. Year after year, the

number of factories and plants increases, and the material well-being and cultural level of the working people inhabiting the numerous Soviet national republics rise.

In his brilliant work "Marxism and the National Question," written in late 1912 – early 1913 and still serving as a program and guide to action both for peoples fighting for their liberation from the yoke of capital and for peoples building socialism and communism, as well as in his other works, Comrade Stalin pointed out that the regime of the dictatorship of the proletariat is the sole regime capable of solving the national question, i.e., a regime capable of creating conditions ensuring peaceful cohabitation and fraternal cooperation of various nationalities and tribes. The resolution of the national question in the USSR is one of the greatest achievements of our epoch. National oppression, which existed for centuries, has been replaced by the great friendship of equal, sovereign peoples, which was tempered even more firmly during the years of the Great Patriotic War.

Comrade Stalin created the sole scientific, Marxist-Leninist theory of the nation, exposing the opportunism and lifelessness of the schemes of the Austrian Social Democrats. The Austrian Social Democrats, the Bundists, and the Mensheviks gave a false concept of the nation as an aggregate of people united by a community of character, disconnected from any territory, and preached the platform of "cultural-national autonomy." This opportunist and extremely dangerous platform for the working movement of "cultural-national autonomy"—that is, the right of a nation to solve only questions concerning cultural life—removed the question of the class struggle and was aimed at

severing the proletariat from the struggle against capital; it chattered about "harmony of class interests" and proposed to realize "freedom of nationalities" not bound to specific regions. This rotten stance disunited the proletariat of various nations, bound the working class and working people of various nationalities to the "domestic" bourgeoisie, and was in reality an expression of extreme bourgeois nationalism. "Bauer's point of view," Comrade Stalin pointed out, "which identifies a nation with national character, tears the nation away from the soil and turns it into some invisible, self-sufficient force. The result is not a nation, living and acting, but something mystical, elusive, and otherworldly"[182].

The Leninist-Stalinist doctrine on the nation, created back in the pre-October period and smashing the idealistic "theory of the nation" preached by the Austro-Marxists, acquired exceptional significance in the post-October period and especially during the years of the Second World War and after its conclusion, when the ideologues of the imperialist bourgeoisie, heading towards its demise, most zealously began to spread all sorts of rotten racial, misanthropic ideas. The racial ravings of fascism and the misanthropy of the new edition of racism currently preached by Anglo-American imperialists are incomparably more reactionary and aggressive in their essence than the notorious "theory of the nation" of the Austrian "socialists"; they are also built on the anthropological elements of "racial blood" and "racial soul" and set themselves the goal of "justifying" the domination of imperialists, of

[182] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 2, p. 301.

"special chosen nations," over weak peoples lagging behind in their development.

The imperialists of the USA and England are pursuing a policy of oppressing peoples throughout the capitalist world. Their standard-bearers, trying in every way to "justify" racial and national inequality, have launched a campaign against national sovereignty under the flag of cosmopolitanism. To "justify" the preparation of a new war waged by American and English imperialists, the worst enemies of humanity, they preach old, decrepit, fascist "ideas" of opposing nations and the domination of some nations over others, of subjecting peoples to the new pretender to world domination—American imperialism.

Comrade Stalin exposed the misanthropic racial theory of the German fascist obscurantists. After the Second World War, he smashed the racial ravings of the Anglo-American imperialists. Comrade Stalin showed with exhaustive completeness that Churchill and his friends in England and the USA began the business of unleashing a new war by proclaiming racial theory, i.e., they are following in the footsteps of the Hitlerites. "The German racial theory led Hitler and his friends to the conclusion that Germans, as the only full-fledged nation, must dominate other nations. The English racial theory leads Mr. Churchill and his friends to the conclusion that nations speaking the English language, as the only full-fledged ones, must dominate the remaining nations of the world.

In essence, Mr. Churchill and his friends in England and the USA present nations not speaking the English language with something like an ultimatum: recognize our domination

voluntarily, and then everything will be in order—otherwise, war is inevitable.

But nations shed blood for five years of a cruel war for the freedom and independence of their countries, and not so that the domination of the Hitlers might be replaced by the domination of the Churchills. It is quite probable, therefore, that nations not speaking the English language and constituting at the same time the vast majority of the world's population will not agree to go into slavery"[183].

Comrade Stalin gave a clear, classic definition of a nation: "A nation is a historically constituted, stable community of people, formed on the basis of a common language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up manifested in a community of culture"[184]. At the same time, Comrade Stalin emphasized that not a single one of the indicated features, taken separately, is sufficient to define a nation. Moreover, the absence of even one of these features is sufficient for a nation to cease being a nation.

Comrade Stalin showed the process of the formation of a nation as a historical category of a certain epoch. "...a nation, like any historical phenomenon," writes Comrade Stalin, "is subject to the law of change, has its own history, beginning and end." Nations took shape during the period of the development of capitalism, but there was a time when nations did not exist; just as a time will come when nations will not exist at all and mankind will merge in international unity.

---

[183] *Bolshevik*, No. 5, 1946, p. 2.

[184] Ibid., p. 296.

Comrade Stalin further showed how, as a result of the development of capitalism, the process of the formation of national and multinational states takes place, along with the origin of national oppression, which intensified especially in the epoch of imperialism, when "capitalism grew into a world system of colonial oppression and financial strangulation of the gigantic majority of the earth's population by a handful of 'advanced' countries"[185]. Colonial oppression and colonial exploitation are inherent in capitalism by its very nature. Imperialism has unprecedentedly intensified and increased the scale of this oppression and exploitation. Out of the two and a quarter billion population of the globe, the majority was doomed to severe colonial and semi-colonial oppression, to a semi-starved, beggarly, disenfranchised existence. In addition, within almost every capitalist country there are numerous small and large nationalities subjected to incredible economic and political oppression by the ruling nation.

It is precisely for this reason that the national question, or the question of the struggle against national inequality, against the domination of one nation over another, for an equal and independent existence, has grown into the national-colonial question—into the question of the struggle of the oppressed peoples of the world, the peoples of colonies and semi-colonies, for freedom and independence. The epoch of imperialism put the national-colonial question in the forefront of the national liberation struggle, since "the contradiction between the handful of ruling 'civilized' nations and hundreds

---

[185] Ibid., p. 297.

of millions of colonial and dependent peoples of the world" was increasingly exposed and aggravated, becoming one of the most important contradictions of the epoch of imperialism.

Comrade Stalin exposed the class essence of bourgeois national movements in oppressed countries. He exposed the attempts of the bourgeoisie to mask its class interests under the slogans of "unity of nations," "national traditions," and the like, and to subordinate the proletariat and all working people to itself.

To the "theory" of rampant bourgeois nationalism expressed in the platform of "national-cultural autonomy," Comrade Stalin opposed the Bolshevik principle of the right of nations to self-determination up to state secession[186]. This means that each nation, in accordance with its tasks and interests, decides the question of its state existence and has the right to state secession, to the formation of an independent state. But the question of secession, according to Stalinist doctrine, must be decided based on specific historical conditions and the practical necessity and expediency of the development of each nation. Secession may take place and may not take place, while the self-determination of nations is a mandatory condition for the Bolshevik resolution of the national question. "Inasmuch as the Soviet states federate on the basis of voluntariness, the right to secede remains unused by the will of the peoples themselves making up the RSFSR"[187]. Moreover, the friendship and cohesion of the Soviet national republics are growing ever stronger; not only do they not raise the question of seceding

---

[186] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 6, p. 73.

[187] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 5, p. 43.

from the single fraternal family of peoples forming the Soviet Union, but they are strengthening it increasingly, which answers their fundamental, vital interests. At the same time, the number of equal participants in this voluntary union is growing. New republics are flowing into the family of Soviet peoples, the previously severed Ukrainian and Belarusian peoples have been reunited, and year after year the might of the Land of Soviets grows.

In his work "The National Question and Leninism," written in 1929, Comrade Stalin raised the Marxist-Leninist theory of the nation to a new height. If before the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution only bourgeois nations existed, new, Soviet nations have formed within the Soviet state. Comrade Stalin called them socialist nations. "The working class and its internationalist party," wrote Comrade Stalin, "are the force that binds these new nations together and leads them. The alliance of the working class and the working peasantry within the nation for the liquidation of the remnants of capitalism in the name of the victorious building of socialism; the destruction of the remnants of national oppression in the name of equality and free development of nations and national minorities; the destruction of the remnants of nationalism in the name of establishing friendship between peoples and affirming internationalism; a united front with all oppressed and disenfranchised nations in the struggle against the policy of conquests and aggressive wars, in the struggle against imperialism—such is the spiritual and socio-political profile of these nations.

Such nations should be classified as socialist nations"[188].

The Bolshevik Party, on the basis of the Leninist-Stalinist national policy, practically combined the principle of the self-determination of nations, the full and comprehensive development of each nationality, taking into account all its national properties and features, with the principle of proletarian internationalism and the fraternal commonwealth of nations. In the Soviet Union, formerly backward nations have been raised to the level of advanced ones. As opposed to bourgeois nationalism and pernicious imperialist cosmopolitanism, which deny national differences, national culture, language, and national sovereignty, the Leninist-Stalinist theory of the national question proceeds from the necessity of the full and comprehensive development of the culture of peoples, socialist in content, national in form, and internationalist rallying, equality, and friendly cooperation of peoples.

In the Soviet Union, all conditions have been created for the comprehensive and full-fledged development of new, socialist nations. These nations are characterized, firstly, by profound internationalism, and secondly, by cohesion and friendship, moral-political unity, and mutual support, which has been brilliantly confirmed by the entire history of the existence of the Soviet Union.

Along with the process of rallying and strengthening socialist nations, the process of the disintegration of bourgeois nations in capitalist countries and the subjugation of entire countries

---

[188] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 11, p. 339.

and peoples to American imperialism is taking place. National contradictions and national discord are growing within each capitalist and colonial country; imperialists instigate one nation against another; bloody national conflicts are becoming more frequent in the colonies. The most striking example of this is India, where national and religious clashes are of an extremely acute character.

Comrade Stalin's doctrine on the nation is of world-historic significance. Most countries of the East are multinational states where the process of nation-formation is at various stages of development and where acute national discord, artificially fanned by the imperialists lording it over them, has always existed. The experience of solving the national question in the Soviet Union is truly invaluable both for the former colonial peoples who have freed themselves from imperialist oppression and for the peoples still fighting for their liberation.

The Great October Socialist Revolution exerted an immense revolutionizing impact on the peoples of colonial and dependent countries. In essence, there is not a single country in the world where the October Revolution has not caused a growth in political activity and the awakening of the broad masses of the people to political life. It instilled faith in the hearts of millions of working people in the possibility of victory over imperialism. The liberation movement, which had developed previously in many Eastern countries, intensified significantly and rose to a new stage. The Soviet Union became a guiding star for peoples fighting for their liberation, serving as an inspiring example for them.

From the very first days of its existence and throughout its entire history, the Soviet state has invariably and consistently supported and supports the struggle of all colonial and dependent peoples oppressed by imperialism for freedom and independence. Through numerous barriers and cordons, the truth about the Soviet Union reached and reaches the oppressed peoples—the truth that, having liberated the peoples oppressed by tsarism, Soviet power in its domestic and foreign policy implements the principles of the equality of races and nations, respect for the sovereignty and independence of peoples, recognition of the principle of self-determination up to secession, and the policy of democracy, peace, and international cooperation.

The Leninist-Stalinist policy of the Soviet state was a powerful revolutionizing factor in the struggle of colonial and semi-colonial peoples. Comrade Stalin wrote in 1923: "The slogan of the struggle for the liberation of nationalities, a slogan reinforced by such facts as the liberation of Finland, the withdrawal of troops from Persia and China, the formation of the Union of Republics, open moral assistance to the peoples of Turkey, China, Hindustan, Egypt—this slogan was first uttered by the lips of those who triumphed in the October Revolution. It cannot be called an accident that Russia, which previously served in the eyes of oppressed nationalities as the banner of oppression, has now turned, after becoming socialist, into the banner of liberation"[189]. It is no accident that the names of the great leaders of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the Soviet state, V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin, are now the most

[189] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 5, p. 347.

beloved names among the peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies, as well as among the peoples of all countries of the world.

As the might of the Soviet state grew, its role in the international arena and the significance of the moral support it renders to small and oppressed peoples also grew.

During the years of the Second World War, when the armies of fascist murderers and thugs fell upon humanity, striving everywhere to establish a predatory regime of enslavement and misanthropy, the Soviet Union acted as the liberator of peoples. Before the eyes of the peoples of the entire world, including colonies and dependent countries, the heroic Soviet people and their army crushed German fascism and Japanese imperialism. The majestic victory of the Soviet Union over fascism contributed to the rapid growth of the national self-awareness of peoples oppressed by imperialism, indicating to them their place in the general liberation struggle. These peoples closely linked their struggle against fascism with the anti-imperialist struggle for their liberation. The fall in the colonies of the prestige of imperialist metropoles—England, France, Holland —which retreated without a fight before the fascist aggressors, also contributed to the growth of the self-awareness of colonial peoples and the intensification of their liberation movement.

During the war years, the governments of colonial powers, in order to secure the support of the colonies, came forward with demagogic promises to grant oppressed peoples freedom and self-government. The USA promised independence to the Philippines; England—to India, Burma, Transjordan; Holland —to Indonesia, etc. However, after the end of the war, these

promises were quickly forgotten. As for the peoples of India, Transjordan, or the Philippines, the "independence" they received turned out to be fictitious, merely masking the same imperialist oppression and exploitation.

In the post-war period, the fundamental opposition between the policy of the socialist power and that of the imperialist powers regarding oppressed peoples manifested itself even more clearly. Reality quickly destroyed the illusions that colonial peoples associated with the creation of the United Nations. They hoped that this body would be able to curb the attempts of colonial powers to restore the old regime of oppression in the colonies and protect them from the aggressive policy of imperialist states, especially since the United Nations Charter included the requirement of equal rights and sovereignty of large and small nations. However, the bloc of colonial powers headed by the USA and England, relying on the voting machine obedient to them, achieves the resolution of colonial issues in its narrow selfish interests, striving to use the United Nations as a screen for creating alliances and blocs directed against peace and security, against the forces of democracy, and against peoples fighting for freedom.

This aggressive course is opposed by the policy of the Soviet Union, heading the camp of democracy and socialism, which defends the interests of universal peace and security, the sovereignty and freedom of all oppressed peoples. The Soviet government tirelessly and consistently exposes the policy of the imperialist bloc and stands up in defense of the Indonesian, Egyptian, Syrian, Lebanese, and other colonial and dependent peoples. Thanks to the support of the Soviet Union, whose

international significance has exceptionally increased as a result of its victory in the Second World War, and thanks to its consistent and deeply principled policy in the UN, direct assistance was rendered to a number of colonial countries.

Colonial peoples are increasingly convinced that "the existence of capitalism without national oppression is just as unthinkable as the existence of socialism without the liberation of oppressed nations, without national freedom"[190].

They know about the speeches of USSR representatives in the United Nations. These speeches reach the most remote corners of the globe and find sincere gratitude from oppressed peoples for their decisive support of their liberation struggle. The enemies of the Soviet Union, the enemies of peace and democracy, trying to undermine the growing sympathies of colonial peoples for the USSR, raise a frantic howl, falsely depicting the broadening popular liberation struggle as "communist conspiracies," "intrigues of Moscow," etc.

However, contrary to the policy of the imperialists, the very fact of the existence of the mighty state of victorious socialism, its invariable and consistent defense of oppressed peoples and support of their struggle for independence and freedom inspire colonial peoples and raise them to the fight. "Shaking imperialism, the October Revolution at the same time created in the person of the first proletarian dictatorship a powerful and open base of the world revolutionary movement, which it never had before and upon which it can now rely. It created that powerful and open center of the world revolutionary movement

---

[190] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 5, p. 19.

which it never had before and around which it can now rally, organizing a single revolutionary front of proletarians and oppressed peoples of all countries against imperialism"[191]. The existence of this revolutionary center facilitates the struggle of colonial peoples for freedom and independence. They see and know what they must fight for and with whom they must go in this struggle.

As a result of the Second World War, a further aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism and a deepening of the crisis of the colonial system took place. The national liberation movement of the peoples of colonial and dependent countries rose to a new, higher stage.

The works of Lenin and Stalin indicate the main paths and perspectives of the national-colonial revolution, and provide a brilliant analysis of the conditions for its victory. The guiding directives of Lenin and Stalin on these issues are now being put into practice. In his works devoted to the development of the revolution in China, Comrade Stalin showed the struggle of two paths: the path of the national bourgeoisie, which at a certain stage of the movement betrays the united revolutionary front and the interests of its people, enters into an agreement with imperialism and fights alongside it against revolution, ending it with the establishment of the domination of capitalism; and the path of the proletariat, which pursues the goal of consolidating its hegemony and leading the millions of working masses behind it in order to overcome the resistance of the national bourgeoisie, achieve the victory of the anti-

---

[191] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 10, pp. 245–246.

feudal revolution, and gradually transfer it to the rails of the socialist revolution.

The question of the hegemony of the proletariat in the national liberation movement is the cornerstone of the Leninist-Stalinist doctrine of the national-colonial revolution, a decisive question both for the scale, direction, and content of the entire movement as a whole, and, of course, for its results. As early as 1920, Lenin pointed out that "at first the revolution in the colonies will not be communist, but if from the very beginning the communist vanguard stands at its head, the revolutionary masses will be led onto the correct path to achieving the set goal through the gradual acquisition of revolutionary experience"[192].

Historical experience, the experience of the Great October Socialist Revolution, has shown that the correct direction can be given to the masses only by a genuinely and thoroughly revolutionary class—the working class—and its vanguard—the Communist Party. Comrade Stalin teaches that "the proletariat cannot emancipate itself without emancipating the oppressed peoples." And further Comrade Stalin points out: "Precisely because the national-colonial revolutions took place with us under the leadership of the proletariat and under the banner of internationalism, precisely for this reason the pariah nations, the slave nations, rose for the first time in the history of mankind to the position of nations that are truly free and truly

[192] V. I. Lenin, *Works*, vol. XXV, p. 575.

equal, infecting the oppressed peoples of the whole world with their example"[193].

In the liberation movements of the peoples of many colonial and dependent countries, leadership at first belonged to the national bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie headed the united anti-imperialist front wherever it took shape, in order to direct the movement along the channel it needed, to decapitate it in the final analysis, and to use this movement for its narrow, class purposes. The history of the national liberation struggle of oppressed peoples is the history of the betrayal of the liberation movement by the national bourgeoisie, a chain of its treasons and collusion with the imperialists of the metropoles. In the initial stages of the liberation struggle, the working class was within the general mass of the struggling people and only gradually began to play an independent political role and increasingly came to the forefront of leading positions in this struggle. Before the Second World War, almost nowhere, with the exception of China, did the colonial proletariat yet occupy a leading place in the movement, nor was it its hegemon. After the war, a new, most significant and finally determined fact of the national liberation movement, a decisive guarantee of its success, is that the working class acts as the leading force of the liberation movement in most colonial countries. If earlier the young colonial working class led only separate battles, now in the majority of colonies, semi-colonies, and dependent countries it has become the hegemon in the nationwide struggle against imperialism, the standard-bearer of the struggle for the freedom and independence of its people. Led by communist

---

[193] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 10, p. 243.

parties, the working class is the most powerful and sole consistently revolutionary combat force of the anti-imperialist movement in the colonial world. In many colonial and semi-colonial countries, communist parties—the vanguard of the working class—have become the leading political force of the national liberation movement. They managed to unite and organize the struggling people on a nationwide scale, make their struggle more organized, set new goals for them, and lead them to the realization of these goals.

During the years of the upsurge of the national liberation movement caused by the victory of the October Revolution in Russia, the communist parties of colonies and dependent countries were still weak and inexperienced; in many states they were only then being born. The creation of communist parties was closely connected with the formation of the colonial working class, a strong impetus to which, as is known, was given by the First World War. Over the years between the two world wars, the communist parties of colonial countries grew significantly both quantitatively and organizationally and politically. They became more cohesive, the ideological and theoretical level of their cadres rose, and their political role in leading the national liberation movement strengthened. Communist parties absorbed the teaching of Lenin and Stalin, studied the experience of the great Communist Party—the party of the Bolsheviks—and turned into militant parties that traversed a difficult path of revolutionary tempering, acquiring the experience of struggle and leadership in mass battles, the experience of defeats and victories. Under their leadership, the

national liberation movement of colonial peoples rose to a higher stage.

Comrade Stalin in his scientific works and practical activity paid and pays enormous attention to the formation of communist parties in the countries of the East, to the elaboration of their strategy and tactics at various stages of the national liberation movement. Comrade Stalin especially emphasizes the necessity of taking comprehensive account of the specific features of each colonial country when elaborating the tactical line of communist parties. He points out that without taking into account certain tactical principles of Leninism, it is impossible to lead the revolution in colonial countries. "I have in mind such tactical principles of Leninism as:

a) the principle of the mandatory consideration of the nationally peculiar and nationally specific in each individual country;

b) the principle of the mandatory utilization by the communist party of each country of the slightest opportunity to provide the proletariat with a mass ally, even if temporary, shaky, unstable, unreliable;

c) the principle of the mandatory consideration of the truth that for the political education of millions of masses, propaganda and agitation alone are insufficient, that for this, the political experience of the masses themselves is necessary"[194].

---

[194] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 9, p. 331.

Based on the principles of the Leninist-Stalinist doctrine, the communist parties of the countries of the East elaborated their tactical line, mastered the mass movement, and led and lead the working class in its struggle to consolidate its hegemony in the liberation movement and push the national bourgeoisie out of leading positions. It was along this path that the glorious Chinese Communist Party successfully proceeded, under the leadership of which the Chinese people's democratic revolution won a world-historic victory. The struggle of the peoples of Indonesia, Indo-China for freedom, and a number of other actions of the popular masses in colonial countries also take place under the direct leadership of the working class and communist parties.

The Leninist-Stalinist theory of the national-colonial revolution teaches that a fundamental question of the possibility of the proletariat of the colonies exercising hegemony in the liberation movement is the question of the peasantry. The colonies are agrarian countries with the absolute predominance of the peasant population. A feature of the colonial peasantry is that in its overwhelming majority it has no land or almost no land. The central figure of the village in the colonies is the sharecropping tenant or the peasant owner of a tiny parcel who cannot feed the peasant and his family. Crushed by need, living semi-starved, the millions-strong peasantry is a natural ally of the proletariat in the liberation struggle. To an even greater degree, its ally is the numerous agricultural proletariat—the farm laborers. All these working strata, entangled by pre-capitalist survivals and crushed by usurious bondage, have a vital interest in radical transformations of the existing order, in

the agrarian revolution. They increasingly understand that the fulfillment of this task, the realization of their aspirations, is possible only in the struggle under the leadership of the proletariat. In the working class, the peasantry sees its leader and liberator.

The national bourgeoisie, for its part, also fights for the peasantry, hoping to use it in its class interests. But here is the weakest point of the colonial bourgeoisie. The unbearable exploitation of the colonial peasantry can be destroyed only through an agrarian revolution. Meanwhile, the bourgeoisie of China, India, and Egypt, by virtue of its direct interests, is so closely connected with landownership, with usurious capital, with the exploitation of the peasant masses in general, that it opposes not only the agrarian revolution, but also any decisive agrarian reform. It escapes—not without foundation—the realization that the mere open posing of the agrarian question will give an impetus to the revolutionary process of fermentation among the peasant masses and accelerate its pace. Thus, the reformist bourgeoisie can hardly make up its mind to approach this fundamental painful question in a practical way.

The struggle of the village workers for land, for human conditions of life and labor, for democratic freedoms merges into a single common stream of the liberation, anti-imperialist struggle of the colonial peoples, their struggle for national liberation, headed by the working class and its communist vanguard.

Comrade Stalin points out the possibility and necessity at certain stages of the revolution of creating a single national anti-imperialist front in the colonies. It is necessary, teaches

Comrade Stalin, to strictly distinguish "between revolution in imperialist countries, in countries oppressing other nations, and revolution in colonial and dependent countries, in countries suffering from the imperialist yoke of other states. Revolution in imperialist countries is one thing; there the bourgeoisie is the oppressor of other nations, there it is counter-revolutionary at all stages of the revolution, there the national element, as an element of liberation struggle, is absent. Revolution in colonial and dependent countries is something else; there the yoke of imperialism of other states is one of the factors of the revolution, there this yoke cannot but affect the national bourgeoisie as well, there the national bourgeoisie at a certain stage and for a certain period can support the revolutionary movement of its country against imperialism, there the national element, as an element of the struggle for liberation, is a factor of the revolution"[195].

The positions of the national bourgeoisie of the colonies and semi-colonies regarding imperialism, even at the initial stages of the development of the liberation movement, are not identical. Part of this bourgeoisie, the so-called comprador or intermediary bourgeoisie, directly serves the interests of imperialism. As for the national industrial bourgeoisie, especially the big bourgeoisie, it cannot but express its dissatisfaction with the policy of the imperialists, who are hindering in every way the development of productive forces in the colonies. As its role and significance in the process of industrial production increase and it takes an ever greater part in the exploitation of the colonial working class, its appetites

[195] J. V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 10, pp. 10–11.

grow. It would prefer to exploit the working class and working peasantry unshared by anyone else. But, firstly, the industrial bourgeoisie of the colonies is still weak, and secondly, it is beginning to experience an ever greater fear of the growing labor movement, of the liberation movement of the peoples in general. Inasmuch as it sees and knows that the anti-imperialist struggle is closely linked with the class struggle, which threatens it directly, it increasingly slides onto the positions of both economic and political cooperation with imperialism and betrayal of the national interests of its people.

A direct consequence of the Second World War, the victory of the Soviet Union over the fascist aggressors, post-war international political events, and above all the sharp strengthening of the camp of democracy and socialism, is that in the colonies and dependent countries the big national bourgeoisie, the upper strata of the military, various financiers and dealers—all these strata, following the feudals, landowners, and comprador bourgeoisie, have everywhere and finally crossed over to the camp of reaction and imperialism, constituting the stronghold of imperialism in the colonies and semi-colonies. Fear of losing their class privileges forces them to cede a significant part of the surplus value created by workers and to be satisfied with those handouts that imperialism throws at them with the aim of splitting the national front that formed during the war years in many colonial countries.

Now there is open treason and betrayal not only by the big bourgeoisie of India and the Kuomintang bourgeois reactionaries, but also by the bourgeoisie of the Philippines,

Indonesia, Burma, and a number of other colonies and semi-colonies. The big national bourgeoisie of many countries has traversed a rapid path of treason and betrayal of the national liberation movement. In many countries, such as India and Indonesia, it has already become an enemy of its peoples, no less, if not more cruel than the imperialist colonizers.

Marxism-Leninism teaches that the weak development of productive forces, foreign national oppression, as well as the presence of strong survivals of feudalism and pre-capitalist relations determine the character of the national-colonial revolution as an anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution, gradually growing into a socialist revolution. Under conditions of the deepening general crisis of capitalism, characterized by a sharp aggravation of all imperialist contradictions, including the contradictions between metropoles and colonial countries, the powerful scale of the national liberation movement and the victory of the national-colonial revolution in a number of countries, this revolutionary process is developing at an increasingly rapid pace.

The national liberation movement, which has risen to a new height as a result of the victories won by the Soviet Union in the Second World War and on the path of building a communist society, develops as a struggle for a people's democratic revolution in the colonies. This is facilitated by the successful experience of people's democratic construction in the Mongolian People's Republic, North Korea, and China. The slogan of the struggle for a new, people's democracy is becoming the most popular slogan of the national liberation movement in the colonies. People's democracy as a form of

power carrying out the functions of the dictatorship of the proletariat under modern conditions, under conditions when the great Soviet Union and the mighty camp of democracy and socialism exist, most fully corresponds to the transitional period to socialism.

It is precisely this form of power that fully corresponds to the interests of the broadest masses of the working people of the colonies. The anti-imperialist struggle, the struggle for people's democracy unites under the leadership of the working class the overwhelming majority of the people, including the petty bourgeoisie and individual strata of the middle bourgeoisie. People's democratic power wages a successful struggle for liberation from the imperialist yoke and carries out genuinely democratic transformations in economic life and the socio-political structure, creating all conditions for the transition to socialist construction. Thus, the people's democratic revolution in the colonies is primarily anti-imperialist and anti-feudal in character. But in the future, it undoubtedly grows into a socialist revolution. The pace of this growing over depends on the specific features of each colonial country. The stages and paths of this transition were basically formulated by Comrade Stalin in his well-known propositions on the development and prospects of the Chinese revolution.

The transitional period in colonial and semi-colonial countries from complete economic and financial bondage and enslavement to economic and political independence and freedom, to socialist construction, will undoubtedly be difficult and peculiar in each of these countries. It is determined by the combination of many political and economic factors, the

degree of industrial development, the level of consciousness and organization of the proletariat and its communist vanguard. A decisive and favorable factor facilitating the transition to socialist construction in the countries of people's democracy in the East, as in the West, is the existence, aid, and support of the great socialist state—the USSR—and the further strengthening of the democratic camp throughout the world. The experience of the Mongolian People's Republic and the Korean Democratic People's Republic shows that the direct assistance of the Soviet Union plays a decisive role in resolving the most acute problems arising in the process of development of states of people's democracy.

The brilliant doctrine of Lenin and Stalin on the national-colonial revolution arms the communist parties, the international proletariat, the peoples of colonial and dependent countries for the struggle against imperialism, for national and social emancipation, for independence.

"We had to fight," Mao Zedong wrote, "enemies inside the country and abroad, inside the party and outside it. We are grateful to Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, who gave us weapons. This weapon is not machine guns, but Marxism-Leninism... The cannon salvos of the October Revolution brought Marxism-Leninism to us. The October Revolution helped the progressive elements of the world and of China to apply the proletarian worldview to determine the fate of the country and review their own problems. To walk the path of the Russians—such was the conclusion"[196].

---

[196] *Pravda*, August 5, 1949.

The revolutionary events that unfolded after the Second World War in colonies and semi-colonies irrefutably show that the struggle of the oppressed peoples is proceeding under the banner of the great teaching of Lenin and Stalin.

Questions of Economics, No.12, 1949.